

TO **Guelph City Council**

SERVICE AREA Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment
DATE June 5, 2012

**SUBJECT Official Plan Amendment No. 48 - Phase 3 of the
Official Plan Update**

REPORT NUMBER 12-59

SUMMARY

Purpose of Report:

To provide the final draft of Official Plan Amendment 48 which completes the update to the Official Plan. To provide a summary and response to comments received since the January 30, 2012 release of the draft Official Plan including comments from the April 2, 2012 Public Meeting. To describe revisions to the Official Plan policies in response to public comments.

Council Action:

To consider adoption of Official Plan Amendment No. 48; Phase 3 of the Five Year Official Plan Review.

RECOMMENDATION

"THAT Report #12-59 regarding Official Plan Amendment No. 48 – Phase 3 of the Official Plan Update from Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment dated June 5, 2012 be received,

AND THAT Official Plan Amendment No. 48, initiated by the City of Guelph including schedules and associated definitions be adopted in accordance with Attachment 1 – Official Plan Amendment 48;

AND THAT Council declare to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing that Official Plan Amendment No. 48 meets the requirements of Section 26 of the Planning Act in that it conforms with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, has regard to matters of Provincial interest and is consistent with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement."

BACKGROUND

"Official Plan Amendment 48" is the third and final phase of the Five Year Review of the City's Official Plan.

Purpose and effect of the Official Plan Amendment:

OPA 48 finalizes the Five Year Update of the Official Plan. OPA 48 is being undertaken in accordance with Section 26 of the Planning Act and is intended to ensure that the Official Plan is in conformity with provincial legislation and plans and is consistent with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). OPA 48 also incorporates recommendations from City plans and studies.

Subject Lands

OPA 48 applies to all land within the municipal boundaries of the City of Guelph.

Overview of Amendment

OPA 48 amends, updates or provides new policies with respect to:

- strategic directions and vision to guide growth to the year 2031;
- achievement of the City's growth management framework;
- Watershed Planning and Water Resources;
- Public Health and Safety including natural and human-made hazards;
- Mineral Aggregate Resources;
- Climate change and the City's Community Energy Plan;
- Cultural Heritage Resources;
- Transportation providing greater focus on transit, walking and cycling;
- Municipal services and infrastructure;
- Affordable Housing;
- Parks and Trails;
- Urban Design consistent with the Urban Design Action Plan;
- Land Use designations; and
- Implementation and the use of planning tools associated with height and density bonusing, the regulation of exterior building design through site plan control and the introduction of a development permit system.

REPORT

Purpose of the report:

- To provide a final draft of OPA 48 for Council's consideration of adoption (refer to Attachment 1);
- To summarize issues and comments raised at the Public Meeting held on April 2, 2012 and through written correspondence;
- To provide a staff response to the issues and comments; and
- To present revisions to the proposed Official Plan Amendment in response to the issues and comments for Council's consideration.

Issues and Staff Response:

The following provides a summary of the main issues and comments that were raised at the Public Meeting or through written correspondence.

1) Population Projections and Urban Boundary to 2031

Summary of Concerns: Comments were submitted expressing concerns that the City does not have sufficient land available within its boundary to support the projected population and employment to the year 2031. Of particular concern was a perceived shortfall of available land to provide the dwelling units necessary to support the projected population.

Staff Response: Official Plan Amendment No. 39 was the City's Growth Plan conformity amendment. A considerable amount of study was conducted as background to OPA 39 through the Local Growth Management Strategy (LGMS). Council's approval of the Local Growth Management Strategy established the population and employment projections for 2031 and confirmed that there is sufficient land within the City's boundary to accommodate the projected population and employment figures. The LGMS concluded that the greenfield areas of the City would need to be developed at higher densities, with a greater percentage of multiple unit housing and in a more compact form than in the past to meet the minimum density targets of Places to Grow. The Council adoption and subsequent Provincial approval of OPA 39 set in place the City's growth management strategy and confirmed the City's urban boundary and projected population and employment.

2) South Guelph (Clair-Maltby) Secondary Plan

Summary of Concern: Comments have been submitted requesting that the City give priority to the initiation of the Secondary Plan for Clair-Maltby.

