

## Attachment 5: Comments and Response Table

### Comments on Guelph Innovation District Draft Secondary Plan (October 2012)

The comments received on the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan following its public release and circulation in October 2012 are summarized in the following table. Comments are organized by Chapter/Policy of the Draft Secondary Plan starting with the Chapter 1: Introduction, and ending with General Comments. This provides the reader with the opportunity to see what comments were received for each component of the GID Draft Secondary Plan and make the connection to the proposed Official Plan Amendment which incorporates the Secondary Plan into the City's Official Plan. The comment number references the number assigned to the piece of correspondence received which is included in Attachment 4: Comments submitted by the public, stakeholders and agencies, in PBEE Report 13-62. The date, source and comment summary is presented next, followed by a staff response to the comment. The proposed Official Plan Amendment 54: Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan presented in PBEE Report 13-62 reflects the staff response.

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
	<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b>					
1	<i>Principle 1: Protect What is Valuable</i> Creating a place that respects natural and built heritage resources, making citizens stewards of the resources for current and future generations.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Replace "built heritage resources" with "cultural heritage resources".	Principle revised to replace "built heritage resources" with "cultural heritage resources".
2	<i>Principle 1: Objectives</i> b) Respect the existing topography and sightlines, including river vistas and views of both Downtown and the historic Reformatory Complex.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Clarify the location of vistas and views in a Schedule.	Appendix A has been added to the Secondary Plan which shows the location of public views for potential protection during the development of the lands. Appendix A is for illustrative purposes only and does not constitute part of the Secondary Plan policies.
3	<i>Principle 1: Objectives</i> c) Ensure compatible public access opportunities to the <i>Natural Heritage System</i> and cultural heritage resources, including those designated in the Official Plan, and promote their celebration, especially river vistas and edges, the Provincially Significant Earth Science Area of Natural and Scientific Interest, and the historic Reformatory Complex.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Clarify the location of vistas and views in a Schedule. Clarify if the location of provincially significant ANSI is the same as 'significant natural area' in Schedule A.	See response in row 2 for vistas and views comment. The provincially significant ANSI is within the area designated 'significant natural area'.
4	<i>Principle 1: Objectives</i> d) Integrate the <i>Natural Heritage System</i> and cultural heritage	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and	Reword to indicate that new development will be integrated within the existing design and not the other way round.	Principle revised to read "Connect surrounding land uses with the <i>Natural Heritage System</i> ".

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
	resources with surrounding land uses and provide opportunities for compatible research, educational, recreational, transportation and urban agricultural uses.			Sport		
5	<i>Principle 1: Objectives</i> e) Ensure, where appropriate and feasible, the preservation and adaptive reuse of cultural heritage resources, including the historic Reformatory Complex and associated cultural heritage landscape.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	The meaning of "appropriate and feasible" is unclear. Recommend the same language as in the PPS, i.e. "significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved". Use the term conservation instead of preservation. Need to acknowledge the cultural heritage of the Eramosa River as part of the Grand River Watershed, a designated Canadian Heritage River. There may be some cultural heritage resources in the Guelph Research Station property. Another provision could be added, i.e. "Apply best efforts to arrange for an alternate use of the built heritage resources that requires minimal or no change to its heritage attributes (adaptive reuse)."	Reworded objective to align with the PPS. References added to include the Guelph Research Station property. The City acknowledges the cultural heritage value of the Eramosa River and feel that the Natural Heritage System policies of OPA 42 afford significant protection of this resource. A reference has been added to Principle 1: Objective a) recognizing the designation of the Eramosa River Valley as a Canadian Heritage River. The Cultural heritage resource policies in the City's Official Plan Update and included within the GID Secondary Plan will address cultural heritage resources in the Guelph Research Station property and others within the GID lands. An Appendix is included, for illustrative purposes only, that shows the location and status of cultural heritage resources within the GID. The City does recognize cultural heritage resources in the Guelph Research Station property including the Turfgrass Institute Building (G.M. Frost Centre), and remnant elements of the Correctional Centre (e.g. a remnant orchard, some stone walls and a metal staircase).
6	<i>Principle 2: Create Sustainable and Energy Efficient Infrastructure</i> Building infrastructure that is efficient, focuses on renewable energy sources, and supports an integrated energy distribution system that enables a carbon free lifestyle.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Add "Council shall support the reduction of waste from construction debris as a result of the demolition of buildings by promoting and encouraging the adaptive reuse of existing building stock."	New objective 2 g) added in response to this comment.
7	<i>Principle 3: Establish a Balanced</i>	42	Jan. 7	Ministry of	Unclear if new connections to replace	Principle revised to change "Build new" to

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
	<p><i>Mobility System</i> Making connections that serve the community, allow current and future generations to walk or cycle to daily needs, and provide convenient transit services to access broader activities.</p> <p><i>Objectives</i> e) Build new connections for pedestrians, cyclists and potentially transit users across the Eramosa River valley to better connect uses and activities.</p>		2013	Tourism, Culture and Sport	existing bridges or if there will be additional crossings.	"Create and enhance". The intent is for additional crossings and to maintain existing ones.
8	<p><i>Principle 4: Promote a healthy diversity of land uses and densities</i> Creating meaningful places to bring people, activities, environment(s) and ideas together, creating a sense of arrival and inclusion.</p> <p><i>Objectives</i> h) Create a memorable landmark area/structure to serve as a beacon/partner to the Church of Our Lady Immaculate in Downtown.</p>	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Provision unclear. Is Plan recommending a structure visible from downtown? Is it a building or monument? How would this impact upon cultural heritage resources that may be at the Guelph Research Station property? What principles are in place to guide its design?	Objective clarified. Intent is to tie together public views and identities between GID and Church of Our Lady Immaculate in Downtown. Block Plan and development approvals process will address this objective through detailed planning and design. The City's cultural heritage policies would protect cultural heritage resources.
9	<p>j) Respect (and emulate where appropriate) the Beaux-Arts design of the cultural heritage landscape component of the historic Reformatory Complex.</p>	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Unclear what City wants to achieve. Suggested wording "New developments on the site should adopt an architectural vocabulary and design elements that are compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from the heritage property."	No change to this objective. Suggested wording has been added as per comment in policy 6.4.2. Policy 11.2.6.3.1.2 also clarified to include need for development to be compatible with and respectful of cultural heritage resources.
10	<p><i>Principle 6: Grow Innovative Business and Employment Opportunities</i> Grow Innovative Business opportunities that support the knowledge-based innovation sector, green jobs and knowledge-based industries, within a compact, mixed use community.</p> <p><i>Objectives</i></p>	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Clarify how this fits with Section 6.4 (Land Use Designations – Adaptive Reuse). Replace "built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes" with "cultural heritage resources".	The Adaptive Re-use designation provides flexibility to re-purpose the historic reformatory complex and to support development that is compatible with and respectful of cultural heritage resources. The re-use of the structures and respectful changes should lead to showcasing the resources.

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
	e) Encourage employment uses within the historic Reformatory Complex that can showcase the site's built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscape.					Replaced "built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes" with "cultural heritage resources" throughout the GID Secondary Plan.
Chapter 2: Natural and Cultural Heritage						
11	2.1 Intent The natural and cultural heritage policies below are provided to shape and regulate the preservation and enhancement of the <i>Natural Heritage System</i> and cultural heritage resources found within the Guelph Innovation District. The policies below are informed by the Vision and supporting Principles which seek to reflect Guelph's history and celebrate the rich heritage resources of the District, including the Eramosa River valley, dramatic topography and views, and historic Reformatory Complex.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Need to acknowledge the cultural heritage of the Eramosa River as part of the Grand River Watershed, a designated Canadian Heritage River. There may be some cultural heritage resources in the Guelph Research Station property. The Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario (ARIO) owned property should be referred to as the Guelph Research Station which incorporates the Guelph Turfgrass Institute and agroforestry research. The main building should be referred to as the G.M. Frost Centre.	See row 5.
12	2.2.3 The City will identify and support opportunities to provide greater public access to the <i>Natural Heritage System</i> including examining potential for a pedestrian footbridge located central to the site, providing a direct connection between the western development and the Reformatory complex to the east and linking trail systems subject to an environmental assessment or EIS.	39	Dec. 4, 2012	GRCA	In general support development of trails and walkways adjacent to river corridors and significant valley lands. As part of the EIS completion, additional supporting information will be required in terms of addressing the Natural Hazard in relation to the trails system. Specific emphasis and supporting documentation may be required for the pedestrian foot bridge. GRCA staff would provide further comments and review of any proposed Terms of Reference in support of the EIS.	Policy changes not required since concerns will be addressed through the development approvals process and environmental study requirements.
13	2.2.4 The City will control access to the Natural Heritage System through wayfinding and signage along public trails to minimize impacts on flora and fauna.	41	Dec. 12, 2012	Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC)	Stewardship should be highlighted in the GID Secondary Plan. Interpretative signage, brochures and materials should be a priority.	No change. Policies are included in the GID Secondary Plan in support of the interpretative signage comment.

