

COUNCIL PLANNING AGENDA



DATE MAY 20, 2010 @ 7:00 p.m.

Please turn off or place on non-audible all cell phones, PDAs, Blackberrys and pagers during the meeting.

**O Canada
Silent Prayer
Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest**

PUBLIC MEETING TO HEAR APPLICATIONS UNDER SECTIONS 17, 34 AND 51 OF THE PLANNING ACT

1) Envision Guelph – Official Plan Update

Proposed Official Plan Amendment 42 to Address the Natural Heritage System and Comprehensive Update to the Official Plan

- a) Staff presentation by Marion Plaunt
- b) Delegations (limited to a maximum of ten minutes)
 - i) Gene Valeriote
 - ii) Kristi Mahy
 - iii) Albert Willis
 - iv) Arthur Churchyard
 - v) Peter Adams
 - vi) Michelle Saunders
 - vii) Victor Labreche
 - viii) Matt Soltys
 - ix) Richard Chaloner

Correspondence:

- Beverly Smyth
- Karen Lee
- Lynn & Luc Haman
- Michele Vindum
- Robert Mason
- Meg Thorburn

- c) Staff summary

ADJOURNMENT

TO **Guelph City Council**

SERVICE AREA Community Design and Development Services
DATE May 20, 2010

SUBJECT **Envision Guelph - Official Plan Update
(Proposed Official Plan Amendment 42 to Address the
Natural Heritage System and Comprehensive Update
to the Official Plan)**

REPORT NUMBER 10-59

RECOMMENDATION

"That Report 10-59 dated May 20, 2010 from Community Design and Development Services regarding proposed Official Plan Amendment No. 42 **BE RECEIVED;**

That staff be directed to proceed with the Natural Heritage System components of the DRAFT Official Plan amendment for Council's consideration and adoption on July 27, 2010; and

That the remainder of the Draft Official Plan Amendment be deferred to provide more time for the public to review and provide comments."

BACKGROUND

Official Plan Amendment No 42 (OPA 42) is the second phase of the City's comprehensive Official Plan Update. Phase one of the Official Plan Update, Official Plan Amendment No. 39 (OPA 39), was approved in June 2009 and established a growth management framework for the City to the year 2031. OPA 39 was based on the recommendations adopted in June 2008 as part of the City's Local Growth Management Strategy, which involved extensive public and stakeholder consultation between 2006 and 2008.

OPA 39, brought the City's Official Plan into conformity with the Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and set out key growth management principles which included, planning for a projected population target of 175,000 and an additional 32,400 jobs by the year 2031. OPA 39 established that future growth to 2031 would be accommodated within the current City limits and would grow at a steady average annual growth rate of 1.5%.

OPA 42 addresses recent changes to provincial legislation, e.g., the *Ontario Heritage Act*, the *Planning Act*, the *Clean Water Act*, and ensures the City's Official Plan is consistent with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS).

The Amendment also incorporates recommendations from recently adopted Master Plans and studies that have been initiated by the City, including:

- Natural Heritage Strategy (2009)
- Affordable Housing Discussion Paper (2009)
- Employment Lands Strategy (2008 and 2009)
- Urban Design Action Plan (2008)
- Community Energy Plan (2007)
- Strategic Plan (2007)
- Infrastructure Master Plans (various)
- Guelph and Wellington Transportation Plan (2005).

These studies have been carried out over a number of years in preparation for the Official Plan update. For example, the Natural Heritage Strategy was initiated in 2004. The development of the criteria for the Natural Heritage System underwent extensive public engagement in 2008 and 2009. In July 2009, Council directed staff to use the March 2009 Natural Heritage Strategy as the basis for the development of the Natural Heritage System and policies for inclusion in the Official Plan Update. In February 2010, the City released the draft mapping and policies for the Natural Heritage System for public review and input. The Natural Heritage System and policies included in the DRAFT OPA 42 include the refined mapping and policies resulting from the input since February 2010.

In March 2010, the Key Directions for OPA 42 were posted on the City's web site. Two public meetings were held on March 10 and 11, 2010, and a number of focused consultation sessions were held with ministries and agencies, interests groups, and the Guelph and Wellington Development Association.

The full DRAFT Official Plan was available for public review on April 19, 2010 and a series of public open houses were held on April 20, 21, and 22 at City Hall (The *Planning Act* requires one open house to be held). The purpose of the open houses was to provide the public with an opportunity to review the draft policies, proposed Schedules and related background material, and to ask questions of planning staff in order to obtain an understanding of the Draft Plan. The public have been invited to make written and/or verbal submissions on DRAFT OPA 42 to Council at the May 20th Statutory Public Meeting.

The Province and affected ministries and agencies have been circulated the Draft Official Plan and have been provided with draft policies and background material.

The City has branded the Official Plan Update and associated processes as 'Envision Guelph'. The phrase is intended to communicate the role of the Official Plan to envision the City to the year 2031.

REPORT

Purpose and Effect of Proposed OPA 42

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to address:

- recent changes to Provincial legislation;
- consistency with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement;
- policies to implement the growth management framework articulated through OPA 39; and
- recommendations from Guelph's recent Master Plans and studies.

If approved, proposed OPA 42 would:

- update the Official Plan organization;
- replace the current Core and Non-Core Greenlands System and policies with the recommended Natural Heritage System and policies consistent with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement;
- promote urban agriculture and community gardens;
- set out requirements for energy conservation and sustainable design;
- encourage and provide opportunities for renewable and alternative energy systems;
- establish policies to ensure high quality urban design consistent with the directions approved in the City's Urban Design Action Plan;
- update the City's transportation policies to provide a greater focus on transit, walking, cycling, transportation demand management and the use of rail for goods and people movement;
- introduce new planning tools to achieve the objectives of the Official Plan, such as density bonusing, regulation of exterior building design through site plan control, and introduce a framework for that would allow the establishment of a development permit system;
- establish an affordable housing target and implementation measures;
- provide greater certainty for infill and intensification within the Built-up Area of the City through minimum and maximum densities and by directing higher densities to arterials and collectors and other suitable areas as appropriate;
- establish minimum and maximum heights and densities designations within most designations;
- focus new growth at transit supportive densities within the Downtown, along Intensification Corridors, and Mixed Use Nodes established in Official Plan Amendment No. 39.

Overview of Proposed OPA 42

The following is brief overview of the changes proposed in the draft Official Plan. For a detailed explanation of proposed changes refer to Attachment A. The Plan chapters are organized as follows:

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Introduction | 7. Urban Design |
| 2. Strategic Directions | 8. Land Use |
| 3. Planning Healthy and Complete Communities | 9. Implementation |
| 4. Protecting What is Valuable | 10. Glossary |
| 5. Municipal Services | 11. Secondary Plans |
| 6. Community Infrastructure | 12. Schedules |
| | 13. Appendices |

Chapters 1, 2, and 3

The first chapter has been revised to clearly set out the purpose and organization of the Plan and how it should be interpreted. Chapter 2 sets out the City-wide vision, guiding principles and goals that inform and set the local context for the Official Plan. The third chapter includes the growth management strategy for the City based on the policies adopted as part of OPA 39. Chapter three also sets high level policy direction for matters that are essential to building complete and healthy communities, such as natural heritage protection, energy sustainability, employment land conversion policy, transportation, servicing and community infrastructure.

Chapter 4

Chapter four identifies matters that important to protect over the long-term. This chapter includes the Natural Heritage Policies and replaces the current Core and Non-Core Greenlands policies. The new Natural Heritage System identifies Significant Natural Areas for long term permanent protection (i.e. ANSIs, Habitat of Endangered and Threatened Species, Significant Wetlands, Surface Water and Fish Habitat, Significant Woodlands, Significant Valleylands, Significant Landform, Significant Wildlife Habitat(including Ecological Linkages), and Restoration Areas). The Natural Heritage System policies also identify Natural Areas where development may be permitted provided Environmental Impact Studies demonstrate that there will be no negative impacts to the natural features or their ecological functions. (e.g. other wetlands, cultural woodlands and locally significantly wildlife habitat). Restoration areas, wildlife crossings are identified, and environmental stewardship and monitoring programs are also outlined to address such issues as invasive species, deer, pollinator habitat.

Water quality and quantity is identified as a significant natural resource to be protected, conserved, and enhanced in accordance with the PPS. Source water protection policies are introduced and the City’s wellhead protection areas are mapped on Schedule 11.

Policies ensuring public health and safety (e.g. natural hazards, flood plains, landfill constraint areas, and potentially contaminated properties) have been updated.

The City’s Community Energy targets and climate change objectives are incorporated into Chapter 4. These policies promote local generation of renewable and alternative energy, the efficient distribution of energy including district energy, and conservation

measures. Energy density is introduced and integrated into the land use and transportation planning process.

Updated Cultural Heritage policies have been included to reflect the new provisions of the Ontario Heritage Act and the PPS, e.g., provisions for the review of development proposals adjacent to designated properties, provisions for inclusion of and review of non-designated properties in the Heritage Register.

Chapters 5 and 6

Municipal Services policies (e.g. staging of services, water & wastewater, storm water management) have been updated to reflect recently completed infrastructure master plans, water conservation targets, and promotion of low impact storm water management techniques.

Appropriate provisions to recognize the role of the City's Site Alteration By-law and Termite Control By-law have been included.

Updates to the transportation policies have been made in the section entitled - 'Moving Goods and People to incorporate the Growth Management principles, appropriate provisions of the Guelph and Wellington Transportation Study, Transportation Strategy Update, and the Community Energy Plan. Greater focus is provided on active transportation (i.e. walking and cycling), transportation demand management, transit and the use of the Guelph Junction Railway for goods and passenger movement. Key "Main Streets" have been identified on Schedule 7 which will have a pedestrian and transit oriented focus, e.g. Downtown and Victoria Rd. N.

The Community Infrastructure section outlines provisions including encouragement for public art and the development of a public art policy for the City. A 36 % target for affordable housing and implementation tools have been incorporated into the Official Plan. Bonusing for density and height are proposed for development proposals that target affordable ownership for households below the 40th percentile income level. Affordable housing will be monitored through Affordable Housing Implementation Reports and the Development Priority Plan.

The Barrier Free policies have been updated to incorporate the policy direction of the Ontarians with Disabilities Act.

The Parks and Recreation Policies have been refined to include Urban Squares as a component of the Parks and Open Space System and to establish updated Parkland dedication policies recommended in the Recreation, Parks and Cultural Strategic Master Plan.

Chapter 7

Urban design policies have been updated to implement the policy direction set out in the Urban Design Action Plan. New provisions include urban squares (e.g. courtyards, plazas, piazzas) are promoted as a means of provide public space within an urban context. Detailed policies related to public art, public views, parking, vehicle-oriented uses, signage, accessibility, lighting, and areas that serve as gateways to the City are addressed. Detailed policies have been included for low,

medium and high-rise built forms as well as for commercial and industrial development.

