
From: Steve Gyorffy <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 2:19 PM
To: Andrew Pinnell
Cc: Scott Davey
Subject: Zone Change for 157 Schweitzer St

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Attn: Andrew Pinnell, Senior Planner

Dear Mr Pinnell,

Re: Neighbourhood Meeting Follow-up

The members of our neighbourhood appreciated the further information and insights provided during the zoom meeting of June 26th, 2025. However, this meeting further reinforced my concerns about the myriad of justifications put forth in support of this project. Many of these justifications don't hold up under closer examination.

In the following I will summarize the many reasons for my concerns.

Concerns:

- **Storm Drainage**
- **Misleading Photographs**
- **Official Plan Adherence**
- **Proposed Variances from New Bylaw**
- **Consents**
- **Notifications**
- **Regional Municipality of Waterloo - Site Servicing Questionnaire**

Good evening Mr. Pinnell,

There were many concerns that could not be addressed during the course of the June 26 public meeting due to time constraints.

We can appreciate your's and Mr. Davey's position that the Zoom format is how these meetings are currently done and have been for some time. With all due respect, you work in a modern environment that has utilized technology for efficiency. However, the Zoom format does create accessibility issues for many residents, as was witnessed by the number of senior neighbours that came together at the Bridgeport Community Centre in order to access the meeting to express their valid concerns. Many residents, namely the two most affected by the application and adjacent to the subject property, are seniors who do not have access to email or other electronic communications. This process needs to consider the accessibility issues to remain equitable and inclusive of everyone impacted.

There will be some residents who are unaware of the application. Postcards were sent to some neighbouring homes, but some did not receive one. Additionally, it was mentioned that there should be signage on the subject property for the proposed development. There is none, nor has there ever been. We address this specifically, with photographs below.

It is clear that the new owner of 157 Schweitzer Street has not spent much time in this community. It is also clear he does not understand the impact his proposal will have on the current residents and homes in the neighbourhood.

Many residents in the City of Kitchener likely do not understand that Bridgeport East, while a part of Kitchener, has its own unique identity. Many of the residents that live in this specific part of the neighbourhood have lived here for 40, 50 or even 60 years, since Bridgeport was first developed and not part of Kitchener. Lark Street, Schweitzer Street and Schofield Drive are streets that end in farmer's fields at the absolute edge of the city boundary.

The attraction to this neighbourhood is the lot sizes, the low-density housing and being at the edge of the city where traffic issues do not impact our immediate neighbourhood. This is why we chose to move here almost a decade ago. This proposed development, requiring a zoning amendment, and exceptions to that amendment, will impact the immediate neighbourhood considerably.

Scoped Planning Justification Report

We have reviewed the Scoped Planning Justification Report filed by MHBC Planning. There is a lack of veracity in some of the areas covered in the report that the Planning Committee should be aware of. There are also issues with the other documentation that came with the application to the city.

The photographs included in the report are of homes on other streets, but not the affected Lark Street.

There are no two-storey homes on Lark Street. There are 2 two-storey homes on Schofield Avenue. Many of the lot sizes or frontages on Lark Street have more than 60 to 70 feet to accommodate side split homes. It is troubling and has us questioning intentions and the veracity of other areas of the report, that not one single home from Lark Street was included in the photographs to represent the character of the neighbourhood for the Planning Committee. At the recent public meeting, when this issue was touched upon, MHBC responded with the mischaracterization of 14 Lark Street as being a two-storey home. This is not the case, nor was a photo of this home submitted in the report. All of the houses on Lark Street are, in fact, either side splits or bungalows only. Below are four homes on Lark Street near the subject property and are more representative of the lot size and homes in the immediate area.







Please note, these homes are side splits with the lower level partially below grade and therefore cannot be considered two storeys.

Additionally, the inclusion of photographs in the report of two homes on Daniel Avenue, as representative of the neighbourhood, is also troubling. The 2 one-storey homes photographed were part of a Habitat for Humanity build that happened many years ago. Those homes are not representative of the other homes and lots in the neighbourhood but are certainly representative of an already established increase to the density of the larger neighbourhood in Bridgeport East.

The inclusion of a home on Schofield Drive characterized as a three-storey home is inaccurate as well. That home was a raised bungalow on a sizeable lot that was renovated to two storeys to accommodate the family that owned it. The bottom level of the home is mostly below grade and cannot be considered a three-storey home. Again, this misrepresentation casts doubt on the veracity of the report submitted.

The inclusion of photographs of two semi-detached homes in the small sample size of photographs offered by MHBC is also a misleading representation of the surrounding lots and house sizes in the greater neighbourhood. These homes are an exception to the norm and already represent an increase in the density of the larger neighbourhood in Bridgeport

East. This misrepresentation of our neighbourhood has been done in an attempt to make this application pass without actual knowledge this neighbourhood.

The report's conclusion characterizes this severance of 3 lots, with 30-foot frontages, from a current backyard as "modest intensification." During the meeting and in other parts of the report, it was characterized as gentle intensification. Despite the wordsmithing, it is considerable intensification on Lark Street.

While all of the other lots on the street are much wider to accommodate side splits and bungalows, the proposed lots will only have 30-foot sized lots. This is **not in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood** and specifically with the affected Lark Street and **is contrary to Policy 17.E.20.5 of the City Official Plan specifically section b) that reads "the lots reflect the general scale and character of the established development pattern of surrounding lands by taking into consideration lot frontages, areas and configurations."** The surrounding lands are Lark Street, Schofield Avenue and Schweitzer Street and should not include Daniel Avenue.

