

From: Paul Steele [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, June 9, 2024 10:11 PM
To: Alexander Burnett [REDACTED]
Subject: Proposed Development 93 Trinity St.

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Paul Steele and Patti Prieur
39 Trinity St.
Stratford, ON
N5A 4P5

June 9, 2024

Dear Mr. Burnett,

As residents of the Trinity and Douro St. neighbourhood we have some concerns regarding the rezoning and redevelopment plan initiated by the BMI Group for 93 Trinity St. We recognize that higher density building developments are needed as future models for our cities however this one takes things to extremes in our opinion.

Our main concern is the rezoning from Factory District to R5. This proposal is not in compliance with the current bylaws; amendments will need to be made that go above and beyond the current R5 bylaws. The problem we see with this is that it does not fit with the aesthetic of our city and definitely not with the aesthetic and density of our neighbourhood.

The first issue is the 10-story apartment, we think a building of this height would be more suited to the outskirts of the city, if at all. Not only that it could set a precedence for future rezoning in any neighbourhood. An apartment building this height could also impact property values negatively.

A second issue is density. According to the regulations in section 6.4.5, maximum lot coverage is 30%. Is the BMI Group proposal within this regulation? And the maximum density would be exceeded by a substantial amount. How will this type of density impact schools, enjoyment of our residential outdoor spaces, and traffic levels on local streets?

A third issue is parking. The proposal does not meet current requirements for the density of the development. This will have an impact on the local residents by significantly increasing on street parking. This again, could have an impact on property values, the aesthetic of the and enjoyment of the neighbourhood.

A fourth issue is setbacks. Shallow setbacks of new buildings will change the physical character of the neighbourhood. With less visible green space along streets an urban feel will be created. Is this what we want?

A fifth issue is the percentage of landscaped open space. Looking at the proposed plan it does not appear to be the minimum 35% as stated in Table 6.4.5 of the Zoning By-law for the City of Stratford. How can we acquire more information on this?

A sixth issue is short-term stays. It appears that BMI Group currently has a license since they are allowed to have short-term stays at their Bradshaw Lofts development, so will this also be allowed at this site? If so, it will be a contributor to further housing affordability issues, and could affect property values of the new development and of current residences, enjoyment of the neighbourhood, and on street parking.

The last issue is affordable housing. It is our understanding according to section 2.5.3.5 of the bylaw that maximum density can be increased by 1 additional dwelling unit only if every two affordable dwelling units are provided up to a maximum of 20% of the permitted maximum density. BMI has not stated anything about affordable housing in their plans. Our city needs affordable housing and we disagree whole-heartedly with any type of short-term units being allowed and the lack of affordable housing.

In summation this development is too dense and is not what Stratford or this neighbourhood needs. Hopefully the city will not approve this current proposal without considering Stratford's citizens' concerns. This decision should not be taken lightly and should not be rushed. With careful thought and consideration, we believe that middle ground could be achieved.

Sincerely,

Paul Steele and Patti Prieur