Chapter 8

Residential

Minimum and maximum heights and densities are specified within designations permitting residential uses. The General Residential designation has been revised within the Built-up Area of the City to provide greater certainty regarding minimum and maximum densities, i.e., a minimum density of 15 units per ha and a maximum of 35 units per ha and a maximum height of 3 storeys. Additional height and density, to a maximum of 100 units/ha and a maximum height of four(4) storeys, may be permitted along arterials and collectors and may also be permitted within the General Residential Built-up Area designation, but only where bonusing is provided. The General Residential designation in the Greenfield Area would permit a minimum of 20 units per ha and a maximum of 100 units per ha, and a maximum of 5 storeys.

Intensification in the form of medium and high density designations are directed to transit supportive locations such as the Downtown, to the Mixed Use Areas, Centres and Corridors identified on Schedule 2. Medium Density would permit a maximum of 100 units per ha and a minimum of 35 units per ha. Heights are required to be between 2 and 5 storeys.

High density Residential would permit densities between 100 and 150 units per ha and heights are required to be between three (3) and ten (10) storeys.

Downtown Guelph

Policies acknowledge that the Downtown Secondary Plan is under preparation and once approved will replace the current Official Plan policies.

Mixed Use Areas, Corridors and Centres

New terminology replaces the Mixed Use Nodes, Intensification Areas and Neighbourhood Centres with Community Mixed Use Areas, Mixed Use Corridors and Neighbourhood Mixed Use Centres, respectively. The commercial policies remain unchanged with respect to retail uses. Additional Neighbourhood Mixed Use Centres have been added to Schedule 2. To achieve a mixed use character, medium and high density residential development is permitted within all three Mixed Use designations and residential unit targets have been assigned to each of the Community Mixed Use Areas and Mixed Use Corridors.

Commercial Service

Commercial Service Areas have been revised to create vehicle-oriented and commercial service focus areas. Drive-through and vehicle-oriented uses are not permitted in other land use designations and are intended to be focused within the Commercial Service designation. For this reason, additional Commercial Service Areas have been designated on Schedule 2.

Commercial-Residential Designation

The Commercial-Residential designation replaces the former Commercial Mixed Use and Mixed Office-Residential Designation and recognizes the areas within the City where a mix of commercial and residential uses co-exist. The intent of these two designations remain unchanged, and the office and/or commercial focus of specific areas have been recognized through the policy.

Employment Areas

The employment areas remain virtually unchanged with the exception that higher densities are proposed within the Greenfield area to ensure the 50 persons and jobs per ha can be achieved. Density targets of 36 jobs per ha are proposed for the industrial designations, and 70 jobs per ha, in the Corporate Business Park. Minimum heights of 2 stories are encouraged in the Greenfield Industrial and Corporate Business Park designations to reduce land consumption requirements.

Regeneration Area

Regeneration Area is introduced as a new land use designation that is intended to spark reinvestment and redevelopment within underutilized areas of the City. The Regeneration Area designation includes the former IMICO site and the north side of York Road between Watson Road and Victoria Road. This area will be subject to a detailed secondary plan. In the interim, existing uses may continue and minor expansions would be permitted until the Secondary Plan is approved to guide future redevelopment.

Other than minor wording, few substantive changes were made to the Major Institutional and Major Open Space and Parks Designations.

Major Utility

Major Utility is a new designation that includes large scale utility facilities that serve a city-wide function including, water and waste water treatment facilities, transfer stations, municipal and hydro works/offices.

Special Study Area

Two Special Study Area designations have been identified on Schedule 2, namely, the Guelph Innovation District and the area south of Clair Road to Maltby Road. These two areas make up a large portion of the Greenfield area and will be planned to accommodate a significant portion of the forecasted population and employment growth for the City.

Secondary Plans will be required to plan future development in these key areas.

Approved Secondary Plans

Secondary plan policies contained within the current Official Plan (e.g. Eastview, Goldie Mill, South Guelph and Victoria Road North) have been incorporated into the general policies of the Plan and revised, where necessary, to be consistent with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement and conform with the Growth Plan.

The Silvercreek Junction Secondary Plan (recently approved by the OMB) is the only area that is identified on Schedule 2 as having an approved secondary plan. The Silvercreek Junction Secondary Plan is appended under Chapter 11 of the Official Plan. As additional Secondary Plans are approved, (e.g., for the Downtown, the Guelph Innovation District and the Community Mixed Use Areas) they will be added to the Official Plan as discrete plans under Chapter 11.

Exceptions

Exceptions applicable to specific properties have been identified and included in Chapter 8.

Chapters 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13

Implementation policies have been updated to enable the City to make use of planning tools provided through the Planning Act. This includes bonusing policies that would enable Council to permit additional height and density in exchange for community benefits (e.g., affordable housing, green building certification, underground or structured parking, etc), regulation of exterior building design through the site plan approval process, and setting the framework for a development permit system.

The glossary has been update, including additional terms that are consistent with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement.

Next Steps

The full Official Plan Amendment 42, as presented at the May 20th Council meeting, constitutes the statutory public meeting required under the *Panning Act* for the second phase of the Official Plan Update. However, it has been determined that only the Natural Heritage System policies and mapping should go forward for adoption in July 2010 in order to provide more time for public input on the remainder of the Official Plan Update released on April 19,2010. The Natural Heritage System policies and mapping have been the subject of extensive public engagement and have been available to the public since February 2010.

The remainder of the Official Plan amendment will be brought back to Council for consideration early in 2011, after careful consideration of the comments received.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN

The adoption of Official Plan Amendment No. 42 is a critical step to achieving the City's Strategies goals, which include:

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

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There is sufficient funding in the Official Plan Update budget for additional public meetings and reproduction of the Plan.

Capital costs associated with additional studies and growth proposed in the draft Official Plan will be forecasted as part of the capital budget and funded in part through the development charges. The City will continue to work the Province in a collaborative partnership to present a business case and examine opportunities for government investment in public infrastructure as appropriate to ensure that the growth forecasted by the Growth Plan and the City's Official Plan can be accommodated in a fiscally sustainable manner.

DEPARTMENTAL CONSULTATION

Community Design and Development Services (Engineering)
Legal Services
Finance

COMMUNICATIONS

Many of the policy inputs to the proposed Official Plan involved an extensive public engagement processes (e.g., Natural Heritage Strategy, Affordable Housing, Growth Management Strategy). Building on the public engagement that has already taken place, a number of meetings were held in March 2010 with the public and key stakeholder groups to communicate the key policy directions contained within the OPA 42. Notice of these meetings was published in the City News section of the Guelph Tribune on February 25 and March 4, 2010, posted on the City's website, and mailed/emailed to persons and organizations that have been involved and or requested notice in Official Plan and related initiatives.

Three public open houses were held on April 20, 21 and 22 2010 where the full proposed draft Official Plan and related information and background material was available for public review. Planning staff was available to answer questions. Notice of the public open houses was published in the City News section of the Guelph Tribune on April 8 and 15, posted to the City's website, mailed to persons and public bodies prescribed in Ontario Regulation 543/06, and mailed/emailed to persons and organizations that have been involved and/or requested notice in Official Plan-related initiatives.

A statutory public meeting of May 20, 2010 provides an opportunity for the public to make representations or submit written comments on the proposed Draft Official Plan amendment (OPA 42). Notice of the Council meeting was provided with the notice of public open houses.

ATTACHMENTS


Attachment A: Detailed Summary of Draft Official Plan Update Changes

Attachment B: Proposed Official Plan Amendment No. 42 (Previously Distributed and available online at <http://guelph.ca/living.cfm?smocid=2341>)



Prepared By:

Greg Atkinson MCIP, RPP
Policy Planner
519-837-5616 ext. 2521
greg.atkinson@guelph.ca



Prepared and Recommended By:

Marion Plaunt MES, MCIP, RPP
Manager of Policy Planning and
Urban Design
519-837-5616 ext. 2426
marion.plaunt@guelph.ca



Recommended By:

James N. Riddell
Director of Community Design and Development Services
519-837-5616 ext. 2361
jim.riddell@guelph.ca

ATTACHMENT A

Detailed Summary of Draft Official Plan Update Changes

The following summarizes the key changes proposed through the City’s DRAFT Official Plan Update – Amendment 42.

OFFICIAL PLAN SECTION	DRAFT POLICY DIRECTION
Official Plan Schedules and Appendices	<p>Schedule 1: Growth Plan Elements</p> <p>Schedule 2: Land Use Schedule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural Heritage System replaces Core and Non-Core Greenlands. • Downtown Urban Growth Centre modified to reflect Growth Plan Elements Schedule 1 (OPA 39). • The Special Study Area in east Guelph modified to reflect the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan Study Area, with the exception of the Service Commercial and Neighbourhood Centre designations on York Road. • The South Guelph area currently identified as Reserve Lands and including a portion of the designated Corporate Business Park west of Gordon, and the General Residential area to the east of Gordon included in a Special Study Area and will require a Secondary Plan prior to consideration of development proposals. • Additional Commercial Service designations have been added to provide further opportunities for vehicle oriented uses, e.g., north of the intersection of Laird and Clair, Arkell and Victoria, Speedvale east of Elmira Road, and Paisley and Imperial. • Additional Commercial Residential Designations to recognize site specific amendments to the Official Plan and to encourage similar such uses, e.g., along Gordon St. and Woolwich Street north of the Downtown. • Re-designation of isolated Industrial designations in keeping with the City’s Phase 2 Employment Land Strategy, e.g., north of the Woodlawn Community Mixed Use Area Designation and north of the Watson Community Mixed Use Area Designation. • New Regeneration Area Designation, which includes the former IMICO site and adjacent lands, and the Service Commercial designation on the north side of York Road east of Victoria Road. • Addition of new Neighbourhood Mixed Use Designations, e.g., Clair and Victoria, Arkell and Gordon, Woolwich and Speedvale. • Establish two designations for General Residential, one within the Built-up Area and the second within the Greenfield Area with separate policies (addressed in Land Use Section). • New Medium and High Density designations throughout both the Built Up Area and the Greenfield Area - in particular along Intensification Corridors, arterials and collectors, e.g., Gordon St. and Victoria St. south of Stone Road and locations along the Guelph Junction Railway, south of Speedvale. Their identification provides more certainty for growth and are required to ensure that the Growth Plan intensification targets are achieved. • Waste Management designation renamed ‘Utilities’ and all major public utility facilities are included in this designation e.g., Municipal Street

Detailed Summary of Draft Official Plan Update Changes

The following summarizes the key changes proposed through the City’s DRAFT Official Plan Update – Amendment 42.