Staff Response:

This area has primarily been identified as requiring a secondary plan to:

- Establish land use designations that contribute towards the goal of compact urban form to meet the density target for the greenfield area and to address the population and employment projections; and to
- Undertake the necessary related studies to support future urban growth in the area, including a comprehensive servicing strategy for the area.

While the need for a secondary plan does not seem to be the main issue, the timing of the initiation of the Secondary Plan and the priority afforded to the study has been cited as a major concern by a number of developers and consultants. At present, the provision of funding for the Clair-Maltby Secondary Plan is included in the 10 Year Capital Budget Forecast for the years 2014 - 2016. The timing for the funding in the budget is determined as part of the prioritization exercise of the Capital Budget process. Council could change the timing of the funding for the secondary plan through the budget process. Preparatory work to support initiation of the secondary plan process (i.e., development of the terms of reference) could commence prior to 2014 subject to staff resources and Council work plan priorities.

Through the Local Growth Management Study it was determined that the lands south of Clair would be needed to meet projected population and employment growth in the latter stages of the planning period (i.e., 2020 and beyond). This takes into consideration the availability of units in draft approved and registered

plans of subdivision and lands that are suitably zoned for residential use in other areas of the City that are anticipated to be developed in the short to medium term.

A portion of the secondary plan area is designated as Reserve Lands. This designation indicates that these lands are considered to be part of the long term urban land supply. Background work to the Local Growth Management Strategy concluded that there is sufficient land within the City's corporate boundary to 2031 and that development in a compact and higher density form could result in lands being available to support population and employment growth beyond 2031. The completion of a secondary plan will provide further information about the potential of the Reserve Lands to support population and employment growth and will consider timing for future development of these lands. It is important to note that the Reserve Lands designation applies to lands at the City's eastern and southern boundaries and that development in these areas would not occur until servicing becomes available. Servicing would only be extended into these areas in a logical and economical manner which contributes to the anticipated timing of development in the long-term.

3) Greenfield Density Target and Employment Lands

Summary of Concerns: Comments were received expressing concern that the greenfield area density targets for the Industrial and Corporate Business Park designations are unattainable and that warehouse uses should be directed to locate within the greenfield area.

Staff Response: The City is required by the Growth Plan to plan to meet the minimum greenfield area density target. The Growth Plan includes the following policies:

- 2.2.7.2 The designated greenfield area of each upper- or single-tier municipality will be planned to achieve a minimum density target that is not less than 50 residents and jobs combined per hectare.
- 2.2.7.6 Municipalities will develop and implement official plan policies, including phasing policies, and other strategies, for designated greenfield areas to achieve the intensification target and density targets of this Plan.

To fulfill policy 2.2.7.6 of the Growth Plan the City completed the Local Growth Management Strategy and the Employment Lands Strategy.

Through the Local Growth Management Strategy it was determined that the greenfield areas of the City would need to develop at a greater density than in the past in order to achieve the target of 50 persons and jobs per hectare. As part of this, the permitted density ranges for residential designations were revised and minimum densities were established. Residential lands are expected to compensate for other land use designations by developing at densities higher than 50 persons and jobs per hectare.

The City completed the Employment Lands Strategy (Phase 1 and 2) in part to create a long-term vision and plan for future employment lands in keeping with Places to Grow. Phase 2 of the strategy provided an analysis of current and expected employment densities and provided recommendations for future employment land development.

The Employment Lands Strategy Phase 2 recommended an average density for future development of employment lands of 46 jobs per hectare. This recommended average density represents a long-term target based on the City's policy objectives and was informed by recent and anticipated market trends. The Strategy further stated that future density levels achieved on employment lands could be lower than the recommended target. It was recommended that the City continue to monitor density trends.

The density target was broken down based on land use designation. For Industrial Lands the recommended target is 36 jobs per hectare. For Corporate Business Park lands the Strategy recommended a target of 75 jobs per hectare; this has been reduced in the Official Plan to 70 jobs per hectare. The strategy recognizes that there will be challenges to meeting these density targets particularly in relation to the continued development of warehousing/transportation land uses combined with manufacturing uses that use increased automation.

The density targets are intended to be achieved over the long-term to 2031. The Industrial and Corporate Business Park designations contain a range and mix of employment uses that taken together contribute towards planning to achieve the density target. The range of uses is supported by the City's economic development strategies as articulated through the Prosperity 2020 report which recommends diversifying the City's economic base and focusing on agri-food and innovation, advanced manufacturing and environmental technologies. Warehousing uses have not been restricted and continue to be a permitted use in appropriate land use designations throughout the City. Staff continue to be supportive of monitoring our employment lands in terms of the job densities created on average across the greenfield area and of maintaining a range and mix of employment uses.

