

From: Michelle Wan
Subject: Additional residential units

Stephen O'Brien
City Clerk
City of Guelph

Dear Mr. O'Brien,

Please ensure that my comments below are made available to City Council before Friday 10 July.

I am deeply concerned with the potential negative impact of the proposed zoning bylaw/official plan amendment related to additional residential units. Essentially this amendment opens the door to converting neighbourhoods designed for single family dwellings into multi-occupancy rental zones. Areas surrounding the University are particularly at risk. Since it appears that Guelph has no ability to block what has been mandated by the province, in order to preserve the integrity of our neighbourhoods, I urge the city to apply the most stringent controls possible to additional structures, including:

1. A much wider setback from property lines, which will have the effect of not only mitigating the impact on privacy but will go some way toward controlling the size of accessory buildings.
2. Disallow 2-story structures. On standard city lots, the addition of a 2-story structure close to property lines will not only impact privacy and increase the potential for noise nuisance, it can also block sunlight from adjacent houses.
3. Require a parking space for each accessory unit.
4. Limit the size of accessory units to one bedroom.
5. Increase the staffing of the by-law enforcement department, since in addition to the problems neighbourhoods such as the McElderry Community already face arising from student rentals, new complaints and conflicts will undoubtedly arise.
6. Allow home owners to apply for a reduction in property tax where it can be shown that adjacent additional units have decreased their resale value.

Thank you.
Michelle Wan

From: Lori Fleming
Subject: Changes to residential properties, coach houses, etc

I gave already emailed my two councillors about the negative impact the proposed changes on our neighborhoods. I live on Koch Dr where we have numerous rental properties, they out number true residential houses. The investor landlords jam 6, 7 or even 8 kids in a house. Garages, dining rooms are all turned into bedrooms. This overloads the streets with cars and people. It creates more people congestion on the streets. Weekends and holidays are even worse with parties and

all the problems associated with this events. These problems are well documented. If you allow people to build these coach houses it will only exacerbate the problems. I am strongly against all the proposed Changes.

Stephen Fleming

From: Françoise Py-MacBeth

Subject: 58 pages! Re. Accessory buildings on residential properties.

Hello,

The statement made by Michelle Wan reflects perfectly my position on your by-law project. The resulting density would generate lack of privacy, stress on utilities, parking overflow. It is also well documented that occasional renters such as students neglect basic maintenance of dwellings and grounds. Single-family homes would be purchased for profit, rented to a maximum of persons without any regard for the neighbourhood.

I totally object to your plans.

Regards,
Françoise Py-MacBeth

From: Kristin Laing

Subject: City council meeting regarding changes to accessory buildings for residential units

Dear Mr. O'Brien

Please ensure that our comments below are made available to City Council before July 10th, 2020.

My husband and I are very concerned with the proposed zoning bylaw/official plan amendments relating to the addition of backyard and side yard units in residential areas. Essentially these amendments open the door to converting neighbourhoods designed for single family dwellings into multi-occupancy rental zones which is something that we, as home-owners, did not sign up for when we purchased our home. As we live near the University of Guelph, our neighbourhood is particularly at risk. There has already been an incident of a 'rooming' house attached to the back of a single family dwelling at the corner of Harvard Rd. and Grierson Drive several years ago which never should have been approved by the city.

The proposed changes which include a minimal setback of 0.6 m from property lines as well as a maximum of 30-40-50% in-fill of the back or side areas of a single family dwelling are ridiculous. Allowing 2-story structures with limited parking close to property lines will not only impact privacy and increase the potential for noise nuisance, it will also cause congestion on the surrounding streets

and block sunlight. Allowing an additional two units, one of which is considered to be unattached to the main structure is absolutely unacceptable.

We understand that housing is in short supply and that granny-flats may be the solution for an aging population but these amendments will only open the door potentially to slum-conditions in our cities. In an age when many offspring move repeatedly over the years to obtain new employment opportunities, it is unlikely that 'grannies' will stay for the interim of their lifetimes in an attached flat.

We urge the city to apply the most stringent controls possible to additional structures, including:

1. A much wider setback from property lines which will have the effect of not only mitigating the impact on privacy but will go some way towards controlling the size of accessory buildings
2. Disallow 2-story structures
3. Require a parking space for each accessory unit and not allow the parking to be incorporated into the parking already available for the main building
4. Limit the size of accessory units to one bedroom to eliminate rooming houses

Please consider our concerns.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Kristin and John Laing

From: Darren Shock

Subject: Proposed Zoning Bylaw and Official Plan Amendment: Additional Residential Dwelling Units

Good afternoon,

I am writing to pass along some brief comments regarding Additional Residential Dwelling Units, and the proposed Zoning Bylaw and Official Plan Amendments that are the subject of the public meeting on July 13, 2020.

As the owner of a house with a registered accessory apartment, I support the changes being proposed. They seem reasonable, and could assist with the construction of a somewhat more diverse range of additional dwelling units in a larger part of the City.

More specifically, I want to highlight two proposed changes that I think are positive, though I think the City could move further on one of them.

- Section 5.6 of the discussion paper recommends removal of the zoning regulation to preserve the external building facade. This provides a clearer option to place the entrance to the accessory apartment on the front of the building, if that is the best

design option for the unit. The current regulations may, in some cases, be a barrier to efficient design of accessory apartments.