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
14	2.2.7 The Provincially Significant Earth Science ANSI shown on Schedule 4A within the District presents opportunities for important low impact scientific and educational activities. These activities will be supported and showcased in conjunction with the adjacent trail network shown on Schedule B.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	There was no Schedule 4A attached. Clarify the location	Schedule 4A is a Schedule to the Official Plan. References have been changed to refer to general schedule names of the City's Official Plan and to clarify that they are OP Schedules.
15	2.2.7	45	Aug. 8, 2013	River Systems Advisory Committee (RSAC)	There are a number of areas of significant limestone cliffs on both sides of the Eramosa River. RSAC suggests that these interesting local geological features be highlighted and preserved and built into plans wherever possible.	No change. The cliffs along the Eramosa River include those within the Provincially Significant Earth Science ANSI which are to be preserved.
16	2.2.8 As identified on Schedules A and C, the eastern portion of the District is predominantly designated as Adaptive Re-use within a cultural heritage landscape with built heritage resources in the historic Reformatory Complex. Land uses within the cultural heritage landscape boundary are subject to the provisions of the cultural heritage resource policies found in Section 4.8 of the Official Plan. Policies related to the Adaptive Re-use land use designation can be found in Section 6.4 of this Secondary Plan.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Need to acknowledge the cultural heritage of the Eramosa River as part of the Grand River Watershed, a designated Canadian Heritage River, as well as the views and vistas mentioned in the river valley. There may be some cultural heritage resources in the Guelph Research Station property. Delete "built heritage resources". The Guelph OP (Sept 2012 consolidation) does not have Section 4.8.	See response in row 5.  Section 4.8 is the Cultural Heritage Resources section of the City's Official Plan Update (OPA 48). References have been changed to general sections of the City's Official Plan and not specific policy numbers.
17	2.2.9 Ontario Heritage Trust or the appropriate authority will be requested to hold heritage conservation easement(s) for all features identified as provincially significant heritage resources.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Not sure what the City wants to achieve. Suggested wording "Cultural heritage resources shall be conserved through long-term protection mechanisms.	Policy revised for clarity and generalized. (See policy 11.2.2.2.4) When provincially significant cultural heritage resources are leaving Provincial ownership it is common for these resources to be protected by a heritage conservation easement. Policy recognizes this process to ensure protection of provincially significant resources.
18	2.2.10 A conceptual plan shall be	42	Jan. 7	Ministry of	Unclear what the purpose of a conceptual	Policy reworded for clarity and to align with

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
	required as part of a Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment to ensure that the cultural heritage resources within the site will be conserved and incorporated into any future design intent.		2013	Tourism, Culture and Sport	plan is. Please clarify terms: Built Heritage Resource Impact Assessment vs. Cultural Heritage Resources Impact Assessment. Suggested wording "A Heritage Impact Assessment and/or Conservation Plan will be required to ensure...." As in Comment for Principle 3e) new development must work around what exists, not vice versa. Recommend removing "and incorporated into any future design intent".	the Ontario Heritage Toolkit. What the Ontario Heritage Toolkit refers to as a Heritage Impact Assessment is called a Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment, a defined term in the City's Official Plan (OPA 48).
19	2.2.11 All land uses within the District are subject to the provisions of the cultural heritage resource policies found in Section 4.8 of the Official Plan.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	The Guelph OP (Sept 2012 consolidation) does not have Section 4.8.	See response in row 16.
20	2.2.12 It is the intent of this Secondary Plan to conserve <i>cultural heritage landscapes</i> , such as the area delineated as the historic Reformatory Complex on Schedule A that have been modified by human activities and are valued by the community.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	If provision 2.2.9 is reworded as suggested there is no need to include this provision. The cultural heritage landscape boundaries may be larger than what is in Schedule A.	"Schedule A" changed to "Appendix A". The Natural and Cultural Heritage Schedule A included in the draft Secondary Plan has been changed to an Appendix in the draft Official Plan Amendment.
21	2.2.13 New development shall preserve and enhance the cultural heritage landscape character through integrating cultural heritage resources, landscape elements and important views in site design.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Reword to say that new development will integrate with the existing cultural heritage resources.	Policy reworded to state that new development will respect cultural heritage resources and important public views and public vistas. (See policy 11.2.2.2.9)
22	2.2.14 For archaeological resources, prior to site alteration or soil disturbance relating to a Planning Act application or a Site Alteration application under the Municipal Act, any required archaeological assessment shall be approved by the Province of Ontario and the City, indicating there are no further concerns for <i>archaeological resources</i> within the subject area.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Consistently use italics, e.g. "archaeological resources". Remove reference to Province approving archaeological assessments. Include map to indicate areas of archaeological potential. Suggested wording "Where an archaeological assessment has not been done... OR "The Secondary Plan area has some areas of archaeological potential as defined in Schedule x. Areas of archaeological potential are areas that could contain archaeological resources. The	Policy deleted. The GID Secondary Plan will rely on the City's Official Plan policies for archaeological resources. As per OPA 48, mapping for archaeological potential is not included in the Official Plan because the source data is out of date and there are no recent or planned updates. The Official Plan policies for archaeological resources will guide the need for studies related to archaeological potential.

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
					identification and evaluation of such resources are based upon archaeological fieldwork undertaken in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act. Archaeological assessment will be required prior to the submission of any planning application.”	
23	2.2.15 Encourage the retention and integration of the Turfgrass Institute Building into the Guelph Innovation District community. New development shall have regard for the building form, material and existing views towards the Turfgrass Institute. Where feasible, landscape features associated with the Turfgrass Institute are to be incorporated within the planned public open space and park adjacent and south of the building.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Understand that the Turfgrass Institute Building has been listed on the municipal register. Please clarify whether the municipal heritage committee has looked at whether this property meets Ontario Regulation 9/06. Revisit proposed wording to address the PPS direction that cultural heritage resources shall be conserved. A provision associated more with the natural features of the cultural heritage landscape could also be added “Preserving vegetation – such as trees, shrubs, grasses and other living plant material that is important in defining the overall heritage value of the landscape.”	No change. The Turfgrass Institute Building (G.M. Frost Centre) has not yet been listed on the Municipal Register but is recognized by Heritage Guelph and staff as a built heritage resource. Heritage Guelph has passed a motion requesting that staff include the Turfgrass Institute Building (G.M. Frost Centre) as a property to be listed when a future report recommends expansion of the current Municipal Heritage Register.
24	2.2.16 The topography associated with the Eramosa River Valley within the Guelph Innovation District offers appealing vistas towards the historic Reformatory Complex as well as the Downtown, providing a distinctive character to the area. Future development shall take advantage of favourable topography and vistas and minimize the need for re-grading on site, where possible.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Clarify the location of vistas and views in a Schedule.	See response in row 2.
25	2.2.17 Any proposed bridge crossing of the Eramosa River will utilize the existing slopes and maintain the topography of the <i>Significant Valleyland</i> .	39	Dec. 4, 2012	GRCA	Suggest adding “while ensuring that existing Natural Hazards are appropriately addressed and not further aggravated”.	Policy integrated with general mobility policies of the GID Secondary Plan with suggested wording concerning natural hazards added. (See policy 11.2.4.1.4)
26	Significant Natural Areas	39	Dec. 4,	GRCA	Recommend that emphasis be placed on	Policies have been deleted. The GID

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
	2.2.18 – 2.2.20		2012		the inclusion of native plants to be incorporated into landscaping and any natural area enhancement.	Secondary Plan will rely on the City’s Official Plan policies through OPA 42 which promote the inclusion of native plants.
27	2.2.20 All development on <i>adjacent lands</i> to the <i>Significant Valleylands</i> as shown on Schedule 4D of the Official Plan shall be subject to site plan control where design issues such as compatibility with adjacent and nearby development, sensitivity to local topography and natural features will be reviewed.	39	Dec. 4, 2012	GRCA	Recommend use of Native Species of plants as part of any landscaping criteria to be used as part of the site plan process.	The policy has been deleted. The GID Secondary Plan will rely on the City’s Official Plan policies through OPA 42 which promote the inclusion of native plants through the development process.
28	2.2.23 Enhancement and <i>restoration</i> of existing surface water features and their riparian areas will be encouraged to support <i>fish habitat</i> and the improvement of water quality and quantity.	41	Dec. 12, 2012	Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC)	Three big areas of concern from an environmental perspective (water quality and quantity and hence ecological function) are: Cargill, point source pollution from the Ward coming through Clythe Creek and the dam.	The Surface Water Features and Fish Habitat policy referenced by EAC has been deleted. The policies for Block Plans in section 11.2.7.3 include EIS requirements that will deal with EAC concerns.
29	2.2.23	45	Aug. 8 2013	River Systems Advisory Committee (RSAC)	The major ponds on site do not appear to be addressed. Information on depth, water quality, water sources and flow, fishery status and possible enhancement, suitability for swimming and boating would greatly benefit planning for the site. We note that there are numerous opportunities on the site to improve the ecological integrity of the Eramosa River system by improving water quality flowing off the site, through possible creation of wetland habitat, through day lighting some reaches of the small tributaries on site, through planting of riparian vegetation and the reduction of grassed fields adjacent to water course.	No change. The major ponds are included within the Significant Natural Areas of the GID as per OPA 42, as shown on Schedule B: Land Use. Policy 2.2.23 has been deleted. The policies for Block Plans in section 11.2.7.3 require an EIS in accordance with a Terms of Reference approved by the City. The EIS will include the establishment of natural heritage management objectives and stewardship/restoration recommendations for the City’s Natural Heritage System within the GID, including enhancement and restoration of existing surface water features and riparian areas to support fish habitat and improvement of water quality and quantity.
30	2.2.24 The Guelph Innovation District also includes <i>hedgerows</i> , smaller wooded areas and individual trees that are part of the urban forest.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	See 5.2.18 also – increase, where feasible and appropriate. Need to add a disclaimer about impact on the cultural heritage landscape and associated views and vistas.	Policy revised to add “in a manner that respects the cultural heritage landscape and associated public views and public vistas”. The policy refers to identifying opportunities

