

## **Correspondence Revised Agenda:**

### **Statutory Public Meeting Report – 520 Speedvale Avenue East– File 0ZS20-006-2020-130**

Dear Mayor Guthrie:

We live at XX Newstead St. We are very opposed to the proposed development at 520 Speedvale Ave E.

We realize that people need housing but this far too dense. People need space outside

not just parking spaces. This plan would leave little room for outdoor green space. Trees will be destroyed

as well. Traffic is steadily increasing on our street which is used as a way of avoiding traffic lights

at major intersections. Speed is also an issue. "Residential area" signs have been installed

which are ignored. We have many seniors (ourselves included) on our street.

Thank you.

Jim and Judy Sweeney

\*\*\*

I wanted to provide feedback on the proposed 520 Speedvale development.

I want to express my encouragement for the concept of transitioning this area from an institution to residential. With the need to increase density within the built-up area, this is a wise use of space.

With that said, I am concerned about the area for amenity spaces. The common amenity area appears to be compliant, however I would argue that this is strictly in form and not function. The common area along the eastern portion is narrow, especially after considering that some landscaping will need to occur. It seems unlikely that this area could be used for much beyond a corridor. With the ground level private amenity area nearly half of what is required for compliance, it seems particularly important that outdoor spaces are available for recreation and for improving quality of life. I would like to see 8 fewer units on the north end; this way a larger contiguous common amenity area could be achieved, and potentially several existing trees would no longer need removal.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments, and best of luck with this project.

Best,

Leah B.

\*\*\*

Just to follow up on my pervious note, I would like you to ask the Developer has considered building Single Family detached Homes on this property. It would cause less unhappiness from the Neighbours & would fit in with the character of the area around it.

Thank you

Evelyn Linton

\*\*\*

We desire to make known our opposition to the proposed plan to redevelop the lands at 520 Speedvale Avenue East with the associated rezoning. The plan appears to squeeze as many units onto the property as possible and where existing requirements can't be met, to apply for an amendment. Given there is no guarantee that any of these units will qualify as affordable housing we see no justification for allowing any of the amendments if the zoning change is approved.

First it is important to note that this land has been previously developed and still holds a large, structurally sound building and many trees, which would need to be removed. A use consistent with its current zoning such as community centre, private school or daycare would be more appropriate for the environment and the neighbourhood.

The setback is not in keeping with the homes in the neighbourhood (as illustrated on page 43 of the Justification report) and inappropriate for the new units directly facing onto Speedvale as their private amenity areas would be very close to a busy, noisy street as well as being undersized .

Parking is a concern. With only 1m (less space for the proposed fence and landscaping) between the parking spaces and the property line on the west side and no allowance between the other spots and the sidewalks snow storage may be a problem. The landscape islands are apt to be of limited help given the need to plant 313 new trees somewhere. This could reduce the number of available spaces as well as impacting fire safety. With limited on street parking emptying the lot for snow removal might prove challenging. On street parking is hindered due to: no on street parking on Speedvale, Victoria and Eramosa; cul de sac design of Carmine and Ramona; multiple apartment buildings on Delaware at Speedvale; danger crossing Speedvale at Newstead; no sidewalks or curbs on Newstead and Montgomery.

Noise is also a concern. While the report addresses street noise for the new units and recommends keeping windows closed and using air conditioners it doesn't address how the noise from 64 air conditioners will affect neighbours or the environmental impact they will have.

These are just a few of our concerns. However, it should be obvious from examining the list of requested amendments that this proposal does not satisfy Guelph's vision of what a medium density development should be. These requirements were established through years of experience and careful deliberation and should not be abandoned.

Ian & Judith Renaud

\*\*\*

I was advised by my councillor to register as a delegate for an upcoming meeting at which one of the topics will be the development at 520 Speedvale Ave East.

My schedule doesn't allow me to speak at the meeting so I'd like to have my input addressed otherwise.

I've already spoken with Councilor Goller on several occasions about traffic on Newstead Street.

To start, I'm for development of this property. As a XXXXX in Guelph, I'm aware that at times, the property has been a spot for vagrants and transient people to squat many of whom I've observed wandering through our neighbourhood at all hours of the day.

I would like to see the property remain zoned as low density however, as the current proposal only raises my level of concern with respect to the issues of traffic in our neighbourhood that I've spoke to councillor Goller about.

One of the reports for the current proposal included data that stated in excess of 25k vehicles operate on Eramosa/Speedvale/Victoria during "daytime" hours. Many of these drivers already use Newstead Street as a thruway to avoid traffic signals/congestion at the major intersections. Introducing 64 units to this property will only increase the number of vehicles attempting to bypass those intersections throughout the day. This will just mean more drivers who ignore the current signage to drive slowly and continue to drive at speeds not appropriate for the area. Safety for my children and others in this area is of utmost importance and I am already concerned that this issue has not been taken seriously by the city. Since Newstead St already lacks a barrier (ie. Curbs/sidewalks/boulevards) from the roadway, I fear that more vehicles equals more risk for kids playing and those walking in the neighbourhood. Not only is Newstead St. used as a shortcut for cars, but there are many students walking to St. James, John. F. Ross, and other schools in the area.

In addition, 64 units and 83 parking spaces doesn't add up. Many families operate two vehicles so where will the overflow end up? where will visitors park? Carmine PL? Newstead St? Montgomery St? These are already VERY narrow streets, again with no sidewalks, and frankly, I don't want to have someone parking their vehicle in front of my residence, on one side or the other, for 9 months of the year. The suggestion that the average family drives 1.5 cars is out of date and frankly, not accurate for our city. If you simply walk around streets close to condo buildings or townhouse developments that do not offer a minimum of two spaces per residence, the residential side streets are full of overflow parking. This is a serious issue.

Again, my household is all for development of this property, but please, consider keeping the current zoning requirements with appropriate parking.

Thank you, Zac Martin