- Section 5.9 proposes several changes to the Zoning Bylaw related to parking. My preference would be to remove the requirement for any additional parking associated with the additional dwelling unit, particularly in higher density areas or areas better served by transit. However, the proposed changes to align with the Planning Act seem reasonable and should add some additional flexibility.

There is still quite a bit of engagement to be done on this, which may change the proposal slightly. At this point, I am supportive of these changes, but will continue to monitor this as it moves along.

Thank you.

Darren Shock

From: wayne huck

Subject: Zoning Changes

Attn: Stephen O'Brien

Dear Sir, I was going to write an email clarifying how I feel about this ridiculous zoning change and rant and rave about you, the City, the councilors and the Mayor. I realized that it is the Province of Ontario I should be going after and I hope you can give me an address where I can send a letter of complaint. In the meantime, the attached letter from Michelle Wan says everything I want to say about this situation and does it much better than I could.

Yours truly,
Wayne Huck

Stephen O'Brien
City Clerk
City of Guelph

Dear Mr. O'Brien,

Please ensure that my comments below are made available to City Council before Friday 10 July.

I am deeply concerned with the potential negative impact of the proposed zoning bylaw/official plan amendment related to additional residential units. Essentially this amendment opens the door to converting neighbourhoods designed for single family dwellings into multi-occupancy rental zones. Areas surrounding the University are particularly at risk. Since it appears that Guelph has no ability to block what has been mandated by the province, in order to preserve the integrity of our neighbourhoods, I urge the city to apply the most stringent controls possible to additional structures, including:

1. A much wider setback from property lines, which will have the effect of not only mitigating the impact on privacy but will go some way toward controlling the size of accessory buildings.

2. Disallow 2-story structures. On standard city lots, the addition of a 2-story structure close to property lines will not only impact privacy and increase the potential for noise nuisance, it can also block sunlight from adjacent houses.
3. Require a parking space for each accessory unit.
4. Limit the size of accessory units to one bedroom.
5. Increase the staffing of the by-law enforcement department, since in addition to the problems neighbourhoods such as the McElderry Community already face arising from student rentals, new complaints and conflicts will undoubtedly arise.
6. Allow home owners to apply for a reduction in property tax where it can be shown that adjacent additional units have decreased their resale value.

Thank you.
Michelle Wan

From: Doreen McAlister
Subject: Letter to council re accessory buildings

Please include in council package.

Dear Mayor and councillors:

I wish to comment on proposed changes regarding accessory buildings. It is clear that the following recommendations are unacceptable to those of us who live in neighborhoods where there a lot of student rentals. Please do not adopt the following:

1. Two storey height. No accessory dwelling should exceed a single story in order to preserve privacy for neighbors.
 2. .6 meter setback: such a small distance between the building & the lot line does not allow for any buffer, eliminates privacy & sunlight, & will inevitably damage trees
 3. An accessory bldg should only be permitted to have one bedroom. Any more than that increases the risk of multiple student occupants, accompanying noise, parking issues and reduced privacy for adjacent back yards
- Please do not destroy the character of the neighborhoods we have cared for over the past decades. I have been a resident on this street for more than 35 years and deplore the changes proposed. If implemented, it will be a huge loss for our community.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Regards
Doreen McAlister

From: Susan Bushell
Subject: Written Comments re: Proposed Amendments to Zoning Bylaw: Additional Residential Dwelling Units

Hello Abby

Here are my comments concerning the proposed amendments to the Additional Residential Dwelling Units Bylaw. I will be attending the Council meeting online, on Monday evening

I own a home in Guelph. My husband and I have lived in downtown Guelph for 33 years and bought our current home 6 years ago. We've always had a plan to add an additional dwelling in our basement walkout but were stopped by the current bylaw and the fact that we do not have a legal driveway nor space for three parking spaces on our front lawn.

Our neighbourhood is diverse where every home is different and there are many eras of housing. It's one of the oldest and most prized neighbourhoods in all of Guelph. This is what makes our neighbourhood so enjoyable. It's diverse and friendly.

It's also close to the public transit hub, the river, the TransCanada Trail and the downtown core. The neighbourhood is well connected. This is why we've continued to live here so long. We have always felt we wanted to provide a really nice home within our neighbourhood for a single person or a couple.

However I am noticing in recent years that many young people cannot afford homes in Guelph but want to live here and grow families here. I find there are fewer dwelling units and even our neighbourhood appears to have fewer students, young singles, couples and seniors. It's not healthy for a neighbourhood to be mostly high income retired folks.

I'd like to see our city support opportunities for younger people to live in established homes and neighbourhoods and begin to consider staying and buying homes themselves. I'd also like our city to have policies in place that assist and encourage them to buy and renovate and create additional dwellings themselves to help them afford today's housing prices. This in turn makes sure those selling their homes receive good value for their investment.

