

## Michael Oliveri

---

**From:** Greg B [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 30, 2025 5:13 PM  
**To:** E\_Clerks  
**Subject:** Feedback - 32 Grand Ave proposed development

### **This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Good afternoon,

I'm writing with my feedback about the proposed 28-storey development in downtown Galt, as outlined in the Cambridge Times:

[https://www.cambridgetimes.ca/news/waterloo-region/28-storey-tower-proposed-in-galt-near-gaslight-district/article\\_9bb42b4e-f134-5f10-a4b2-b35a6d611995.html](https://www.cambridgetimes.ca/news/waterloo-region/28-storey-tower-proposed-in-galt-near-gaslight-district/article_9bb42b4e-f134-5f10-a4b2-b35a6d611995.html)

I'm not able to attend the upcoming meeting but want to provide my feedback regarding my neighbourhood.

I really struggle with understanding how development is guided and regulated in our city. It seems that every time I go by a development sign, or read of development, it's for work that feels incredibly out of touch with the community. The Downtown Galt & Dickson Hill area is a fairly well-kept historical zone, and if I am honest (and a little biased), it's a desirable area for people to live. According to the article, the developer would like to raze a heritage building and create a tower that's twice the height of the Gaslight towers (already the tallest buildings in the area) and 83% full of bachelor & 1-bedroom units. I don't even know what to say other than incredulously ask "why"? Do we really need so many sleeping spaces - I can't in good faith call them 'homes' - that we will permit bulldozing the things that make this area unique and desirable to live in, replacing historic structures with a non-descript tower? We can't just build another heritage property to maintain character. I'm pretty sure nobody has ever looked at Grand Ave and thought "if only this area had a 28-storey apartment building, THEN I'd want to live in this neighbourhood." Why stop at 28 floors? Why not 60 floors? We could also probably fit a few more apartment towers where Knox's Church, Central Church and Queen's Square/the Cenotaph are.

The city has building requirements so that we grow in a manageable, desirable way, and this development seeks to be exempted from a number of important ones:

- maximum building height: 21m. Proposed height: 88m, 4 times the maximum
- dwelling units/hectare: 250. Proposed density: 1605 units, 6 times the maximum
- Proposed setback of 0m (exemption requested from the city's requirement)
- Required outdoor amenity space (exemption requested from the city's requirement)
- "The urban design report states the building has been designed with stepbacks above the sixth floor to reduce its visual impact from the street." The street view isn't the only visual impact that should be considered; given the height of the project it'll be visible from almost anywhere in West Galt.

I'm a little baffled as to why a proposal like this isn't just outright rejected as it doesn't meet the current

zoning requirements. The city would be at my door in an instant if I started running a convenience store out of my home, or if I rebuilt my house to have 8 storeys, but it feels that whenever a developer is doing 'housing', compliance with requirements aren't required. It also sometimes feels that these projects have outrageous first proposals, so that when they're altered to merely ridiculous proposals (ie. a reduction from 28 to 24 storeys, which is still 3 times higher than permitted), the community is supposed to be happy. Why do we have 'requirements' if they're not actually required? - can we change the name to 'guidelines', or 'recommendations' so that we're all honest about what they really are? Requirements that can be waived or not enforced aren't really requirements at all.

I would presume that the developers/owners/investors don't currently live in the West Galt neighbourhood and won't live in their project, if it's completed. They have zero interest in the community they're participating in. Are we interested in actually building a community where people desire to live, grow, and play, or fitting as many people into a hectare as possible?

Thanks,  
Greg Beifuss

