

36 ELLIOTT ST. CAMBRIDGE ON CA.

I RICK HENRY AM WRITING THIS LETTER ON
BEHALF OF MYSELF AND MY WIFE JACQUELINE
RIDEOUT OWNERS OF [REDACTED]
CAMBRIDGE ON.

TO THE MAYOR & COUNCIL:

WE DO NOT AGREE WITH
THE CONSTRUCTION OF A MULTI UNIT RESIDENTIAL
DWELLING ON A SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING LOT. I AM
ALL FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & HOUSING^{hi} TO PUT A
6 UNIT APT. COMPLEX UP ON A SINGLE LOT I FEEL IS
UNREASONABLE. THIS AREA IS ALREADY CONGESTED WITH
THE APTMENTS, CONDOS, NURSING HOME AND SCHOOL NEAR
BY. SIX UNITS - AVERAGE FAMILY - 3 PEOPLE, 2 CARS EACH,
PLUS VISITOR PARKING? WE FEEL THERE ARE BETTER AND
BIGGER PROPERTIES IN CAMBRIDGE TO BUILD A 6 UNIT
COMPLEX, THEREFORE WE CAN NOT SUPPORT THIS
CONSTRUCTION PLAN.

- R.H.

- J. Rideout

Hello Vincent,

We are a small group of very concerned citizens and are writing to express our opposition to the development of the above listed property as presented in the recent variance application circulation. Our neighbours, Jacqui Rideout, Rick Henry of [REDACTED] and ourselves will be unable to attend the variance committee meeting and I have attached a note with their views on the subject as well as our own in this writing.

The development as presented, is too dense and not in keeping with the spirit of family residences currently in the area. We also have additional concern on the very limited parking available in our neighbourhood. This development, as presented will only add congestion with any additional overflow parking requirements. The developer has made an assumption that each tenant will have 1 car per household. We believe this to be wrong and too low. Planning for two cars per household at a minimum is more realistic. You only need to drive through any subdivision in the evening and my point will be illustrated. Evenings and weekends streets throughout the city have cars parked wherever they can be squeezed in. Elliott/Henry/Center/Albert/McAuslan are no exception to this congestion.

The developer of this property clearly has no plans to reside on site and has no vested interest in ensuring that the parking is enough for the size of building they propose. The overflow from the Elliott Street nursing home located directly beside the applicant's property, on many days spills over onto Elliott street and all of the surrounding side streets. The staff and visitors parking from the nursing home make the streets difficult to navigate with little respect for the people that live here. There are days when emergency services, ambulance and fire service, struggle to get through the congestion of parked cars. Truck deliveries to the nursing home some days are either fully on the road to make deliveries or half in the drive way and half sticking out onto Elliott Street.

We strongly oppose this application as presented and urge city staff to look very carefully at the proposal and consider all points of view. As a life lifelong Cambridge resident, local business owner and home owner at [REDACTED] for 35 years we would appreciate your thoughtful input prior to any committee decision.

City Staff have set development parameter bylaws for a reason and we ask that the parameters be respected in this case and the variance application as presented be denied. An approval will open the city to precedent that may be regrettable in the future.

Respectfully

Mark & Michelle Trombley

[REDACTED]
Jacqui Rideout & Rick Henry

WARD # 6

File # ORD3/24

RE: 36 ELLIOTT ST, CAMB, OUT

LAMBERT + PATRICIA VANDERWELLE

- Home owners -

- We would like to be notified of any future Committee or council meetings at which recommendations are to be considered
- We would like to be notified of the approval of the proposal, or of the refusal of a request to adopt the Official Plan Amendment or to amend the Zoning By-law

To the City of Cambridge, Community
Development Department and the city
Clerk

Having seen proposed area for dwelling + parking
 we are concerned/opposed to having 8 parking
 spaces 6 feet from property line directly
 facing side of my house, with walk-way
 less than 3 feet from property line

- is a walk-way necessary -?
- is there not any different options?
 for parking

- In the event of ourselves selling our property
 in the future it will significantly reduce
 the value of our property, having been retired
 for 2 years this property is our nest-egg
- If amendment goes thru this will have
 a large impact on our quality of ~~lives~~ ~~our~~
 our lives + financial status

Yours truly: Len + Pat VanderWelle

Lambert Vander Welle [REDACTED]

Yes I would like to attend the meeting in

Person and wish to speak

oct 15/24 6:30pm

- I have no computer to register

as I would like to register this way

if possible

- as per conversation with Michael

Thank you

- LEN + PAT VANDERWELLE, PROPERTY OWNERS

[REDACTED]

- THANK-YOU MEMBERS OF COUNCIL + COMMITTEE MEMBERS FOR LETTING ME SPEAK TODAY

- My wife would be present today, but due to the

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

and cannot appear. this proposed amendment has only added more stress to her existing condition, which has added more stress to the both of us.

- at the back of 36 ELLIOTT ST there is a large black-walnut tree well over 120 years old and a large linden tree, cutting these trees down would be a shame, as it is a habitat for numerous Red tail, Grey, black squirrels + numerous bird species. With the loss of these trees it will reduce the population of these animals, as the Grand River is in such close proximity lots of these animals call these trees home.
- I know we cannot stop growth in the region. But we all have a responsibility to preserve Flora + Fauna in urban areas.

- with proposed parking lot area, comes lots of lights, I guess our days of dark nights are over, as it will be lit up every night
- these people are not home-owners but property investors, with ^{the} expectation of profit
- for two years I cut front + side lawn only when By-Law enforcement got involved they cut their lawn
- at rear of property is a Falling/Failing shed which I had to support from my side so it would not fall on my property

- In respect to Committee + Council Members
if you + your family members lived here ~~for~~
+ were proposed with this amendment
would you agree, I think not
- I plead with Council to keep it as a
- Residential "R-4" designation.
- Again I thank-you for hearing my concerns

Sincerely yours:

Len + Pat VanderWelle