Revisions have been made to the Official Plan policies to provide clarity to the greenfield area density targets. The policies have been moved from the individual land use designations and inserted into Section 3.14 Employment Lands in a modified form. The policies indicate that employment lands are planned to contribute toward the greenfield area target and that the City will monitor employment lands in terms of average densities within those designations. Concern seems to stem from the policies being located under the land use permissions for height and density; the recommended relocation of these policies to Chapter 3 is intended to clarify that the densities are not meant to be applied to individual development applications but are to be measured as an average for the greenfield area. Staff continue to support the inclusion of a policy encouraging low-density employment uses to locate within the built-up area in terms of both supporting the redevelopment of under-utilized sites and in terms of preserving greenfield area lands for uses that contribute towards the City's objectives of compact development at higher densities. Again, these uses continue to be permitted in appropriate land

use designations in the greenfield area, consistent with the City's existing Official Plan.

4) Community Mixed-use Node and Community Mixed-use Centre policies

Summary of Concern: Question from Council related to Community Mixed-use nodes not achieving the policy vision.

Staff Response: Staff stress that the vision is intended to be achieved over the long-term. The land use designations on Schedule 2 of the Official Plan provide the range and mix of permitted uses that would achieve the vision of pedestrian-oriented and transit-supportive development with amenities and commercial uses in proximity to residential neighbourhoods. Medium and high density residential uses are designated within walking distance of the designated commercial centres. Market and economic conditions will ultimately determine the timing for the full build-out of the permitted uses. The commercial designations including the permissions for retail floor area were planned based on a twenty year time horizon. Thus, the actual need for the commercial space may be towards the end of the planning period depending on the site's geographic location and the demographic characteristics of the Nodes.

Policies are included in Section 3.11 Community Mixed-use Nodes of the Official Plan requiring urban design concept plans to be developed for major development proposals within the Community Mixed-use Nodes. These concept plans will provide guidance to the short-term development of sites within the Node and will consider and plan for the long-term evolution of the Nodes in support of the vision for higher density mixed-use areas.

5) Infill and Intensification Policies

Summary of Concern: Council requested information about how the nature and feel of neighbourhoods is protected through the policies in the Official Plan.

Staff Response: Infill and intensification are expected to occur in appropriate locations throughout the City including low density residential neighbourhoods. Places to Grow requires the City to meet an intensification target of 40% of all new residential development by the year 2015 and each year thereafter. In respect of this requirement, the Official Plan contains policies that encourage infill and intensification that is compatible with its immediate vicinity. The Urban Design Chapter includes policies for low rise residential built-form and the Land Use Chapter includes development criteria for multi-unit and intensification proposals. The low density residential designation for the built-up area of the City includes a maximum density of 35 units per hectare which allows for a mix of housing in low-rise and low density forms such as detached, semi-detached and townhouse units. The Official Plan also identifies intensification corridors (approved through OPA 39) which are intended to be the focus for higher density mixed-use developments. Policies for intensification corridors state that development within the identified corridors will be directed and oriented toward arterial and collector roads in order to minimize compatibility concerns in adjacent, internal neighbourhoods.

Infill and intensification proposals including lot severances are encouraged throughout the built-up area of the City to support the efficient use of existing services and the land base and to contribute toward the achievement of the intensification target. The combination of the above noted policies, in conjunction with zoning regulations such as lot frontage, area and setbacks, supports compatible infill and intensification within our existing neighbourhoods and encourages the provision of a mix and range of housing in all areas of the City.

6) Urban Design

Summary of Concern: A number of comments were received related to the parking and minimum height policies in the non-residential land use designations. Concern was expressed that the parking policies were prescriptive and would be cost-prohibitive. Concern was expressed that the minimum height of 2 storeys in certain locations was not economically feasible. Additional comments were concerned with how the urban design policies would be applied to site-specific developments.

