

**Statutory Public Meeting Report 1242-1260 Gordon Street and 9 Valley Road
Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments
File: OZS20-004 and 23T-20001 Ward 6 - 2020-124**

General Correspondence – Revised Agenda

Comments re: File number OZS20-004

The following are my comments on the proposed development at 1242-1260 Gordon Street and 9 Valley Road. I ask that they be part of the record for the September 14th meeting on File Number OZS20-004.

It is my hope the City Staff and City Councillors during their planning meeting on September 14th take this application by Tricar Properties Limited (Tricar) seriously. Based on the Planning Justification Report dated May 25, 2020, Tricar is requesting exceptions to 17 of 27 Zoning Regulations. This seems excessive, with some of the requested exceptions being substantial amendments and counter to precedence.

I understand the property in discussion is currently Zoned as R1.B (as per current Zoning Map) however, the Guelph Official Plan designates this land as High Density. When the City approved this location as High Density, I can only imagine they had visions of high density in compliance with the current Zoning By-law for R4.B High Density Apartment. I do not believe the City approved this location as High Density with the expectation of Ultra-High Density, and 17 of the 27 zoning regulations requiring an exception.

I also understand the need for Tricar to request these exceptions. With land cost skyrocketing in Guelph, for a developer to maximize their profits, they need to maximize the density of units per hectare. However,

I do not feel it is the City's responsibility to assure corporate profit in development. I believe the corporation should maximize their profits within the current guidelines or delay their project until such time as profit is available. If the City feels it is necessary to approve amendments to Zoning By-laws, in order to provide profits to developers and ensure future development, then I believe the City should also provide local residences property value guarantees that their property values will not decline below the value prior to the development.

Issue 1: Density

The land is currently approved for High Density, not Ultra-High Density. The request to amend the zoning from 150 units per hectare to 271 units per hectare is irresponsible and against precedence. The Gordon Street Intensification has set precedence over the last few years with the approval of R4.B development projects. In Section 5.4.3.2.12, 1440-1448 Gordon R4.B-12 Zoning set a maximum 130 units

per hectare. In Section 5.4.3.2.13, 1077 Gordon R4.B-13 an exception to Maximum Density units/ha was not required. In Section 5.4.3.2.14, 716 Gordon R4B-14 an exception to Maximum Density units/ha was approved to 156 units/ha. And in Section 5.4.3.2.20, 1888 Gordon R4.B-20 an exception to Maximum Density units/ha was approved to 175 units/ha.

An increase to 271 units/ha would represent a 55% increase over the highest approved Maximum Density in recent years. There is nothing about this site compared to the others which would warrant such an exception. There are no amenities near this location to accommodate the 377 units. The closest grocery store is a 2 km or 20 minute walk one way, which would result in more vehicle traffic for day to day activities. This level of density is more appropriate for locations that have amenities near by, such as the Clair/Gordon node.

Issue 2: Set Back

During the City's road show, selling and promoting the idea of the Gordon Street Intensification, both the document Urban Design Concept Plans for the Gordon Street Intensification Corridor dated April 2018 and staff during meeting, promoted the intensification as follows:

- Promote greening of Gordon Street through the **design and location of buildings**, by establishing a **consistent landscaped street frontage** and retaining healthy regulated trees when possible.
- Promote mid-rise as the dominant built form for intensification **to frame streets, site edges and outdoor** amenity spaces.
- Promote sunlight, views and privacy through appropriate building design, including heights, floor plates, overall massing, separation distances, and **appropriate street setbacks**.

This application is requesting significant amendments to the Minimum Front and Side Yard Set Back. Both set back requests are significantly against Zoning By-law and precedence. The City stated part of the intensification is to promote appropriate street setback, yet this application is putting the edge of the building 2.4m from the Gordon Street Side and 0.8m from Street A.

With the proposed Gordon Street Improvements, and the widening of Gordon to allow a centre turn lane, and widening the side walks on the East side of Gordon to accommodate both pedestrian and bicycle traffic, having an apartment 2.4 meters from this is not promoting a "frame streets, site edges and outdoor amenity spaces" or providing "separation distances, and appropriate street setbacks".

Precedence for both R4.A and R4.B zoning appears to increase the Front and Side Yard Set Back and not reduce it.

Issue 3: Angular Plane

Another key point stressed by staff and the Urban Design Concept document is the importance of Angular Plane. The current Zoning By-law states a 45° Angular

Plane. This application is requesting a 60° from Gordon Street and 71° from Street A. The Urban Design document stipulates the “application of 45° Angular Plane to control the height of new development adjacent to lower rise buildings and open space.”

One of the key points stressed by staff at the Intensification open house, was that the 45° angular plane would be upheld to ensure residences close to the developments, those who have owned their homes for decades, would not lose sun exposure, or have tall buildings butting up next to them. This move to such a steep angular plane result in the residence at 1236 Gordon to be in the shadows of a monster tower. The steep angular plane would also result in significant shadow issues for the intersection at Gordon and Edinburgh resulting in a brief tunnel in an otherwise well thought out and planned mid-rise corridor to the City’s centre.

Issue 4: Parking

As many others have likely mentioned, parking is a significant issue already on the side roads of Valley Road and Landsdown Drive. Between 1155 Gordon (Gordon Gate Townhomes) and the apartments at 1219 Gordon (Solstice 2), Landsdown and Valley are current at capacity for overflow parking. At times, both sides of Landsdown are used for overflow parking, turning Landsdown into a narrow single lane, without enough space for school busses or emergency vehicles to pass. This endangers the current residences of the neighbourhood.