The lot sizes are **NOT** similar in size to surrounding lots, they are considerably smaller. Noted on page 11 of the MHBC's report, they suggest similar lot sizes on Schofield Drive, Schweitzer Street and Daniel Avenue. This is not accurate. Additionally, the report neglects to mention Lark Street, where the houses will be built. That omission is glaring, and it would take 5 minutes to walk the neighbourhood to see this inconsistency in the report.

The proposed front yard setbacks have the houses sitting closer to the road than any other homes on the street and will cause them to stand out. This would not be necessary if the owner chose to sever one lot from the existing property. This would allow sufficient space to put a home with similar offsets to the existing homes on the street, with similar lot sizing. When considering the policies of **section 4.C.1.8 of the City Official Plan - a) the proposed single detached dwellings will NOT be similar to other dwellings in the immediate area, contrary to MHBC's report.** While MHBC states the front yard setbacks will not require a reduction under RES4 zoning, it will not be in keeping with the rest of the homes on the street.

While recognizing the importance of the Provincial Planning Statement and reaching residential targets, this development is not in keeping with current zoning or even the proposed rezoning application from RES3 to RES4, as the owner will ask for additional exceptions to zoning requirements if he is successful in having the property rezoned. Additionally, this application really is not about meeting provincial residential targets. It is about the owner, Mr. Mishra, increasing his wealth by severing the lots for resale.

As it was pointed out in the meeting, the intention of the owner is to sever the lots and resell them, not develop them. What is to stop the new owners of the lots from building multi-unit dwellings on those lots? What will those new lots be zoned as, RES4? This could create even greater intensification in this purposely built low density neighbourhood bordering on agricultural land.

With the selling of the proposed 3 lots to individual builders/buyers, there could be very different homes built on those lots. As well, the construction process could be a long, drawn-out affair causing disruption to the entrance of this small neighbourhood for an extended period of time. There is no other access or egress point to Lark Street or Schofield Drive. All residents must pass by this location in order to reach their homes or leave the neighbourhood. Multiple builds over a drawn-out period of time will cause considerable and unreasonable disruption to residents.

All of the residential homes on Lark Street are zoned for RES3. All of the residential homes on Schofield Drive are zoned for RES3. The majority of the homes in the surrounding neighbourhood are zoned for RES3. The exceptions are a small number of lots that were rezoned to RES4 to allow for a few semi-detached homes, the Habitat for Humanity build on Daniel Avenue and the large agricultural lots across from the subject property belonging to the church at the end of Schweitzer Street.

The applicant is trying to get the property rezoned to allow for more lot severances because the proposed development does not comply with the current fabric of the neighbourhood nor current zoning. Additionally, he will be seeking amendments to the RES4 zoning, if permitted, to make up for insufficiencies in the current plans as they relate to yard setbacks and driveway widths.

On page 7 of the report is Table 2 that speaks to the application being consistent with the PPS Policy of 2024. In the first paragraph, MHBC speaks to the zoning by-law amendment permitting "*the development of single detached dwellings with smaller lots, broadening the mix of housing styles and lot sizes in the area, increasing housing choice.*" This is an example of where assertions in the report can be incongruent with other areas in the report. MHBC speaks to the proposed development **retaining the character of the neighbourhood but here it reports it will broaden housing styles and lots sizes.** If compared with the immediate and surrounding neighbouring houses, the new lots and houses will be very different from the current lot sizes and style of homes. **This is contrary to the policies of the City Official Plan.**

There will potentially need to be **remediation of the property related to the septic tank system and a potential automotive repair site.** Most homes in this neighbourhood were,

at some point, on septic systems and many homes still have them buried in their yards despite current connections to the city sewer/sanitation systems. The subject property is no exception and that has been addressed later in this document as being misrepresented in the Region's Environmental Site Screening Questionnaire.

In reference to the Region's desire to transition existing neighbourhoods to **15-minute neighbourhoods**, it cannot go without mention that Bridgeport East is somewhat isolated from the rest of Kitchener, which is separated by an already congested single bridge. While there is an industrial park nearby offering some employment opportunities and some smaller limited park areas (Sylvia Park only in this immediate neighbourhood), there are **no grocery stores and very limited other commercial properties servicing the community**. There are also **no schools** leaving a requirement to bus children to the nearest schools. As there is a **single GRT transit route** for the entire Bridgeport East community, to reach the nearest grocery store requires a bus change or a long walk up the hill on Bridge Street, after getting off on Lancaster Street, to reach the local Freshco. Otherwise, without a car, folks needing groceries would have to ride the one bus route that services the area a considerable distance. It is difficult to manage without a car here. The Region's goal of 15-minute neighbourhoods might not be possible on this side of the bridge.

There is a **single two-lane bridge** that offers access from Bridgeport (and many commuters to the East, such as Breslau, Guelph), to the rest of Kitchener. Intensification at any level in this community creates **strain on the traffic flow from Bridgeport East into Kitchener**. During commuting times, traffic is backed up considerably to wait to cross the bridge. Until there is another bridge or a widening of the existing bridge, **traffic congestion will continue to worsen** at this bottleneck. Additionally, a very large new industrial site is under construction and that will also add to the bottleneck of workers and residents alike trying to access other parts of the Region.

While the neighbourhood falls within the "built up" area referred to on page 9 of the report under heading **3.3 City of Kitchener Official Plan**, it is just inside the built up area. Lark Street, Schofield Drive and Schweitzer Street areas where the **subject property is situated are very close to agricultural land and the city boundary**. All of these roadways end at a dead end a short distance away in farmer's fields.

