

Hello Lindsay

To the best of my knowledge there has been no invitation for the public as yet to make comment about the proposed Tricar development for Gordon/Valley Road. However, I would like to see a few comments at this time and will follow-up with additional input later when invited.

First I would like to say that as a citizen of this city, I abide by the laws and by-laws in place and in fact I am held accountable for my actions and penalized if I should violate any of these laws.

So I am a little distressed to see that the same expectation of compliance with laws and bylaws in this city, do not seem to be expected from developers, otherwise a developer would not seek to bend or unfollow the existing rules. It would seem the developer regards the existing regulations as a starting point for negotiations and the city appears to be a willing partner to this position. Why?

In brief, here are my comments.

According to the City's Official Plan, the site in question is regarded as future High Density, in my opinion that's a given, whether I like it or not. And I don't, but I understand that increasing density is a reality. It would be wonderful if the city would consider changing that designation to Medium Density as that would mean that the building(s) would blend into the existing neighbourhoods, both old and new and not stand out like a sore thumb. Can and how do we do this?

Within the existing regulations, Tricar wants to UNFOLLOW rules.

Tricar wants not just to UNFOLLOW the City's definition of High Density – 10 storeys but to CHANGE the definition to the 12 storeys that they want on this site. In addition to more floors, more people are to be squeezed in, 271 units per hectare vs the policy of 150 units per hectare, over an 80% increase.

Furthermore, Tricar wants to UNFOLLOW 17 of 27 - 62% - of zoning regulations with respect to High Density Apartments.

Do any of these things seem reasonable?

The following excerpt is from a City of Guelph document, with bolding added for emphasis, by me.

*Purpose of a Zoning By-law*

***A Comprehensive Zoning By-law is a precise document used by the City to regulate the use of land. It states exactly what land uses are currently permitted in Guelph and provides other detailed information such as: - where buildings or structures may be located; - types of uses and dwellings permitted; - standards for lot size, parking requirements, building height, and required yards.***

*Guelph's Zoning By-law is needed to help the City implement the objectives and policies of the Official Plan. The Zoning By-law acts as a **legal tool** under Ontario's Planning Act **for managing the use of land and future development** in the City.*

*Zoning By-laws **also protect property owners** from the development of conflicting land uses. Any use of land or the construction or use of any building or structure not specifically authorized by the By-law is prohibited.*

The City's Official Plan and bylaws need to be followed.

The city needs to walk its talk by holding itself accountable for maintaining the standards it has set in place and making sure developers work to those standards. The City and the developer need to be held to the same standard of conduct, obeying all the laws, as its citizens are.

I understand that there is a September 14<sup>th</sup> Council Planning meeting. I would appreciate it if this correspondence would be included on the agenda. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

Valerie Gilmor

\*\*\*

I offer these comments about the proposed development at 1242-1260 Gordon Street and 9 Valley Road and ask that they be part of the record for the the September 14th meeting.

Valerie Gilmor

### **Re: Official Plan and Zoning Amendments**

As a homeowner living at [REDACTED] Valley Road, I believe the City should not approve an amendment to the Official Plan to permit a site specific policy to allow, either a maximum building height of 12 storeys or an increased density of 271 units per hectare. The Official Plan designation of high density as 6-10 storeys with 100-150 units per hectare should be followed.

### **Official Plan Amendment**

The proposed development of **two 12 storey towers is an anomaly** amid the single family homes and medium density apartment buildings immediately adjacent the site, even though the developer claims their development is compatible in scale, height, setbacks, appearance and site. This is blatantly not so. **Two 12 storey towers will dwarf all buildings in the vicinity**, be they 5 storey, 2 story or 1 storey.

Furthermore the **topography** of the site **means that buildings will appear even taller** than they are, **totally inappropriate aesthetically, out of character with existing neighbourhoods and their quality of life and incompatible with the city's Urban Design Concept Plan** which states, "*Gordon Street is envisioned to become a vibrant pedestrian friendly street **framed by mid-rise buildings**, continuous rows of healthy trees, and active at grade uses that engage the street and the sidewalk*".

**Two 5 storey buildings would be much more compatible** to existing forms and still **enable the city to meet its goal of increased density and well scaled intensification.**

Attached are drawings, to scale, and prepared by Jack Humphrey, Conestoga APFM Student, which provide a picture of a 12 storey tower in context.

The city's density requirement for this rezoned site is 100-150 units per hectare. However in asking for 271 units per hectare, the **developer is actually seeking a minimum increase of 81% up to 171% in density,** beyond the by-law. Maintaining the City's current standards should be the order of the day and will ensure compatible building forms in this area.

### **Zoning By-law Amendments**

The developer wants to **decrease all setbacks** (front yard, exterior side yard, rear yard), **minimize distances between buildings, reduce common amenity areas by almost 50%** in order to maximize the buildings' footprints. In addition **angular planes** from the buildings to the park and street **are 60% to 92% greater** than required by law, creating a canyon like effect at street level, unsympathetic to a pedestrian environment. How can life be best lived and enjoyed by residents of any new building or by neighbours when physical distances and vibrant and attractive areas are minimized?

**Parking is an ongoing concern. Neighbourhood streets,** Landsdown Drive and Valley Road, **already act as parking lots** for the townhouses and apartment block on the west side of Gordon. **This will only get worse** with this development as **visitor parking is 40 spots shy** of what is required and **some residents of the towers simply won't have parking spaces on site.** How will this be addressed?

Perhaps the city might **institute parking permits** for those using streets as parking lots because insufficient on-site parking is provided. Interestingly, over **400 parking spaces** have been allotted to **bicycles.** Where is the research that indicates, vehicle use will decrease in this time of electric cars and bicycle use will increase as a means to get to work, go to dinner or grocery shop in Canada's climate?

**Traffic will increase even more.** The proposed road will spill many of the 377 vehicles onto Gordon Street, either at the new intersection or where Landsdown meets Gordon at the north end. The intersection at **Gordon and Edinburgh is already deficient in managing both traffic volume and flow.** The developer estimates 92 outbound trips will occur in peak AM hours, only 24% of the buildings' capacity. This is hard to believe.

There is **no left-turn lane** at the new intersection, an obvious omission, which means extra long wait times to simply enter the intersection, never mind turning right or left or going straight ahead. **Critical corner lot sight lines are not in compliance** and will result in reduced visibility.

Additionally, Landsdown Drive North will see a dramatic increase in traffic volume and safety issues will arise for residents. The Urban Design Concept Plan clearly states, "**design Landsdown Road as a two-way residential street, not as a service lane**", and yet a service lane is exactly what is being planned.

**Environment 707 trees now. 101 trees left standing. 606 trees destroyed,** removing habitat for a variety of birds, creating erosion issues and potential for invasive plant species on neighbouring properties, all for ease of construction. Can we not do better?

**Intensification is one driver of development** in Guelph's south-end. **But it should not be the most significant one.** I also believe **people,** their desires and the communities they create **are an essential and critical driver** to determining the future housing options, residential environments, small businesses and green space. How we shape our physical world directly affects how we see, experience and know our neighbourhoods, our cities and ourselves.

The challenge here is to refine this proposed development into a well scaled intensification plan that creates meaningful, human scale and quality residential and inviting public spaces, that contribute to people's health, happiness and wellbeing. By doing this, we can preserve, enhance and protect the high quality of life which, historically, has been one of Guelph's greatest strengths.