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
	<i>Development and site alteration will identify opportunities for protection, enhancement and restoration of the urban forest and contribute to maintaining and increasing canopy cover.</i>					therefore the inclusion of feasible and appropriate in the policy is unnecessary.
31	2.2.24	45	Aug. 8 2013	River Systems Advisory Committee (RSAC)	Will a tree cover inventory be completed? We recommend that redevelopment reduces impacts on existing trees and forested areas. Much of the site is currently old field and there are several areas where agro forestry is practiced. We encourage the identification of opportunities to restore forests (to improve natural infiltration will help maintain creek and river base flow) and to build on the existence of cultural forests on site.	The City will complete a tree inventory for municipal street trees and park trees as per the Urban Forest Management Plan. Developer(s) will be required to complete a tree inventory and tree preservation plan to meet EIS requirements and the City's Private Tree By-law, as part of a development application(s). The urban forest policies of OPA 42 and proposed urban forest policy in the GID Secondary Plan (OPA 54 – 11.2.2.4) address impacts on existing trees and forested areas. The improvement of infiltration is supported by the Stormwater management, Low Impact Development policies in the City's OP and proposed in the GID Secondary Plan (OPA 54 – 11.2.3.4).
<b>Chapter 3: Energy, Servicing and Stormwater</b>						
32	3.3.1d) All new buildings within the GID shall connect to a district energy system, if available. Buildings can be excluded from mandatory connections should they exceed the energy efficiency of the district energy plan and have a lower carbon intensity.	44	April 11, 2013	Infrastructure Ontario	Request explanation of proposed policy, particularly when it is our understanding that exceeding the energy efficiency of the DE plant could be relatively easily obtained.	Policies revised to encourage and/or potentially require development to connect to a district energy system where it has been established or is planned. Policy consistent with Downtown Secondary Plan and Official Plan (OPA 48) policies.
33	3.3.4 Within the GID, 100% of the available roof area will be encouraged to be dedicated to roof top solar technologies such as photovoltaic or solar thermal.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Include a disclaimer about impacts on heritage buildings and landscape or suggested wording "Retrofits for achieving energy efficiency will only be undertaken to a heritage building where it is demonstrated that retrofitting can be accomplished without compromising the	New policy added. (See policy 11.2.3.2.5)

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
					heritage integrity of the building". Also see previous comment on Principle 2 regarding adaptive reuse of heritage buildings.	
34	3.4.3 Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (ICI) development shall be encouraged to decrease water use through the reuse and/or substitution of water demands via greywater reuse or rainwater harvesting. Developers shall be required to demonstrate the efficient use of potable water with any development application. A target of 250 litres per day, per employee, is proposed for the new ICI development.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	The City should ensure policy does not conflict with PPS or any other policy in City's Official Plan.	No change. Conformity with PPS and City's Official Plan considered and ensured as part of policy development.
35	3.5 Stormwater	3	Nov. 12, 2012	Mark Goldberg	Collection and reuse of rainwater that falls on buildings in the GID should be required as part of the City's water conservation strategy. Could experience a 50% reduction in residential municipal water demand since 50% of use is for flushing toilets and washing laundry.	No change. Outside City's jurisdiction to make this mandatory, however policies 11.2.3.3.2 and 11.2.3.3.3 indicate that development will implement the City's Water Conservation and Efficiency Strategy and that rainwater harvesting will be encouraged for ICI development.
36	3.5.4 GID development shall comply with the recommendations and requirements of the City of Guelph Source Water Protection Plan.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	The Source Water Protection Plan needs to be approved by MOE prior to implementation. As drafted this policy requires development within the GID to comply with the recommendations and requirements of the Source Water Protection Plan regardless of whether the Source Water Protection Plan is in effect and force.	Policy deleted. The City's Official Plan policies related to source water protection will be updated for the entire City following approval of the Grand River Source Protection Plan. The City will ensure development applications consider proposed source water protection plan policies through the development approvals process.
37	3.5.5 Infiltration stormwater best management practices (BMPs) (other than increased topsoil depth) that are to be located on private lands are to be listed on land title agreements. The City should have easements for rights to access and maintenance over BMPs located on private lands.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	The City may wish to investigate whether best management practices can be registered on title.	Policy deleted.

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
38	3.5.6 The City shall minimize the amount of chloride (salt) infiltration into groundwater through best management practices when applying salt to streets during winter months. In addition, the City may secure the use of stormwater winter by-pass systems (bypassing the infiltration best management systems that receive treated runoff from roadways and parking areas) so long as it is demonstrated in technical studies submitted in support of the development process that a balanced annual water budget (surface runoff, groundwater recharge, evapotranspiration) can still be obtained.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	The City should ensure that policy is consistent with source protection plan policies.	Policy deleted. Stormwater policies (policy 11.2.3.4) revised through staff review. The City's Official Plan will be updated based on the Grand River Source Protection Plan once it is approved. The City will ensure development applications consider proposed source water protection plan policies through the development approval process.
<b>Chapter 4: Mobility</b>						
39	Table 1. Public Street Classifications and Standards	44	April 11, 2013	Infrastructure Ontario	Setbacks too restrictive. 1 to 3 m more appropriate along major roadway Concerned that parking not permitted along arterials	Setbacks changed to 1 to 3m. Policy is consistent with the City's Official Plan. Parking not permitted on arterials except as may be permitted in accordance with the Official Plan.
40	Table 1	43	Jan. 17 2013	Ministry of Infrastructure	The City may wish to provide a range of possible right-of-way widths including narrower street widths to help achieve a more compact built-form and to shorten pedestrian crossings.	Right-of-way width for Arterial Roads changed to "26m to 36m (As per OP)" to align with the City's Official Plan and to "26m" for Main Street and Collector Roads, including the identified Main St. Policy 4.3.13 deleted and added to Block Plan requirements as policy 11.2.7.5.2 which references the development of alternative development standards for the road network. The City will consider reduced road widths through the development process.
41		44	April 11, 2013	Infrastructure Ontario	Concerned no commitment to build bridge crossing early in development process. Also request that bridge also provide a single vehicle lane to accommodate transit buses	The need and justification for a pedestrian crossing is essential to achieve the Vision, Principles, Objectives, land use and transportation policies of the GID Secondary

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
					and that a strong commitment be made to develop good transit service early in the development of the community.	Plan which prioritize active transportation and connecting the "urban village" with development on the east side of the Eramosa River. However establishing a link for transit use will involve ridership targets and transit operational alternatives. The differences in cost and river system impacts between a pedestrian crossing and a vehicular bridge will also be significant. The potential for a vehicular bridge will be considered through the Block Plan process.
42	4.3.6 d) If future development necessitates extension of College Ave. East over the Eramosa River Valley, consideration shall be given to controlled access for transit and pedestrian traffic.	41	Dec. 12, 2012	Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC)	The active transportation link is supported as it connects both sides of the river and promotes low impact mobility.	No changes required.
<b>Chapter 5: The Public Realm</b>						
43	5.2.3 Streets shall incorporate a high degree of landscaping within the public right-of-way allowance, inclusive of: landscaped boulevards separating sidewalks from all through traffic including on-street parking lanes. Where landscaped boulevards are not feasible, the design and placement of street trees to sustain a healthy urban tree canopy shall be provided.	43	Jan. 17 2013	Ministry of Infrastructure	The City may wish to revisit wording of the policy to clarify that street trees may be provided on all streets for shading and pedestrian comfort, and not just where landscaped boulevards are not feasible. This suggested revision may help to further achieve a pedestrian-focused and human-scaled environment.	Policy 11.2.5.2.2 modified slightly. It is understood that a healthy tree canopy would provide shade.
44	5.2.10 This Secondary Plan identifies two existing public park spaces and the creation of two new public park spaces, each with distinct roles and functions within the community. City staff will secure and develop the new parkland through the development application process, making use of the provisions under the Planning Act to provide these	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	Appears to conflict with section 5.2.11. Unclear how conflict will be resolved.	Policies revised to improve clarity and note that two new parks are required which would be secured at the development stage. (See policies in section 11.2.5.3)