OFFICIAL PLAN SECTION	DRAFT POLICY DIRECTION
	<p>works yard, water works and sewage treatment facility and hydro facilities.</p> <p>Schedule 3 - Incorporated the existing Downtown Land Use Schedule in new Official Plan format</p> <p>Schedule 4 - Natural Heritage System (NHS) Designations</p> <p>Schedule 4A - NHS – ANSIs, Habitat for Provincially Threatened and Endangered Species and Wetlands</p> <p>Schedule 4B - NHS Surface Water and Fish</p> <p>Schedule 4C - Significant Woodlands</p> <p>Schedule 4D - Significant Valleylands and Significant Landform</p> <p>Schedule 4E – Significant Wildlife Habitat</p> <p>Schedule 5 - Development Constraints</p> <p>Schedule 6 - Staging of Development</p> <p>Schedule 7 - Road and Rail Network</p> <p>Schedule 8 - Trail Network</p> <p>Schedule 9 - Bicycle Network</p> <p>Schedule 10 - Areas of Archaeological Potential</p> <p>Schedule 11- Wellhead Protection Areas</p> <p>Appendices</p> <p>Appendix 1 - Natural Heritage Strategy Ecological Land Classification</p> <p>Appendix 2 - Designated Heritage Resources</p>
<p>1.0 Introduction</p> <p>1.1 Purpose of the Plan</p> <p>1.2 Plan Organization</p> <p>1.3 Interpretation</p> <p>1.4 Planning Area</p>	<p>The introductory Chapter has been revised to clearly articulate the purpose, format, and interpretation provisions of the Plan.</p>
<p>2.0 Strategic Directions</p> <p>2.1 Official Plan Vision</p> <p>2.2 Guiding Principles</p> <p>2.3 Strategic Goals of the Plan</p>	<p>The Mission Statement, Operating Principles, and Major Goals of the Official Plan have been updated to reflect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Plan, • The Provincial Growth Plan, • Local Growth Management Strategy, • OPA 39, • Community Energy Plan, • 2005 Provincial Policy Statement, and • Council adopted policy documents.
<p>3.0 Planning Complete and Healthy Communities</p> <p>3.1 Purpose of this Section</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new chapter in the Official Plan that includes the broad objectives and growth management policies from OPA 39 (the Growth Plan Conformity Amendment). • Inclusion of growth management objectives, as adopted through OPA 39.

Detailed Summary of Draft Official Plan Update Changes

The following summarizes the key changes proposed through the City’s DRAFT Official Plan Update – Amendment 42.

OFFICIAL PLAN SECTION	DRAFT POLICY DIRECTION
3.2 Objectives 3.3 Population and Employment Forecasts 3.4 Settlement Area Boundary 3.5 Settlement Area Rural Boundary Separation 3.6 Housing Supply and Residential Density 3.7 Built-up Area and General Intensification 3.8 Urban Growth Centre 3.9 Major Transit Station Area 3.10 Intensification Corridors 3.11 Community Mixed use Nodes 3.12 Greenfield Area 3.13 Affordable Housing 3.14 Employment Lands 3.15 Making Land Use and Transportation Connections 3.16 Natural Heritage System 3.17 Culture of Conservation 3.18 Energy Sustainability 3.19 Municipal Services 3.20 Community Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of broad objectives relating to the economic, cultural, natural, and social environments. • Objectives and policies relating to development around the fringe of the City’s boundary. The urban fringe policies have been included in this section as they are directly connected with the objectives of the Growth Plan. • Establish general direction for sustainable transportation. • Inclusion of sustainable energy objectives and the policy direction to integrate land use planning, transportation and energy.
4.0 Protecting What is Valuable 4.1 Natural Heritage System 4.1.1 Purpose 4.1.2 Objectives 4.1.3 General Policies 4.1.4 General Permitted Uses 4.1.5 Significant	<i>Natural Heritage System(NHS)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Replace the Core and Non-Core Greenlands designations and policies with Natural Heritage System designations and policies.</i> • <i>Integrates the PPS (2005).</i> • <i>Systems approach to recognizing and maintaining the ecological function and connectivity of the City’s NHS.</i> • <i>Two Natural Heritage designations are identified on Schedule 2 (Significant Natural Areas and Natural Areas).</i> • <i>Passive uses permitted within the entire Natural Heritage System, e.g.,</i>

Detailed Summary of Draft Official Plan Update Changes

The following summarizes the key changes proposed through the City’s DRAFT Official Plan Update – Amendment 42.

OFFICIAL PLAN SECTION	DRAFT POLICY DIRECTION
<p>Natural Heritage System</p> <p>4.1.6 Natural Areas</p> <p>4.1.7 Wildlife Crossing Locations</p> <p>4.1.8 Urban Forest</p> <p>4.1.9 Vegetation Compensation Plan</p> <p>4.1.10 Natural Heritage Stewardship and Monitoring</p> <p>4.2 Environmental Impact Studies</p>	<p><i>low impact scientific and education, fish and wildlife management.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Minimum buffers are required for a number of features, e.g., 30 m from a Provincially Significant wetland.</i> • <i>Minimum buffers to be established at the time of Environmental Impact Study(EIS), e.g., ANSI’s, Significant Valleylands, Significant Wildlife Habitat.</i> • <i>Recognizes legally existing uses.</i> • <i>Identifies the significant portions of the Paris Galt Moraine for protection based upon 20% slope concentrations and closed depressions.</i> <p>Significant Natural Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Includes: ANSIs, Habitat of Endangered and Threatened Species, Significant Wetlands, Surface Water and Fish Habitat, Significant Woodlands, Significant Valleylands, Significant Landform, Significant Wildlife Habitat, and Restoration Areas.</i> • <i>Identified for long term permanent protection.</i> • <i>Development and site alteration not permitted with Significant Natural Areas except for passive recreation, educational and scientific research activities, fish and wildlife management, forest management, habitat conservation, and restoration activities.</i> • <i>Essential transportation and linear utilities may be permitted in specific features or areas i.e., Ecological Linkages, Significant Landform, Significant Valleylands, and Surface Water and Fish Habitat.</i> • <i>Stormwater management facilities permitted within certain buffers, Significant Valleylands, Ecological Linkages and Restoration Areas.</i> • <i>Renewable energy systems permitted in Significant Valleylands.</i> • <i>Municipal Wells and underground water storage permitted in the Significant Landform.</i> <p>Natural Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Includes Other Wetlands, Cultural Woodlands, and Habitat of Significant Species.</i> • <i>Contains features and functions that require detailed study prior to consideration for development and site alteration.</i> • <i>Development and site alteration may be permitted provided there is no negative impact to the natural features or their ecological functions.</i> • <i>Requires protection of existing trees or Vegetation Compensation Plan required for removal of trees over 10 cm DBH and healthy native shrubs or cash-in-lieu.</i> <p>Wildlife Crossing Locations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Identified to ensure wildlife crossing measures are implemented to reduce risk to wildlife and vehicles.</i> <p>Urban Woodlands</p>

Detailed Summary of Draft Official Plan Update Changes

The following summarizes the key changes proposed through the City’s DRAFT Official Plan Update – Amendment 42.

OFFICIAL PLAN SECTION	DRAFT POLICY DIRECTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a canopy cover target of 40% by 2031. • Encourages protection of plantations, hedgerows, and individual trees which are not part of the Natural Heritage System. • Requires protection of trees or Vegetation Compensation Plan for trees removed over 10 cm DBH or cash-in-lieu. <p>Vegetation Compensation Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vegetation Compensation Plan directs restoration predominantly to established buffers, Significant Valleylands, Significant Landform, Ecological Linkages and Restoration Areas. • Restoration may include meadow or shrub habitat. • Replacement planting should be indigenous species. • Details of the replacement requirements of the Vegetation Compensation Plan and cash-in-lieu provisions will be addressed and detailed through the Urban Forest Management Plan. <p>Stewardship and Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies added to address invasive species, deer, land stewardship, pollinator habitat and ecological monitoring. <p>Environmental Impact Statements (EIS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIS provisions refined to reflect the 2005 PPS with respect to surface and groundwater features and the linkage between these features and the Natural Heritage System. • Clarification regarding adjacent lands analysis as part of EIS. • Identification of other studies required in support of EIS, e.g., Ecological Land Classification, Wetland Evaluation, Tree and Shrub Inventory, Wildlife Inventory (e.g., breeding bird study), Water Balance.
<p>4.3 Watershed Planning</p> <p>4.4 Water Resources</p> <p>4.5 Public Health and Safety</p> <p>4.5.1 Natural Hazards Flood Plains Erosion and Hazardous Sites</p> <p>4.5.2 Landfill Constraint Area</p> <p>4.5.3 Potentially Contaminated Sites</p> <p>4.5.4 Noise and Vibration</p>	<p>Watershed Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated to emphasize the role of subwatershed planning, in particular as it relates to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the protection and improvement of surface water and groundwater features and systems, ○ linkages between surface water, groundwater and natural heritage features in accordance with the Provincial Policy Statement, and ○ as the basis for comprehensive stormwater management. <p>Water Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Resources protection and conservation policies revised to incorporate 2005 PPS. • Updated to include appropriate references and provisions with respect to Source Water Protection Plan in accordance with the <i>Clean Water Act</i>. • Establish policies to restrict development and site alteration to protect,

Detailed Summary of Draft Official Plan Update Changes

The following summarizes the key changes proposed through the City’s DRAFT Official Plan Update – Amendment 42.

OFFICIAL PLAN SECTION	DRAFT POLICY DIRECTION
	<p>restore or improve municipal water supplies, vulnerable surface water and groundwater areas and sensitive surface water and groundwater features¹ and their hydrologic function.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require technical studies in support of development or site alteration that demonstrate how the water quality and quantity within Wellhead Protection Area and other vulnerable or sensitive areas are to be protected or improved. • Identify Well Head Protection Areas (Schedule 11) based on the following categories; 100 m from a municipal well, with 2, 5 and 25 year time of travel from a municipal well. • Include provisions to facilitate provincial funding for removal or mitigation of threats associated with existing wells and septic systems. • Policy provisions to implement the Water Conservation and Efficiency Strategy (2009). • Discourage use of potable water for outdoor watering. • Protect wetlands and other areas that contribute to groundwater. • Prohibit the placement of new underground chemical /fuel storage tanks within the City. <p>Public Health and Safety</p> <p>Flood Plain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood Plain Two Zone and Special Policy Area policies remain substantially unchanged. <p>Steep Slope, Erosion Hazards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steep slope, Erosion Hazard Land and Unstable Soils section updated to reflect the PPS and the Conservation Authority Regulations. <p>Landfill Constraint</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor wording changes to the Landfill Constraint section to recognize the role of the Eastview landfill site as part of the City’s Open Space and Parks system.

¹ Vulnerable means surface water and groundwater that can easily be changed or impacted by activities or events, either by virtue of their vicinity to such activities or events or by permissive pathways between such activities and the surface water and or groundwater.(PPS)

Sensitive in regard to surface water and groundwater features, means areas that are particularly susceptible to impacts from activities or events including, but not limited to water withdrawals, and additions of pollutants.

Detailed Summary of Draft Official Plan Update Changes

The following summarizes the key changes proposed through the City’s DRAFT Official Plan Update – Amendment 42.