Staff Response: The policies related to parking and minimum heights for non-residential land use designations have been reviewed and revised. The policies have been deleted from the non-residential land use designations and inserted into the Urban Design Chapter as “encourage” policies. In terms of parking, staff continue to be supportive of alternatives to surface parking. The parking policies continue to use the term “encourage” and should not be interpreted to mean that underground or structured parking is required. The policies that required a minimum height of 2 storeys have been removed from the non-residential land use designations in Chapter 9 and inserted into Section 8.6 Built-form. These policies have been modified to state that a minimum height of 2 storeys is encouraged to provide definition to streets and open spaces. Future intensification and redevelopment is also supported through such strategies as designing buildings to support future expansions.

The urban design policies in the Official Plan are intended to provide the City’s vision for future development of the full range of land uses at various locations and each policy will not necessarily apply in all circumstances. As such, the implementation of the policies will vary depending on the context, geographic location and form of development proposed. Site-specific urban design matters will be addressed at the time of an application.

7) Affordable Housing

Summary of Concerns: Concerns related to the affordable housing targets included:

1. Application of target to new housing units only;
2. Definition of affordable housing;
3. Inclusion of target for social housing; and
4. Inclusion of a target for rental housing.

Staff Response: The City prepared an Affordable Housing Discussion Paper in 2009 which addressed the definition of affordable housing, the method for determining the target and recommendations for implementation.

The Discussion Paper stated that the affordable housing targets would apply to new construction only. In order to comply with the PPS (Section 1.4.3), the City is required to “establish and implement affordable housing targets for an appropriate range of housing types which are affordable to low and moderate income households”. Although the resale market may contribute to the overall affordability, municipal planning policy exerts little direct influence on the resale market. Therefore, the affordable housing target applies only to new construction. The target applies to an annual percentage of all new residential units constructed and is not intended to be applied as 30% of units within each individual development proposal. Implementation strategies related to the target are to be determined through an upcoming Affordable Housing Strategy.

The Ministry of Infrastructure indicated that the definition for affordable housing should be revised to be in accordance with the Growth Plan’s definition. The definition of affordable in the Growth Plan is:

Affordable:

- a) In the case of ownership housing, the least expensive of:
 1. Housing for which the purchase price results in annual accommodation costs which do not exceed 30 per cent of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households; or
 2. Housing for which the purchase price is at least 10 per cent below the average purchase price of a resale unit in the regional market area.
- b) In the case of rental housing, the least expensive of:
 1. A unit for which the rent does not exceed 30 per cent of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households; or
 2. A unit for which the rent is at or below the market average rent of a unit in the regional market area.

Through the Affordable Housing Discussion Paper, the City established a method for determining what affordable means in the Guelph context. It was determined that for the City of Guelph, the least expensive of the two options in the definition is the average purchase price of a resale unit and the average market rent of a unit. Therefore, the definition used in the Official Plan includes only the portion of the Growth Plan definition that applies to the Guelph context. For example, the method determined that based on 2008 data, 10% below the average resale price (\$237,088) is lower than the purchasing price of households at the 60th percentile without exceeding 30% of the gross annual household income (\$255,200), therefore, housing priced at \$237,088 or below would be considered affordable for the City of Guelph. Since the method outlined in the Affordable Housing Discussion Paper for determining what affordable means is the basis for the affordable housing policies in the Official Plan, staff continue to support the definition as drafted in the Official Plan update.

The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing commented on the inclusion of a separate target for social housing and questioned how the City would encourage the

meeting of this target given that the County of Wellington is responsible for the provision of social housing. In response to this comment, the policy has been revised to indicate that the City is supportive of the achievement of the County's target with respect to the provision of social housing.

Comments were received questioning why the affordable housing target includes a breakdown by owner and rental housing. The Growth Plan and the PPS requires that official plans establish and implement a minimum target that is affordable to low and moderate income households for the full range of housing. Therefore, a target has been established for both ownership and rental units. While the City cannot regulate tenure, the policy will be used to promote and encourage the development of rental units.

8) Drive-throughs: Use permissions and accessibility

Summary of Concern: Council asked for information about the permissions for drive-throughs and commentary on the accessibility of drive-throughs.