There are so many reasons that these amendments are long overdue and much needed

1. To provide much needed housing to Guelph residents
2. To create diverse housing for many stages of life within one neighbourhood
3. To create affordable community housing within established neighbourhoods without the responsibility and financial commitment of an owned home
4. To create security for houses when one resident is away, reducing the likelihood of break-ins which are increasing in Guelph
5. To create more accessible housing
6. To create more access to the downtown core and support for it's businesses and events
7. To create a source of income for seniors who still own their home and want to continue living independently

8. To assist seniors in keeping their homes and create much needed income for old age care
9. To assist new buyers and families to afford a home in Guelph
10. To encourage pride of ownership and keep homes renovated, to code, safe and up to date
11. To maintain and increase the value of homes in Guelph
12. To foster neighbourly connection reducing mental health stress
13. To reduce use, deterioration and costly repairs and maintenance on arterial roads and suburban infrastructure
14. To minimize the likelihood of deterioration of neighbourhoods or the closing of neighbourhood schools

There is only one suggestion I'd add in that the restrictions for homes with only one parking space be eased and that variances are allowed more easily especially in the downtown and older neighbourhoods where we want to increase density but land for driveways can be very limited.

The new Proposed changes look very promising and you've obviously done great work here. I'm very hopeful that all will go ahead as drafted and we will have a new bylaw by autumn. If so my husband and I are looking forward very much to creating another home in Guelph.

Please keep me updated on developments. I'll be online on Monday evening

Warmly,
Susan Bushell

Dear Mayor and City Councillors,

The following comments are associated with your planning public meeting scheduled on July 13, 2020 respecting 'Additional Residential Units'. Thank you for the opportunity to providing input on this matter. The topic is quite complex as it is attempting to balance various interests associated with housing for community members. Several issues come to mind: appropriate community standards for reasonable levels of infill on existing residential lots in the City; provision of new opportunities for new housing, regulations for new development that are compatible with existing built-up residential areas.

For the purposes of my comment, I want to present some ideas that I think planning staff should give additional attention to:

1) The overall approach has been to create a one size-fits all regulatory approach to the topic. While this may be useful for equity/ease of administration, it does not adequately address the development pressures of this housing form that can vary across the City. For example, in older areas in proximity to the University, there may be a desire for investors to build a 3 unit product on an oversized lot. Land use compatibility issues could be created between residents living side by side where one lot has +12 bedrooms (with 3 units) form, and the next lot has a seniors couple aging in place in their long established family bungalow.

2) While the proposal being put forward is predicated on providing new forms of affordable housing, there is no mechanism in practice to mandate this. The additional new units can comprise standard housing units that are not subject to normal planning development costing implications such as parkland dedication and development charges.

3) There are potential financial implications to the City. The provision of new units also necessitates the expansion to operating costs for hard (water, sewer, transportation) and soft (library, park and recreation) services. What is the anticipated financial impact that the planning proposal will have on existing taxpayers in Guelph?

4) The proposal needs to be integrated with many of the other planning studies that are underway but not reviewed in the background Discussion Paper. For example, how do the proposed new parking provisions fit with the 'parking and driveways review' that is underway? What is the estimate of uptake on new units that will need to be considered and integrated into the 'planning growth management strategy'?

Thank you for reading, and all the best in your review and deliberations.

Sincerely,

Paul Kraehling MCIP RPP (Ret.)

Stephen O'Brien

City Clerk

City of Guelph

Dear Mr. O'Brien,

Please ensure that my comments below are made available to City Council for the July meeting regarding Additional Residential Unit Review: Planning Act Update to the Official Plan and Zoning Bylaw Discussion Paper, July 2020.

I am concerned with the potential negative impact of the proposed zoning bylaw/official plan amendment being proposed as they relate to additional residential units. I understand that this is partially being mandated by the Province, but this amendment has the potential of severely decreasing both current property values as well as enjoyment of personal property.

I am a homeowner near the University of Guelph, and have already been impacted by groups of "unrelated tenants" in existing additional residential units. The inclusion of Additional Detached Residential Units without proper restrictions in place will not make matters any better. These have the potential of changing the character of existing neighbourhoods from Family to Multi-Family. People have purchased single-family-dwellings for a reason.

Knowing that changes will be happening, I would appreciate consideration be given to the following:

1. A wider setback from property lines than 0.6 meters. On page 33 of your discussion paper for July 2020, it mentions that "In Kingston, the detached additional residential unit must comply with the minimum yard setbacks applicable to the primary dwelling unit." And on page 34, "The City of Ottawa sets a minimum 1 m interior side yard setback and rear yard setback for detached additional residential units where there is no window or entrance. In all other cases the interior side yard and rear yard setback is 4 m."

I would propose the side and rear setbacks be the same as the primary dwelling, such as Kingston has done.

I could find no reference for the need for easements on adjoining lots, but with less than two feet between the new additional residential unit and the property line / fence, there is likely insufficient room for ongoing maintenance. I am not in favour of forcing existing homeowners to have to grant easement rights in these situations. Imagine being in an existing house with 5 foot setbacks, and now have a neighbour's eavestrough hanging over your fence...

2. Require a parking space for each accessory bedroom / den, as opposed to unit.
3. Limit the number of bedrooms / den to two (2).
4. Only permitting an additional detached residential unit if an additional residential unit is already in existence in the primary residential unit.

Regards,
Al Pentland

I have a great deal of concern regarding the dwelling units that could be built in side or backyards with regards to their potential use as Airbnb rentals by absentee landlords. Having looked at the city's website, I cannot find any reference to bylaws that address these short term rentals. In a Mercury article dated Aug, 2017 it is stated: "City staff are...set to undertake a bylaw review on short term rentals and bed and breakfasts, which would include Airbnb rentals, later this year." David Wiedrick, Manager of Bylaw, Security and Licensing, informed me, by email, that the Airbnb review is continuing and will go to council in November.

