

**Subject:** RE: File OZS19-015

Hello

I have said before I am totally against a 25 Storey building in the downtown area. It greatly upsets me to see any company want to build this type of building in the downtown area.

I live in the downtown area and this building will block the view of the Church of our Lady which is a symbol of history, family and community regardless of what your religious beliefs are and is a beautiful skyline for the downtown area. It also concerns me when a company as this one came to town, they bought every apartment building they could get and any other building they could get creating a monopoly.

I am not in favour of this type or size of building in the downtown build it elsewhere preferably in another town/ city.

Tasha Heart  
\*\*\*

I am a longtime Ward 1 resident and retired professor of real estate economics from the University of Guelph.

I am strongly in favour of this development.

The last reported vacancy rate for the city is 1.4% well below the 3% considered balanced. It's been at about that rate for many years. It's extremely difficult for renters to find appropriate rental units. Rents are rising much faster than inflation because of the short supply.

Issue 2 on page 14 of the city's affordable housing strategy from 2017 states "a lack of available primary rental supply makes it difficult for people to find affordable rental housing." This statement is still very much true today. While some purpose built rental has been constructed in the last few years in Guelph, there is still substantial need for more units.

This site is also ideal for an intensified mixed-use development. It's walking distance to all the downtown amenities and next to the transit hub. Some residents may be able to work in the building reducing car use. More people working and living downtown is also good for the health of the businesses downtown. Other residents can easily commute to Toronto by GO without needing parking near the station.

This development also works to meet the requirements of the province's Places to Grow act, both for people living and working downtown. It also provides housing to help companies attract new employees to Guelph.

I am sure councillors have received pressure to reduce the height of the building. You need to recognize that there are fixed land costs to development and economies of scale as development size increases. If you reduce the size of the development, the owner will need to charge higher rents to cover the extra costs. Council needs to recognize the implications of this type of adjustment. The developer could also design a shorter wider building but that would be less aesthetically appealing in my view.

A further advantage to this development is reduction of sprawl; I would much rather 200 residents in one building than 200 ground level units of sprawl at the edge of the city.

I would be happy to discuss this further if anyone is interested.

Sincerely

Jane Londerville

\*\*\*

Mayor Guthrie and Members of Council:

Please follow the recommendations of Planning Staff and refuse the development application from Skyline for 70 Fountain St. and 75 Farquar.

The Skyline application violates so many By-laws and planning principles, I'm not sure where to begin.

The Skyline tower would violate a key restriction in our By-laws - it would be higher than the Basilica of Church of Our Lady, permanently changing the skyline of our City.

Skyline's play for 25 storeys conveys a complete contempt for our democratic planning process and for the heritage integrity of our downtown.

Under Places to Grow Provincial legislation, downtown Guelph was designated as an "Urban Growth Centre." The Council of the day set to work to craft a new Official Plan to anticipate and manage the required growth – the Downtown Secondary Plan. Professional planning staff, citizens, members of Council and developer consultants and stakeholders worked together over many months to come up with a made-for-Guelph plan. The plan would ensure we would meet a minimum target of 8,500 residents in the downtown by 2031.

A key feature of the Downtown Secondary Plan was the preservation of the heritage character of the downtown core. High-rise development was slated for the perimeter of the downtown on the lowest topographical sites. No building would be allowed to be higher than Church of Our Lady.

The addition of new green space needed for more residents was anticipated, with a plan to expropriate and revert the plaza on the south-west corner of Wellington and Gordon to a riverside park.

In fact, the Downtown Secondary Plan was considered so creative and visionary that in 2013, it captured one of most prestigious planning awards in the Province - the *Ontario Professional Planners Institute Excellence in Planning Award*.

In the press release from the City <https://guelph.ca/2013/11/guelphs-downtown-secondary-plan-receives-oppi-excellence-planning-award/> Todd Salter, general manager of Planning Services for the City, said the following: "*Receiving the Excellence in Planning Award is a great honour for the City. It is gratifying to see the work of our City staff and all of the community members who contributed to the development of the plan being recognized on a provincial level by our peers and colleagues.*"

Over the past several years, the Downtown Secondary Plan has been rolling out as planned. We have the two Tricar towers and the Metalworks complex along the river. A 14-storey condominium has been approved at 71 Wyndham St. south. The Urban Master Plan for the Baker district is currently in process. Not only are we on-target to reach 8,500 residents, there is no question we are going to shoot past that number. Nearly every development to date has negotiated a couple of extra storeys from Guelph City Council in exchange for delivering additional benefits to the community. The catch now? The Ford government delivered a gift to Ontario developers by eliminating this mechanism known as "density bonusing". There are now no benefits available to the community in exchange for granting extra height.

