
From: LESLEE

Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 4:41 PM

To: Jan Liggett <liggettj@cambridge.ca>; Helen Shwery <shweryh@cambridge.ca>; Mike Devine <devinem@cambridge.ca>; Sheri Roberts <robertss@cambridge.ca>; Ross Earnshaw <earnshawr@cambridge.ca>; Corey Kimpson <kimpsonc@cambridge.ca>; Nicholas Ermeta <ErmetaN@cambridge.ca>; Scott Hamilton <hamiltons@cambridge.ca>; Adam Cooper <coopera@cambridge.ca>; Hardy Bromberg <BrombergH@cambridge.ca>

Subject: Hood Street and Grand Ave Proposal

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Good Afternoon:

Thank you for your time and consideration regarding the proposed 28 story tower at last night's Public Meeting.

It was extremely heartening to hear that with a few exceptions, everyone that attended felt the proposal was completely inappropriate for the small space that

Mr. Raj Vinepal plans to develop.

The major concerns of course being parking, traffic infrastructure, damage to historic buildings and overall preservation of a historic area.

I must say I found it very strange that, when asked, Patterson Planning would give no examples of buildings completed by the developer.

I would think any completed development projects would be a source of pride for any respected developer.

Naturally my neighbour Carrie Thomas and I come in very strongly against this project. We realize that the building process will irreparably damage our century homes.

It will create untold problems, noise, air quality, foundation damage, large 24 hour lighting over our properties, shading, wind damage, lack of privacy to name a few.

One of the questions asked of me during the meeting was how far would the building be from our properties. I misspoke and responded with 30m, thinking it referred to the perimeter of Hood Street and Grand. **Correction** after seeing the planners renderings, I realized the building will only a **few feet** from our homes.

We extend an invitation for a site visit to all council members and staff involved with making decisions around this property. A visit to our homes and properties will give you a better idea just how life altering a poorly planned development in

that location will be for us. You may walk as you probably won't find parking, unless it's in Barnacle Bill's.

I really enjoyed Colleen's input.

Please feel free to reach out and set up a visit time. We would be happy to accomodate you.

Regards

Leslee Urquhart



I'd like to receive a notice for the outcome by council.

From Jennifer H.

Date Wed 7/16/2025 5:28 PM

To Nicole Goodbrand <goodbrandn@cambridge.ca>

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.



Hi Nicole,

How are you?

Hopefully this is right spot to add my name and email to receive notice of the council's outcome of this permit application.

I'm not in favour of it; I live in Galt, mere minutes from this proposed development. Traffic, the eyesore of it, and decreased housing affordability are my reasons against.

Thanks,

Jennifer

Kind regards, Jennifer Holmes



Re: 32, 36 and 38 Grand Ave

From Sheri Hinton

Date Wed 7/16/2025 10:11 AM

To Nicole Goodbrand <goodbrandn@cambridge.ca>

Cc Sheri Roberts <robertss@cambridge.ca>

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Hi Nicole,

I attended last night's meeting and had a question. 4 minutes and 45 seconds into Scott's presentation he spoke about road widening for Hood and Grand Ave. I did not see that in the summary slides although it may be in one of the drawings I don't quite understand. Is it possible to understand what that widening looks like? Specifically:

1. Is it the entire length of the streets mentioned?
2. What is the impact on existing infrastructure/properties on the streets?

Thanks,

Sheri

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jul 3, 2025, at 19:51, Sheri Hinton wrote:

>

> Hi Nicole,

> I just passed by the sign for the zoning application for Grand Ave. I noticed it is for 328 residential units, but only 150 parking spots (16 off site). Can you please help with the rationale of such a low ratio in an already congested area? There are 89 bike spots. This seems to be a very disproportionate distribution.

> Also,

> What is the expected visitor parking and number of wheelchair spots.

> Thanks,

> Sheri

> Sent from my iPhone

Michael Oliveri

From: Dave Ottenbrite [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 5:19 PM
To: E_Clerks
Subject: Council Meeting July 15 re: OPA/ZBA Application for 32, 36 and 38 Grand Avenue South

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Madam Mayor and Councillors,
As a resident of Ward 5 I am well aware of the parking issues that exist in the immediate neighbourhood of the proposed 28-storey tower for Grand Avenue South. I am a volunteer with the parking-challenged Hamilton Family Theatre, a frequent patron of the Gaslight District and have organized the recently-held Cambridge Jazz Festival at Tapestry Hall, for which we experienced parking concerns. In short, on the subject of parking in this neighbourhood, I believe my opinion to be well-founded and I feel that the parking plan is grossly inadequate. I urge all Councillors to carefully consider this application, as I trust they will.

Thank you for your consideration,
David Ottenbrite

[REDACTED]
Cambridge

Sent from my iPad

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

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 setbacks 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



Michael Oliveri

From: Suzanne Rerrie [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2025 1:56 PM
To: E_Clerks
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: 32, 36 & 38 Grand Ave. South - Patterson Planning Consultants Proposal

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

As a lifelong Cambridge resident and 20+ year West Galt resident, I am firmly opposed to the development proposal referenced above.

This development is NOT in the best interest of the Cambridge Community, nor is it appropriate for this site. Over the last two years we have experienced excessive traffic congestion in the downtown Galt Core (in many areas of Cambridge in fact). The existing infrastructure is already overwhelmed. Use of the "major transit area" referenced by the consultants is not a feasible option for many downtown residents for whom mobility is an issue and who rely on vehicle transportation. Businesses in the core are already at a disadvantage due to a severe lack of parking, public parking spaces are being eliminated on a consistent basis. Emergency vehicles heading to calls must AND DO traverse the congested downtown core streets multiple times throughout EACH day - with the addition of a new shelter as well as the existing one (The Bridges) and 2 retirement homes in this tight downtown space the potential for MORE emergency calls is very likely.

The City of Cambridge and especially the downtown Galt region has always been considered picturesque and unique with our historic church steeples and riverscape. The proposal of this 28-storey monster is blatant greed on the part of the developers and the City alike, in my opinion. More and more these things seem to be organized and arranged behind closed doors and then a bit of theatrics happen and then the proposal gets knocked down a couple storeys??? I suspect to make it look like our Municipality has the concerns and interest of the community... only to get pushed through at what was probably the goal of the developers (and the City & Region) all along.

I have serious concerns over this proposal, and also am amazed at the number of Galt and Cambridge residents who are even unaware of it (the proposal ??) - I guess they all missed the newspaper article from a couple weeks ago.

I was also unable to access the consultants supporting studies and would be very interested in reviewing their Traffic Study, Noise Study and Shade Study in particular.

Regards,

Suzanne Rerrie

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]