As there are no bylaws in place regarding short term rentals, then, in my opinion, that needs to be addressed as part of this entire bylaw review process. As Money Sense magazine has stated that Guelph is the number one place, in Canada, to invest in real estate, I am sure a savvy investor would love to investigate short term rental opportunities.

I would assume the idea behind adding additional housing units is to help with providing more affordable housing not to turn many ADUs into only Airbnb units.

Thank you for the opportunity to address a very important change coming to our neighbourhoods,

Sylvia Watson

Dear Mr. O'Brien:

I was very dismayed to read on Geulph today that a new proposal to allow for a second two-story dwelling to be built on residential properties is on the table. I live in the Old University Neighborhood and feel that this will have a negative impact on our community. I fear that residents adjacent to these properties will lose their privacy and be subjected to increased noise and activity. There will definitely be an increase in traffic, adding more noise as well as pollution. On -street parking is an issue. First of all it looks like we're living in a parking lot and second, trying to maneuver around parked cars on narrow streets can be a challenge. Some of the properties are owned by out of town landlords or developers, whose main concern is making profit and not the appearance or well being of the neighborhood. The other concern is the removal of trees and green areas to make room for additional buildings. which will have a negative environmental impact. I am also wondering how this will affect saleability and property value of neighboring homes. Taxes are high in this area and seem to increase every year. With additional larger buildings on existing properties, I am guessing that infrastructure will need adjusting accordingly, causing taxes to be raised even more.

So, I would like you to know that I am very much opposed to "two second story dwellings" in addition to existing main buildings on standard city lots. I am actually not in favor of any additional buildings on properties, but I know the province has a mandate to increase population density whether I like it or not.

Please let this be known to city council before proposals are considered on July 13

Thank you

Gitta Housser

Stephen O'Brien

City Clerk

City of Guelph

Dear Mr. O'Brian.

I am sure by now you have received a lot of comments on the subject matter but one in particular, I agree most and that is the one from Michelle Wan which I could have not put any better myself. Just in case you missed it I am going to attach it here.

"Dear Mr. O'Brien,

Please ensure that my comments below are made available to City Council before Friday 10 July.

I am deeply concerned with the potential negative impact of the proposed zoning bylaw/official plan amendment related to additional residential units. Essentially this amendment opens the door to converting neighbourhoods designed for single-family dwellings into multi-occupancy rental zones. Areas surrounding the University are particularly at risk. Since it appears that Guelph has no ability to block what has been mandated by the province, in order to preserve the integrity of our neighbourhoods, I urge the city to apply the most stringent controls possible to additional structures, including:

1. A much wider setback from property lines, which will have the effect of not only mitigating the impact on privacy but will go some way toward controlling the size of accessory buildings.
2. Disallow 2-story structures. On standard city lots, the addition of a 2-story structure close to property lines will not only impact privacy and increase the potential for noise nuisance, it can also block sunlight from adjacent houses.
3. Require a parking space for each accessory unit.
4. Limit the size of accessory units to one bedroom.
5. Increase the staffing of the by-law enforcement department, since in addition to the problems neighbourhoods such as the McElderry Community already face arising from student rentals, new complaints and conflicts will undoubtedly arise.
6. Allow homeowners to apply for a reduction in property tax where it can be shown that adjacent additional units have decreased their resale value.

Thank you.

Michelle Wan"

I would like to urge you to let know counsellors of our citizen's comments on the matter, in particular, the counsellors of Ward 5 who do not appear to help the interest of the Ward. It is in my humble opinion totally unacceptable that such important notice of zoning change is done in such a hurried way, in summer time when people may be on vacation at their cottage and on top of it, during a pandemic with very little notice to the residents of the Ward 5 to absorb the profound significance of this proposed change. Ward 5 is a RESIDENTIAL AREA, we worked hard to keep our properties nice which reflects on the qualities of the City as well. We like to keep it this way.

Thank you,
Dan Noventa

Dear Sir:

Re: File: OZS20-02

Please note that this email is date stamped July 9, 2020 and should therefore be recorded as received prior to July 10, 2020, and included in any materials going forward for further consideration and/or to City Council.

As long-time residents in Guelph, we are expressing our deep concern about the proposed changes, particularly given that we reside in a residential area close to the University of Guelph. While acknowledging that providing living space for

family members is important, as outlined in 3.2 of "Additional Residential Unit Review: Planning Act Update to the Official Plan and Zoning Bylaw – Discussion Paper, July 2020", there are significant concerns that predominantly single-family neighbourhoods will be converted to multi-occupancy rental neighbourhoods. Given that Guelph appears to have limited control over how our zoning by-laws are to be set, it is imperative that regulations, restrictions and well-managed oversight be put in place within the City's ability to do so. In addition, tax assessments will need review should any of the changes have an impact on assessment and property values.

In particular we recommend the following:

A. 3. Number of Units (Sec. 5.3)

Recommend that only one additional residential dwelling unit be permitted on a lot, either within the same building as the primary dwelling OR one located in a separate building on the same lot, resulting in a maximum of two dwelling units per lot.