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
	park spaces over time.					
45	5.2.11 Final park locations will be determined in accordance with the development process. If alternative park locations are deemed more appropriate then changes to the location can be made without an amendment to this Plan.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	Appears to conflict with section 5.2.10. Unclear how conflict will be resolved.	Reworded to improve clarity. Policy provides flexibility to potential park location. Schedule B changed to show two new park locations with a symbol to emphasize the conceptual nature of the park space locations. (See policies in section 11.2.5.3)
46	5.2.22 The City shall encourage an integrated public art approach that tells a multi-purpose thematic story tying together the natural and cultural significance of the District, with its future vision. Seize opportunities presented within the historic Reformatory Complex, trail network, parks and open space designations, and lookout points and vistas as potential public art locations.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	There is an opportunity for interpretation and commemoration of the site. Suggested wording in addition to the proposed provision: "The cultural heritage landscape and visual relationships to built heritage resources shall be conserved and monitored to allow for meaningful interpretation. Interpretive signage, public art, way-finding strategies and other techniques may be considered. Please note that the former Reformatory Complex includes lands that are used by the Guelph Research Station, Cargill and municipal properties.	Policy suggestion incorporated into policy 11.2.2.2.8.
47	5.3.6 Nodes represent the confluence of many activities and uses within the District. They are important gathering and meeting places, and the public realm should be designed to reflect their importance.	4	Dec. 17, 2012	Carm Piccoli/Mario Venditti	Nodes are not defined. Nodes are not a designation. Request clarification with respect to the Node and it's application to this property since it is not a designation in Schedule C, Land Use.	Nodes are identified at the intersection of arterial and collector roads within the Mixed-use Corridor (GID) designation now shown only on Schedule C: Built Form Elements to show relationship with permitted heights and identify locations to clarify policy directions.
	<b>Chapter 6: Land Use and Built Form</b>					
48	6.2.3 The District will be developed to support and accommodate emerging innovation businesses and other "green" energy industries that will serve to support the emergence of the District as an innovation centre together with the knowledge-based research centre located within the University of Guelph and with the civic	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Replace "the cultural buildings and landscapes of the historic Reformatory Complex" with "the cultural heritage resources of the area."	Policy 11.2.6.1.3 revised to refer to the "cultural heritage resources of the area."

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
	hub and cultural centre of Downtown. Large tracts of undeveloped land, proximity to the University and Downtown, scenic viewsheds and the cultural buildings and landscapes of the historic Reformatory Complex and strategic marketing to attract new businesses will serve to advance this third cluster within the University-Downtown-GID trinity.					
49	6.2.3	3	Nov. 12, 2012	Mark Goldberg	Helpful to have discussion around how emerging innovation and green energy industries will be attracted and retained. Also will there be a screening process to determine eligibility of businesses to be GID tenants? If so, what would it look like?	The Secondary Plan implementation section includes the preparation of an Implementation Strategy that will address these comments. (See policy 11.2.7.5.1) In addition policy 11.2.7.7 directs the City to work in partnership with the Province and other stakeholders towards the effective and efficient development of the lands.
50	6.2.6 In order to contribute to achieving the City-wide Population and Employment and density targets for 2031, the GID is planned to achieve: a) 8,000 – 10,000 jobs b) 3,000 – 5,000 people	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	It is unclear how the City will ensure targets met if section 6.3.3 allows zoning by-law to establish heights lower than the recommended heights in Schedule D.	Policy revised to set a specific employment and population target. In addition policies revised to implement a Block Plan approach which will be used to ensure targets are met. Targets are established in policy 11.2.7.3.3 for each Block Plan area. Development approvals and zoning regulations will support achievement of the targets.
51	6.2.7 The topography, landscape and natural and cultural heritage features associated with the Eramosa River are unique to the District. Future road alignment, siting and massing, and design of development should enhance scenic views of the Eramosa River valley and cultural heritage landscape features associated with the historic Reformatory Complex, as well as views of Downtown, by:	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Clarify what the cultural heritage features associated with the Eramosa River are.	No change based on comment. Cultural heritage features include a portion of the cultural landscape already identified by the Province that fronts onto the Eramosa River. Appendix A identifies cultural heritage resources.

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
	<p>a) Maintaining the modified grid pattern of streets identified in Schedule B and Schedule C and design future streets to respond to the natural open space and topographic conditions found on the site;</p> <p>b) Enhancing the view corridor of the Eramosa River by providing single loaded local roads where feasible on the table lands in the mixed use employment area to allow public access to views of the Eramosa River;</p> <p>c) Maintaining views of the Eramosa River and cultural heritage landscape features from the urban village and other residential areas to the north of College Avenue East; and</p> <p>d) Maintaining view corridors of Church of our Lady Immaculate in Downtown from College Avenue East and prominent nodes in the District.</p>					
52	6.2.8 The predominant character of built form within the District will be established by mid-rise and employment buildings with a limited number of high-rise buildings at strategic locations marking the Nodes and gateways. A range of building types is to be encouraged, including mid- and high-rise residential and mixed use buildings, townhouses, research, design and office complexes, manufacturing and live/work units.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	The height range provided does not appear to have been established for mid- and high-rise buildings. The placement and height of new buildings may impact the cultural heritage resources: therefore, it is recommended that the height be made explicit for each type of building style.	No change based on comment. Heights are not specifically controlled for the Adaptive Re-use area to ensure maximum flexibility in supporting a new use for the cultural heritage resources. A maximum height of 10 storeys, as per the Official Plan is set. Building heights within the Adaptive Re-use area will be determined as part of the development approval process which includes the establishment of appropriate zoning regulations. There are also specific policies within the Secondary Plan for the Adaptive Re-use area that deal with compatibility of new uses. In addition, the development will be subject to general Official Plan policies that deal with development of and adjacent to cultural heritage resources. A separate height

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
						schedule is included in the Secondary Plan that deals mainly with lands west of the Eramosa River.
53	6.2.11 Stormwater management facilities shall be integrated within development as a component of the publicly accessible open space and park network including the following:  a) Fencing around ponds shall be minimized in favour of shallow slope grading adjacent to pooled areas; b) Where feasible integrate stormwater management facilities within connections between parks and natural heritage features; and c) Providing open spaces, public rights-of-way to perimeters of stormwater management ponds.	43	Jan. 17 2013	Ministry of Infrastructure	Supportive of the policy. City may wish to also consider stormwater management facilities that use land in a compact way and promote pedestrian connectivity such as under-park filtration systems.	Policy revised to incorporate reference to facilities using land in a compact way that promotes connectivity. (See policy 11.2.6.1.11)
54	6.3 General Built Form and Site Development Policies	39	Dec. 4, 2012	GRCA	Recommend that the sub-section or amendment to existing sub-sections be included to emphasize and encourage the use of Native (Local) species of landscaping. Specific emphasis may be suggested in areas adjacent to the Natural areas/River Valley Corridor to further promote enhancement.	No change. The GID Secondary Plan will rely on the City's Official Plan policies through OPA 42 and OPA 48 which promote the inclusion of native plants.
55	6.3	3	Nov. 12, 2012	Mark Goldberg	Rainwater collection and reuse should be mandated.	No change. See response in row 35.
56	6.3 General Built Form and Site Development Policies (e.g. 6.3.5, 6.3.7, 6.3.8 (d) and 6.3.9)	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	Need to consider Building Code requirements that apply to some of the proposed policy approaches while implementing the secondary plan.	No change. Conformity with Building Code will be ensured at the time of development.
57	6.3.2 Heights within the District are to be consistent with the vision, principles	44	April 11, 2013	Infrastructure Ontario	Request that maximum heights be specified in Plan and that at these nodal locations	Maximum heights increased to 10 storeys to be consistent with the maximum heights of

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
	and policies of this Plan. Maximum building heights within the District are indicated in Schedule D. Additional height will be located within nodes located at key intersections and at the urban village to provide focal points for the District in accordance with the policies of this Plan. Minimum building heights and maximum number of floors are indicated in Schedule D.				building heights in the 12 to 15 storey range are appropriate.	the City's Official Plan (OPA 48). Heights sufficient to meet population and employment targets. An additional two storeys is permitted through bonusing in nodal areas within the Mixed-use Corridor (GID) designation.
58	6.3.3 The implementing <i>Zoning By-law</i> may establish heights lower than the recommended heights in Schedule D to maintain viewsheds of the Eramosa River and the Downtown.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	It is unclear how the City will ensure targets in section 6.2.6 are met if zoning by-law allowed to establish heights lower than the recommended heights in Schedule D.	Meeting targets not directly dependent on height; density is also considered. Targets established in policy 11.2.7.3.3 and will be monitored and planned through the Block Plan process. Policy 11.2.6.2.3 maintained.
59	6.3.5 Definition of street edge is a priority within the District to create a rhythm and spacing of building entrances and appropriately sized storefronts to encourage pedestrian activity. The implementing <i>Zoning By-law</i> may establish building frontages along all public streets. Maximum building setbacks from the property line on public streets are included in Section 4, Table 1.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	Need to consider Building Code requirements that apply to some of the proposed policy approaches while implementing the secondary plan. Building Code has setbacks for property lines that must not be exceeded.	No change. Conformity with the Building Code will be ensured at the time of development.
60	6.3.7 In addition to other policies of this Plan, blocks, buildings and structures will be organized to define a public realm including, public streets and laneways, driveways and sidewalks that contribute positively to the character and identity of neighbourhoods in the District, including:  a) – j) (complete policy not repeated here)	42	Jan. 7, 2013	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	Need to consider Building Code requirements that apply to some of the proposed policy approaches while implementing the secondary plan. Distances from fire hydrants to building entrances may be of concern to local fire department. Need to ensure established distances do not conflict with Fire Code.	No change. Conformity with the Building Code will be ensured through the development approvals process.