OFFICIAL PLAN SECTION	DRAFT POLICY DIRECTION
	<p>Potentially Contaminated Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require development applications to submit documentation on the previous use of a potentially contaminated site and on lands adjacent to the site. Revised to clarify the need for a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment required for all development or site alteration affecting a potentially contaminated site. Record of Site Condition required where a change to a more sensitive land use is proposed and for development on known or suspected brownfield sites. <p>Noise and Vibration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor modifications to reflect the provisions of the PPS and ensure impacts on sensitive land uses are minimized and or mitigated in accordance with provincial requirements. <p>Mineral Aggregate Resources Area Section</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mineral Aggregate Extraction provisions removed from the Plan.
<p>4.6 Community Energy and Climate Change</p> <p>4.6.1 Objectives</p> <p>4.6.2 General Policies</p> <p>4.6.3 Local Generation</p> <p>4.6.4 Local Sustainable Transmission</p> <p>4.6.5 End Use Efficiency/Conservation</p> <p>4.6.6 Transportation – Urban Form/Density</p> <p>4.6.7 Corporate Leadership</p> <p>4.6.8 Climate Change</p>	<p>Community Energy and Climate Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update the current Climate Change section of the Official Plan to promote sustainable development through conservation, efficiencies and design. Reflect the provisions of the <i>Green Energy and Economy Act</i> which facilitates and streamlines production of energy from renewable energy systems that are no longer subject to land use planning approval. Implement Community Energy goals through renewable and alternative energy systems, sustainable transmission, district energy, efficiencies, conservation, transportation and urban form. <p>Renewable Energy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports renewable energy systems including solar thermal and geothermal systems. <p>Alternative Energy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permits alternative energy systems such as, combined heat and power, in all designations, except within General Residential and Medium Density Residential designations. Permit new large scale alternative energy power generation producing greater than 10 megawatts through an amendment to the Plan. <p>Sustainable Transmission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage utility adaptation to emerging technology, such as smart metering and advanced telecommunication.

Detailed Summary of Draft Official Plan Update Changes

The following summarizes the key changes proposed through the City’s DRAFT Official Plan Update – Amendment 42.

OFFICIAL PLAN SECTION	DRAFT POLICY DIRECTION
	<p>District Energy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage the development of guidelines and technical standards to implement district energy. • Undertake feasibility studies for district energy in conjunction with secondary plans. • Support public private partnerships to implement district energy. • Development required to be district energy ready, where district energy is planned. <p>Efficiency and Conservation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require energy/water conservation plan and completion of City sustainability checklist as part of complete application. • Outline potential municipal incentives (e.g., CIP grants, density bonusing, expediting processing of development approvals, etc.) that may be provided for meeting standards beyond Building Code requirements. • Policy direction to monitor energy efficiency to meet Energy Goals and Targets. • Encourage energy and water efficiency standards. <p>Sustainable Building Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage Energy Star, LEED Building Standards or equivalent based on Canada’s Natural Resources EnerGuide rating system. • Ensure building location, street and lotting patterns maximize advantage of active and passive solar systems. • Encourage building design to go beyond the current building code (e.g., multi-residential). • Building energy/water efficiency labeling required. • Encourage retrofitting of existing buildings. • Encourage use of environmentally friendly and locally sourced building materials. • Strongly encourage three stream waste separation in multiple residential buildings. • Reduce local heat island impacts (landscaping) and roof material including but not limited to green roofs. • Require sustainable exterior building design details (e.g., light coloured building facades, window glazing treatment/awnings) • Maintain and require three stream waste separation in new development. <p>Integrated Energy Mapping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use energy mapping to identify potential district Energy Areas and provide support for the establishment of minimum densities and transportation networks. • Identify land use, building development and transportation practices that directly impact energy demand.

Detailed Summary of Draft Official Plan Update Changes

The following summarizes the key changes proposed through the City’s DRAFT Official Plan Update – Amendment 42.

OFFICIAL PLAN SECTION	DRAFT POLICY DIRECTION
	<p>Corporate Leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lead by design through actions such as, implementing energy and water conservation programs, supporting public /private partnerships that exhibit energy efficiencies, encouraging changes to the Building Code, preparing energy conservation and demand management plans for municipal assets, require all new municipal buildings to be LEED silver, and encourage low maintenance landscaping on City lands. <p>Climate Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish long term goals for zero carbon emissions.
<p>4.7 Cultural Heritage Resources</p> <p>4.7.1 Objectives</p> <p>4.7.2 General Objectives</p> <p>4.7.3 Heritage Designation</p> <p>4.7.4 Heritage Conservation Districts</p> <p>4.7.5 Development and Site Alteration Adjacent to a Designated Heritage Property</p> <p>4.7.6 Non-Designated Properties Included in the Heritage Register</p> <p>4.7.7 Archaeological Resources</p> <p>4.7.8 Heritage Guelph</p> <p>4.7.9 Heritage Trees</p> <p>4.7.10 Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment</p> <p>4.7.11 Scoped Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment</p> <p>4.7.12 Cultural Hiertiage Conservation Plan</p> <p>4.7.13 Cultural Heritage Review</p> <p>4.7.14 Implementation Policies</p>	<p>Cultural Heritage Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Terminology refined to reflect the PPS. Inclusion of policies for analysis of development proposed on adjacent lands to designated properties (PPS). New provisions for inclusion of properties of heritage value and interest (non-designated) in the Heritage Register. Provisions for the process for addition to and/or removal from the Heritage Register of properties of heritage value or interest (non-designated). Inclusion of provisions for identification of heritage trees.
<p>5.0 Municipal Services</p> <p>5.1 Introduction</p> <p>5.2 Objectives</p>	<p>Municipal Services</p> <p>Staging of Development</p>

Detailed Summary of Draft Official Plan Update Changes

The following summarizes the key changes proposed through the City’s DRAFT Official Plan Update – Amendment 42.

OFFICIAL PLAN SECTION	DRAFT POLICY DIRECTION	
5.3 General Policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staging and phasing policies/mapping (Schedule 6) updated to reflect growth management and detailed Secondary Plan processes. Deletion of detailed Secondary Plan staging policies as these areas are built. <p>Water Supply, Waste Water, and Solid Waste Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotion of water conservation consistent with the City’s Community Energy goals and recommendations of the Water Conservation and Efficiency Strategy Update (2009). References to the Water Supply Master Plan (2006), Wastewater Treatment Master Plan (2009), and Solid Waste Management Plan (2008). Policies to ensure growth can be sustained through physical servicing capacity. <p>Stormwater Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refined stormwater management policies to reflect low impact stormwater management and appropriate reference to the Stormwater Master Plan underway. Include policies to reflect the water quality and quantity provisions of the PPS. <p>Site Alteration and Termite Control</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate provisions to recognize the role of the City’s Site Alteration By-law and Termite Control By-law have been included. <p>Movement of People and Goods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotion of Transportation Demand Management. New policy to require bicycle lanes on all arterials, wherever possible. New policies that promote walking and cycling. Encourage shorter trip distances through compact mixed use urban form. New policy to reflect transit as the preferred vehicular mode of transportation in keeping with the Growth Plan and OPA 39. Establish new average daily modal split target from current 10% (Transit Strategy) to 15% for transit, 15% walking and 3% cycling. Introduction of ‘Main Street’ street type (e.g., pedestrian-oriented road in Downtown, Victoria Rd. N and in Mixed Use Nodes and Corridors). Incorporation of applicable portions of the Guelph & Wellington Transportation Master Plan and Transportation Strategy Update. Removal of Stone Road and College Ave extension into Wellington County. Incorporate provisions for accessibility. e.g., sidewalks on both sides of the street (<i>Accessibility for Ontarians’ with Disabilities Act</i>). Encourage use of rail for goods and people movement. 	
5.4 Staging of		
5.5 Development		
5.6 Water Supply		
5.7 Waste Water		
5.8 Treatment		
5.9 Solid Waste		
5.10 Management		
5.11 Stormwater		
5.12 Management		
5.12.1 Site Alteration		
5.12.2 Termite Control		
5.12.3 Electrical		
5.12.4 Transmission Lines		
5.12.5 and Pipelines		
5.12.6 Movement of People		
5.12.7 and Goods – An		
5.12.8 Integrated		
5.12.9 Transportation		
5.12.10 Network		
5.12.11 Objectives		
5.12.12 General Policies		
5.12.13 Barrier Free		
5.12.14 Transportation		
5.12.15 Demand		
5.12.16 Management (TDM)		
5.12.17 Active Transportation		
5.12.18 – Pedestrian		
5.12.19 Movement and		
5.12.20 Bicycles		
5.12.21 Public Transit		
5.12.22 Major Transit Station		
5.12.23 Area		
5.12.24 Transit Promotion		
5.12.25 Inter Regional		
5.12.26 Transit Network		
5.12.27 Road Network		
5.12.28 Functional Hierarchy		
5.12.29 of Roads		
5.12.30 Road Design		
5.12.31 Trucking and Goods		
5.12.32 Movement		
5.12.33 Noise and Vibration		
5.12.34 Railways		
5.12.35 Airport		
5.12.36 Parking		
5.12.37 Coordination		
5.12.38 Provincial /County		
5.12.39 Connections		
5.12.40 Development		
5.12.41 Adjacent to Planned		
5.12.42 Transportation		

Detailed Summary of Draft Official Plan Update Changes

The following summarizes the key changes proposed through the City’s DRAFT Official Plan Update – Amendment 42.

OFFICIAL PLAN SECTION	DRAFT POLICY DIRECTION
Corridors 5.12.21 Road Widening 5.12.22 Intersection Improvements 5.12.23 Implementation of Transportation Initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition and promotion of future role of Guelph Junction Railway for both goods and people movement. • Potential for reduced parking requirements for development within the Downtown, Mixed Use Nodes, Intensification Corridors, Major Transit Station Area, and for affordable housing.
6.0 Community Infrastructure 6.1 Community Facilities 6.2 Public Art and Culture 6.3 Affordable Housing 6.4 Barrier Free Environment 6.5 Recreation and Parks 6.5.1 Objectives 6.5.2 City Trail Network 6.5.3 Park Hierarchy 6.5.4 Urban Squares 6.5.6 Community Parks 6.5.7 Regional Parks 6.5.8 Parkland Deficiencies 6.5.9 Parkland Acquisition 6.5.10 Parkland Dedication 6.5.11 Other Agencies 6.5.12 Parks Development 6.5.13 Recreation, Parks and Culture Strategic Master Plan	<p>Public Art and Culture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encouragement of cultural facilities and incorporation of public art throughout the City. • Encourage cultural facilities such as museums, art galleries, etc. as an integral part of the City’s social and cultural fabric. <p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>Specific annual affordable housing targets, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 36% average annual target of all new housing to be affordable e.g., 37% Affordable Ownership, 3% Affordable Rental, 6% Social Rental. • Affordable housing to be provided throughout all areas of the City. • Implementation of the affordable housing target will be outlined in annual Affordable Housing Implementation Reports. • Accessory apartment target of approximately 90 units encouraged per year. • Bonusing for density and height are proposed for development proposals that target affordable ownership for households below the 40th percentile income level. • Affordable housing targeted in areas served by transit, shopping, parks, and other community facilities (e.g. Downtown, Community Mixed Use Areas, Intensification Corridors). • Larger developments to provide full spectrum of affordable housing (i.e. tenure and type). • Establish policies to assist in the provision of affordable housing through expedited development approvals, using surplus government lands, leveraging senior government funding, and financial assistance. • Focus on retention of exiting rental housing through rehabilitation, restriction of condominium conversion, demolition control and enforcement of the property standards by-law. <p>Barrier Free Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Polices and terminology update in accordance with the 2005 PPS and Accessibility for Ontarian’s with Disabilities Act. <p>Recreation and Parks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporation of Trail Master Plan (2005) – Existing and Proposed Trails (Schedule 8). • Specification of parkland per 1000 population in accordance with the recommendations of the Recreation, Parks and Cultural Strategic Master

Detailed Summary of Draft Official Plan Update Changes

The following summarizes the key changes proposed through the City’s DRAFT Official Plan Update – Amendment 42.