Outside of the MHBC report there are **other considerations** for this application. Currently, we experience **frequent power outages** during all seasons of the year, and these are not specific to weather events. They just happen. However, just a few nights ago as we were trying to finish this document, there was an outage with a storm. Adding three more houses to the grid will offer further strain on an already overburdened power grid. This has been the

case for the duration of our time in this neighbourhood and we see the potential for it becoming worse without sufficient updating to the current infrastructure.

As mentioned, many times during the meeting, there is concern about the water table in the neighbourhood and storm runoff. With the **considerable reduction of the green space** on the property of 157 Schweitzer Street in the proposal, we are left wondering how that will **impact the ability for water absorption** during inclement weather and the spring melt in our immediate neighbourhood. With the current soil make-up, with clay being predominant, the water table levels are a concern. Our home experiences sump pump drainage requirements in the spring melt, as do many homes in the neighbourhood. How will the **loss of green space and the construction impact the balance and flow of water in and on the ground?** A proper study should be completed and made public.

The answers offered that the "engineers" said it would not be a problem is insufficient to calm this concern. I speak further to this below in the report and include photos of the stormwater system we currently have on this side of Lark Street. As mentioned by another resident during the meeting, the nearest connection to the city storm system is at Daniel Avenue and Schweitzer Street. The water draining from the proposed new lots will have nowhere to go and will have to run over the land, as the current culvert is buried at this point.

Snow removal is another concern in this neighbourhood. We experience a lot of snow in this neighbourhood, with snowbanks reaching large volumes due to the close proximity of open agricultural land and drifting. We are able to disperse this snow from our driveways along our lot lengths and driveway lengths. The proposed development does not sufficiently take into account **where snow will be placed with smaller lot sizes. If the proposed lot sizes are 9 metres and a typical width of a single driveway under the current governing zoning by-law for this neighbourhood (85-1) is 2.6 metres to a maximum of 8 metres or 50% of the lot width, where will the snow from these driveways be placed?** These same driveway dimensions exist in the new zoning by-law 2019-051 that is being phased in.

There are **no sidewalks** in this neighbourhood. As it is, residents and children must walk and play on the side of the road. **Increased traffic on Lark Street will pose a safety risk to current residents.** There is already **poor overhead city lighting**, creating darkened areas and poor visibility at that intersection of Lark Street. **This lack of lighting, the narrow street, lack of sidewalks and an increase in traffic exacerbates this safety concern.**

Application for Zoning By-Law Amendment

Notice Signs

Please note all properties subject to an application for a Zoning By-Law Amendment are required to post notice signs. As per Council Policy I-705, should the subject property be situation at an intersection or have frontage on more than one public road, notification signs will be required for each street frontage. [...] Property specific notice signs are provided by the City, at the cost noted in the fees section of this form, and shall be installed by the applicant.

A photo of the installed property specific notice sign must be sent to the File Planner prior to the application being deemed complete. The sign(s) shall remain in place until a decision has been made by Council and the applicable appeal period has expired. At that time, it is the responsibility of the applicant to remove the sign(s).

There have never been any signs posted on the property on either of the frontages on Schweitzer Street or Lark Street. It would appear this application is not complete at this time and should not have proceeded to the next steps of “Notice of Application.” Some residents may not be aware of this application.

The following photographs were taken of the subject property at 157 Schweitzer Street immediately following the public meeting held on June 26, 2025.





8. Proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment

There are acknowledged deficiencies, by the applicant, in meeting Low Rise Residential Four (RES4) regulations. As such there is a request for amendments to site specific regulations to comply with zoning by-laws due to their proposed severance of the land from one lot to four lots.

With these acknowledged deficiencies, the applicant still proposes they be granted exceptions to the RES4 zoning by-law to enable them to sever the lot into four lots, instead of exploring ways to sever the lot without requiring exceptions to the zoning by-law.

Under closer inspection of a portion of the proposed changes to the existing lot, you can see the rear yard of this long-established home becomes 1.6 metres. There is a deck that is currently larger than the proposed setback for this yard attached to the home (as seen in the photo below). Additionally, it is **absurd for MHBC to suggest that this backyard now becomes a side yard to meet zoning requirements for yard offsets. Simply calling it the side yard does not make it so.** The house situated here is oriented to have a rear sliding door that exits onto a deck. This home is 157 Schweitzer Street and the front yard and front of the house and front door face Schweitzer Street. Again, to suggest that the current side

yard of this property now becomes the front yard in order to meet the requirements of the zoning law is ridiculous. The home is oriented to have the front yard on Schweitzer Street.



Rezoning this property to RES4 to accommodate the deficiencies of this proposal seems to be an abuse and manipulation of the current zoning regulations in the name of maximizing profits.

The existing driveway will now require an exception to be within the requirements of the law. Additionally, the rezoning will still require exceptions for the yards of the original property and all of the rear yards for the retained and new proposed severed lots.

Under the current governing law Zoning By-law 85-1, the minimum lot area for a residential home should be 411 square metres with minimum widths of 13.7 metres. None of the current proposed lots whether the original or new severed lots meet all of the requirements of RES3 and thus the request to move to RES4. However, if the proposal to sever the property was done in a more reasonable manner to more closely resemble the surrounding lands, as required, there would be no need to have the property rezoned to RES4.