(with garden suites to continue to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis)

B. 4. Unit Size (Sec. 5.4)

- Current zoning limits have accessory apartments at 80m² or 45% of total floor area, whichever is less. 80m² is equal to 860 ft², which is larger than most condos under construction or for rent in Guelph. We see no need to change this unless the size is decreased to 50m².

- The maximum size of an additional residential dwelling unit within a separate building on the same lot as the primary should not exceed the 45% of the total net floor area (unchanged) or 20% of the back or side yard, whichever is less.

C. 5. Number of Bedrooms (Sec 5.5)

The maximum bedrooms should be decreased to either a studio apartment or one bedroom at the most.

D. 6. Unit Design (Sec 5.6)

Any additional units should 'fit' into the style of the primary unit from a visual perspective.

E. 7. Height (Sec 5.7)

An additional residential dwelling should not exceed more than one storey (with no loft) with an overall maximum ceiling height equal to the height of the first storey of the primary building or less.

F. Location and Setback (Sec 5.8)

- An additional residential dwelling should have a minimum of 3m side and rear yard setback, with a minimum of 1.2 m unobstructed pedestrian access in the side yard leading to the additional unit.

- The minimum distance between the primary dwelling and the additional residential dwelling unit in a separate building on the same lot should be 4m.

G. Parking (Sec 5.9)

A maximum of one additional parking space in addition to that required for the primary dwelling, with no parking on the driveway space between the boulevards. Very real issues related to noise pollution, privacy and safety concerns due to increased traffic are driving this feedback. In addition, there is concern about the City's ability to enforce any infringements to whatever the final by-laws are, so attention and budget needs to be allocated.

We look forward to the outcome of these further deliberations and discussions.

Respectfully submitted,
Michelle McCarthy and Mario Gozzi

Dear Mr. O'Brien,

Please ensure that our comments are made available to City Council on Friday July 10th.

We are concerned with the potential negative impact of the proposed zoning bylaw/official plan amendment related to additional residential units. As Guelph is unable to block what has been mandated by the province, in order to preserve the integrity of our neighbourhoods, we urge the city to apply the most stringent controls possible to additional structures, including:

1. A much wider setback from property lines, which will have the effect of not only mitigating the impact on privacy but will go some way toward controlling the size of accessory buildings.
2. Disallow 2-story structures. On standard city lots, the addition of a 2-story structure close to property lines can block sunlight from adjacent houses and be an eyesore.
3. Require the homeowner to reside in one of said buildings, either the main or the accessory. This will curtail absentee landlords and multiple student buildings on one lot.
4. Require a parking space for each accessory unit.
5. Limit the size of accessory units to one bedroom.
6. Increase the staffing of the by-law enforcement department, since in addition to the problems neighbourhoods such as the McElderry Community already face arising from student rentals, new complaints and conflicts will undoubtedly arise.
7. Allow adjacent homeowners to apply for a reduction in property tax where it can be shown that additional units have decreased their resale value.

Sincerely,
Karen and Jim Herchel

I live on Rickson Ave and this proposal would have a significant negative result. We already deal with Student rentals that are owned by persons or companies who do not contribute to the neighbourhood. See #1 Rickson for what can happen with absentee landlords. These already decrease the value of properties here as there is little we can do when properties are neglected. This area could become like that in Waterloo where the whole streets became rentals many of which were also poorly

kept. Two stories is too high and will allow for what would essentially be lodging houses. This would SIGNIFICANTLY decrease and change property values because of more traffic , temporary residents, poor upkeep etc. Thus, it would alter a life style that we have paid taxes to enjoy.

I strongly support the proposal put forth by the Mcelderry community group.

Marion Cassolato

Dr. Mr. O'Brien,

Please reply to this email confirming that our comments on accessory buildings are included in City Council's package before July 10th, 2020.

We have deep concerns with the potential negative impacts and issues that would be created based on the proposed zoning bylaws / official plan amendments related to accessory buildings on residential lots.

Our neighbourhood already faces issues due to student rentals and absentee landlords. The proposal being put forward would continue to add to the existing frustrations experienced by our community as a whole.

We live in a single dwelling family oriented neighbourhood and we are therefore urging City Council to seriously consider how these changes will alter the character of the neighbourhoods and negatively impact the community as a whole.

Below are our comments as they pertain to the Executive Summary in the discussion paper:

Page 4 - 4. Unit Size

The recommendation to remove the maximum size of 80 sq.m should be maintained and modified specifically for the separate accessory unit. The maximum size should be 45 sq.m or 25% of the yard whichever is less.

Page 5 - 5. Number of Bedrooms

Maximum number of bedrooms should be maintained at 2 for main dwelling and only 1 for the separate accessory building. (That would be a total of 5 bedrooms if the main dwelling and accessory building were rented - which is more than enough and will still pose serious issues to existing neighbours)

Page 5 - Unit Design

Preservation of the external building facade should be maintained. This is important to maintain the character of the neighbourhood.

Page 5 - Height

Should be single story only. Anything taller than this creates privacy issues, environmental issues and potentially affects the character of the neighbourhood. Anything bigger Increases the likelihood of multiple tenants living in the unit.

Page 5 - Location and Setback

The proposed set backs are not enough and should at least be doubled.

Page 6 - Parking

A parking space MUST be required for each accessory unit. On street parking is already an issue in the area and more units will contribute to more on street parking. If existing lots have no legal off-street parking, then there should be no exemption for additional dwelling units (they already have a parking problem and we want to make it worse?). Parking in general needs to change, restrict time of when parking can occur and the duration, cars should obtain permits for overnight parking. This could be a revenue stream for the City and online applications can accommodate this.