OFFICIAL PLAN SECTION	DRAFT POLICY DIRECTION
	Plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of urban squares as park space.
7.0 Urban Design 7.1 Objectives 7.2 General Policies 7.3 Sustainable Urban Design 7.4 Public Realm 7.5 Landmarks, Public Views, and Public Vistas 7.6 Gateways 7.7 Built Form: Low Rise Residential Forms 7.8 Built Form: All Built Forms other than Low Rise Residential Forms 7.9 Built Form: Buildings in Proximity to Residential and Institutional Uses 7.10 Built Form: Mid-rise Buildings 7.11 Built Form: High-rise Buildings 7.12 Built Form: Vehicle-oriented Uses 7.13 Transition of Land Use 7.14 Parking 7.15 Access, Circulation, Loading and Storage Areas 7.16 Signage 7.17 Display Areas 7.18 Lighting 7.19 Landscaping and Development 7.20 Safety 7.21 Accessibility 7.22 Urban Squares 7.23 Public Art 7.24 Development Adjacent to River Corridors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refined objectives reflect the Urban Design Action Plan. • Development proposals reinforce a modified grid-like street network and new cul-de-sacs only where warranted by natural site conditions. • Reverse lotting and ‘eye-brow’ streets adjacent to arterial and collector roads strongly discouraged. • New policies proposed to achieve a stronger pedestrian oriented environment (e.g. on-street, parking, transit priority measures, etc.). • Requirements for development to address the street edge. • City-wide gateways identified and co-ordination of street infrastructure. • Subdivision entrance features (i.e., signs etc.) and gated subdivisions strongly discouraged. • Rear lane development encouraged where appropriate. • Protection of public views to landmarks and natural areas. • Reverse lotting adjacent to natural areas discouraged. • Garage width and setback policies to minimize dominance on the streetscape. • Policies added for the design of midrise and high-rise buildings (reduce massing and encourages buildings with podiums and narrow shafts). • Design policies for automobile-oriented uses related to drive-throughs, gas stations, etc. • Underground parking and shared driveways are encouraged or strongly encouraged dependent upon densities and uses. • Addition of signage policies. • Lighting policies added addressing shielding, light spillage, lighting levels based on context/compatibility. • Updated accessibility policies. • Underground utility servicing encouraged. • Landscaping policies added. • Public art policies added. • Urban Square policies added (Urban Squares may be public or private). • Sustainable streetscape designs on adjoining roadways (e.g. non-invasive and drought and salt-tolerable plantings, bioswales, rain absorbent landscaping, granular-based pavers, street furniture, curb ramps, lay-bys, bicycle facilities, transit shelters). • Sustainable subdivision design standards (e.g., layout of street/lot patterns to maximize solar gain, limit block length, pedestrian connections, etc.). • Policies for Secondary Plans (i.e., Goldie Mills, South Guelph, Victoria Road North) generally removed or made applicable City-wide.

Detailed Summary of Draft Official Plan Update Changes

The following summarizes the key changes proposed through the City’s DRAFT Official Plan Update – Amendment 42.

OFFICIAL PLAN SECTION	DRAFT POLICY DIRECTION
<p>8.0 Land Use Designations</p> <p>8.1 All Land Use Designations General</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognition of public energy generation facilities and private energy generation facilities less than 10 megawatts as a permitted use as appropriate in all land uses designations except as limited by the specific designations e.g., Natural Heritage System and provided for in the <i>Green Energy and Green Economy Act</i>. New policy direction supporting urban agriculture and community gardens.
<p>8.2 Land Uses Designations Permitting Residential Development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section identifies the uses permitted in all land use designations that permit residential development and include the following uses: affordable housing, special needs housing, lodging houses, home occupations, schools, places of worship, day care centres and convenience commercial.
<p>8.3 Residential</p> <p>8.3.1 All Residential</p> <p>8.3.2 General Residential</p> <p>8.3.3 Medium Density Residential</p> <p>8.3.4 High Density Residential</p>	<p>General Residential Designation</p> <p>Separate General Residential policies in the Built Up Area and the Greenfield area to ensure stable residential areas within the Built Up Area and flexibility within the Greenfield area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Built-up Areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximum density of 35 units per hectare within the Built-up Area Maximum three (3) storey height limit Additional height and density permitted: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> on lands adjacent to arterial and collector roads (i.e. up to a maximum height of 4 storeys and density of 100 units per hectare); and within the Built-up Area outside of lands adjacent to arterial or collector roads, a maximum of 4 storeys and a minimum of 15 units per ha and a maximum of 100 units per hectare may be permitted subject to development criteria and the bonusing provisions of the Official Plan (e.g. provision of affordable housing, green building certification, public art, etc.) Greenfield Area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greenfield Area to permit a mix of low, medium and high density residential development between 20 and 100 units per hectare to allow flexibility for a full range of housing opportunities as projected by the Growth Management Strategy. Maximum height of 5 storeys. Permit coach houses and garden suites without an amendment to the Zoning by-law, but subject to Site Plan Approval. Continue to permit accessory dwellings in single and semi-detached dwellings throughout the General Residential designation. <p>Medium Density Designations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum density 35 units per hectare.

Detailed Summary of Draft Official Plan Update Changes

The following summarizes the key changes proposed through the City’s DRAFT Official Plan Update – Amendment 42.

OFFICIAL PLAN SECTION	DRAFT POLICY DIRECTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum density 100 units per hectare. • Minimum height 2 storeys. • Maximum height 5 storeys. • Additional height and density may be permitted through the bonusing provisions. • Additional medium density residential designations identified on the Land Use Schedule to provide more certainty and to direct intensification along arterials and collectors (including the Guelph Junction Railway), adjacent to the Mixed Use Areas, Centres and Corridors. • Structured/underground parking encouraged. <p>High Density Residential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum density 100 units per hectare • Maximum density 150 units per hectare • Minimum height 3 storeys • Maximum height 10 storeys • Additional height and density may be permitted through the bonusing provisions. • Additional high density residential designations identified to provide more certainty and direct intensification along arterials and collectors, as well as along the Guelph Junction Railway, adjacent to the Community Mixed Use Nodes, and within the Intensification Corridors identified on Schedule 1 • Structured parking strongly encouraged.
8.4 Downtown Guelph	<p>Downtown Guelph</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No major changes, but recognition that the Secondary Plan is under preparation. • Terminology changes to reflect the Downtown as defined on Schedules 1 and 2 as the City’s Urban Growth Centre. • Provisions to achieve a density of 150 persons and jobs per hectare in accordance with the Growth Plan requirements and Official Plan Amendment 39.
8.5 Mixed Use Areas, Corridors and Centres Designation 8.5.1 Community Mixed Use Area Designation 8.5.2 Mixed Use Corridor Designation 8.5.3 Neighbourhood Mixed Use Centre Designation	<p>Community Mixed Use Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of the Silver Creek Community Mixed Use Area on Schedule 1 Growth Plan Elements, on Schedule 2 and included under the Secondary Plan Section (OMB decision Jan 12, 2010). • Policy provisions to establish residential unit targets for each of the Community Mixed Use Areas. • Permit medium/high density residential uses to ensure walkable, mixed use, and transit supportive development. • Minimum height 2 storeys of usable space. • Maximum height 6 storeys.

Detailed Summary of Draft Official Plan Update Changes

The following summarizes the key changes proposed through the City’s DRAFT Official Plan Update – Amendment 42.

OFFICIAL PLAN SECTION	DRAFT POLICY DIRECTION
8.5.4 Plan Amendment Requirements 8.5.5 Impact Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underground/structured parking encouraged. • Surface parking only permitted in rear or side yard. • Drive through and auto service uses not permitted. • Retain the limitations on retail floor area and major office use within the Community Mixed Use Areas as established by the Commercial Policy Review. • Retain the provisions that small scale offices and services may be permitted in the Community and Neighbourhood Mixed Use Nodes and that Major Office would be focused in the Downtown and Mixed Use Corridors (e.g. Stone Road, Eramosa, Silvercreek). <p>Mixed Use Corridors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Former Intensification Areas renamed to Mixed Use Corridor designation. (Silvercreek, Eramosa/ Stevenson and Stone Road). • Residential Unit provisions for each of the Corridors to ensure Mixed Use. • Minimum height 2 storeys of usable space. • Maximum height 5 storeys except within the Stone Road Corridor a maximum height of 8 storeys would continue to be permitted. • Residential minimum density of 100-150 units per ha. • Underground/structural parking encouraged. • Retained retail floor area provisions as established by the Commercial Policy Review. • Additional height and density may be permitted subject to the bonusing provisions of this Plan. • Provision for Secondary Plans to be developed to vision and guide future development in the Mixed Use designation. <p>Neighbourhood Mixed Use Centres</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy provisions to ensure that medium/high density residential is established to ensure walkable, mixed use, and transit supportive development. • Minimum height 2 storeys of usable space. • Maximum height 5 storeys. • Drive through and auto service uses not permitted. • Surface parking only permitted in rear or side yard. • Medium and high density residential development permitted.
8.6 Commercial 8.6.1 Commercial Service 8.6.2 Commercial Residential	<p>Commercial Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential uses no longer permitted in Commercial Service designations. • Focus on vehicle-oriented uses such as drive-throughs and service stations and currently permitted uses. <p>Commercial-Residential Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Former Mixed Office-Residential and Commercial Mixed Use designations

Detailed Summary of Draft Official Plan Update Changes

The following summarizes the key changes proposed through the City’s DRAFT Official Plan Update – Amendment 42.

OFFICIAL PLAN SECTION	DRAFT POLICY DIRECTION
	<p>combined into Commercial Residential designation distinction between office and retail/service commercial uses retained through policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum height 4 storeys.
<p>8.7 Employment Areas – Industrial</p> <p>8.8 Corporate Business Park</p> <p>8.9 Institutional Research Park</p>	<p>Employment Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insertion of employment land conversion criteria adopted through OPA 39. • higher densities are proposed within the Greenfield area to ensure the 50 persons and jobs per ha can be achieved. • Density targets of 36 jobs per ha are proposed for the Industrial designations, and 70 jobs per ha, in the Corporate Business Park. • Minimum heights of 2 stories are encouraged in the Industrial and Corporate Business Park designations to reduce land consumption. • Enhanced urban design criteria proposed to reflect the Urban Design Action Plan. • Encourage structured or underground parking in Institutional Research Park and Corporate Business Park.
<p>8.10 Regeneration Area</p>	<p>Regeneration Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of a new land use designation that will focus on the reuse of underutilized sites (e.g. IMICO site, north of York Road between Watson Parkway and Stevenson, and on the currently designated Mixed Office–Residential designation north of York Road west of Stevenson). • Objectives of the Regeneration Area are to establish land use designations that revitalizes the area and promotes the use of the Guelph Junction Railway for goods and people movement, addresses the gateway function of York Road and aims to clean up brownfield sites. • Secondary plan required to guide future development. • Focus on high quality and sustainable design. • Allows for minor development to occur prior to Secondary Plan in accordance with the objectives of the section and existing zoning provisions.
<p>8.11 Major Institutional Designation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No significant changes
<p>8.12 Open Space and Parks Designation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated to reflect Guelph Trail Master Plan and Recreation, Parks & Culture Strategic Master Plan. • Refined Schedule 8 identifying existing and proposed City Trails.
<p>8.13 Major Utility Designation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste Management designation renamed ‘Utilities’ and all major public utility facilities placed in this designation e.g., Municipal Street works yard, water works and sewage treatment facility.