For example, in keeping with RES3 zoning, the property can be properly severed into two lots with the original retained lot measuring 29.8 metres by 27.4 metres and the new severed lot 21.1 metres by 27.4 metres. There would be no requirement for rezoning.

An example of reasonable intensification occurred with this infill home built on Schofield Drive. It was built on a lot severed from 9 Lark Street. The lot and home is in keeping with the surrounding lands and homes.



If the subject property is rezoned to RES4, this unreasonable proposal can then proceed but in addition to this, the original retained lot/home can then be further altered. The current home is more than 50 years old and has not been well maintained in recent years. It stands to reason that once rezoning is permitted, the original retained home/lot can be further severed or a multi-unit dwelling could be added without restriction, furthering the intensification of this tiny corner of the city.

9. Proposed Zoning By-law designation Chart

The site specific regulation request includes an exception to the Zoning By-law to allow:

- **reduced minimum front yard setbacks for all of the proposed lots**
- **permit the maximum width of the driveway for the retained lot to exceed maximum widths**

- reduced minimum rear yard setbacks for all of the proposed lots

Again, these exceptions or amendments to the by-law would not be required if there was alternate consideration of how the lot was severed. If the lot was severed in a more responsible way with slightly less intensification, exceptions to existing laws would not be required.

10. Site Conditions

It is noted there are veracity issues with how this section has been completed, whether intentional or oversight. It serves to mislead the Planning Committee, not giving them all of the available information to make an informed decision on this application.

b) What is the length of time that the existing use(s) of the subject land have continued?

No answer

c) Are there existing buildings on the subject property? Yes

- *If yes, are any of the existing building or structures 50 years of age or older?*

No answer

This property was constructed prior to 1970 which would make the original home older than 50 years.

g) Are there any buildings or structures proposed to be built on the subject lands? No

The intent of the owner/applicant is to sever the one existing lot to make 4 lots. The additional 3 lots are proposed to be sold for building additional homes on them.

11. Proposed Servicing

c) Stormwater Drainage – A preliminary stormwater drainage report is required for all types of storm drainage. Select the proposed stormwater drainage servicing below: Sewers

While this is proposed stormwater drainage for the site, there does not exist current stormwater sewers at this location. Currently, Schofield Drive has a series of ditches and culverts to manage stormwater drainage. These ditches are also utilized for the homes to pump excess ground water that enters their sump pump wells in the spring melt or when the water table is high. These ditches lead to and join a culvert at the

corner of Schofield Drive and Lark Street. The culvert, which is buried approximately 2 feet below the surface, runs under the front of the properties situated at 9 and 7 Lark Street and continue along the side of the property situated at 157 Schweitzer Street to the corner. It is then diverted to the storm drain at the corner of Daniel and Schweitzer Streets.

The current state of this stormwater culvert is not sufficient. It is prone to freezing due to its shallow depth and does get blocked by snow in the winter.

Please see the photos below.





Regional Municipality of Waterloo – Environmental Site Screening Questionnaire

3. Was the subject property ever used for commercial purposes where there is potential for site construction Answer: No

Neighbouring witnesses, who have lived here in excess of 40 years, report that automotive repair was regularly conducted at 157 Schweitzer Street. Witnesses report there is an automotive pit below the garage of the residence that was commonly used for automotive repair work and oil changes.

6. Is there reason to believe that this property may be potentially contaminated based on historical use of this or an abutting property? Answer: No

Again, neighbours report that automotive work was done at this residence and there is an automotive pit below the garage of the residence. If this pit was in fact used for oil changes and other automotive work, there needs to be a proper inspection done by the Region to ensure there is no contamination of the surrounding property.

10. Does the property use or has it ever used a septic system? Answer: No

It is stated with certainty that there was a septic system in use at this property prior to it being connected to the city's sanitary sewage system. Most homes in the area have septic tanks on the property despite now being connected to the city's sanitary system.

Having regard to the above stated concerns regarding the Application for Zoning By-law Amendment, as well as the somewhat uninformed Regional Environmental Site Screening Questionnaire, there are sufficient concerns and issues with the application that warrant further investigation prior to the Planning Committee meeting so they may make an informed decision regarding this application.

In closing, we can confidently say this proposed application causes considerable concern. Increased strain on infrastructure that has not been updated to meet current standards, such as stormwater movement, water table and ground saturation and hydro power, congestion on the bridge, as well as increased safety concerns over street lighting, lack of sidewalks and more traffic on a narrow street.

The addition of three 30 foot lots with two storey houses onto a street that has predominantly 60 to 70 foot lots with side splits and bungalows does change the character of the immediate neighbourhood. The zoning changes will permit reduction in green space requirements on each lot.

If the applicant reduced the proposal to only sever the lot once to allow one additional home, it would allow for the lot size, yard setbacks and home style to more closely resemble the character of the neighbourhood and current zoning. If this proposal is allowed to proceed, it will change the character of the street and impact the existing properties and residents in a number of ways, as outlined above. Additionally, we do worry about what these changes will do to impact property values on our street and set precedents for further intensification to the subject property and surrounding properties once the lots are sold.

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns and comments,

Julie Sudds and Rebecca Shay

From: Steve Gyorffy <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2025 8:59 AM
To: Andrew Pinnell
Cc: Scott Davey
Subject: 157 Schweitzer St

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Re: Planning Application - 157 Schweitzer St

My name is Steve Gyorffy and I have lived at [REDACTED] for 57 years. I am also a former City Engineer having worked for the City of Kitchener for 34 years. Therefore, I am familiar with development applications in the past and how they were handled. I am concerned about this current proposal which will have a substantial impact on our established 60 year old neighborhood.