Guelph has embraced and planned for intensification of both our downtown and strategic nodes and corridors throughout the City. It is the job of local Councils and professional planning staff to set the quantity, location and timing of growth. An increased number of residents brings an increased need for services and infrastructure such as parks, roads, libraries and recreation centres. We need managed growth, not a developer free-for-all.

It's not clear what game Skyline is playing. Are they asking for something completely outrageous hoping to hoodwink us into a "compromise" of 12 storeys which would effectively double the allowed height maximums on the current site?

If Council approves this development at 12 storeys, or at 25, it will essentially put our Downtown Secondary Plan in the shredder. This tower would overwhelm the armoury and drill hall and loom above the train station and old City Hall. It would irrevocably change the landscape and character of our City core. Even more concerning, the planning precedent set by this development would essentially declare open season on developer-driven, profit-based development rather than democratically-guided managed growth.

And why should citizens even bother participating in crafting Official Plans if they are going to be successfully thrown under the bus by developers? Why should everyday people volunteer hours of their time for the Clair-Maltby Secondary Plan if at the end of the day, Council itself isn't willing to respect the work of the community?

We have a great plan for downtown intensification. We should stick to it. Council needs to say, "No," to Skyline.

Sincerely,

Susan Watson

\*\*\*

Good Day,

Regarding a developer's plan to erect an UBER-TOWER at 70 Fountain Street East, a matter which comes before Council (AGAIN) on Monday July 13, 2020 ...

- Much as I'd like to phone-in, doing so would be deleterious to my blood-pressure
- Yes, beauty is in the eye of the beholder, but the eyes of umpteen non-invested people have berated this proposal ... this sore thumb
- It's simply far too high, far too dominant, and far too ugly
- There are those who will, for whatever reason, disagree, but I think this structure is an affront ...
- It's out-of-keeping with the downtown streetscape
- No single building / no single company should have the right to so severely impose itself in a city-centre
- The determination of the developer smacks of greed, vanity, and disregard for the city
- Consider, for goodness sake, nearby residents who will live amid the shadow and gaze of the behemoth (bully), not to speak of wind-currents and increased traffic
- Yes, condo towers have been built in recent years, as on Woolwich Street, but their height is softened by the fact that they are rooted in a valley, whereas the building proposed for 70 Fountain Street East all but sits atop the plateau that is the Central Business District.
- What mayor or councillor would tolerate the arrival of such a tower within a stone's throw of their home?

Finally, two of the things many of us have learned over the past four months are:

1) the folly of densification, whereby hordes of people live in close proximity to each other

and

2) the need for more parkland

I do not think that Guelphites oppose development. What they oppose are ...

— development that is incompatible with the best interests of the city and its citizenry.

— development that is downright ugly

— development that does not garner a fair return to the city in the form of cash and / or parkland

It is hard to conjure a greater example of incompatibility than the proposed tower and the host of beautiful buildings within a kilometre of it.

John Parkyn

\*\*\*

Dear Mayor & Council,

On July 13th Council will be considering two proposals that will, if approved, negatively impact the liveability of our City.

1. The Skydev development is asking to allow for a 25-storey building in the heart of downtown Guelph. This request is, simply, absurd. The City of Guelph has a clear Downtown Secondary Plan, which not only meets the provincial requirements for Guelph as a 'place to grow' but has received accolades. The Skydev proposal contrasts starkly with myriad features of the Downtown Secondary Plan, a plan that has been recognized as visionary and tailor-made for the City of Guelph. In my view, any proposal that does not conform with what has already been deemed as 'good municipal planning' should not even have been permitted to come under review.

Please support our city staff recommendations and vote to reject the Skydev development proposal. Any modification of the proposal that does not comply with the Downtown Secondary Plan is unacceptable.

2. A proposal to allow two-storey accessory buildings on residential properties. In theory, this could create more diverse housing choices, make aging in place more affordable, and help more customers for some neighborhood businesses. However, currently, city staff are recommending that accessory dwellings can take up to 30 per cent of the existing back or side yard, be up to two stories high and built 0.6 metres from the property line. These recommendations align well with infinite densification and concurrent loss of privacy, green space and quality of life in our

communities. Traffic and parking is already an existing and growing concern in Guelph. In reviewing this proposal, please consider surveying Guelph residents to assess how to move forward to maximize the benefits and minimize the impacts. Two stories of a dwelling looming at the edge of a property and potentially overlooking another private property should not be an option.

Sincerely,

Pia K. Muchaal