

- ADDENDUM -
- GUELPH CITY COUNCIL MEETING -
- September 6, 2011 -

DELEGATIONS

- a) 1077 Gordon Street – Proposed Official Plan Amendment and Associated Zoning By-law Amendment (File OP1101/ZC1011) – Ward 6

Correspondence:

- Chris and Christine Manfini

- b) 2011 Market Square Business Promotion Program

Delegations:

- Marty Williams, Downtown Guelph Business Association
- Ron Valeriotte, Carden Street Merchants
- Mark Rodford, Cornerstone

Correspondence:

- Jen Turnbull

BY-LAWS

"THAT By-law Numbers (2011)-19248 to (2011)-19249, inclusive, are hereby passed."

<p>By-law Number (2011)-19248 A by-law to authorize the conveyance to 2257524 Ontario Inc. of the lands described as Part of Block 5, Plan 61M169, designated as Parts 1 and 2, Reference Plan 61R11687, City of Guelph. <i>(Revised legal description)</i></p>	<p>A by-law to authorize the conveyance of land.</p>
---	--

We are writing to oppose the proposed by-law zoning change of 1077 Gordon Street from a medium density housing to a high density housing of three separate, four storey apartment buildings.

When we purchased our house at Balfour Court (directly across from the property in question on Gordon Street) we were told we were moving into an executive family neighbourhood. To our great dismay, we are surrounded by rental properties, and homes with illegal basement apartments rented out to students. These tenants and students have little regard for our properties (leaving garbage out for days, hosting very large and loud parties at all hours of the night, excessive vehicles that drive at very high speeds with no caution for the neighbouring children, and the list could go on forever.

We are extremely frustrated and angered by the fact that there appears to be nothing that we can do. We have argued variance applications of our neighbours who are renting illegal basement apartments, only to have their variance approved. Why do we have these By-laws if they can be ignored or varied whenever it suits the need of the owners? I strongly urge you to stop approving these property / housing / building variances!

These are 3 large apartment buildings being proposed for Gordon street near my house. Once again, the tenants will consist of too many students due to its proximity to the university. With such a large number of apartments, the traffic in the area will be increased significantly. I'm sure we will experience traffic congestion with that many cars trying to enter and exit from the buildings. Not to mention again the increase in noise, garbage, and partying at all hours.

Four stories high?? Our property will be a fish bowl! We work very hard and put alot of expense into maintaining our property. We will no longer be able to enjoy the privacy of our own backyard because the apartment buildings will be looking directly down onto us.

I'd like the Committee of Adjustment to take ourselves and our existing home owner neighbours into consideration when making this decision. Your decision will certainly have a negative impact on our homes value and the quality of our existing neighbourhood. And what about the wildlife that exists on the property in question. For most of the year, the property remains unmaintained, and birds, frogs, and small wildlife have taken up habitat in the area. Before we push them out of their habitat we need to take them into consideration the impact that this will have on our wildlife.

Please don't let us down yet again. Stop the variance! Say NO.

Chris and Christine Manfini

To Guelph City Council,

I'd like to respectfully submit my comments on the proposed Market Square Business Promotion Program.

As an avid downtown supporter and frequent customer of downtown shops and restaurants, I'm looking forward to the completion of the improvements. Meanwhile, I sympathize with the business owners who have endured extraordinary construction-related frustrations and hardships.

The proposed program is certainly a positive gesture, and it could be effective at increasing short-term revenue for downtown businesses, and attracting new customers.

However, I do have some concerns with this approach. Please consider the following during your deliberations:

1. Although the circumstances of the downtown construction are unique, an ad-hoc approach (in the absence of a supporting policy) could be seen by many as

- unfair to other businesses affected by construction, and
- setting a risky precedent for similar scenarios in the future.

2. Some downtown business owners have behaved inappropriately, by publicly insulting City staff. These behaviours violate the City's corporate Harassment and Discrimination Policy: "The City will not tolerate, ignore or condone workplace harassment, discrimination or any pattern of inappropriate, disrespectful behaviour that a reasonable person would consider to be humiliating, demeaning, offensive or intimidating. The City considers such actions to be a serious offence, which may result in disciplinary action up to and including termination of employment."

I have also seen and documented what I consider to be a threatening window display in a downtown business, which may violate the City's Workplace Violence Policy, according to which:

"Workplace Violence includes:

- verbal or written threats to physically attack a worker
- leaving threatening notes or sending threatening emails

Violence that occurs outside the normal workplace but which has an impact on the working environment, including working relationships, may also be considered violence in the workplace."

I've attached photos of this display, for your reference. The pictures are a bit unclear, but one shows a note attached to a toy gun that reads: "Which way to Council Chambers?"

There is absolutely no excuse for this conduct. It is hurtful, distressing, and contrary to the spirit of our community. I oppose rewarding any business owner who has contributed to City staff harassment or workplace violence.

I suggest establishing a City-wide policy to support programs like the one proposed, based on sound rationale and good value. It should include criteria for program beneficiaries such as respectful conduct, consistent with City policies. Development of such a policy should also include consideration of other approaches.

Thank you for considering my comments,

Kind regards,
Jen Turnbull