

From:
To: [Committee of Adjustment \(SM\)](#)
Subject: Application A2025-064 and A2025-065
Date: Friday, July 4, 2025 8:24:24 AM

You don't often get email from

[Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Committee

My Submission letter against the Application for the Adjustments (A2025-064) and (A2025-065) in regards to 82 Brunswick being torn down and replaced by a semi-detached building comprised of three units each. That would be a total of six units (6000sq foot building on a small property) and a paved yard for parking (2 parking spots total), where once stood a single-family dwelling. Though we welcome a multi-family build at that site to help address the growing population of Kitchener, we, as the direct neighbours, are very concerned about the size and scale of the proposed build for the following reasons:

1. Traffic and Safety risks on a narrow street – the lack of parking that will be available on the property will therefore increase on street parking in an area where the sidewalk ends and many pedestrians and children on bicycles must switch to using the road. Yes there is parking on one side of the street, but not during winter months for the road is even narrower due to snow banks. Giant Tiger is private parking for shoppers and the closest public parking is at Breithaupt Centre. Does The City of Kitchener want people parking at the Breithaupt Centre all year long when they're not using the centre?
2. Over-development and lack of green space by putting this many units and parking on one lot of land. Small units attract transient tenants, who rely on maintenance to remove snow, clean up garbage and provide any upkeep, as observed from the recent build at 273 and 271 Hartwood Ave.
3. The loss of green space with the reduction of 15-17% of the front yard and widening the driveway, concrete sidewalks beside building for rear access, removing the mature trees in the backyard which greatly reduces the noise pollution from the neighbouring apartment buildings.
4. We need to keep with the style of our current neighbourhood that is filled with century brick homes and triplexes well back from the road to allow for single families to live and grow.
5. Six units in one small location with only two parking spots will be an issue of who parks there and where the others park their vehicles. Parking double deep to over hang onto the road way, which again, is already a narrow roadway.
6. To me, this is still the same size build that they tried to apply for. 6000 square foot building on a small lot. Build a duplex, max 2000 square foot build. One unit 1500 and a 500 unit and still have green space in the front yard and back yard which I believe will be more welcomed. A family would enjoy, and be able to call home.
7. Some may call it an answering to the Housing crisis, maybe - yes and no. It's more on the point of affordability to own a place to call home. To build maximum size in a limited space is to make maximum dollars for the investor, thereby allowing the investor to buy another down the road to build another unit(s) for maximum income, while leaving behind the crisis of lack of parking/greenspace/cleanup and maintenance that the old units will require from transient tenants. All I can say is look what has happened in Waterloo by the Universities.

If you have any questions or concerns, you're welcome to contact me.

Sincerely.

Peter Eckstein