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
61	6.3.7 b)	3	Nov. 12, 2012	Mark Goldberg	Not apparent from Schedule D, which shows some arterial roads, that orientation of blocks to take full advantage of solar collection will be reflected in planned subdivisions.	No change. Development blocks and their orientation will be determined through the Block Plan process and subsequent development approvals process that will also create the local road structure. This policy direction will be addressed as part of the Block Plan process as set out in the Implementation section of the Secondary Plan.
62	6.3.8 The District shall be designed to accommodate the needs of persons with disabilities. Urban design considerations for a barrier-free environment should include, at minimum, the following: (d) Outdoor accessible parking spaces should be located near accessible building entrances. Indoor accessible parking spaces should be located near accessible elevators, or as close as possible to exits.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	Need to consider Building Code requirements that apply to some of the proposed policy approaches while implementing the secondary plan. Building Code has requirements for access to barrier free parking from barrier free entrances.	Comment noted. Barrier-free requirements are addressed through the site plan approval process.
63	6.3.9 To ensure an attractive streetscape and maximize opportunities for passive energy efficiency/carbon neutrality architectural controls shall be developed to address detailed building design aspects such as: massing, passive energy efficiency matters, siting, grading, elevation articulation, garage articulation, materials colour, sustainability and quality, and roof design.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	Need to consider Building Code requirements that apply to some of the proposed policy approaches while implementing the secondary plan. City should ensure roof designs in compliance with Building Code as there are certain energy efficiency and fire-related matters regarding this topic.	No change. Conformity with the Building Code will be ensured at the time of implementation. Minor revision to policy 11.2.6.2.9; architectural controls may be required through Block Plan process.
64	6.3.10 Garages shall be designed so that they are not the dominant feature in the streetscape. Garages for all ground-related dwelling shall generally be in the rear yard garage accessed by laneway or front driveway. This will	44	April 11, 2013	Infrastructure Ontario	Request clarification as to whether the City is accepting and promoting public rear lanes and further that the City make a firm commitment to creating alternative development standards to minimize land consumption and cost of municipal	Yes the City is accepting of public rear lanes. Yes the City is committed to creating alternative development standards in accordance with Official Plan policy and is already implementing alternative standards where appropriate.

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
	allow for: a) Ground floor front porches, windows and front facing rooms to create a more attractive housing and neighbourhood safety through casual surveillance; b) The creation of an attractive streetscapes; c) Adequate space for street trees and front yard landscaping; and d) Additional opportunities for sufficient on-street parking in front of the units.				infrastructure.	
65	6.4 Adaptive Reuse, Employment Mixed Use 1 and Employment Mixed Use 2 policies	42	Jan. 7, 2013	Ministry of the Environment	These policies encourage a mix of land uses that include certain industrial uses. No specifics provided to ensure the uses will be compatible. Adequate provisions needed in Official Plan to ensure land use compatibility within GID not compromised.	Industrial uses deleted, only manufacturing related to research and development permitted. Regulations related to compatibility are contained within policy 11.2.6.4 of OPA 54. Land use policies, permitted uses and locations have taken compatibility into account. In addition, the development approvals process and zoning regulations will support the achievement of land use compatibility.
66	6.4.1 Adaptive Re-use areas are identified in Schedule C. These include areas containing provincially significant heritage resources where the conservation, rehabilitation, restoration, maintenance and re-use of historic buildings and landscapes will serve as the focal point of new development. They shall have a mix of compatible uses including institutional, educational, commercial, office, light industrial, residential, live/work and open space and park in a form that respects the existing built heritage form, cultural heritage landscape	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Replace "historic buildings and landscapes" with "built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes". Please clarify the relation of the proposed land uses between provision 6.4.1 and provision 1.2 Principle 6 – Item e. Suggested wording "Apply best efforts to arrange for an alternative use of the property that requires minimal or no change to its heritage attributes (adaptive reuse).	Replaced "historic buildings and landscapes" with "built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes." (See policy 11.2.6.3.1.1) Changes made to policy 11.2.6.3.1.2 to address "best efforts" comment. Want to allow sufficient flexibility for adaptive re-use of the resources and consistent with the City's Official Plan treatment of cultural heritage resources.

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
	features, as well as the relationships between cultural heritage resources considered for adaptive re-use and redevelopment.					
67	6.4.2 Within the GID, initiatives shall be considered to ensure that new construction, adaptive re-use and development are sympathetic and complementary to existing cultural heritage attributes of the historic context, including street patterns, building setbacks and building mass, height, and materials.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	See comments for Principle 4 – item j on page 3. (Unclear what City wants to achieve. Suggested wording “New developments on the site should adopt an architectural vocabulary and design elements that are compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from the heritage property.”)	Policy clarified to address need for development to be compatible with and respectful of cultural heritage resources (See policy 11.2.6.3.1.2). Wording suggested by Ministry modified to refer to defined term in the Official Plan, i.e. <i>cultural heritage resource</i> . Replaced “subordinate and distinguishable” with “respectful” to fit with the <i>Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada</i> , the City’s Official Plan (OPA 48) terminology and to allow sufficient flexibility for adaptive re-use of the resources.
68	6.4.3 The adaptive reuse of built heritage resources shall ensure that the original building fabric and architectural features are retained and that any new additions will complement the existing building.	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Merge the two provisions 6.4.2 and 6.4.3 and add some provision about the landscape. Suggested wording “Conserve the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes when creating any new additions to a heritage property or any related new construction. Make the new work physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from the heritage property”.	New policy added to cultural heritage section. (See policy 11.2.2.2.3)
69	6.4.6 The minimum floor space index (FSI) in the Corridor Mixed Use designation shall be 1.0 and generally be a maximum of 3.0 except within Nodal areas where the maximum FSI shall generally be 4.0 if it can be demonstrated that: a) Buildings incorporate a vertical mix of uses where any one use does not occupy more than 60% of the building; and	44	April 11, 2013	Infrastructure Ontario	Delete section 6.4.6 a). Within the context of the GID, it is extremely difficult to create viable development with this particular mix of uses. Ground floor commercial activity with residential above is likely the predominate form and composition that can be expected in this location.	Policy deleted. Policies for Mixed-Use Corridor (GID) revised to require development within the identified nodes on Schedule C and within the identified Main Street area to have retail and service uses on the ground floor, to animate the street level, with a minimum height of approximately 4.5 m to allow flexibility in use. (See policy 11.2.6.3.2.4)

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
	b) Buildings meet the green design requirements of Section 3.4 and the GID Implementation Strategy.					
70	<p>6.4.10 In addition to policies 6.3.7 and 6.3.8, the following additional built form policies shall apply to all development located within a Node:</p> <p>a) Buildings with long façades shall be designed with architectural articulation and changes in material to create interesting building forms, compatible development which breaks up the visual impact of the massing. Articulated massing may include: building stepping/façade step-backs, layered massing (horizontal or vertical) and modulation and change in materials and colour.</p> <p>b) The massing and articulation of buildings taller than five storeys shall provide appropriate transitions to areas with lower permitted heights, minimizing impact on the street level as well as shadow impacts. A minimum step-back of 3m-6m shall be implemented at the 5th storey. The floorplates of floors above the fifth storey generally shall be a maximum of 1000 square metres. Figure 3 indicates the general built form that is to be achieved.</p> <p>c) All buildings should be finished with high quality, enduring materials, such as stone, brick and glass.</p>	44	April 11, 2013	Infrastructure Ontario	Step back at the 5 <sup>th</sup> floor of buildings with a max. 8 storey height not necessary and does not create an attractive or implementable building form. Should delete policy and graphic. Built form and other design guidance should be contained in design guidelines for the community if not covered by City's general design documents.	No change to policy. Consistent with Downtown Secondary Plan. Flexibility to built form policies is provided in the Implementation section (See policy 11.2.7.1.3). (See policy 11.2.6.3.2.6)
71	6.4.12 As indicated in policy 6.4.12, Employment Mixed Use 1 areas provide for a range of employment uses as well as residential uses. The following uses	4	Dec. 17, 2012	Carm Piccoli/Mario Venditti	Section provides for a range of Employment Uses and Residential Uses. Does this permit Higher Density Residential Uses in the form of Condominiums and Apartments?	No change to permitted residential uses. Policy would only permit live/work uses. Freestanding residential buildings are not permitted.