This application is requesting a reduction of visitor parking spaces from the required 96 to 57. Instead of Landsdown Drive experiencing over capacity street parking from time to time, this will result in the street being overcrowded all the time.

Parking is a known issue in Guelph, and the only way the City can get ahead of this issue, is to require new development properties to provide enough parking for the inhabitants and their guest. By accepting this application for reduced visitor parking, the City would effectively remove the current residences ability to have guests visit and park on the street.

Landsdown and Valley are unique. There is no other side street which can be used for overflow parking. We can not park on Gordon or Edinburgh or Arkell. Landsdown already sees the overflow from 2 medium density properties. There is nowhere else for the overflow from 1242 Gordon to go. The city staff selling the intensification of Gordon Street stressed during their open house, any new development would have sufficient parking for the development and visitors and overflow will not congest Landsdown. I am urging the city staff to hold up their commitment to these assurances.

Closing Comment

The Gordon Street Intensification is understandable. The Urban Design Concept outlined several key considerations in order to obtain the communities support. It is not in the City's best interest to have sold the community on a design concept, only to approve something completely different. It is also not the City's responsibility to ensure corporate profits to a developer when they do not provide the same guarantees to the current residents about their property values. Tax revenue and growth are important, but not at any cost. I encourage the City to seriously consider the issues with this application and turn it down as is. All the issues with this application can be rectified by meeting the zoning requirements, lowering the unit per/ha, lowering the building height and increasing the setbacks.

If any City Councillor or Staff wish to discuss my concerns directly with me, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely yours,

Bruce Everitt

I would like to offer the following comments regarding the proposed development for the above file.

Pro

- density
- city taxes

Con

- exceeds maximum height density approved previously
- does not protect wild life
- parking issues on Landsdowne and Valley Rd
- noise from traffic and residents
- would effect sunshine on homes on Valley and wind tunnel studies
- depreciates home values on Valley Rd
- traffic control issues on Gordon
- safety issues from traffic
- non compatible with current properties on Valley Rd and Landsdowne
- doesn't fit environmental landscape

As a homeowner on Valley Rd please keep me updated with all correspondence for the above file with the city.

Gary McDonald

This email letter has been sent by owners on White Cedar Estate.

We are a neighborhood group who is concerned with the plan and scale of the building project that is being proposed for 1242-1260 Gordon Street. We purchased our homes with the belief that the vision for this corridor was medium density development with a focus on creating a village-like atmosphere with some commercial spaces and pedestrian accessibility as per the City's plan posted on their website. Instead the plan for this space now includes high density institutional buildings that will stick out above everything else in the city and especially in the area you propose which is currently lush with vital natural ecosystems and mixed family neighborhoods. Our belief is that it is vital for the future of this city that you consider the consequences that allowing this plan to go through will have for future generations and for the overall development of Guelph. You have an opportunity here to choose between the difference of turning our small community focused city into a crowded and disconnected place where people drive to and from. We understand that growth is part of the future plan for many parts of Ontario over the next several decades but this can be done in a way that maintains the integrity of the community that the citizens of Guelph deserve. There are so many reasons why this plan is not only problematic but potentially devastating to this area. Outlined are some of the main points we would like to bring to your attention.

- **Doesn't align with the overall vision of Guelph** - this style of living is more reminiscent of Mississauga or downtown Toronto. 191 000 people (future projected population) does not mean there needs to be large highrise buildings, this is more in keeping with cities with a population of 500 000 +. This does not align with Guelph's reputation for environmental protection and community and natural space integration.
- **Sets a precedent** - allowing this type of building which does nothing to promote the kind of neighborhood living Guelph is so well known for only opens up the potential for more builders and makes it easier for other builders to take advantage of Guelph's ideal location, high real estate value and low crime rates.
- **Too much density** going into this one small area - it is not spread out over the city and this is an area that is already experiencing rapid growth and increase in density. These buildings will take away from the natural landscape and ecosystems surrounding them. We would be curious if these buildings were proposed in the Exhibition Park area how people would feel.
- **Parking** - the plan does not include enough parking which will inevitably spill onto the surrounding streets.
- **Traffic** - this many units on top of all the other until going in at the corner of Arkell and Gordon will absolutely increase traffic on Gordon. The traffic on Gordon will always be a problem as you can never speed it up through the university, downtown or the bridge at the Boathouse.

We are asking you to please not let a builder change the vision of Guelph that the city council has worked so hard to maintain.

Best Regards,

On behalf White Cedar Estate

Milorad Svenda

Dear Councillors MacKinnon and O'Rourke,

Tonight I read about the trio of development bids heading to council this week. I know that there will be no final decisions made this week but thought I would make my thoughts known to you, my council representatives, as you enter into the session. I really only have concerns with the 1242-1260 Gordon Street development. Having attended the information sessions on the widening of Gordon through the stretch that this development will occur on, and which council recently approved (the widening), I am concerned that the lessons have not been learned. The widening of Gordon will alleviate the current traffic issues and accommodate *some* further development along this section of Gordon (or so we are lead to believe), but this development proposal seems a little excessive in that light. I am concerned that it will put us right back to where we started in terms of traffic and safety in this area. I am not anti-development by any means, but the potential addition of two 12 storey apartments (377 units; 586 parking spots) really seems to be ignorant to the history (and on-going) of development impact in this area. Further, 12 stories seems to be a sizable increase to the current developments in this area (6-7 stories and stacked town homes).

I ask you, as my representatives on council, to give these proposals some sober thought and to perhaps require a reconsideration of the number of units proposed (e.g., reduce to 8 stories perhaps).

Thank you so much for your time and your representation of Ward 6.

All the best,

Thomas Graham, PhD