Additional Comments:

1. Restrict the cutting of existing trees to build accessory buildings. This would limit the impacts on privacy, environmental concerns and the character of the neighbourhood.
2. Impose a restriction that renting out the separate accessory building is only allowed if home owner lives on the property. This will limit having the entire property being rented to multiple tenants and would help to reduce current issues with absentee landlords.
3. Home owners directly impacted by the accessory building should have an equal right or say in the style, size and standard of structure.
4. Impose meaningful fines (thousand dollar fines, not hundreds) for breaking bylaws and use that revenue to hire more bylaw officers.
5. Significantly increase the property taxes of homeowners that build separate accessory building to offset the impact on city infrastructure AND reduce taxes of homeowners who experience a reduction in property value due to accessory building development.

We have no concerns with home owners who wish to rent out units in their homes while they live on the property because generally, they have a vested interest in what goes on in their own community and with their property. This is not the same for owners who purchase homes for an investment and don't live in the city or the neighbourhood. Our bylaws need to protect the people who live, work, play and invest in our communities.

The City has an opportunity to keep existing neighbourhoods intact while meeting Provincial government requirements, by focusing efforts on new developments where community expectations are established during design and building. The potential negative impact to existing communities far outweighs the limited number of additional dwelling units that may be achieved. Imposing stricter bylaws in established neighbourhoods is key to maintaining the character of the community as a whole.

Thank you.

Rosemary and Darrin Popescu

(McElderry Community)

To Whom It May Concern:

Additions to homes are acceptable, either attached or unattached to the original structure.

There will be a need to balance the area of property versus volume of structures.

We already have monster homes on tiny properties and big properties with big homes, with little backyard, a pool and/ or deck & barbeque area for tight outside living.

The symmetry between properties will be contentious as to how close can property structures be built before intensification becomes suffocation and squalor.

We already see the effects of postage size properties and Alice In Wonderland structures close to choking roads, sidewalks and neighbours with a small piece of backyard and maybe a deck abutting against each other in close proximity, with hardly any room in the driveway for one particular-sized car in a made-to-measure garage.

The lower end of Rickson Avenue at Edinburgh is an example of congestion by property, structures and automobiles on top of each other.

The neighbourhood dynamics in a pile must be interesting.

The stability point has been and will always be the cost of the land, the cost of the structures and of course the taxes.

Intensification would usually occur on older properties with small homes and large yards.

The chances of homeowners adding on to homes is possible.

Older folk would not be interested in additions.

Young folk with family that are able to afford buying or inheriting an older larger property may take advantage to add/build, assuming they have money.

A middle-aged homeowner may consider adding another structure such as a granny flat to accommodate aging parents/ relatives, again on a larger older property.

Therefore, would it be conceivable that such older and larger properties are the provincial target for investors to buy-up?

Older larger properties may be subdivided into smaller properties to accommodate more independent structures called tiny homes with smaller properties at a hefty price per property.

This is happening already.

Another scenario is that adjacent properties, usually older homes with larger properties, are amalgamated by investors to build apartments, condominiums, old age homes and long term care nursing homes.

This is happening on Gordon Road.

Therefore, the intent of this provincial legislation is not for homeowners, but for investors to convert existing neighbourhoods into intensified investments with bigger costs for higher returns and smaller habitats for humanity, moving towards a third-world level of living in a mushroom.

Toronto is already there as an example/ model of mushroom living at a high cost.

It is apparent that we are moving towards more loss of home ownership.

The replacement for home ownership will be smaller homes at higher cost with tiny yards and frontage.

Alternatively, one may rent an expensive apartment with parking inside/outside at an additional cost.

One may also buy an over-priced condominium nook and cranny or rent the wee space from an investor that owns half the condominium building.

Yes, dear politicians, Guelph will be catching up with the world class squalid cities of the world where poverty is a matter for more police, as we are already experiencing.

Canadians need not worry about home ownership as 49% of children are still living with their parents.

As cost of food and shelter/transportation are becoming less affordable, the birth rate will be dropping further now exacerbated by the pandemic poverty.

Do Canadians know that the last time that birth rate equaled death rate was 1971?

The aging population has overtaken the young population now reduced further and faster by this pandemic.

By 2035, most Canadians will be rich immigrants with lots of money, including money launderers, that can buy up anything and everything, and they do and will,

according to the national strategy to attract investors and investments in a dying country that is for sale.

My biggest question is, where is Canada and Guelph going to accommodate the migrant economic working slaves that will not be paid or paid little, to not afford a mushroom accommodation? Will Guelph be subsidizing big business housing?

The economic slaves are already here and the pandemic has glaringly shown that Canadian minimum wage and overtaxation is creating poverty such that it is not worth working, to not afford to own or rent a mushroom.

We are at short term gain for long term pain when we do not respect ourselves with basics such a safe, affordable and accessible food, shelter/transportation, work/income to pay for aforementioned with taxes, and children lest we forget the future, and a viable environment fastly falling apart.

Good luck with your latest devolvement of community as things are more important than people, called Canadians, soon to be on the street looking for a tent city, to call the police.

