

Committee of Adjustment 1 Carden Street Guelph, ON NIH 3A1

May 5th, 2020

RE: PARKING VARIANCE FOR 25 WELLINGTON STREET WEST

Dear Committee of Adjustment Members

First of all, thank you for considering this unusually high request for a minor parking variance for 25 Wellington St West, We understand a variance of 8 parking spots from the required 51 requires further explanation which is why I am writing you this letter.

BACKGROUND

During the first six months of 2019, we embarked on an ambitious program of community conversations revolving around senior's housing, healthcare and their interconnectivity. Our initial discussions began with Gail Hoekstra of the Welcome-In Drop-In Centre and continued with Domininca McPherson of the Guelph & Wellington Task Force for the Elimination of Poverty as well as Maryanne Wilford and Ken Chupa of the GWSA. At the beginning of March, we hosted an informal gathering on the topic of Ageing Well in Guelph that included geriatric support workers from CMHA Waterloo Wellington, representatives from St. Joseph's Healthcare and County of Wellington Housing Representatives Paul Skinner and Michelle Shears. These collaborative sessions were followed up by several meetings with Dana Khan, Elizabeth Nieson and Ella Zarevich of the Waterloo Wellington LHIN/CCAC between March and June in addition to meetings with Janet Redman of Guelph Independent Living. Building on the ideas and discussions that emerged from these productive meetings, we have worked diligently to design a building that could serve the needs of the ageing population of Guelph; a facility where active, able bodied seniors can live downtown in close proximity to the medical community that supports an enriched quality of life. Our vision fills an identifiable gap for the senior who requires minor assistance to lead a fulfilling life but is not yet in need of the composite care of a retirement home or long term care facility. Our comprehensive concierge services, designed to support all aspects of wellness, will provide peace of mind for families and their loved ones.

THE SUITES AT ROYAL CITY PARK

With wellness in mind, our meetings with the LHIN focused on the opportunity to provide PSW support. This service would provide hands on assistance in the home to further support independent living and the opportunity to age well in the home and on one's

own terms. It is our hope that The Suites at Royal City Park, as the upper two floors will be known, will foster the growth of a vibrant, connected community that provides an alternative to seniors isolation and the associated comorbidities.

It is also our hope that this facility can fill this gap in the market for the most number of active seniors. The property currently has 16 suites per floor, or 32 Units combined on the 3rd and 4th floors. Our concept, however, requires a minimum of 2 units per floor to ensure the seniors engagement we seek to provide has space in which to work. Each floor will have a fitness room which will have weekly classes and be available for treatments from massage therapists, physiotherapists, and foot care specialists. There will also be a comprehensive lounge area for residents' social activities. These common elements require a total of 4 rooms, meaning *The Suites at Royal City Park* could provide up to 28 residential units for the seniors population of Guelph.

The ground floor and second floor of the property will be occupied by St. Josephs Health Centre who will be running an Alzheimer's Day Patient Facility on the ground floor and an Acquired Brain injury clinic on the second floor. There remains space for an additional 2 or 3 smaller medical offices which we intend to fill with seniors related practices, such as a hearing clinic or a podiatrist. The Medical Office portion of the site requires 21 parking spaces under the zoning, however, we know most patients of St. Joseph's who will be accessing the facility do not drive or no longer hold a licence.

Regardless, the 21 spaces required for the first two floors, leaves only 22 parking spaces available for the residential portion of the building, or 20 residential units once visitor parking is included. The economics of the project are challenging at this number of residential units and the concentration of residences necessary for optimal service delivery too few, hence our initial request for 6 parking stalls variance to allow for 26 residential units.

As the conversations with our development team and architect have transpired, we have had discussions on how to lose residential units, not because they are not viable or available or needed but because we have insufficient parking to satisfy the increased unit count. To me, given the varied uses in the building and the focus on seniors, the prescribed D1 zoning will be in excess of the demand created by additional occupants at this facility, and it seems worth further discussion before we submit a plan with less rooms that we might otherwise have been able to provide.

Furthermore, we have already implemented an arrangement with Virtucar which currently has a vehicle parked on site and which will return from across the street when the construction is complete. This feature coupled with access to LCBO, grocery and Pharmacy within walking distance, as well as 8 bus routes all should function to further lessen the requirement for any resident of this building to need a car and limit those residence with one that apply.

Due to limitations of time and the evolution of this project, we have not contracted affordable housing agreements yet, but have engaged in meetings to that effect and can commit that any additional variance over 6 could be conditional on having those units contracted as affordable. It is our intent, and once we have the confirmed approvals, a requirement for many affordable housing programs, we can conclude our previous discussions with the region to create this additional low income housing inventory at the prescribed discount to market rents.

I do understand it is a large variance for this committee, and parking is a sensitive subject generally, but it is our hope upon further review, that the committee finds that the variance would not adversely impact the parking situation generated by this property, and that this committee also consider the creation of additional street parking resulting from our reducing entry points to the property from the current 3, to 1 as requested by the City's traffic engineer at the time of our initial submission.

I would be happy to provide to additional information or speak further on the project. In the meantime I provide a copy of a letter from the LIHN provided to us last year and a broad outline of the types of services we plan to offer to all residents of the facility, no matter it be 20, 26 or 28 when we hope to open winter 2021.

Thank you again for your consideration and I look forward to hearing your decision.

Michael von Teichman Development Manager