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
	<p>may be permitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Manufacturing uses;</li> <li>b) Research and development facilities;</li> <li>c) Live/work uses;</li> <li>d) Office and administrative facilities;</li> <li>e) Cultural, education and institutional uses;</li> <li>f) Hotel and convention facilities;</li> <li>g) Entertainment and commercial recreation uses; and</li> <li>h) Associated accessory retail uses that are an integral component of the primary uses.</li> </ul>					
72	6.4.14 The maximum floor space index (FSI) in the Employment Mixed Use 1 designation shall generally be 0.6.	43	Jan. 17 2013	Ministry of Infrastructure	City should ensure that the proposed floor maximum space index of 0.6 in the draft policy would not limit the City's ability to achieve transit supportive densities and a more compact built-form given this land use designation's proximity to proposed major transit stops and nodes which is in keeping with Principle 5 objectives.	Policies related to maximum FSI have been deleted. Staff conclude that there is no need to limit the FSI in this designation.
73	6.4.25 Residential areas are identified in Schedule C and include lands containing medium density housing forms such as townhouses and apartments and a limited supply of low-medium density housing forms such as single and semi-detached dwellings. The final distribution of these typologies will be determined through the subsequent development process and regulated through the implementing Zoning By-Law.	44	April 11, 2013	Infrastructure Ontario	The focus on multi-unit housing forms creates a particularly narrow community demographic. Need a more appropriate balance of housing to meet housing desires of the community and to achieve a "complete community" with a range of housing types.	Limited supply of single and semi-detached residential housing forms have been added to the policies to allow a wider range of housing forms. The City's growth management strategy plans for a shift to more medium and high density residential housing forms and the GID area is anticipated to contribute to that shift. (See policy section 11.2.6.3.5) The GID will contribute to the planning of the overall City being a "complete community".
74	6.4.25	6	Dec. 4, 2012	Liz Gray	Are you not concerned that residential area will complain about smells from Cargill	No change based on comment. Ministry of Environment (MOE) minimum separation

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
					plant?	distance guidelines between industrial and sensitive land uses ( e.g. residential) have been reviewed in determining the appropriate location of residential lands. In addition policies within the Secondary Plan, the City's Official Plan and use of the MOE guidelines in the processing of development applications will address land use compatibility issues such as noise, dust, odour and vibration concerns.
75	6.4.26 As indicated in policy 6.4.26, Residential areas permit a wide range of housing. The following uses may be permitted:  a) Multiple unit residential buildings such as townhouses and apartments; b) Detached, semi-detached and duplex dwellings; c) Convenience commercial uses; d) <i>Live/work</i> units; e) Community services and facilities; f) Home businesses; and g) Park space including urban squares.	4	Dec. 17, 2012	Carm Piccoli/Mario Venditti	Section provides for a range of housing. Does this designation permit Higher Density Residential Uses in the form of Condominiums and Apartments?	No change. Yes apartments are permitted and addressed through Secondary Plan policies therefore condominiums are an option. (See policy 11.2.6.3.5.2)
76	Special Residential Area (GID) policies 6.4.30 – 6.4.32	5, 8-38	Nov. 28, 2013 – Dec. 10, 2013	Donna Sunter, Tara Kelly, Randy Shaw, Carole Ann Hattle, Vic Walser, Samm Shaw, Ron Van Hulst, Nancy Gaunt, Steve Henry, Kathy Free, Janice Bacon,	Move from Phase 4 to Phase 1 and allow to develop on private water and wastewater services.	Section revised and designation name changed to "Glenholme Estate Residential". New policies added to permit limited, infill residential development on private services in the interim until full municipal servicing is available within Glenholme Estate Residential Area to address comments. Also phasing policies have been deleted. (See policy 11.2.6.3.6)

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
				Rick LeGault, Nick Szijgyarto, Jeff Crichton, Matthew Hooker, Barbara Piccoli, Ron Asselstine, John Endicott, Nancy Hoffman, Marta Redmond, Alex Drolc, Ken Spira, Mark Dennis, Patrick Morris, Wendy Lewis, Ed Newton, Brian McCulloch, Susan Shaw, Billy Schwartzenburg, Bill Spira, David Spira, Earl Martin		
77	6.5 Special Policies	42	Jan. 7, 2013	Ministry of the Environment	MOE has guidelines regarding land use compatibility. It is suggested that the City use these guidelines and consult with MOE staff on an as needed basis.	No change. Guidelines will be used and MOE staff consulted as needed.
78	6.5.3 Sensitive land uses may be prohibited in the Zoning Bylaw or limited (through massing and siting, buffering and design mitigation measures) in areas in proximity to the Major Utility and Industrial designations	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	The City should ensure these reports are identified in the City's complete application policies.	The pre-consultation and complete application requirements section of the current Official Plan, specifically policy 9.3.4, includes these requirements. (See policy 11.2.6.4.2)

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
	to ensure compatibility. In addition, noise and air emissions reports shall be required and vibration and illumination reports may be required, in support of development approval requests. Such environmental reports are to specify how compatibility will be achieved and maintained between the Waste Resource Innovation Centre and Cargill and the proposed development, and may include measures aimed at minimizing impacts.					
<b>Chapter 7: Interpretation and Implementation</b>						
79		41	Dec. 13, 2012	EAC	There is a lack of management guidance for the Natural Heritage System in this area due to the lack of a subwatershed study. Recommend that the Natural Heritage System of the GID lands be subject to a comprehensive Master Plan exercise. EAC requests to review the Natural Heritage Study prepared in support of the Secondary Plan to help formulate a Terms of Reference for a Master Plan.	EIS and stormwater study requirements have been added to Secondary Plan and will be further addressed through the Block Planning process. (See policies 11.2.7.3.7, 11.2.7.3.8, 11.2.7.3.9 and 11.2.7.5.3)
80	7.3.2 The implementing Zoning By-law will establish a required mix of uses to be incorporated within new development to ensure each phase of development contributes to achieving the overall GID residential and employment targets established in Section 4. Demonstrating that the residential and employment targets are met within existing and approved development will be one of the conditions for release of additional lands through subsequent phases of development.	44	April 11, 2013	Infrastructure Ontario	Want policy deleted since market for employment envisioned for the GID is much more limited and specialized than the residential market and will require a long-term development view. Tying the development of the phasing of each component will unduly constrain the workings of the marketplace and frustrate development interest in light of residential and employment uses being absorbed at different rates and dependent on a number of factors that are different for each land use.	Phasing policies have been deleted and a Block Plan approach proposed. Development of Block Plans (see section 11.2.7.3) and the setting of sub-targets and other controls provide greater certainty to the development process.
81	7.4.1 Nodal areas located within	44	April 11,	Infrastructure	Policy does not correspond to Schedule D	Policy and Schedule revised to indicate height

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
	Corridor Mixed Use designations containing recommended height limitations identified in Schedule D of between 25 and 34 m, will be permitted an additional two stories, subject to the bonusing policies of the Official Plan.		2013	Ontario	height map and requires clarification. More appropriate to identify number of storeys rather than absolute height limits in m to provide some flexibility at design stage.	in storeys. (See section 11.2.7.4 and Schedule C.)
82	7.5.4 Additional implementation tools the City will utilize to activate implementation of the Secondary Plan, include: a) A Stormwater Management Master Plan that establishes water quality, water quantity and natural environment objectives and stormwater management design requirements for development in the GID; b) A Water and Wastewater Master Plan that establishes conceptual design and development standards for development in the GID; and c) A District Energy Feasibility Study with Guelph Hydro and landowners to guide implementation and development of a District Energy System in the GID.	42	Jan. 7, 2013	Ministry of the Environment	Assume that master plans mentioned will be undertaken and completed in accordance with the provisions of the MEA Class EA.	No change. Yes future studies and plans will be undertaken and completed in accordance with the provisions of the MEA Class EA as applicable. (See policy 11.2.7.5.3)
83	7.8.1 In addition to definitions of the Official Plan, the following definitions are applicable in the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan:	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Include definition for "adaptive reuse". Suggested wording "means the alteration of heritage buildings and structures to fit new uses or circumstances while retaining their heritage attributes. Alter means to change in any manner and includes to restore, renovate, repair, or disturb. Alteration has a corresponding meaning. (Definition, Ontario Heritage Act)	Definition for "adaptive re-use" added as follows: "means the alteration of built heritage resources to fit new uses or circumstances while retaining their heritage value and attributes." Suggested wording modified to refer to defined term in OPA 48, i.e. built heritage resource. OPA 48 adds the following definition to the City's Official Plan for "alter (and alteration) means: A change in any manner, and includes