I could understand the need for a zoom process during pandemic times. However, the city now seems to have adopted this same process even though the pandemic is long over. As a former city employee, I have attended many public meetings. On my retirement, I have attended both public and zoom meetings. I have found that an in-person open house is much more informative and productive. I am disappointed that the city would not provide one at an excellent city resource like the Bridgeport Community Centre. The Ward Councillor should also attend such a meeting. This is important since there are a substantial number of retired seniors on our street who may not be capable of or interested in participating electronically.

It almost seems that the city is trying to ram this project through by providing minimal information to neighboring residents. This is borne out by the proposal for a zoom meeting and the fact that I placed a call to the File Manager requesting further information on receiving the mail-out and to date my call has not been returned.

I acknowledge and recognize the city's initiatives to increase housing density, but any such endeavours need to recognize site conditions and any associated constraints that they impose.

There is a major change requested in zoning from R-3 to RES-4. That is a significant change for our neighborhood by itself. However, it is also requested that we support relief from requirements related to setbacks, driveway width, and building height. In particular, the current proposal to move the building setbacks closer to the street by 1.6

meters will stick out like a sore thumb on the entrance to the street. The other proposals leave no backyard for the existing house and little greenspace on any of the proposed lots. The major reduction in greenspace will exacerbate the chances for flooding in this area and negate the city's efforts for more stormwater management.

Being in an area on the fringe of the city, access to public transit is not as readily available as in core areas. As a result, area residents tend to have multiple cars increasing the need for readily available parking. The proximity of the 3 lots will negate the space for street parking in front of these lots. That will require visitors to park elsewhere on the street. Many area residents have more than one car. On a walk around the corner this morning, I noted a property with 5 cars in the driveway. These were all accommodated on the property's driveway. There will certainly be a problem accommodating anything more than a single car in this proposal. The Habitat homes on neighboring Daniel Ave are a fine example of lower cost housing. With slightly wider lots, they can accommodate ample parking at the side of each house. They were constructed in 1993 with even President Jimmy Carter coming to help build them!

There are also some infrastructure considerations. This area has a high water table. Special precautions were taken over 40 years ago during the installation of the sanitary sewers to not lower the high groundwater table for fear of damage to existing structures. Many homes have major problems with sump pumps running frequently in the early spring. Despite the comments by the applicant's Engineer, there is not adequate storm drainage on the street. A shallow culvert pipe was installed years ago to conduct sump and ditch drainage from the corner of Schofield Drive to Schweitzer Street. This pipe is shallow and prone to freezing thus blockage. It cannot be considered a proper storm drain by engineering standards. It has previously collapsed requiring repairs by the city. The closest proper drainage outlet which is below frost depth is located one block away at the intersection of Schweitzer St and Daniel Ave. Drainage problems will be exacerbated by the substantial reduction in green space substituted by non porous surfaces on further development.

Although the proponent supplied an engineering report on the suitability of this project, there is no information provided with respect to construction constraints and the impacts of the water table in this area. The construction of a new foundation in close proximity to the existing dwelling at #7 Lark St (Harbach) presents an unreasonable impact to the existing house both from the standpoint of accommodation of her house and the potential for structural impacts. The suitability of soil and groundwater conditions for further development is not addressed in this proposal.

In addition to the concerns noted above, further development on this site is premature until a proper storm drainage system is installed from the intersection of Lark St and

Schofield Ave to the intersection of Schweitzer St and Daniel Ave to preclude the aggravation of existing drainage issues.

In summary, this proposal is clearly overkill - like trying to put ten pounds of sugar in a five pound bag. It doesn't fit!

Respectfully submitted
Steve Gyorffy

From: Zekiel Foncardas <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2025 9:11 PM
To: Andrew Pinnell
Subject: 157 Schweitzer St. Neighbourhood Meeting

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Good day Andrew,

My name is Zekiel, and I am a UW planning student.

I'm just curious as to what Kitchener's open houses/public meetings look like. May I attend the neighbourhood meeting for 157 Schweitzer (I see that it is online) to observe?

--

Thanks,
Zekiel

From: Paul Kordish <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 7:56 PM
To: Andrew Pinnell
Subject: Re: 157 Schweitzer St. Proposed Development Zoom Meeting

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi Andrew,

Sorry to bother you, but further to our recent discussion, my MIL requested that I bring something to your attention.

At the virtual meeting, Julie spoke about the Septic Tank situation on the subject property. Perhaps I misunderstood her, but I got the impression that she was not aware of a Septic system ever existing and that City service was in place. Although that is the case currently, when 157 Schweitzer was originally built in the 60's, it utilized a Septic Tank.

Mrs. Boes is not sure if the tank was ever decommissioned, but she is certain that it was never removed in the 50+ years that she has lived next door.

We thought that we should bring this matter to your attention, as it obviously has important implications for your investigation and planning process in respect of the rezoning application.

Thank you and please don't hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.

Regards.

Paul

On Fri, Jun 27, 2025 at 10:28 AM Andrew Pinnell <Andrew.Pinnell@kitchener.ca> wrote:

Hi Paul,

Thank you for your comments.

I am sorry that you had trouble with the audio at last night's Zoom meeting. Note that the recording of the Virtual Neighbourhood Meeting that was held on June 26th and the presentation slides will be posted on following website in the coming days: www.kitchener.ca/planningapplications

As I mentioned, the upcoming Planning Committee meeting will be a hybrid format (you may attend in-person or virtually). I can confirm that I have added you to the notification list and you will receive further updates on this application.