Staff Response: The issue of policies prohibiting drive-throughs was addressed through Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment Report 12-11. In response to comments submitted on the 2010 draft of the Official Plan Update, Staff decided to remove the policies related to prohibiting drive-throughs. Urban design policies were introduced to provide direction as to design and site matters for drive-throughs to ensure compatibility with adjacent land uses and consistency with other relevant policies and objectives (e.g., walkability). Comments on drive-throughs expressed that the prohibition was a contradiction to the nature and location of the land use designations where commercial uses are permitted (i.e. on arterial and collector roads which are expected to accommodate large volumes of traffic and on sites with large surface parking areas). The matter was raised again at the Public Meeting on April 2, 2012 with inquiries related to the rationale behind removing the prohibition of drive-throughs and to accessibility.

Staff note that the City has not prepared background documentation with respect to prohibiting drive-throughs as a use. A number of other municipalities are currently involved in or have been involved in Ontario Municipal Board hearings related to restricting or prohibiting drive-throughs. Staff are monitoring these cases and continue to propose that the issue of regulations for drive-throughs be considered through the comprehensive Zoning By-law Update. This process would allow for careful consideration of the issue and allow Council, the public and stakeholders input into the process and any proposed regulations.

In terms of accessibility, the Ontario Restaurant Hotel and Motel Association (ORHMA) provided comments in support of drive-throughs as a service option for people with mobility or physical challenges and the elderly.

9) Transportation Policies for Modal Shares

Summary of Concern: Council asked for clarification regarding the policies in Chapter 5 for modal shares specifically related to the increase in mode share for cycling to 3%.

Staff Response: Policy 5.1.1 of the OP Update states that:

The City will plan, implement and maintain a transportation system to facilitate:

- i) Increasing non-auto mode shares for average daily trips to 15% for transit, 15% for walking and 3% for cycling; and
- ii) Reducing the amount of energy used for transportation by 25% from 2007 levels by 2031.

The basis for the 3% is the "Bicycle- Friendly Guelph Project." Report 08-55 to the Community Development and Environmental Services Committee in May 2008 indicated that cycling accounted for 1% of all daily trips in Guelph. Through this report, Council authorized staff to proceed with developing a bicycle transportation plan to make Guelph a bicycle-friendly city and achieve a target cycling modal share of 3% of all daily trips in ten years. The Official Plan update includes this target as a policy. Engineering Services is currently developing the Bicycle Transportation Plan which will include an implementation strategy related to achievement of this target. The City will continue to monitor its progress toward achieving the modal share targets. Should there be any changes in the proposed targets or policy basis, the policies in the Official Plan may be updated through an amendment or through the next Five-year Review.

10) High Volume Water and Wastewater Users

Summary of Concern: Comments were submitted related to the policies that discourage users that require high volumes of water use and wastewater discharge from locating in the City. The concerns related to discouraging the development of employment lands and discouraging potential businesses from locating in Guelph.

Staff Response: Staff continue to be supportive of policies that reflect the principles of conservation and sustainability in relation to the City's finite water supply and the assimilative capacity of the Speed River for handling wastewater discharge. A single industrial user with high volume water or wastewater needs could negatively impact the supply within the City and have repercussions on future growth and development potential unless water and wastewater capacity impacts can be addressed in a satisfactory manner.

Staff have agreed to provide clarity to what constitutes high volume users through the development of guidelines to assist in the evaluation of development applications. These guidelines will not be introduced as policy into the Official Plan since they are subject to change and would likely become outdated in the Official Plan prior to the next Five-Year Update. A general policy related to this has been added to the Official Plan (Section 6.1). Information about the guidelines will be communicated to Council through a future report from Engineering Services.

11) Linked Open Space and River Systems

Summary of Concern: Comments were submitted expressing concern that the policies related to a linked open space system were reduced or diminished in the Official Plan and that the River Systems Management Plan has been abandoned.

Staff Response: Official Plan Amendment No. 42 (OPA 42) – Phase 2 of the OP Update – addressed the Natural Heritage components of the Official Plan and

provided a comprehensive update to the natural heritage policies. OPA 42 positioned the Official Plan as an environment first plan with the Natural Heritage System (NHS) being considered through a systems approach rather than a feature specific approach. One feature of the NHS is the rivers which are addressed through the Significant Valleyland policies in OPA 42.

OPA 42 includes the following, which describes the purpose of the NHS:

4.1.1 Purpose

The purpose of the Natural Heritage System is to protect natural heritage features and areas for the long term, and maintain, restore and where possible, improve the bio-diversity and connectivity of natural heritage features and ecological function of the Natural Heritage System in the long term, while recognizing and maintaining linkages between and among the natural heritage features and areas and surface water and groundwater features.

