

Application for the Adjustments A2025-064 and A2025-065

I am writing once again as the family living directly beside the proposed site of 82 and 84 Brunswick Avenue. We feel that once again, the developer has proposed a design that is looking to only maximize their profit, rather than contribute to the harmony of our community. Again, we believe that this property, to safely be added to our neighbourhood could only have a maximum of 4 separate units. I offer the following submissions for your consideration

Parking

- a) Once again by even further reducing the number of parking spaces to only providing 2 for the entire proposed 6 units, will in no way provide enough spaces for the future residents.
 - I completely understand the City's desire to reduce the reliance on cars but according to Statistics Canada 90% of households have at least one car. Not providing parking will only mean tenants, their friends, delivery trucks etc. will all park on our street.
 - 271 and 273 Hartwood Rd., right around the corner from us only has 4 units and they provide 4 parking spaces. There are always cars parked illegally, blocking sidewalks, boulevards and causing safety issues for children and the elderly that frequent the sidewalks.
 - **Excessive parking on the street creates a serious safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists. We only have parking on one side of Brunswick and the sidewalk does not extend to the end of the street. Our community has to walk on the road to reach Giant Tiger, school cross walks and the nearby Community Centre. We have a concentration of small children in the section of road as well as elderly and disabled neighbours that we as the residents take extreme care to watch out for when parking and moving our vehicles. A busy building with extremely limited parking would be a hazard to our safety.**
 - The developer will say they are providing the minimum of what they are required to but the "policing" of the potential problems will fall to the neighbours to call By-law.
 - If the developer were to consider setting the house further towards the street, there would be room in the back for a parking lot similar to other multi family dwellings in our diverse neighbourhood.

Negative impact of reducing the yard to 5.6 meters rather than the required 7.5

- b) The proposed reduction of the rear yard setback of 5.6 meters instead of the minimum required 7.5 meters is another indicator of excessive greed.
 - Rather than allow their tenants a decent size back yard to enjoy, the developer is attempting to squeeze the largest building they can into the space to maximize their rents. The building already is at the maximum width it can reach on the property, with no space left on their property to replace the natural fencing they will be cutting down that we shared with our former neighbours.

- At the last committee meeting we were told that there is plenty of space between our properties in outside yard and driveway. I would like to argue that we do have space between the buildings, but they plan on building their sidewalk directly along the property line after removing the bushes and fence we set up with our neighbour to ensure our dog stays in our yard.
- With the yard becoming so small, where does the builder propose the new cart-based collection (2026) bins to be stored? On the sidewalk beside our garden?
- A four-unit building could be designed to be narrower and allow yard space, parking and not overwhelm the space and we wouldn't have to rebuild fencing for privacy along our property line.

Believe it or not the housing crisis is being addressed. Properties for rent are popping up all over Kitchener Waterloo faster than any other type of building. It is my belief that pushing for oversized buildings with no outdoor amenities and no parking when there are so many other options on the market, it will be very difficult for people to rent for any significant amount of time. It just is not a sustainable family option.

I would like to formally request this committee to deny applications A2025-064 and A2025-065 as the variances do not provide enough parking and outdoor living space for the needs of their residents, offers them no privacy or storage for their waste collection bins. This model is not attractive to neighbourhoods or families looking to rent.

Sincerely,

Maggie Wright