There is no maximum timeframe for the owner to commence construction of the new houses. At this point, the application is simply to see approval to change the zoning to allow the *future* severance and construction of the houses.

Your comments will be considered and summarized in the following ways:

- During my Planning analysis; and
- In a recommendation report to Council.

Here are the next steps:



Learn more about the project, share your thoughts and understand your appeal rights, visit www.kitchener.ca/planningapplications.

Thanks,

Andrew Pinnell, MCIP, RPP

Senior Planner | Development & Housing Approvals Division | City of Kitchener
519-783-8915 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | andrew.pinnell@kitchener.ca



From: Paul Kordish <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 8:52 PM
To: Andrew Pinnell <Andrew.Pinnell@kitchener.ca>
Subject: 157 Schweitzer St. Proposed Development Zoom Meeting

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Good Evening Andrew.

My name is Paul Kordish and I was the person who attended the Zoom meeting this evening and who was unable to audio connect despite everything on my system apparently functioning correctly.

My mother-in-law, Edith Boes, is the owner and resides immediately next door to the subject property at [REDACTED].

Given that she is in her 91st year, she did request that I attend the virtual meeting in an effort to help her better understand the scope of the proposed development.

I have 2 requests on behalf of Mrs. Boes.

Firstly, would you kindly add me to your email list for further notifications and developments in respect of this matter.

Secondly, is a question that I was unfortunately unable to submit earlier tonight due to audio technical difficulties.

My question is, once any of the 3 properties are sold, what is the maximum time frame that the purchaser must commence construction of the home on the lot?

Thank you for your assistance in both of these requests.

Best regards.

Paul Kordish

From: Mary Hoch <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2025 9:23 AM
To: Andrew Pinnell
Cc: Scott Davey
Subject: Re: planning application 157 Schweitzer St
Attachments: 2025-06-16 08-49.pdf

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

There is a proposal for a Zoom meeting regarding the planning application for 157 Schweitzer St. on June 26, 2025.

This neighbourhood has a large number of retired seniors, and others are not comfortable with the latest computer technologies and would not be participating in a zoom meeting. We are there for submitting the attached petition for a personal open house style meeting in a convenient nearby centre such as the Bridgeport community centre instead of a zoom meeting to allow input from everyone concerned.

In the event time constraints do not allow for making this change. We have no objection to having this meeting postponed to a later date to accommodate this request.

Your consideration of this request will be appreciated by all the residence listed on this attached petition.

Please confirm these arrangements can be made.

Kind regards
Mary Hoch

From: Mai Ahmed <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 8:54 PM
To: Andrew Pinnell
Cc: Walid Mohiyeldin
Subject: 157 schweitzer st mailing list

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Andrew,

This is Mai Ahmed & Walid Ibrahim the owners of [REDACTED].

Kindly include our emails in the mailing list for any updates and further meetings concerning 157 Schweitzer st. development.

[REDACTED]

Thanks in advance

Mai Khaled Ahmed

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 12:57 PM
To: Andrew Pinnell
Cc: Ross Huehn;
Subject: Fw: Proposed Development of 157 Schweitzer St in Kitchener

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Andrew Pinnell, Senior Planner
City of Kitchener, On
Re: Proposed Development of 157 Schweitzer St
Dear Sir,

I am not in agreement to the current proposed development in my neighbourhood.

1. The retained parcel currently has the front yard and driveway facing Schweitzer St. The existing single detached dwelling is proposed to be retained. The proposal highlights Lark St being the front yard which does not meet the zoning restrictions for both front and rear yard requirements of the retained parcel.
2. I have concerns with the (2) accessory buildings in the rear yard of 157 Schweitzer being demolished and excavations taking place without a review of the environmental impact. It is my belief many old cars were stored for many years in the larger building.
3. My house is located on the west side and is a single detached home as per the homes on Lark St currently R-3 zoning. I want to maintain the main character of my established neighbourhood. I am not in agreement to amendments to the rezoning with the front yard

and rear yards especially. The proposed lots are not similar to the surrounding area on the west side consisting of all of Lark St.

4. Lark St does not have Storm Drains plus we have high ground water levels. The addition of 3 lots is a serious concern !!
This has always been a very serious matter as any modification to our ground water levels could lead to our foundations being impacted. When both the sewers were installed and the proposed gravel pit was under consideration city and township planners were well aware of our concerns and planned appropriate actions. It is my understanding that new house construction requires proper storm drains which may not be possible on Lark St.

These are my current concerns and I look forward to the zoom meeting and will advise any further concerns.