Detailed Summary of Draft Official Plan Update Changes

The following summarizes the key changes proposed through the City’s DRAFT Official Plan Update – Amendment 42.

OFFICIAL PLAN SECTION	DRAFT POLICY DIRECTION
8.14 Special Study Areas Designation 8.14.2.1 Guelph Innovation District Special Study Area 8.14.2.2 Clair/Maltby Special Study Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Study areas are areas where detailed secondary planning is required and for which there is predominantly no underlying designation or permitted uses. • Continue to identify the Guelph Innovation District, including the lands currently designated “Institutional” within a Special Study Area designation. • Identify the South Guelph lands within a Special Study Area. • Objectives defined for each Special Study Area e.g., employment and urban village concept for new development in south Guelph and Guelph Innovation District.
8.17 Exceptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceptions to the Official Plan that have been made through site specific amendment have been identified and included.
9.0 Implementation 9.1 Official Plan Update and Monitoring 9.2 Secondary Plans 9.3 Public Engagement Notification Policies 9.4 Community Improvement 9.5 Implementation 9.6 Property Standards 9.7 Land Acquisition 9.8 Parkland Acquisition 9.9 Municipal Finance 9.10 Pre-consultation and Complete Application Requirements 9.11 Zoning By-laws 9.12 Bonusing Provisions 9.13 Plans of Subdivision, Condominium, and Part-lot Control 9.14 Committee of Adjustment 9.15 Site Plan Control 9.16 Temporary Use By laws 9.17 Interim Control By law 9.18 Holding By law 9.19 Sign By law 9.20 Demolition Control 9.21 Development Permit System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General updating of tools and implementation measures that support successful local planning. • Public engagement policies updated to reflect current City practice of engagement residents via multiple communication mediums. • Bonusing - Additional height and density permitted (subject to Council approval) where appropriate in exchange for community benefits (e.g. Affordable housing, LEED building certification, etc.) • Policies enabling regulation of exterior design through site plan approval process. • Development Permitting System polices expanded to allow for the establishment of a development permitting system in the future (subject to more specific policies being development and a development permit by-law being passed under the Planning Act).

Detailed Summary of Draft Official Plan Update Changes

The following summarizes the key changes proposed through the City’s DRAFT Official Plan Update – Amendment 42.

OFFICIAL PLAN SECTION	DRAFT POLICY DIRECTION
10.0 Glossary 10.1 Introduction 10.2 Definitions 10.3 Glossary of Acronyms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definitions update in accordance with 2005 PPS, proposed natural heritage policies, recent legislative changes, and other documents. • Glossary of acronyms added to assist in understanding of Plan.
11.0 Secondary Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary Plan policies no longer applicable deleted from text e.g., Eastview, Victoria Road North, Goldie Mill and South Guelph • Provisions for Secondary Plans to be prepared for the Community Mixed Use Nodes, Intensification Corridors and Neighbourhood Mixed Use Nodes

ATTACHMENT B

AMENDMENT NUMBER 42 TO THE OFFICIAL PLAN FOR THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF GUELPH

PART A - THE PREAMBLE

The Preamble provides an explanation of the amendment including the purpose, background, basis and summary of the policies, and public participation, but does not form part of this amendment.

PART B - THE AMENDMENT

The complete amendment is attached as Attachment 1.

PART A - THE PREAMBLE

TITLE AND COMPONENTS

This document is entitled envision Guelph – Official Plan Update and constitutes Amendment 42 to the Official Plan.

PURPOSE

Official Plan Amendment No 42 (OPA 42) is the second phase of the City's comprehensive Official Plan Update. Phase one of the Official Plan Update, Official Plan Amendment No. 39 (OPA 39), was approved in June 2009 and established a growth management framework for the City to the year 2031.

The purpose of the Amendment 42 is to address:

- recent changes to Provincial legislation;
- consistency with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement(PPS);
- policies to implement the growth management framework articulated through OPA 39; and
- recommendations from the City's recently approved Master Plans and studies.

The amendment is being processed pursuant to subsection 26 of the *Planning Act*.

BACKGROUND

The background for the preparation of the Official Plan Update has been on-going since 2006 and involved a broad spectrum of stakeholders including the Province, surrounding municipalities, City service departments, and the public. The Official Plan Update was initiated by Council on September 10, 2007.

The Amendment incorporates recommendations from recently adopted Master Plans and studies that have been initiated by the City, including:

- Natural Heritage Strategy (2009)
- Affordable Housing Discussion Paper (2009)
- Employment Lands Strategy (2008 and 2009)
- Urban Design Action Plan (2008)
- Community Energy Plan (2007)
- The City’s Strategic Plan (2007)
- Infrastructure Master Plans (various)
- Guelph and Wellington Transportation Plan (2005).

LOCATION

The changes made through Amendment 42 apply to all land within the municipal boundaries of the City of Guelph.

BASIS OF THE AMENDMENT

Amendment 42 updates the existing 2001 Official Plan and addresses the necessary changes to incorporate recent changes to Provincial legislation, ensure consistency with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement, incorporate policies to implement the growth management framework articulated through OPA 39, and include recommendations from the City’s recently approved Master Plans and studies.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CHANGES

The following is brief overview of the changes proposed in the Draft Official Plan Update. The complete Official Plan Update amendment is attached as Attachment 1.

The Official Plan chapters have been reorganized as follows:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 14. Introduction | 20. Urban Design |
| 15. Strategic Directions | 21. Land Use |
| 16. Planning Healthy and Complete Communities | 22. Implementation |
| 17. Protecting What is Valuable | 23. Glossary |
| 18. Municipal Services | 24. Secondary Plans |
| 19. Community Infrastructure | 25. Schedules |
| | 26. Appendices |

Chapters 1, 2, and 3

The first chapter has been revised to clearly set out the purpose and organization of the Plan and how it should be interpreted. Chapter 2 sets out the City-wide vision, guiding principles and goals that inform and set the local context for the Official Plan. The third chapter includes the growth management strategy for the City based on the policies adopted as part of OPA 39. Chapter three also sets high level policy direction for matters that are essential to building complete and healthy communities, such as natural heritage protection, energy sustainability, employment land conversion policy, transportation, servicing and community infrastructure.

Chapter 4

Chapter four identifies matters that important to protect over the long-term. This chapter includes the Natural Heritage Policies and replaces the current Core and Non-Core Greenlands policies. The new Natural Heritage System identifies Significant Natural Areas for long term permanent protection (i.e. ANSIs, Habitat of Endangered and Threatened Species, Significant Wetlands, Surface Water and Fish Habitat, Significant Woodlands,

Significant Valleylands, Significant Landform, Significant Wildlife Habitat (including Ecological Linkages), and Restoration Areas). The Natural Heritage System policies also identify Natural Areas where development may be permitted provided Environmental Impact Studies demonstrate that there will be no negative impacts to the natural features or their ecological functions. (e.g. other wetlands, cultural woodlands and locally significantly wildlife habitat). Restoration areas, wildlife crossings are identified, and environmental stewardship and monitoring programs are also outlined to address such issues as invasive species, deer, pollinator habitat.

Water quality and quantity is identified as a significant natural resource to be protected, conserved, and enhanced in accordance with the PPS. Source water protection policies are introduced and the City's wellhead protection areas are mapped on Schedule 11.

Policies ensuring public health and safety (e.g. natural hazards, flood plains, landfill constraint areas, and potentially contaminated properties) have been updated.

The City's Community Energy targets and climate change objectives are incorporated into Chapter 4. These policies promote local generation of renewable and alternative energy, the efficient distribution of energy including district energy, and conservation measures. Energy density is introduced and integrated into the land use and transportation planning process.

Updated Cultural Heritage policies have been included to reflect the new provisions of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and the PPS, e.g., provisions for the review of development proposals adjacent to designated properties, provisions for inclusion of and review of non-designated properties in the Heritage Register.

Chapters 5 and 6

Municipal Services policies (e.g. staging of services, water & wastewater, storm water management) have been updated to reflect recently completed infrastructure master plans, water conservation targets, and promotion of low impact storm water management techniques.

Appropriate provisions to recognize the role of the City's Site Alteration By-law and Termite Control By-law have been included.

Updates to the transportation policies have been made in the section entitled - 'Moving Goods and People to incorporate the Growth Management principles, appropriate provisions of the Guelph and Wellington Transportation Study, Transportation Strategy Update, and the Community Energy Plan. Greater focus is provided on active transportation (i.e. walking and cycling), transportation demand management, transit and the use of the Guelph Junction Railway for goods and passenger movement. Key "Main Streets" have been identified on Schedule 7 which will have a pedestrian and transit oriented focus, e.g. Downtown and Victoria Rd. N.

The Community Infrastructure section outlines provisions including encouragement for public art and the development of a public art policy for the City. A 36 % target for affordable housing and implementation tools have been incorporated into the Official Plan. Bonus for density and height are proposed for development proposals that target affordable ownership for households below the 40th percentile income level. Affordable housing will be monitored through Affordable Housing Implementation Reports and the Development Priority Plan.

The Barrier Free policies have been updated to incorporate the policy direction of the Ontarians with Disabilities Act.

The Parks and Recreation Policies have been refined to include Urban Squares as a component of the Parks and Open Space System and to establish updated Parkland dedication policies recommended in the Recreation, Parks and Cultural Strategic Master Plan.

Chapter 7

Urban design polices have been updated to implement the policy direction set out in the Urban Design Action Plan. New provisions include urban squares (e.g. courtyards, plazas, piazzas) are promoted as a means of provide public space within an urban context. Detailed policies related to public art, public views, parking, vehicle-oriented uses, signage, accessibility, lighting, and areas that serve as gateways to the City are addressed. Detailed policies have been included for low, medium and high-rise built forms as well as for commercial and industrial development.

Chapter 8

Residential

Minimum and maximum heights and densities are specified within designations permitting residential uses. The General Residential designation has been revised within the Built-up Area of the City to provide greater certainty regarding minimum and maximum densities, i.e., a minimum density of 15 units per ha and a maximum of 35 units per ha and a maximum height of 3 storeys. Additional height and density, to a maximum of 100 units/ha and a maximum height of four(4) storeys, may be permitted along arterials and collectors and may also be permitted within the General Residential Built-up Area designation, but only where bonusing is provided. The General Residential designation in the Greenfield Area would permit a minimum of 20 units per ha and a maximum of 100 units per ha, and a maximum of 5 storeys.