The purpose clearly speaks to linkages and connectivity. The NHS includes ecological linkages, restoration areas and wildlife crossings which all contribute to creating a linked system.

While OPA 48 (Phase 3) contains policies for the Open Space System: Trails and Parks; it does not address any elements that are covered by OPA 42. The 2001 Official Plan includes policies for a Linked Open Space Concept which generally included open space and natural areas while setting the policy basis for the development of a linear open space system (i.e., trail system). These policies have been carried forward into OPA 48 with some revisions (Section 7.3.1 Trail Network).

On further review, it is acknowledged that the concept of the City's Open Space designation (i.e. parks and trails) and the Natural Heritage System acting as complementary, interconnected systems has been somewhat diminished in the way the NHS policies of OPA 42 and the Open Space System: Trails and Parks policies in OPA 48 are interacting. Therefore, in order to address concerns related to the loss of language around the "linked open space concept", revisions are proposed to the introductory paragraph to the Open Space System: Trails and Parks section of the OP (Section 7.3) to indicate that in some instances the trail and park system may complement or be interconnected with the Natural Heritage System. This is particularly evident along the river corridors where active and passive parkland exists. One objective has been revised to indicate that naturalization and environmental enhancement may occur in appropriate open space and park locations to complement and strengthen adjacent NHS lands.

The 1995 Official Plan and 1995 Zoning By-law incorporated the land use planning aspects of the River Systems Management Plan. Since that time, the Official Plan has been updated twice (2001 and the current update). While many of the policy concepts derived from the River Systems Management Plan are still evident in the Official Plan update (i.e., OPA 42 policies, Urban Design policies) in some instances the City's policies have incorporated different approaches. To be clear, where there is a conflict between the River Systems Management Plan and the Official Plan, the

Official Plan policies prevail. This is also true of provincial policies, plans and regulations.

12) Financial Tools

Summary of Concern: At the public meeting, Council asked staff to examine the feasibility of adopting financial tools such as “front-end financing” to be able to move past potential financial blockages that may be slowing down development. This concern is, in part, related to the concern about the priority setting for the Secondary Plan for Clair-Maltby and for the timing of re-construction of Gordon Street south of Clair Road.

Staff Response: The financing of growth related infrastructure projects is covered through the collection of Development Charges. The Development Charges Act states that the fees are payable at the time of a building permit or at the time of a subdivision agreement unless the Development Charges By-law states otherwise. Municipalities may enter into an agreement with a proponent to pay the charges either before or after they would otherwise be payable. Thus, the Development Charges By-law allows for “front-end financing”. Council currently has the authority to approve the use of agreements to facilitate the early collection of development charges to finance infrastructure and servicing projects.

Staff have drafted the following policy to provide enabling language within the Official Plan to support the use of alternative means to finance infrastructure projects.

The proposed policy is:

- 10.16.4 The City may consider alternative means to finance infrastructure projects such as front-end financing or private/public partnerships to ensure that development occurs in a fiscally responsible manner. The City may enter into agreements addressing the terms and conditions related to alternative financing.

There was also discussion related to providing greater transparency related to the financial impacts of growth. This topic has been raised previously and Watson and Associates were retained to provide a high level overview of the costs of growth in 2007. An initial step to addressing this issue was incorporated into the Official Plan through the OPA 39 policies related to the submission of studies for a complete planning application. OPA 39 introduced a policy through which the City may require the submission of reports or studies that demonstrate “that a proposed development and/or change in land use will not have an unreasonable or unanticipated negative financial impact on the City including, but not limited to, short-term and long-term costs to the City for the provision of municipal infrastructure and services required to support the proposed development and/or change in land use.” While this policy is in place, implementation details have not been determined. Staff recommend that this issue be examined further through the update to the Development Charges By-law. Any outcomes or recommendations of that review could be introduced into the OP in the future.

Overview of Revisions to Official Plan Amendment 48

Revisions to the Official Plan since its release on January 30, 2012 are documented in Attachment 4. The revisions are minor in nature and generally involve modifications to wording, relocation of policies, or addition of policies to provide clarity to a topic area in response to comments. No new policy areas were introduced through the revisions to the Plan. Revisions to the schedules were in response to comments from the Province and to correct errors.