Best regards,

Karen Huehn

Owner



Kitchener

Planning Application - 157 Schweitzer Street

Petition to request in person meeting

Name (Please print)	Address (Please print)	Signature
Steve Gyorffy		Steve Gyorffy
Ross Huehn		Ross Huehn
Marlene Goodwin		Marlene Goodwin
LARRY CRANDELL		Lawrence S. Crandell
Beth-Ann Crandell		Beth-Ann Crandell
Malcolm Wheat		Malcolm Wheat
FRANK KLOPPER		FR
E. Boes		E Boes
Linda Wheat		L Wheat
Lovina Roussel		Lovina Roussel
Bev Roussel		Bev Roussel
Randy Roussel		Randy Roussel
Kathy Service		Kathy Service
Patricia Pinto		Patricia Pinto
Vivian		Vivian Pinto
James McGuire		James McGuire
DORIS KATLAF		Doris Katlaff
Chris Rintjema		Chris Rintjema
Stephanie Ratcliff		Stephanie Ratcliff
Laurie Hackbart		Laurie Hackbart
Greg Hackbart		Greg Hackbart

Planning Application - 157 Schweitzer Street

Petition to request in person meeting

Name (Please print)	Address (Please print)	Signature
PAT HARBACH.		Patricia Harbach
Mary Hoch		Mary Hoch
Tim Hoch		
DEANCA WARZECHA		Deanna Warzech
Hyden Bell		Kan
Jen Bell		Bell
Dallas Bell		DBell
Nathan Bell		Nate Bell
Kyle Bell		Kyle Bell
Pam Comens		Pamela Comens
Scott Comens		S Comens
Lynn Lorenz		Lynn
Brandon Jones		Brandon
Roger Comens		Roger
Karen Huse		Karen Ahmed
Heather Bartholme		Heather Bartholme
James Bartholme		James
Faith Rohit		Faith Rohit
JULIE SUDDS		Julie Suds
Jacob Shay		Jacob Shay
Rebecca Shay		R Shay
Walid Ibrahim		Walid Ibrahim
Mai Ahmed		Mai Ahmed

Planning Application - 157 Schweitzer Street

Petition to request in person meeting

[illegible]

From: Rebecca <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 11:24 PM
To: Andrew Pinnell
Subject: 157 Schweitzer new build
Attachments: Concerns & Comments from 7 Lark Street.pdf

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Please read and take into consideration the attached letter from Pat, my elderly neighbour, residing at [REDACTED] and next to the proposed new build at 157 Schweitzer. She does not have access to electronic communication.

Pat is one of the longest residing residents on Lark Street and is directly affected by the proposed new build. She is one of many of the neighbourhood residents with valid concerns regarding the proposed construction.
Thank you.

PROJECT HOUSE 3

MY NAME IS PAT HARBACH. I LIVE AT [REDACTED] [REDACTED] FOR 61 YEARS. I AM MAD AND UPSET THAT THIS IS HAPPENING IN OUR NEIGHBOURHOOD. THE OWNER (157 SCHWEITZER ST) LIVES OUT OF TOWN HE DON'T KNOW THAT THE NEIGHBOURHOOD IS QUIET, FRIENDLY, AND WELL KEPT, AND NEW PEOPLE WHO MOVE HERE LOVE IT. THE PROPERTY OWNER WANTS TO BUILD 3 HOUSES PACKED INTO SMALL LOTS. ABOUT 10 FT FROM MY HOUSE HE WILL NOT BE AROUND TO LISTEN TO THE NOISE AND THE CONSTRUCTION (I WILL) WHO TO SAY A YEAR FROM NOW HE TAKES DOWN THE MAIN HOUSE (157 SCHWEITZER) AND BUILD 2 MORE HOUSES. WHAT IF A DEVELOPER BUILD 3 HOUSES BESIDE HIS HOME (OWNER) AND RUINS HIS NEIGHBOURHOOD. WOULD HE BE HAPPY? I WORK HARD FOR MY HOME, SO IF THE OWNER WANTS TO MAKE A FAST BUCK DO IT IN YOUR HOMETOWN. PEOPLE HAVE CALLED THE CITY AND GOT NOWHERE SO I WOULD LIKE

- 1 PERSON TO PERSON MEETING
- 2 CITY COUNCILLOR SCOTT DAVEY WARD 1 SHOULD ATTEND OUR MEETING WE VOTED HIM TO HELP THE PEOPLE, NOT TO SIT BACK & WATCH.
- 3 WHO WILL PAY FOR DAMAGE TO MY HOUSE DURING CONSTRUCTION (FOUNDATION)
- 4 WHO WILL PAY FOR DRAINAGE TAXPAYERS OR BUILDER GRADING MY HOUSE FROM WATER RUNOFF IN MY YARD AND MRS BOES.

5.

MY HOUSE COULD BE IN CONSTANT SHADE.

6 MY HOUSE VALVE WILL BE HIT HARD (DOWN)

7. WHAT A VIEW, STICK OUT LIKE A SORE THUMB. WHEN YOU ENTER LARK ST.

I SAY NO NO NO
HOUSE PROJECT 3.

THANK YOU.

From: Tracey Taylor <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 8:42 PM
To: Andrew Pinnell
Subject: Proposed Lark Street development

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Please include me in any communication regarding this proposed neighborhood development.

Regards,

Tracey Taylor

Storm Drainage

The applicant's Engineering Consultant indicates, in its report, that there is a storm sewer on Lark St fronting the subject property. In my 35 years as a municipal engineer, I do not consider the extension of driveway culverts to meet the definition of a proper storm sewer.

Drainage (since we moved into this area in 1968) is accomplished, as in rural settings, by shallow ditches and culverts. Over the years, while being responsible for Public Works Operations, I was involved in rectifying problems with respect to substandard drainage on these streets.

There are an abundance of sump pumps that discharge as a result of the high water table in the area. Water would often lay in the ditches and stagnate due to the fact that we are at the top of the hill, and there is minimal grade to maintain a steady flow in the ditches. As a result, sections of the open ditch were filled in over the years with culvert pipe to remove the unsightly puddling in the ditch.