Intensification in the form of medium and high density designations are directed to transit supportive locations such as the Downtown, to the Mixed Use Areas, Centres and Corridors identified on Schedule 2. Medium Density would permit a maximum of 100 units per ha and a minimum of 35 units per ha. Heights are required to be between 2 and 5 storeys.

High density Residential would permit densities between 100 and 150 units per ha and heights are required to be between three (3) and ten (10) storeys.

Downtown Guelph

Policies acknowledge that the Downtown Secondary Plan is under preparation and once approved will replace the current Official Plan policies.

Mixed Use Areas, Corridors and Centres

New terminology replaces the Mixed Use Nodes, Intensification Areas and Neighbourhood Centres with Community Mixed Use Areas, Mixed Use Corridors and Neighbourhood Mixed Use Centres, respectively. The commercial policies remain unchanged with respect to retail uses. Additional Neighbourhood Mixed Use Centres have been added to Schedule 2. To achieve a mixed use character, medium and high density residential development is permitted within all three Mixed Use designations and residential unit targets have been assigned to each of the Community Mixed Use Areas and Mixed Use Corridors.

Commercial Service

Commercial Service Areas have been revised to create vehicle-oriented and commercial service focus areas. Drive-through and vehicle-oriented uses are not permitted in other land use designations and are intended to be focused within the Commercial Service designation. For this reason, additional Commercial Service Areas have been designated on Schedule 2.

Commercial-Residential Designation

The Commercial-Residential designation replaces the former Commercial Mixed Use and Mixed Office-Residential Designation and recognizes the areas within the City where a mix of commercial and residential uses co-exist. The intent of these two designations remain unchanged, and the office and/or commercial focus of specific areas have been recognized through the policy.

Employment Areas

The employment areas remain virtually unchanged with the exception that higher densities are proposed within the Greenfield area to ensure the 50 persons and jobs per ha can be achieved. Density targets of 36 jobs per ha are proposed for the industrial designations, and 70 jobs per ha, in the Corporate Business Park. Minimum heights of 2 stories are encouraged in the Greenfield Industrial and Corporate Business Park designations to reduce land consumption requirements.

Regeneration Area

Regeneration Area is introduced as a new land use designation that is intended to spark reinvestment and redevelopment within underutilized areas of the City. The Regeneration Area designation includes the former IMICO site and the north side of York Road between Watson Road and Victoria Road. This area will be subject to a detailed secondary plan. In the interim, existing uses may continue and minor expansions would be permitted until the Secondary Plan is approved to guide future redevelopment.

Other than minor wording, few substantive changes were made to the Major Institutional and Major Open Space and Parks Designations.

Major Utility

Major Utility is a new designation that includes large scale utility facilities that serve a city-wide function including, water and waste water treatment facilities, transfer stations, municipal and hydro works/offices.

Special Study Area

Two Special Study Area designations have been identified on Schedule 2, namely, the Guelph Innovation District and the area south of Clair Road to Maltby Road. These two areas make up a large portion of the Greenfield area and will be planned to accommodate a significant portion of the forecasted population and employment growth for the City.

Secondary Plans will be required to plan future development in these key areas.

Approved Secondary Plans

Secondary plan policies contained within the current Official Plan (e.g. Eastview, Goldie Mill, South Guelph and Victoria Road North) have been incorporated into the general polices of the Plan and revised, where necessary, to be consistent with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement and conform with the Growth Plan.

The Silvercreek Junction Secondary Plan (recently approved by the OMB) is the only area that is identified on Schedule 2 as having an approved secondary plan. The Silvercreek Junction Secondary Plan is appended under Chapter 11 of the Official Plan. As additional Secondary Plans are approved, (e.g., for the Downtown, the Guelph Innovation District and the Community Mixed Use Areas) they will be added to the Official Plan as discrete plans under Chapter 11.

Exceptions

Exceptions applicable to specific properties have been identified and included in Chapter 8.

Chapters 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13

Implementation policies have been updated to enable the City to make use of planning tools provided through the *Planning Act*. This includes bonusing policies that would enable Council to permit additional height and density in exchange for community benefits (e.g., affordable housing, green building certification, underground or structured parking, etc), regulation of exterior building design through the site plan approval process, and setting the framework for a development permit system.

The glossary has been update, including additional terms that are consistent with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The development of the Official Plan Update has involved significant community stakeholder engagement that included surveys, public meetings, stakeholder meetings, open houses, and innovative workshops with respect to the numerous background studies.

Special Meeting to Commence Official Plan Update

A special meeting of Council was held on September 10, 2007, to initiate the Official Plan Update and provide the public with an opportunity to provide input at the outset of the process.

Background Studies

Numerous studies and initiatives have been completed with public input in support of the Official Plan update including, the Urban Design Action Plan, Affordable Housing Discussion Paper and the Natural Heritage Strategy. The Natural Heritage Strategy, in particular, is an integral part of OPA 42 and was initiated in 2004. The development of the criteria for the Natural Heritage System underwent extensive public engagement in 2008 and 2009. In July 2009, Council directed staff to use the March 2009 Natural Heritage Strategy as the basis for the development of the Natural Heritage System and policies for inclusion in the Official Plan Update. In February 2010, the City released the draft mapping and policies for the Natural Heritage System for public review and input. The Natural Heritage System and policies included in the OPA 42 include the refined mapping and policies resulting from the input since February 2010.

OPA 42 Public Engagement

In March 2010, the Key Directions for OPA 42 were posted on the City's web site. Two public meetings were held on March 10 and 11, 2010, as well as a number of focused consultation sessions with ministries and agencies, interest groups, and the Guelph and Wellington Development Association.

The full DRAFT Official Plan Update was available for public review on April 19, 2010 and a series of public open houses were held on April 20, 21, and 22 at City Hall. The purpose of the open houses was to provide the public with an opportunity to review the draft policies, proposed Schedules and related background material, and to ask questions of planning staff in order to obtain an understanding of the Draft Plan. The public has been invited to make written and/or verbal submissions on OPA 42 to Council at the May 20th Statutory Public Meeting.

The Province and affected ministries and agencies have been circulated the OPA 42 and have been provided with the background material.

Amendment 42 addresses consistency with the Provincial Policy Statement, and therefore, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing is the approval authority pursuant to Section 26 of the *Planning Act*. The Minister must make a decision on Amendment 42 within 180 days of receiving the amendment, following its adoption by Council.

PART B - THE AMENDMENT

The Amendment

The amendment is attached as **Attachment 1 envision Guelph Draft Official Plan Update** and is in the form of Official Plan text, Schedules and Appendices.

Some sections completely replace the current Official Plan policies and mapping, such as the Natural Heritage Policies (which replace the existing Core and Non-Core Greenlands policies and mapping of the existing Official Plans). Other sections have been modified and updated, as well as reorganized within the new format. A “compare document” will be available for circulation with proposed Amendment 42 (within 15 days after adoption by Council).

Implementation and Interpretation

The implementation of this amendment shall be in accordance with the provisions of the *Planning Act* and applicable legislation.

Amendment 42 is available on the City’s website at **guelph.ca/OPupdate**, at any branch of the Guelph Public Library, or at the Community Design and Development Services office located at 1 Carden Street on the 3rd Floor.

Details of the Amendment

The details of Amendment 42 are in **Attachment 1 – envision Guelph Official Plan Update**.

ATTACHMENT B

AMENDMENT NUMBER 42 TO THE OFFICIAL PLAN FOR THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF GUELPH

PART A - THE PREAMBLE

The Preamble provides an explanation of the amendment including the purpose, background, basis and summary of the policies, and public participation, but does not form part of this amendment.

PART B - THE AMENDMENT

The complete amendment is attached as Attachment 1.

PART A - THE PREAMBLE

TITLE AND COMPONENTS

This document is entitled *envision Guelph – Official Plan Update* and constitutes Amendment 42 to the Official Plan.

PURPOSE

Official Plan Amendment No 42 (OPA 42) is the second phase of the City's comprehensive Official Plan Update. Phase one of the Official Plan Update, Official Plan Amendment No. 39 (OPA 39), was approved in June 2009 and established a growth management framework for the City to the year 2031.

The purpose of the Amendment 42 is to address:

- recent changes to Provincial legislation;
- consistency with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement(PPS);
- policies to implement the growth management framework articulated through OPA 39; and
- recommendations from the City's recently approved Master Plans and studies.

The amendment is being processed pursuant to subsection 26 of the *Planning Act*.

BACKGROUND

The background for the preparation of the Official Plan Update has been on-going since 2006 and involved a broad spectrum of stakeholders including the Province, surrounding municipalities, City service departments, and the public. The Official Plan Update was initiated by Council on September 10, 2007.

The Amendment incorporates recommendations from recently adopted Master Plans and studies that have been initiated by the City, including:

Official Plan Update

Comments on Proposal

Council Chambers, Guelph City Hall

May 20, 2010

Gene Valeriote

Valeriote Property

1968 – 1992 Gordon St

Trustee of Parents' Estate

- 80 acres
- next to Springfield golf course
- when parents bought over 60 years ago: wetlands, hardwood and mixed forests, farm or pastureland (yellow)
- planted over 10,000 trees
- established Christmas tree plantation

- waiting to settle estate for 10 years but development status still under a cloud

Supportive of NHS but causing us severe problems – need your help



Overview of Presentation

- **Comments on Consequences of NHS to Valeriotte property**
 - **Unfair burden on family – 94% of land in NHS**
 - **Specific areas of concern & suggested solutions**
 - ◆ **Special Consideration for our specific problems**
- **Comments on Overall Official Plan**
 - **Identify problems for City & suggest solutions**
 - ◆ **Which will also benefit us**
 - **Make landowners partners and willing good stewards**
 - **Remove small amount of land that has no natural heritage justification**
- **Questions**

Comments on NHS Specific to Valeriotte property



Specific Areas of Concern → Suggested Solutions

- 75 of our 80 acres placed in NHS

94% of our land

- that leaves us only 5 acres (6%) that can be developed and that's split into 3 parcels

Four areas of concern



Phase 3 Recommended Natural Heritage Strategy

Spring 2009 Aerial Photography

Produced by the City of Guelph
Community Design and Development Services
February 2010
Data Sources: Dougan and Associates (2009), City of Guelph (2009)



Comments on NHS Specific to Valeriotte property

First Area of Concern: South Plantation

- green area to left and to north is cultural plantation (CUP) or cultural meadow (CUM)
- included in NHS under landform (20% slope) criterion (though CUM flat open space)
- orange stripe is linkage taken into NHS to expand corridor from 80 m to 100 m wide at narrowest point
 - ◆ maximum made minimum
 - ◆ most restrictive choice

(1) We ask that neither hill nor this linkage strip be in NHS (2 acres)



Comments on NHS Specific to Valeriotte property

Second Area of Concern: Former Plantation Corridor


Why significant woodland?