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
						to restore, renovate, repair or disturb.”
	<b>Schedules</b>					
84	Various	44	April 11, 2013	Infrastructure Ontario	Watercourse shown on north side. should be modified as there is a large storm sewer conveying flows into this area.	Watercourses are shown to be consistent with the Official Plan schedules. A watercourse is not a designation and is shown as a reference feature only.
85	Schedule A	44	April 11, 2013	Infrastructure Ontario	Gymnasium of GCC shown incorrectly as a cultural heritage resource of provincial significance.	New Appendix A does not show the gymnasium of the GCC as a cultural heritage resource.
86	Schedule A	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Recommend map be revised to identify the properties (former Guelph Correctional Centre) as heritage properties. There may be some cultural heritage resources in the Guelph Research Station. It will be the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value (whether in an OHT heritage conservation easement or in a municipal designation) that will inform which attributes are identified. The nomenclature (non-listed, provincially listed) is not clear. There is a need to include the views and vistas that are associated with the cultural heritage value (different from scenic views). See previous comments on Archaeology.	Schedule A deleted. Cultural heritage resources now shown on Appendix A. Appendix A uses terminology consistent with the City’s Official Plan and operational practices. Appendix A also shows public views.
87	Schedule B	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	The cultural heritage resources include built heritage and cultural heritage resources. The map only acknowledges the built form. The cultural heritage landscape as well as the views and vistas can have an impact on the mobility schedule as well. There may be some cultural heritage resources in the Guelph Research Station, especially around the proposed street “A”. If the resources are confirmed, it is not clear if an impact assessment would be done before in order to propose that or how the heritage attributes will be incorporated and/or avoided.	Deleted cultural heritage resources from Schedules within the Secondary Plan. Cultural heritage resources now shown on Appendix A.

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
88	Schedule B	43	Jan. 17 2013	Ministry of Infrastructure	Supportive of the proposed pedestrian crossing near to the proposed transit stop along the rail corridor. The City may also wish to consider an additional pedestrian crossing across the rail corridor and the Eramosa River to increase direct pedestrian and cycling connectivity, and proximity to any intensification corridors identified in the City's Official Plan.	MMAH has clarified that MOI's comments are a friendly suggestion without any specific area in mind. At this time only one new river crossing is shown to provide a pedestrian/bicyclist crossing to increase active transportation connectivity and enhance the City's trail system. Future additional crossings could still occur to respond to transit and recreational needs and demand provided impacts on the Natural Heritage System are considered.
89	Schedule C	5	Dec. 10, 2012	Donna Sunter	Change Employment Mixed Use 2 along Stone Rd. E. to Employment Mixed Use 1 and include a provision that it comply with the values of "Glenholme".	No change. Lands along Stone Rd. E. designated Employment Mixed-use 2 does not permit residential uses to help minimize impacts between industrial uses north of Stone Road and sensitive uses south of Stone Road.
90	Schedule C	44	April 11, 2013	Infrastructure Ontario	Remove cultural heritage resource and landscape notations. Suggest alternative land use schedule re-balancing mix of residential and employment on west side by: extending residential designation south of College Ave.; converting small employment area north of College Ave to residential; and limiting corridor mixed use areas to Victoria Rd., Stone Rd., and College Ave. (See Attached Schedule and Table)	Cultural heritage resources have been deleted from Schedule C. The Land Use Schedule has been developed with consideration of the MDS from major industrial (Cargill) and is based on the vision, principles, growth plan needs, etc. The GID is predominately an employment area under the Vision and growth plan needs. An "Area subject to special policy" has been added to provide the opportunity for additional residential uses.
91	Schedule C	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	The map depicts only the built heritage resources as cultural heritage resources. Please note that the term cultural heritage resources also include cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources. In addition, built heritage resources include structures (e.g. bridges, fences, railway tracks/ties) not only buildings. MTCS recommends that the properties be identified as heritage properties. There may	Cultural heritage resources have been deleted from Schedule C. Cultural heritage resources now shown on Appendix A. Current Official Plan policies address the protection of cultural heritage resources.

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
					be some cultural heritage resources in the Guelph Research Station property. If so, please clarify whether some proposed residential use in property may impact on the resource(s).	
92	Schedule C	4	Dec. 17, 2012	Carm Piccoli/Mario Venditti	The Corridor Mixed Use as shown in Schedule C has to be defined more precisely with respect to property fabric since this is a Secondary Plan which must reflect a more precise delineation of the designation.	No change. Consistent with City's Official Plan which shows both property based designations and more general designations that will be further refined through Block Plans and the development approval process.
93	Schedule C	41	Dec. 12, 2012	Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC)	The trail information does not reflect the informal trails which exist on the site today.	The GID Secondary Plan and the City's Official Plan are aligned with the Guelph Trail Master Plan. In addition the City's Official Plan includes policy related to the improvement and expansion of the Trail Network including adding missing links and overcoming physical barriers.
94	Schedule C	45	Aug. 8 2013	River Systems Advisory Committee (RSAC)	We are encouraged to see the potential for a pedestrian bridge across the Eramosa River and an integration of City and area trail systems. A crossing of the Stevenson/Clythe Creeks immediately upstream of the Eramosa could also be built into long-term plans to provide access to the north side of the Eramosa River, west of the site. There are trails running east from Victoria Road, on the north side of the Eramosa River to the Stevenson/Clythe Creek outlet. These trails, though informal, do not seem to be identified in existing plans. Long-term trail connectivity should be addressed.	The GID Secondary Plan and the City's Official Plan are aligned with the Guelph Trail Master Plan. In addition the City's Official Plan includes policy related to the improvement and expansion of the Trail Network including adding missing links and overcoming physical barriers.
95	Schedule D	42	Jan. 7 2013	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	Although the legend has information about open space and park, the map does not depict that. Clarify the difference between "Open Space and Park and existing Natural Areas" versus "Significant Natural Area and	"Significant Natural Area and Natural Areas" are part of the City's Natural Heritage System. (OPA 42) "Open Space and Park" is an existing OP designation. Cultural heritage resources have been deleted from all

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
					Natural Areas" (Schedule A and C) Include information about the natural and cultural heritage in this map as well, similar to the Mobility map. Include information about the views and vistas. Some of the new tallest buildings (in the Guelph research Station property) are being proposed on the highest elevations in the plan area. There may be some cultural heritage resources in the Guelph Research Station property. It is not clear if an impact assessment was undertaken before to determine potential impacts on the views and vistas. It may conflict with some provisions regarding the protection of views and vistas to and from the innovation district area and downtown.	Schedules within the Secondary Plan and placed in Appendix A along with public views.
96	Schedule D	6	Dec. 4, 2012	Liz Gray	Don't see why height limit is 8 storeys here and not Downtown. This area could support 18 storeys.	Heights increased to 10 storeys to be consistent with the maximum heights of the City's Official Plan (OPA 48). Heights sufficient to meet population and employment targets. An additional two storeys is permitted through bonusing in nodal areas within the Mixed-use Corridor (GID) designation.
97	Schedule E	4	Dec. 17, 2012	Carm Piccoli/Mario Venditti	Request that property (728 Victoria Rd. S.) be moved to Phase 1 since owner prepared to submit applications and plans when the Secondary Plan is approved.	Phasing deleted and a Block Plan approach proposed which includes a number of requirements such as demonstrating how population and employment sub-targets will be met.
98	Schedule E	5	Dec. 10, 2012	Donna Sunter	Change Special Residential Area phasing to Phase 1.	Special Residential Area, now Glenholme Estate Residential is not subject to phasing nor new Block Plan area policies.
	<b>General Comments</b>					
99	Overall	2	Dec. 17, 2012	Freeman McEwen	Plan lacks futuristic thrust and does not reflect the unique opportunity site provides and instead could apply to anywhere. Does not capitalize on many natural features nor build on the environmental strength of the University of Guelph. Support part of the	No changes required. Policies are land use based and would not necessarily prohibit the proposed use. Comment shared with the Province who is the current land owner. The proposed permitted uses would support the types of development

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
					plan concerned with employment and education but would like to see more emphasis on environment, e.g. establishment of an Ontario Environmental Exhibition, demonstrate solar, geothermal and wind turbine energy sources, inform and demonstrate potential advances in fuel generating sources, and emerging field of nanotechnology in revolutionizing food production and medicine. Does not fulfill need to educate the public on the urgent need for action to restore the integrity of our ecosystem.	suggested.
100	Overall	41	Dec. 13, 2012	Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC)	The geology of the river valley in this area is significant and unique and should be highlighted and celebrated in the GID Secondary Plan.	No change. Principle 1c) as well as sections 11.2.2.1 and 11.2.2.3 celebrate the City's natural heritage system including the Eramosa River Valley.
101	Overall	41	Dec. 12, 2012	Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC)	A Subwatershed study wasn't undertaken and EAC hasn't reviewed any Natural Heritage information for the area. It was noted that given the lack a Subwatershed Study, there is a lack of management guidance for the Natural Heritage System in this area. EAC strongly recommends that the Natural Heritage System (i.e., non-developable portion of the lands) of the GID lands be subject to a comprehensive Master Plan exercise. EAC requests to review the Natural Heritage Study which was prepared in support of the Secondary Plan. From this review, EAC can formulate a Terms of Reference for a Master Plan.	A subwatershed study and natural heritage study were not completed as part of the Secondary Plan process. The basis for the Secondary Plan is the area related natural heritage information from the City's Natural Heritage Strategy (the background study to OPA 42). See response to comment 29 on page 9 that discusses requirement for an EIS as part of the Block Plan policies in section 11.2.7.3.
102	Overall	45	Aug. 8 2013	River Systems Advisory Committee (RSAC)	Given the complexity of the site hydrology (and possibly hydro geology), we suggest that existing conditions be well understood to help in planning for ecological restoration and enhancement opportunities and	See response to row 29 that discusses requirement for an EIS as part of the Block Plan policies in section 11.2.7.3. In addition stormwater management studies may be required prior to or as part of Block Plan