Sal De Monte

I live in the McElderry area and am concerned about a 2 story structure for additional residential units. I feel a one floor structure would be adequate for a "granny flat" and feel 2 stories would impact neighboring homes too much. In addition, the close proximity of a two story structure so close to the property line would also have a huge impact .Please reconsider this request and amend to a smaller size and further away from the property line.

Thank you

Carol Klassen

Dear Mr. O'Brien,

I am deeply concerned with the potential negative impact of the proposed zoning bylaw/official plan amendment related to additional residential units. This amendment opens the door to converting neighbourhoods designed for single family dwellings into multi-occupancy rental zones. Areas surrounding the University are particularly at risk.

Since it appears that Guelph has no ability to block what has been mandated by the province, in order to preserve the integrity of our neighbourhoods, I urge the city to apply the most stringent controls possible to additional structures, including:

1. A much wider setback from property lines, which will have the effect of not only mitigating the impact on privacy and mental health but will go some way toward controlling the size of accessory buildings.

2. Disallow 2-story structures. On standard city lots, the addition of a 2-story structure close to property lines will not only impact privacy and mental health and increase the potential for noise nuisance, it can also block sunlight from adjacent houses.

3. Require a parking space for each accessory unit.

4. Limit the size of accessory units to one bedroom.

5. Increase the staffing of the by-law enforcement department and its consistency in enforcing by-laws, since in addition to the problems neighbourhoods such as the McElderry Community already face arising from student rentals, new complaints and conflicts will undoubtedly arise.

6. Allow home owners to apply for a reduction in property tax where it can be shown that adjacent additional units have decreased their resale value.

Thank you.

Carol Hunter & Mark Wilson

Dear Mr. O'Brien,

Please ensure that my comments below are made available to Guelph City Council before July 10th, 2020.

I am very concerned with the potential negative impact of the proposed zoning bylaw/official plan amendment related to additional residential units. This amendment opens the door to converting neighbourhoods designed for single family dwellings into multi-occupancy rental zones.

Case in point - the current regulations allowed essentially a 12 unit apartment building disguised as a rooming house at 50 Grierson Drive. I can only imagine what landlords are going to do if these new proposals in their current form come to be.

Areas surrounding the University are particularly at risk. Since it appears that Guelph has no ability to block what has been mandated by the province, in order to preserve the integrity of our neighbourhoods, I urge the city to apply the most stringent controls possible to additional structures, including:

1. A much wider setback from property lines, which will have the effect of not only mitigating the impact on privacy but will go some way toward controlling the size of accessory buildings.

2. Disallow 2-story structures. On standard city lots, the addition of a 2-story structure close to property lines will not only impact privacy and increase the potential for noise nuisance, it can also block sunlight from adjacent houses.

3. Require a parking space for each accessory unit.

4. Limit the size of accessory units to one bedroom.

5. Increase the staffing of the by-law enforcement department, since in addition to the problems neighbourhoods such as the McElderry Community already face arising from student rentals, new complaints and conflicts will undoubtedly arise.

6. Allow home owners to apply for a reduction in property tax where it can be shown that adjacent additional units have decreased their resale value.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Dan Tourangeau

Please ensure that our comments re the new zoning bylaw are presented to City Council for the July 13 meeting.

My wife, Dorothy, and I have lived in the same house (Ward 5, N1G 2Y7) in Guelph for over 40 years. We have many concerns with the proposed new zoning bylaw.

GROWTH OF GUELPH

Guelph is landlocked thus there are absolute and finite limitations to our supply of good water. Even more significantly, our capability of disposing sewage plant effluent is limited.

Thus no matter what growth the Province may order, it may be impossible in Guelph. Surely zoning plans must consider this impact.

PROPOSED ADDITIONAL RESIDENTIAL DWELLING UNITS - ARDUs

The proposed bylaws refers to two completely different types of ARDUs as if they were equivalent. This is incorrect.

1 - Apartments in a primary residence will add to the number of people in a neighbourhood but not change its basic character.

2 - Separate, stand alone units in a backyard, either a Coach House (permanent) or a Garden Suite (`portable and temporary`). These will have a massive deleterious impact on all the adjoining properties due to the size and small setbacks.

3 - re Garden Suite

- What is implied by the term `temporary` ? An RV bus?

- What is the definition of `temporary`?

- How does a temporary, portable structure get tied in to water, sewage, and power?

4 - re Coach House

- As permanent structures these will impact the adjacent properties by degrading things like: appearance, privacy, sunlight, landscaping, etc. Building foundations only the required 0.6m setback from property lines will negatively impact trees and shrubs. [who will pay for the removal of a tree killed by the root damage during building?] Two story structures should NOT be allowed.

5 - The total number of bedrooms in the ARDUs should be reduced in order that the social fabric of neighbourhoods is not impacted by an extra population that overwhelms local services.

PARKING

The proposed bylaw specifies only ONE parking spot for each of the residences on a lot.

However, a recent Guelph Parking survey found that on average there are slightly more than 2 vehicles per residence in this city. Further the legal and illegal rooming houses in Ward 5 are easy to recognize because there are usually 3-4 or more vehicles parked when the University is in session.

Thus the proposed zoning bylaw is out of touch with reality and must increase the parking space requirement.

INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT

It is our understanding that the definition of a residence implies a maximum number of people in that residence. Historically Guelph has been unable and/or unwilling to transcend administrative silos to inspect and enforce occupancy bylaws, especially in illegal rooming houses.

