

- ADDENDUM -
- GUELPH CITY COUNCIL MEETING -
- April 8, 2013 -

**158 Fife Road Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment (File ZC1215)
- Ward 4)**

Correspondence:

- Astrid Clos
- Lee Anne & Mike McClymont
- Ryan Picken
- Irene & Greg Paterson

**CON-2013.8 25 Lee Street – Proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment
(File ZC1213) – Ward 1**

Delegations:

- Judy Martin, Sierra Club Canada

**CON-2013.9 Barn at 132 Hart’s Farm Lane West – Proposed Removal
from Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Properties**

Delegations:

- Andrew Lambden
- Owen Scott

Correspondence:

- Dr. & Mrs. Dennis Murr

***“THAT By-law Numbers (2013)-19548 to (2013)-19550, inclusive,
are hereby passed.”***

BY-LAWS

<p>By-law Number (2013)-19548 A by-law to authorize the execution of a Subdivision Agreement between Guelph Grangehill Developments Limited, The Corporation of the City of Guelph and TD Canada Trust. (Grangehill Phase 7B)</p>	<p>To execute a Subdivision Agreement. (Grangehill Phase 7B)</p>
---	--

<p>By-law Number (2013)-19549 A by-law to amend By-law Number (1995)-14864, as amended, known as the Zoning By-law for the City of Guelph as it affects property known municipally as 25 Lee Street and legally described as Lots 1-17 and Part of Lot 18, Registered Plan 462 and Part of Grange Road and Cityview Drive, Registered Plan 53 and Part of Block 218, City of Guelph to permit the development of an elementary school (File:ZC1213).</p>	<p>To amend the Zoning By-law as approved by Council April 8, 2013. (25 Lee Street)</p>
<p>By-law Number (2013)-19550 A by-law to confirm the proceedings of a meeting of Guelph City Council held April 8, 2013.</p>	<p>To confirm proceedings of Guelph City Council meeting of April 8, 2013.</p>

Submission from Astrid Clos
 Re: 158 Fife Road



From: Lee Anne McClymont
Sent: April 2, 2013 9:11 PM
To: Al Hearne
Cc: Gloria Kovach; Cam Guthrie; Blair Labelle
Subject: File ZC1215, Zoning Amendment/Proposed Development 158 Fife road

Dear Mr. Hearne

My husband and I who have been residents of Pamela Place for over 20 years are writing to express our concerns regarding the proposed rezoning (Urban Reserve to R.3A) and development plans (13 additional townhouses) to the rear portion of 158 Fife Road. Our issues are as follows:

Density

In December, 2009, at a City Council meeting regarding the development of the front lot of 158 Fife Rd., concerns were raised about the density of the proposed development. At the time, the OMB agreed with current resident concerns, and reduced the proposed density to 506m² per unit. Why then, does this new proposed zoning allow for an increased density, allotting 405m² per unit? Based on the 2009 judgement by the OMB that a high density of housing (under 506m² per unit) is not suitable for the neighbourhood, we are requesting that the zoning density for the back property, at a minimum, match the zoning density of the front property. Furthermore, considering the irregular shape of the property, the restricted access to this land, the proximity to rail tracks, and the awkward location of the property, we are further requesting that the density be reduced even more.

According to 7.2.34 of the Official Plan Land Use Designation and Policies: "Residential lot infill shall be compatible with adjacent residential environments." According the proposed development plan, 3 new dwellings would occupy the same land area as one existing neighbourhood lot. How is this considered compatible with the surrounding residences?

Trees

There are a minimum of 10 mature trees growing along our back property line, bordering the proposed new development. We have concerns that damage to the root structures of the trees may be incurred during the construction process. We would therefore like to request a construction free buffer zone, along ours, and others, back lots, in order to protect the trees and their roots.

Garbage collection

Additionally, we have concerns as to how garbage and recycling programs will operate in this development. Given Guelph's innovative recycling efforts, we are assuming that this new development will adhere to Guelph's official waste management and recycling program policies and as such, our concern revolves around the quantity and placement of any planned communal collection receptacles, specifically with regards to potential odour and rodent and other pest infestation problems.

Light pollution

We are also concerned about the parking and street light pollution which will be introduced into the surrounding neighbourhood backyards. We would request that some form of limit be imposed on how much light pollution of the surrounding properties will be permitted by this development.

Resident use of the emergency roadway

The development plan calls for an emergency-use roadway extending directly beside our backyard property line. This roadway and the use by emergency vehicles is not an issue; our concern is that the residents will use this roadway on a regular basis. We are therefore requesting that some form of barrier be implemented to stop non-emergency use of this roadway.

Snow Removal

Finally, we are concerned as to how snow management and removal will be handled in this development. The high usage of land does not allow for the storage of plowed snow. The proposed roadway and emergency roadway will all need to be cleared of snow, which will need to be piled somewhere. Further, spring melting and runoff may produce flooding in our backyard depending on the placement of the snow piles.

Thank you for this opportunity to voice our concerns regarding this proposed development plan.

