



Introduction

The City of Guelph has advanced the study to identify a redevelopment strategy for the lands at 200 Beverley Street to Phase 2, including the identification of a short list of options. The City intends to continue its consultations with the community and stakeholders as a land use strategy is developed.

This Information Brief provides a summary of work that has been completed in Phase 2 of the project.

Site Description and Background

The property located at 200 Beverley Street was formerly known as the International Malleable Iron (IMICO) site. The site is bounded by the Guelph Junction Railway on the north, Stevenson Street on the west, Beverley Street on the south, and by existing industrial land use on the east. The property is comprised of approximately 13.15 acres of land and is known to have areas of contamination as a result of its history of industrial activity.



The Study Process

Study activities will be carried out in three phases:

- **Phase 1** includes developing a long list of potential future use options, conducting a preliminary market assessment, identifying a short list of options through a screening exercise, developing evaluation criteria for

the short list, and holding Public Information Centre #1.

- **Phase 2** includes conducting a detailed evaluation of the short list of land use options, preparing a concept plan and holding Public Information Centre #2.
- **Phase 3** includes the preparation of a detailed work plan for the recommended land use strategy.

It is anticipated that this study will be completed by March 2005.

Existing Conditions

Infrastructure – The infrastructure that provided service to the former IMICO site is located within the existing road allowance on Beverley Street and includes a watermain, sanitary sewer and storm sewer. The existing services may be sufficient for most land uses considered for the site. A Ward 1 infrastructure study is underway

to determine the physical condition and integrity of underground services.

The surfaces of Beverley Street and Stevenson Street are in a fair to poor state of repair and may require various upgrades to support the land use strategy developed for the site.

A portion of the site in the northwest corner is in the

City's designated flood fringe. The design of any structures located on this area of the site will be subject to the design criteria of the City's Flood Zone Policy.

Local Geology – The site is fairly flat, sloping gently south and southwest towards the Eramosa River. Most of the site is covered with a shallow layer of fill material, consisting of foundry sand, slag and cinders left behind by

the previous industrial activity. Below this is a layer of sand mixed with boulders and cobbles that rests on a fairly flat, hard, porous bedrock.

Groundwater – The water table is about 2.5 to 5 metres below the site. Based on several years of monitoring data, it is expected that the groundwater flows very slowly in a south/southwest direction.

Constraints to Development

The constraints to development are influenced by the nature of contamination and its location within the site.

The foundry sands spread across much of the surface of the northern portion of the site contain elevated concentrations of metals, primarily zinc, while soils in the southern portion generally meet soil quality standards. There are a variety of effective remedial technologies available for the surficial soils in these areas that would allow for redevelopment for most land-uses in the short term.

There are also isolated pockets of contamination in the bedrock located in the southern and western portions of the site. These pockets can be remediated either prior to or during redevelopment of the site, and therefore through effective management, will not act as constraints to development for most land-uses.

The eastern portion of the site includes areas where hydrocarbon contamination is present in shallow soils and extends into the bedrock. Remedial options are available for this area, but may have a longer time-frame associated with them than for other areas of the site. Therefore, this portion of the site has a low potential for short-term redevelopment for most land-uses.

Long List of Future Use Options

The full range of future use options for the site include the following:

- **Residential Uses** – including low, medium or high density

- **Commercial Uses** – including office buildings for professional or business, research or technology activities; retail and personal service shops including small store, big box and mall formats; and commercial parking facilities
- **Business Uses** – including small, medium or large-scale manufacturing, warehousing and/or storage
- **Community Uses** – including adult or child care facilities, indoor/outdoor recreation, education and training facilities, and religious and spiritual facilities
- **Infrastructure Uses** – including rail activities and government facilities and activities

Screening the Long List

The long list of options was screened using two general criteria, requiring a YES or NO response:

1. The Future Use is considered possible by:
 - The preliminary market assessment, or
 - An identified commercial interest, or
 - An identified need by the City of Guelph
2. The future use option supports the proposed land use designation changes in the St. Patrick's Ward Official Plan Amendment (OP0303).

If the response to both statements is a YES, the future use option is considered feasible in a single- or multi-use scheme.

If the responses included one YES and one NO, the future use option is considered feasible in a multi-use scheme in combination with other uses.

If the statements generated two NO responses, the future use option was screened out of the process and will not be further evaluated.