Excessive occupancy in ARDUs could disrupt the social fabric of neighbourhoods and put a large extra strain on local services. How will Guelph manage this and avoid a situation like Brampton?

PUBLIC HEALTH AND GREEN SPACE

These proposed bylaws are derived from the Province's Zoning act which dates back to 2019. The COVID-19 pandemic has taught the world that a sure way to assist in spreading a virus is high density housing. Surely Public Health ought to be involved in any new infill/zoning projects in order to build an environment that will not create future problems.

Further, it is our understanding that Guelph is lagging behind its own current zoning standard for public green space. Creating ARDUs will greatly exacerbate this problem by adding population to existing neighbourhoods.

LEGAL

The proposed Zoning allows for 2 Additional Residential Dwelling Units (ARDU) on any property large enough to support them.

Who owns the additional units?

Can ARDUs be bought and sold independently of the primary residence?

If the ARDUs are always rentals, where does landlord and tenant regulation, etc come into play?

Will the city be willing or able to deal with the well known problems associated with absentee landlords?

COST OF INFILL ARDUs TO THE EXISTING TAXPAYERS

It is our understanding that the funds the city gets from new development do not cover the full cost of services and amenities (roads, parks, schools, police, fire, etc). Recently the Province has mandated that cities cannot recover the full additional costs of new development.

Thus every new residential unit adds to the tax bill of existing taxpayers.

The density increase in the proposed zoning bylaw would simply add to the plight of the taxpayers

Thank you for considering our comments

Yours truly

Ken and Dorothy Fisher

Dear City Council

My name is Dave Worden and I live at X Birch St. here in Guelph. I feel allowing Accessory Units would only bring down the value of a house and reduce the quality of living in Guelph's better neighborhoods that have the lots large enough to do this.

- Units could house as many people as in the main house, doubling the stress on the current aging infrastructure.
- Units would likely be built on properties already being rented. These units would also be neglected and mis-managed as unfortunately many rentals are now.
- Units would increase noise level and danger of fire with this type of density increase in the older, mature tree filled neighborhoods.
- Units would now take away the back yard from the existing family as it would become the front yard of the Unit.
- Units would double the vehicle traffic on our now quiet streets.
- Units would congest our streets with more parked cars for these tenants and their guests.
- Units would have people who are not committed to neighbourhood living and community, and would not be considerate to other home owners because they are not invested, they just rent.
- There would now be people in our neighbourhood who we wouldn't know if they lived here or not. I recognize everyone who lives on my street.
- Our now quiet neighbourhood would have late night traffic, doors slamming, people walking between houses and noise from these units as we, working and family homeowners, need to sleep and get up early for work and family responsibilities.
- There would be no way to Police the number of people staying in these Units and so we could have many transient people just over our fence. Then we would not feel comfortable sitting in our backyard or letting our kids play in the backyard by themselves.

Many Retirees and Families who live here, enjoying the space, will now fear going into their yards as people they don't know watch them from the next yard.

As these units get run down over time, the quality of tenant will also decline. Leading to the downfall of the neighbourhood.

With the only upside being that more taxes would be collected by the city, I don't see this as a good example of City Council working to improve the quality of family house living in Guelph. The City can acquire more taxes from high-rises developments, that are properly designed to increase density.

Please do not do this to the good people of Guelph.

Regards: Dave Worden

Dear Mr. O'Brien,

Please ensure that my comments below are made available to Guelph City Council before July 10th, 2020.

I am very concerned with the potential negative impact of the proposed zoning bylaw/official plan amendment related to additional residential units.

This amendment will further increase the opportunity for especially vulnerable neighbourhoods surrounding the University of Guelph to be drastically negatively impacted by turning them into multi-occupancy rental zones.

Our Ward 5 neighbourhood has been rapidly changing, as each home that comes up for sale is purchased by an investor (usually an absentee landlord/out of town investor), and is turned into a multi-unit student rental income property. This is drastically changing the balance between owners and renters and there are less and less people who actually live in the neighbourhood full time and are interested in creating a thriving community.

As an example, the current regulations allowed essentially a 12 unit apartment building disguised as a rooming house at 50 Grierson Drive. I can only imagine what landlords are going to do if these new proposals in their current form come to be.

Areas surrounding the University are particularly at risk. Since it appears that Guelph has no ability to block what has been mandated by the province, in order to preserve the integrity of our neighbourhoods, I urge the city to apply the most stringent controls possible to additional structures, including:

1. A much wider setback from property lines, which will have the effect of not only mitigating the impact on privacy but will go some way toward controlling the size of accessory buildings.
2. Disallow 2-story structures. On standard city lots, the addition of a 2-story structure close to property lines will not only impact privacy and increase the potential for noise nuisance, it can also block sunlight from adjacent houses.
3. Require a parking space for each accessory unit.
4. Disallow the proposed two front doors on a property.
5. Limit the size of accessory units to one bedroom.
6. Increase the staffing of the by-law enforcement department, since in addition to the problems neighbourhoods such as the McElderry Community already face arising from student rentals, new complaints and conflicts will undoubtedly arise.
7. Allow home owners to apply for a reduction in property tax where it can be shown that adjacent additional units have decreased their resale value.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Christina Tourangeau