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
					improvement in fish and wildlife habitat (with the exception of the Canada Goose). We note the seasonal flooding of the baseball diamond and the effect of high creek flows on recreational use.	approval.
103	Overall	45	August 8 2013	River Systems Advisory Committee (RSAC)	The removal of some of surface water control structures –weirs, dams and bridges - should be considered while balancing the need for cultural and heritage preservation. There are several locations where streams are buried or channelized on the site. There are opportunities to day light (open and restore) some reaches of these streams and integrate them within any proposed development plan. Restoring natural channels would enhance fish passage and improve water quality for downstream reaches and may also improve natural channel functions and processes. Opportunities for enhancement or improvement of these wetlands could be considered once the site hydrology is better understood.	See response in row 29 that discusses requirement for an EIS as part of the Block Plan policies in section 11.2.7.3. In relation to potential improvements/restoration of natural channels for Clythe Creek, a policy has been added indicating that an EA will be completed to determine the realignment of Clythe Creek, as part of the reconstruction/widening of York Rd. No change. The area of wetland along Watson Rd includes areas of provincially significant wetland, as well as an existing storm water management facility.
104	Overall	45	Aug. 8 2013	River Systems Advisory Committee (RSAC)	As a general comment, the Eramosa River flows through the middle of York District Lands and multiple tributaries of the river flow through the site as well. The compatibility of development and re-development of the site on both sides of the Eramosa River should be considered. We see this as an excellent opportunity to incorporate best practices in the integration of the built and natural environment, and encourage thoughtful, creative and innovative use of the site that consciously addresses the rivers and natural features of the site.	No change. The policies of the Secondary Plan area intended to celebrate the rich heritage resources of the GID including the Eramosa River Valley.
105	Overall	45	Aug. 8	River Systems	The mapped locations of streams and water	No change. The mapping of waterbodies and

	Draft Secondary Plan Policy	Comment Number	Date	Source	Comment Summary	Staff Response
			2013	Advisory Committee (RSAC)	bodies on the site does not appear to be accurate, especially as it relates to the network of small buried creeks and minor tributaries to Clythe Creek. We have attached another map of Guelph's natural heritage systems for your reference. It includes mapping of surface water systems on site. This attached map shows some locations of surface water flow on site but it is not comprehensive and should be relied on as one source only.	surface water features is based on the features as identified through OPA 42.
106	Overall	45	Aug. 8 2013	River Systems Advisory Committee (RSAC)	Have locations of landfill sites in the area been identified and will they have an impact on secondary plan elements? We note that there seems to be historic landfill use along the lower reaches of Clythe and Stevenson Creeks.	Yes, Engineering Services has identified historical landfill sites and one exists along on the east side of Victoria Rd. S., north of the Eramosa River. Engineering Services will perform the necessary monitoring, investigative and other remedial work as required.
107	Overall	45	Aug. 8 2013	River Systems Advisory Committee (RSAC)	The City's focus on promoting LID to minimize the volume of stormwater runoff is fully supported by RSAC. RSAC also encourages the City to maximize water quality treatment at the source. In addition, the role of existing swales, headwater drainage features (0 or 1st order), and shallow topographic depressions should be considered and, where feasible, replicated in proposed designs as such features promote infiltration and/or attenuate the downstream hydrograph.	Official Plan policies and proposed GID Secondary Plan policies support this approach (See section 11.2.3.4). In addition stormwater management studies may be required prior to or as part of Block Plan approval (see policy 11.2.7.5.3).
108	Overall	45	Aug. 8 2013	River Systems Advisory Committee (RSAC)	<b>Connecting Links</b> We encourage the increase, across the site, of ecological connectivity through riparian and forested linkages.	A large portion of the GID lands will be protected as part of the Natural Heritage System (OPA 42) which includes policies supporting ecological connectivity and the protection of significant woodlands, valleylands, surface water features and fish habitat which support the protection of riparian and forested areas and their

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
						functions. (See OPA 54 – policy section 11.2.2.1) In addition the urban forest policies of OPA 42 and proposed urban forest policy in the GID Secondary Plan (OPA 54 – policy 11.2.2.4.1) address impacts on existing trees and forested areas along with the City’s Urban Forest Management Plan and the City’s Private Tree By-law.
109	Overall	45	Aug. 8 2013	River Systems Advisory Committee (RSAC)	Invasive Species, such as European Buckthorn are widely present on sections of the site. The assessment and management of invasive species across the site would be appropriate.	The City’s Urban Forest Management Plan identifies the need for invasive species management plan for the City. The policies for Block Plans in section 11.2.7.3 require the preparation of an EIS which could result in environmental management recommendations addressing invasive species.
110	Overall	45	Aug. 8 2013	River Systems Advisory Committee (RSAC)	RSAC sees this site as presenting tremendous opportunity for a community destination and we would like to see this opportunity maximized. A number of existing and potential recreational activities should be explored, supported and enhanced including: swimming; fishing; picnicking; sports; boating; and other cultural amenities. We expect significant use of this site by the public. We wonder if surveys on the use of the site have been conducted to date, and if they could be used to assist in future plans for the site.	The GID Secondary Plan includes policies within its public realm section that deal with the planning of parks, public open spaces and trail networks (See policy section 11.2.5.3). The design and specific activities included within parks and open spaces, and trail networks will be determined through the development approvals process and the City’s park and trail network implementation processes.
111		45	Aug. 8 2013	River Systems Advisory Committee (RSAC)	We understand that lands near the Turf Grass Institute building were historically used by First Nations people. The site provides an excellent opportunity to address our cultural history and to provide a way to integrate the ideas of Guelph’s diverse First Nations population into planning processes and decisions. Suggest involving local First Nations in developing	The GID Secondary Plan includes policies regarding messaging, community engagement, and public art opportunities within the public realm section (See section 11.2.5.3). In addition, the City’s Official Plan includes policies regarding archaeological resources (3.5.9. 3.5.10). First Nations will be circulated notice of the public meeting and invited to be part of the public consultation

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
					site ideas - perhaps to recognize past uses or to provide an area for First Nations cultural practices today and into the future. More research into the archaeological and cultural history of this site would be appropriate.	process.
112	Overall	45	Aug. 8 2013	River Systems Advisory Committee (RSAC)	Human wildlife conflicts with respect to geese will only increase as the site gets more use and attention and needs to be addressed – through policy, habitat management or other means.	See response to row 29 that discusses requirement for an EIS as part of the Block Plan policies in section 11.2.7.3.
113	Overall	45	Aug. 8 2013	River Systems Advisory Committee (RSAC)	We encourage interpretative signage, or other means to maintain linkages and understanding about the history of the site with modern site users.	Policies already included in GID Secondary Plan in support of the interpretative signage comment in natural and cultural heritage, and public realm sections.
114	Overall	7	Nov. 28, 2012	Susan Mason	Mixed income accommodation/mixed age/ability needs further consideration along with keeping costs down in balance with carbon neutral goals.	Policies are land use based and provide the foundation for a mix of income, age and ability by planning for a range and mix of housing and employment types. The overall layout of land uses and transportation systems also support carbon neutral development, including the use of renewal energy, energy efficiency and district energy systems.
115	Overall	43	Jan. 17 2013	Ministry of Infrastructure	Pleased to see City reflected the growth plan related policies in OPA 39 in the draft secondary plan. In particular MOI is supportive of the following policy objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creating a pedestrian-friendly and transit-supportive environment;</li> <li>• Establishing provisions for natural and cultural heritage resources including adaptive re-use;</li> <li>• Directing the preparation of a carbon neutral strategy for the GID; and</li> <li>• Encouraging parking strategies such as shared parking arrangements,</li> </ul>	No changes required.

	<b>Draft Secondary Plan Policy</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
					reductions in on-site parking requirements, and priority spots for carpool, alternative energy vehicles, car-shares, scooters and motorcycles.	
116	Overall	40	Dec 24, 2012	UGDSB	Interested in Secondary School site within GID within Phase 1 lands. Potentially interested in locating elementary school site within GID residential area in tandem with the Open Space and Park designations. Largely satisfied that possible future school sites can be accommodated within most designations.	No changes required.
117	Overall	42	Jan. 7, 2013	Ministry of the Environment	No concerns with the draft GID Secondary Plan	No changes required.
118	Overall	42	Jan. 7, 2013	OMAFRA	No comments or concerns from a Provincial Policy Statement and Growth Plan perspective given lands are within the City of Guelph urban boundary	No changes required.