Sincerely

Lee Anne & Mike McClymont

From: Zryen
Sent: April 2, 2013 8:42 PM
To: Al Hearne
Subject: Questions /concerns for city File ZC1215

Questions /concerns for city File ZC1215

What are repercussions of double the units?

-garbage collection? Where will bins be located?

-if at end of our drive way / entrance at Fife Rd?

-how much parking spaces, plans don't look like enough for residents not to mention visitors

-is the builder required to fence along side or rear of property on 146-152 Fife Rd?

Since the frontage is less than required, traffic will be closer to our property line, a lane for traffic a few feet from our side door does not seem safe, plus with double the traffic.

Who is in charge of maintenance of property, individual owners or condo fee funded plan/committee?

Road widening on diagram, is there a proposed change in the fife road width?

(One diagram online had a dotted line along fife rd labeled road widening.)

Is it condo's or subsidized housing?

Ryan Picken

April 3, 2013

To whom it may concern,

My husband & I are unable to attend the meeting. We are in Philadelphia attending a wedding.

We would like to voice our opinion, disapproval, and concern regarding the proposed request for rezoning of the parcel of land, which abuts my property on 25 Pamela Place. The triangle piece of property bounded by the spur railroad line.

To rezone this rear portion of property from Urban reserve zone to a R3A Zone is outrageous on many levels:

- The minimum lot frontage is far short of the 18 meters required.
- The density in an urban reserve would exhaust the infrastructure and adversely affect the residents bordering the area.
- The railway line as it is, is very close to my own backyard. I see trains daily carrying loads of hazardous material. There is just not enough of a buffer there to allow townhouses in the narrow space as it exists.
- It would be an environmental assault on the land to build townhouses in that triangle as that area is a natural watershed and drainage area.

My opinion is that the landowner/developer is being greedy, he has a plan for townhouses and he has decided cram as many as he can in this space without any consideration for the existing homeowners, the environment or the zoning required.

We are absolutely against said such development for the proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment (File # ZC1215). And wish this to be a part of the record.

Regards,



Irene and Greg Paterson

April 8, 2013

RE: Agenda Item - CON-2013.9 Barn at 132 Hart's Farm Lane West – Proposed Removal from Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Properties

Madame Mayor and Guelph City Council:

We were unable to download the report associated with this application and so do not know if this report addresses our concerns with the proposed demolition of the barn. We are concerned that this proposed demolition is being considered in isolation without consideration of other impacts. The demolition of the barn is not just a heritage issue since the barn's demolition may impact biodiversity through the removal of the potential and/or existing habitat of endangered, threatened and species of concern in Ontario.

We would like Council and city staff to address the following concerns re the demolition permit:

1. Has an Environmental Impact Study for the proposed redevelopment of this property been conducted and reviewed by the city's Environmental Planner and EAC? If not how can we be assured that this barn does not provide habitat for the endangered Barn Owl? See the following information on barn owls:

-Barn Owls listed as an endangered species -

<http://www.mnr.gov.on.ca/en/Business/Species/2ColumnSubPage/287126.html>Recovery -Strategy for the Barn Owl (Tyto alba) in Ontario at

<http://www.mnr.gov.on.ca/stdprodconsume/groups/lr/@mnr/@species/documents/document/286976.pdf>

2. Has the barn been assessed for barn swallows? The Committee on the Status of Species at Risk in Ontario (COSSARO) has added the Barn Swallow to the list of Threatened species to be regulated under the Endangered Species Act, 2007 (ESA). Barn swallows are migratory and lay their eggs from mid-May to mid-August.

http://www.savanta.ca/index.php/blog/comments/Barn_Swallow_Listed_Threatened_Ontario

"The removal and/or routine maintenance of extant rural dwellings and out buildings (e.g., barns, sheds, and garages) may affect breeding and associated habitat for barn swallows".

3. Has the barn been assessed for bat habitat? Bats hibernate from November to March. The big brown bat is the most likely species to hibernate in buildings like houses and barns. -

<http://www.mnr.gov.on.ca/en/Business/Species/2ColumnSubPage/276722.html>

Bats are already experiencing a serious population decline in North America.

Our final comment has to do with the building itself. How can/does the city allow the building's owner let the building deteriorate to such an extent that it can only be torn down? What processes, by-laws etc. (if any) does the city have in place to protect our heritage buildings?? It would appear that the surrounding land is to be redeveloped. Is the proposed demolition of this identified cultural heritage site to be repeated elsewhere in the city as redevelopment is proposed?

We are also concerned with the large hedgerow trees on this property. How many of them are heritage trees that were never designated as part of the cultural landscape heritage on this property. The farm house is circa 1850. The larger hedgerow trees could potentially be over 100 years old, therefore, we formally request that the trees on this property be assessed for heritage landscape designation before it is too late in the redevelopment proposal to protect them.

Given our list of concerns, we formally request that no demolition permit be approved until the Environmental Impact Study has been reviewed by the city's environmental planner and EAC. We also request that the trees be considered for heritage designation. With our ever shrinking tree canopy we cannot afford to lose any more mature trees.

Yours sincerely:

Dr. and Mrs. Dennis Murr