Attachment 5 provides a “track changes” version of the sections of the Official Plan that were revised since January 2012. Revisions are displayed in coloured text and comment boxes are included in the margins to provide a brief description of the change.

Staff have also documented the policies that have been deleted from the current Official Plan through the Five Year Update. A highlighted version of the 2011 Consolidation of the 2001 Official Plan is available on the City website. This document highlights which policies have been carried forward, which policies provide the basis for revised policies and which policies have been deleted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommend that Official Plan Amendment 48 be adopted and forwarded to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing for approval. The policies as drafted conform to the Provincial Policy Statement, the Growth Plan and provincial plans and regulations. OPA 48 provides additional support to the policies approved through OPA 39 in terms of supporting the local growth management strategy and implementing the Growth Plan. OPA 48 is consistent with City plans and studies and provides policy direction with respect to implementation of these plans and studies (e.g., Community Energy Plan (2007), Trail Master Plan (2005), Affordable Housing Discussion Paper (2009), Employment Lands Strategy (2008 and 2009), Urban Design Action Plan (2008), Guelph and Wellington Transportation Plan (2005), Infrastructure Master Plans (various)).

The Five Year Official Plan Review was conducted in three phases and throughout the process provided the public with a variety of opportunities and methods for being involved and expressing their comments. Supporting materials were posted to the City website and made available for review at City Hall. Phase 1 of the Five Year Review (OPA 39) included extensive community and stakeholder engagement over a period of several years.

The following provides a summary of the public consultation process for Phase 2 and 3 of the Five Year Review:

2010	March	Open houses on key directions (March 10 and 11) Consultation sessions with ministries, agencies, interest groups and Guelph Wellington Development Association
2010	April	Open Houses for Draft Official Plan (April 20, 21, 22)

2010	May	Statutory Public Meeting (May 20) (Note: Council resolution to split out Natural Heritage System into its own amendment, remainder of plan becomes Phase 3)
2010	July	Council Meeting – adoption of OPA 42 (July 27)
2011		Review of Comments and meetings with stakeholders
2012	January	Release of Draft Official Plan (new Phase 3) (Note: this is the 2 nd draft of policies contained within Phase 3, first draft released April 2010)
2012	February	Open House (Feb. 29) Meetings with stakeholders
2012	March	Open House (March 6) Meetings with stakeholders
2012	April	Public Meeting (April 2) Meetings with Stakeholders
2012	May	Release of Final OPA 48
2012	June	Council decision meeting

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN

- Goal 1:** An attractive, well functioning and sustainable city
- Goal 2:** A healthy and safe community where life can be lived to the fullest
- Goal 3:** A diverse and prosperous local economy
- Goal 4:** A vibrant and valued arts, culture and heritage identity
- Goal 5:** A community-focused, responsive and accountable government
- Goal 6:** A leader in conservation and resource protection/enhancement

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There is sufficient funding in the Official Plan Update budget to complete Phase 3.

DEPARTMENTAL CONSULTATION

Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment (Engineering)
Finance and Enterprise (Financial Services) (Economic Development)
Community and Social Services (Parks and Recreation)

COMMUNICATIONS

Since the statutory public meeting was held on April 2, 2012, staff have met with a number of stakeholders and individuals who submitted comments to clarify concerns and discuss possible resolutions.

Notice of the June 5, 2012 Council meeting where Official Plan Amendment No. 48 is to be considered for adoption was provided by mail to anyone who requested notification and was published in the City News pages of the Guelph Tribune on May 24, 2012.

ATTACHMENTS

The attachments are available on the City of Guelph website at guelph.ca/envisionguelph. Click on the link for the June 5, 2012 OPA 48 Decision Report with attachments.

Attachment 1: Official Plan Amendment No. 48

Attachment 2: Public Comment and Staff response summary table

Attachment 3: Public Comment Letters

Attachment 4: Summary of Revisions to Official Plan Amendment No. 48

Attachment 5: "Track Changes" Version of Policy Revisions

Prepared By:

Melissa Aldunate
Senior Policy Planner
519.837.5616 ext. 2099
melissa.aldunate@guelph.ca



Recommended By:

Todd Salter
Acting General Manager
Planning Services
519.822.1260 ext. 2395
todd.salter@guelph.ca



Recommended By:

Janet Laird, Ph.D.
Executive Director
Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment
519.822.1260 ext. 2237
janet.laird@guelph.ca