That is what happened in the case of the culvert pipe that was installed in front of the subject properties abutting 157 Schweitzer Street. This pipe does NOT constitute a proper storm drainage system. This pipe is very shallow and gets filled in by snow and freezes at the Schofield Drive inlet during the winter months.

The loss of green space with this proposal; the additional hard surfaces; and the lack of stormwater management facilities in this area will only aggravate future flooding problems on the street. Not to mention the suggested connection of three new sump pumps to a substandard pipe.

Misleading Photographs

To illustrate our neighbourhood, the Planning Consultant Included pictures of houses on neighbouring streets, even a block away, and did NOT include any photos of the homes adjacent to the subject property on Lark St. Therefore, this is not an accurate example of our "neighbourhood" which we all consider to include the full length of Lark Street and its attachment to Schofield Drive.

Official Plan Adherence

The current proposal does not recognize the conditions on our street as suggested in the Official Plan below. The Planning Consultant tries to justify this by likening the proposal to

other streets in the neighbourhood such as Daniel Ave and Schweitzer St. We have no relationship with these streets. Nor did any of us purchase homes here so that we could resemble Daniel Avenue. Again, we consider our homogeneous neighbourhood to be Lark Street and Schofield Drive. Introduction of the proposed dwellings facing Lark Street will therefore interfere with the homogenous nature of our enclave.

Section 4.C.1.8 a) of the City of Kitchener Official Plan states:

“Any new buildings and any additions and/or modifications to existing buildings are appropriate in massing and scale and are compatible with the built form and the community character of the established neighbourhood”

Furthermore:

Section 4.C.1.8 b) states:

“For new buildings in established s, the requested front yard setback should be similar to adjacent properties and support and maintain the character of the existing streetscape and the neighbourhood.”

Furthermore:

Section 4.C.1.8 c) also states

“Scale, massing, design and character of adjacent properties in keeping with the character of the streetscape”

Therefore, the proposal does NOT respect these suggestions.

Proposed Zoning Variances from New Bylaw

The MHBC report talks about variances for this project from the new RES-4 bylaw. However, what the residents are concerned about are the major variances from our existing R-3 bylaw. For example, the new bylaw would allow houses to be 1.6 meters closer to the road which is contrary to the foregoing official plan policies.

As if the changes by imposition of the new bylaw on our street wasn't bad enough, variances are requested from the *proposed* bylaw for this project. It is proposed that the minimum Rear Yard Setback which is required at 7.5 m be reduced to 5.0 m for the retained lands and 5.4 m for the proposed lots. For those of us enjoying ample yards on the street, it is difficult to comprehend the major reduction of any usable yard space remaining, particularly for the existing house.

Consents

Policy 17.E.20.5 requires that Applications for consent to create new lots will only be granted where:

“b) the lots reflect the general scale and character of the established development pattern of surrounding lands by taking into consideration lot frontages, areas and configurations”

The MHBC submission states: “The proposed lots are similar in size to many of the lots in the surrounding area including lots along Schofield Drive, along Schweitzer Street to the west and along Daniel Avenue to the south”. It is interesting to note that the comparison of Lark Street is omitted from this comparison. I surmise it is because there are no such similar lots on Lark St. Yet the new dwellings will front on Lark Street. Perhaps that is why photographs of the existing houses on Lark St were omitted from the consultant’s presentation. The lots on Lark Street are at least twice as wide as the ones in this proposal. Photographs of the Lark St homes (a more accurate depiction of our neighbourhood) can be found in the recent submission by Julie Sudds and Rebecca Shay of 9 Lark St. Once again, let me reiterate that our neighbourhood comprises Lark St and Schofield Drive and our streetscape is radically different from Schweitzer St or Daniel Ave.

Notifications

It is our understanding that the city requires a sign to be posted on a property advising of pending zone changes. To the knowledge of myself and my neighbours, no such sign was ever posted. I also heard that some residents did not receive the postcard notification that was sent out by the city. Poorly communicated notice undermines respect for the long-time residents of the area.

Regional Municipality of Waterloo - Environmental Site Servicing Questionnaire

Incorrect answers were given to this questionnaire. For example answering “no” instead of “unknown” to the question of the presence of a septic tank on the property while the neighbours know that the house was built years before the installation of sewers in the area.

There are also concerns about other environmental considerations due to the presence of a vehicle servicing pit in the attached garage. It seems that the applicant was not exactly conscientiously answering the Region’s concerns.

Conclusions

There are numerous other concerns that my neighbours and I have. I have not enumerated these to avoid duplication but I absolutely agree with their concerns with respect to parking, snow removal etc.

The homes on Lark Street and Schofield Drive are owner occupied. It was discouraging to learn during the zoom call that the applicant is not even from this community and proposes to use the existing home as a rental property. The value of the existing home will be degraded with this proposal and the substantial loss of green space surrounding it. We are concerned that the three new properties could also be built as income properties, substantially degrading the nature of our neighbourhood. It seems that the applicant is not interested in living in our neighbourhood and maintaining it, but only in the opportunity to gain a profit by obtaining this

zone change. Surely the voices of long-standing residents - some of whom have lived here for over 50 years - should take precedence over those of the applicant.

It is a fact that our area has developed since incorporation into the City of Kitchener with such amenities as the installation of sanitary sewers in the late 70's. However, we are still lacking amenities such as storm sewers; curb and gutters; and sidewalks. As a result, I do not believe intensification of the nature proposed in this application is as appropriate as it could be in older and other fully serviced areas of Kitchener.

For the reasons noted above, as well as my previous comments, I cannot support this proposal.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Gyorffy