The exercise screened out the following options:

- Low density housing
- High density – multi-storey housing
- Medium and large box format commercial uses
- Mall format Stores
- Large-scale manufacturing operations

The remaining short list of future use options were combined into the single-use and multi-use schemes, in the following six schemes:

1. Commercial and Residential combinations
2. Community Uses as a single use
3. Commercial, Residential and Community combinations
4. Business and Residential
5. Business, Commercial and Community combinations
6. Business, Infrastructure and Community combinations

These schemes were evaluated in detail following Public Open House #1, which was held in December 2003.

Evaluation Criteria

The first step in this task included the development of evaluation criteria. The proposed evaluation criteria categories are summarized below.

- **Infrastructure Considerations:**
 - Water, wastewater, and energy servicing
 - Roadway network
- **Land Use Considerations:**
 - Compatibility with existing and surrounding and planned land uses
 - Urban design characteristics
- **Remediation Considerations:**
 - Complexity of activities
 - Soil and groundwater conditions
- **Social Considerations:**
 - Provision of public amenity
 - Public health and safety
 - Risk and liability
 - Vehicular and truck traffic
 - Transit services
 - Community profile
- **Financial Considerations:**
 - Remediation costs
 - Infrastructure costs (beyond City's planned investment)
 - Revenue
 - Investment partnerships

Public Open House #1

Public Open House #1 was held on December 16, 2003 at the Italian Club in Guelph. The Open House was open to visitors from 6:30 p.m. to approximately 9:00 p.m. A display of project information was available for visitors to review. In addition to the display, tables were set up to encourage small group discussions. Each table was furnished with a site plan of the study property and a copy of the long list of potential future uses. The study team was on hand to discuss the information with visitors.

There were 31 visitors who provided mailing addresses on the Sign-up Sheet at the registration table. Many are local residents of the area.

Many people wanted to see the property used to benefit the community at large and, in particular, the neighbourhood, including suggestions for parkland, a school, seniors centre, and community centre. There were several small group discussions that noted the stigma of living close to the property and the impact on property values and neighbourhood aesthetics. In general, people seemed supportive of a mixed-use scheme. There was little support for the land uses that would support rail activities.

Identifying the Short List

As a result of the comments received at Public Open House #1, the following mixed-use schemes that were retained for detailed evaluation include the following:

Mixed-use schemes that warrant detailed evaluation include the following:

1. Community Use – outdoor active or passive recreation
2. Community*/Medium Density Residential, Commercial Mix (office, retail, and shops)
3. Community†/Infrastructure (Rail)
4. Community*/Government

* Full range of community use options available.

† A full range of community use options was considered but was not compatible with an infrastructure use.

There were no significant comments received from the public on the proposed evaluation criteria. Therefore, it was recommended that the criteria as proposed be used in the detailed evaluation.

Detailed Evaluation

Prior to completing a detailed evaluation, a scenario profile was developed for each of the

four schemes, together with a summary of remedial options for development. The consultant team completed the evaluation using the evaluation criteria. The evaluation generated the following results:

Based on the results of the evaluation exercise, Community Use is the top ranking land use when evaluation criteria categories are considered as equally important. Community Use is also the top ranking land use when social considerations are considered the most important factor. The Railway Use scenario is the top ranking land use scenario if financial considerations are considered the most important factor.

Evaluation Results and Sensitivity Analysis

% Weighting

Rank	Equal Weighting of Criteria Categories (20%)	Social Considerations most important (40%), all other criteria categories equal (15%)	Financial Considerations most important (40%), all other criteria categories equal (15%)
1	Community Use	Community Use	Railway Use
2	Railway Use	Railway Use	Community Use
3	Community, Government	Community, Government	Community, Government
4	Community, Residential, Commercial	Community, Residential, Commercial	Community, Residential, Commercial

Next Steps

All land use scenario are considered feasible. City staff will present the evaluation and results at a Council meeting in the new year (January/February 2005). Request for Proposals to develop the site will be developed to determine if there are real commercial or other interests in the property. Work will continue with the MOE on environmental issues at the site. Project recommendations are expected to be final by March 2005.

For Information...

Please contact: Jim Stokes, Manager of Realty Services
Legal Department,
City Hall
(519) 822-1260, Ext.2279
jstokes@city.guelph.on.ca
www.city.guelph.on.ca



MARK L. DORFMAN,
PLANNER INC.
N. BARRY LYON CONSULTANTS LIMITED