20-year old second growth
- from plantation trees


2) We ask that the former plantation (FOM) be out of NHS but be used for a linkage corridor

(2.5 acres but mostly linkage)

- as a linkage will be protected but should facilitate service connections & alternative emergency vehicle access between developments



Comments on NHS Specific to Valeriotte property
Third Area of Concern: Front Residential



(3) We ask that NHS boundary follow the red curve to exclude grove, cottage & grounds from NHS (1/2 acre)

Comments on NHS Specific to Valeriotte property

Fourth Area of Concern: *Dry Wetlands*

- MNR evaluated Hall's Pond Complex in 1986
- then golf course created, altering the wetlands
- *Now some wetlands appear dry*
 - MNR agreed in April to carry out re-evaluation
 - ◆ In progress
- (4) We ask that Council incorporate any PSW changes into OP or permit automatic later revision of NHS if needed

Our Requests

- **proposed NHS designation places huge burden on our family**
 - ◆ don't penalize us for over 60 years of good stewardship
 - ◆ would be a great injustice

**Asking Council to prevent it from happening
with specific special considerations**

And not

- **to delay site-specific corrections to the development stage**
 - ◆ would delay establishing what land may be developable
 - ◆ market price would be discounted for risk

Overview of Presentation

- **Comments on Consequences of NHS to Valeriotte property**
- **General Comments on Overall Official Plan**
 - **Balance between Conflicting Objectives**
 - **Identify Problems for City & Suggest Solutions**
 - ◆ Which will also benefit us
 - **Make landowners real partners and willing good stewards**
 - **Remove small amount of land that has no natural heritage justification**
 - ◆ NHS Criteria / Landform


Some Official Plan Objectives

- adequate land supply within settlement area boundary to accommodate growth to 2031
 - ◆ 125,000 → 175,000 = increase of 50,000 people
- Greenfield areas
 - ◆ part of Guelph Innovation District
 - ◆ south of Clair Road to Maltby
 - must accommodate large proportion of future growth
- “The NHS policies aim to strike a balance between protection of the Natural Heritage System while providing for growth & development.....”
- fosters partnerships with...private land owners ...promoting stewardship”

Can it be done with this Plan?

South of Clair Rd. to Maltby

	Area (ha)	% of total
NHS [+ Park] (green)	377	45%
Residential development Study Area (blue) + part other	282	34%
Other (Industrial & Commercial)	176	21%
	835	100%



Is this the right balance ?

282 ha X 50/ha = 14,000 people including those already living there

either the density must be much higher
or
need more land to build on

or both

NHS Criteria

Conflicting Objectives

- **Council Meeting, July 22/09**

- “that staff be directed to address the protection of significant portions of the Paris/Galt Moraine through the Natural Heritage System and policies to be incorporated into the Official Plan Update.”


but

- **Need more building land**


- from where?

NHS Criteria Need a Better Balance

- **Consider Landform Criterion**
 - most of land south of Clair Rd. is on Paris/Galt Moraine
 - criterion selected to define “significant portions” of Moraine : 20% slope
 - in effect any hill south of Clair Rd. is in NHS if it has a 20% slope
- **Is a hill a Natural Heritage feature?**
 - or a flood risk-free place to build a house without disturbing wetlands?
- **Does the landform criterion really *add* “significant protection”?**
 - can we remove it and gain some building space?



What does the Landform Criterion Add?



only 40 ha with linkage overlay

NHS Criteria

The Right Balance - or Too Restrictive?

- **Overlay and application of so many NHS criteria has had unintended detrimental consequences “corrected” by:**
 - **small gaps between protected areas made into “restoration areas”**
 - ◆ areas that didn't meet other NHS criteria but filled in the gaps (more restrictive)
 - **large gaps between protected areas made into linkage corridors**
 - ◆ not shown on any of the maps in OP schedules (more restrictive)
 - **linkage corridors were to be 50-100m wide**
 - ◆ all were made 100 m wide (more restrictive)
- **whenever a choice had to be made it was almost always made in favour of more protection = more restriction**
 - **less room for residential development**

NHS Criteria

The Right Balance - or Too Restrictive?

- **Why choose the greatest restriction?**
 - difficult to remove later once embedded in Official Plan
- **Why not opt for flexibility?**
 - rely on EIS to place restrictions based on site-specific criteria at time of development

NHS Criteria

The Right Balance - or Too Restrictive?

- **Broad Brush Approach**
 - based on tentative and low-accuracy data
- **Overlay of many NHS criteria --> unintended consequences**
 - NHS cut off some areas – leaving them without road access
- **Ad hoc choices usually made in favour of more protection**
 - less room for residential development
- **Overlay of landform criterion redundant**
 - other criteria protected significant portion of Moraine without it
- **Owners are not partners**
 - no decision making ability about their land
- **Flexibility needed to allow adjustments later where appropriate**
 - plan too restrictive for this stage

Suggested Solutions to Building Land Shortfall while preserving integrity of NHS

- **Make landowners true partners**
 - the partnership is not very equal: landowners provide the assets and the City has all of the voting shares
- **Landowners who feel they are real partners**
 - will be good stewards
 - not angry ones
 - everybody benefits

Suggested Solutions to Building Land Shortfall while preserving integrity of NHS

- **Make landowners real partners** and at the same time
- **Correct unintended consequences & errors**
 - permit landowners (with EIS) to remove **10%** of their NHS property
 - gains 32 ha for development
 - ◆ little cost to NHS
- **Eliminate Landform Criterion**
 - if slope stability problem, EIS and engineering can handle it
 - gains 40 ha for development
 - on hills

34% → 43% for development
without damaging integrity of NHS

43% can be changed by varying from 10% or changing linkages

Summary of Suggested Solutions

● General Suggestions

1. **eliminate 20%-slope landform criterion**
 - ◆ rely on site-specific EIS and engineering criteria
2. **make landowners willing partners & stewards**
 - ◆ allow landowners to control 10% of their NHS land
3. **opt for fewer restrictions in Official Plan**
 - ◆ use EIS to restrict at development stage
4. **permit automatic revision of NHS with later better data**
 - ◆ or through secondary plan process

Summary of Suggested Solutions

Our property

- **Specific Requests (Special Consideration)**
 1. **remove plantation land on hill from NHS**
 2. **make corridor between two plantation areas a linkage**
 3. **remove cedar grove & cottage area from NHS**
 4. **incorporate MNR changes (if any) to PSW**
 - **which returns 5 acres of the 75 to our discretion**
 - ◆ **subject to a robust permitting process**
 - ◆ **1 or 2 of the 5 acres for linkage**

or a combination of both general & specific requests

**Extended Text for Guelph Council - Comments on Proposal for Official Plan Update
Presented by Gene Valeriote, May 20/10**

S1	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Official Plan, and specifically, the Natural Heritage part of it.
S2	I'm a Trustee for my parents' estate, which is the Valeriote property on Gordon Street on the north side of the Springfield golf course. Over 60 years ago, our parents bought this 80 acres of wetlands, hardwood & mixed forest, where they built a cottage and later a home. The area enclosed in yellow (and the front part of the property) was formerly cleared pasture and farm land, where I and my sisters helped to plant 10,000- 20,000 trees and our parents established a Christmas tree plantation. We've been waiting to settle the estate for over 10 years but the development status is still under a cloud. We are quite supportive of the NHS idea but the extent of this version is causing us a severe problem and we need your help.
S3	In this presentation, I intend to start by commenting specifically on our property first. The plan is placing a very unfair burden on our family - 94 percent of our land would go into the NHS - and there are some specific areas of concern and solutions to suggest, initially asking for special consideration for our specific problems. I then want to comment on the overall official plan to identify some problems that I see for the City and suggest some solutions, which will also benefit us. One of those is to make the landowners partners and willing stewards; the other is to remove a small amount of land that has no natural heritage justification. Then I'll be happy to answer to your questions or supply you later with more information than I have time for here.
S4	75 of our 80 acres are being placed in the NHS, based on four criteria - that's 94 percent of our land - and that leaves us with only five acres (6 %), that can be developed, and that's split into 3 parcels. There are four areas of concern which I'll identify with this slide and then look at each in more detail. First is the South Plantation area, with this orange linkage through it, then a wooded corridor between that and the North Plantation area, then a front residential area and finally, at the back and sidelines, some wetlands. I'll look at an enlargement of the South Plantation area first.
S5	Part of the South Plantation has been excluded from the NHS since it is a cultural plantation but, inside the red border, the green area to the left and north, which is also cultural plantation on hilly ground, and the cultural meadow at the top of the hill have been included in the NHS under the landform 20% slope criterion, even though that cultural meadow on the top of the hill is flat and open. The orange strip is a linkage, superimposed on the plantation to expand the corridor through here at the narrowest part from 80 metres wide to 100 m wide. Linkages are supposed to be a maximum of 100 m but this makes the corridor a minimum of 100 m. We ask that neither this hill and meadow nor the linkage strip be included in the NHS, i.e., that two acres be returned to development status.
S6	This slide shows the same area, but with the ecological land classifications (ELC) shown. This corridor between the two orange CUPs, was formerly a plantation from which we selectively harvested the trees but allowed the second growth they had produced to continue to grow for later harvesting. Since these trees had not been planted but had naturally succeeded those we did plant, the City's consultant refused to consider this a plantation and it was included in the NHS as significant woodland. We don't see why 20-year old second-growth trees should be considered significant woodland and be included in the core NHS. If it is taken out of the NHS, it can still be used for a linkage corridor and this would be an acceptable compromise for us. It will still be well protected but, as a linkage corridor, it should facilitate the connection of services between the development areas to the north and south and also provide alternative emergency vehicle access. We're asking that the former plantation (FOM) be out of the NHS but be available for a linkage corridor.
S7	The third area is the front residential area. Here we're asking that the NHS boundary continue to follow the 20% slope contour as it appears to do here and here, but then deviates in order to put this cedar grove into the NHS and also the cottage and the adjacent cleared land around the cottage. We think that neither should be in the NHS. We also think that an error in the 20%

	contour was what put the cottage in the NHS and we ask that the boundary be continued along the corrected red curve - which would add another half acre for development.
S8	The Hall's Pond complex was evaluated as PSW in 1986 and since then the golf course has been created, possibly altering some of the wetlands and lowering the water table. Some of the wetlands look dry now and MNR agreed last month to carry out a re-evaluation, which is currently in progress. We're only asking here (4) that the Council incorporate any changes made to the PSW into the official plan or permit automatic revision of the NHS later if needed.
S9	I can summarize our request by repeating that the NHS is imposing a huge burden on our family. We've been good stewards for over 60 years and being penalized for that would be a great injustice. We're asking the council to prevent that from happening. The expressed intention to use site specific corrections at the development stage is no solution because we need to sell this land to settle the estate. Postponing decisions to the development stage would mean developers would now only pay a risk-discounted very low price and later try to add value by obtaining concessions with stronger site-specific data.
S10	Now I'd like to continue to the second part - the general comments on the overall plan - by looking at the balance between conflicting objectives, identifying some problems we see for the City and suggesting solutions which we think also benefit us. We propose a way to make the landowners real partners and willing good stewards and propose removing a small amount of land from the NHS that has no natural heritage justification. For that we look at the NHS criteria especially the landform criterion.
S11	One of the objectives of the official plan is to accommodate growth of 50,000 people in the next 20 years, many of whom will have to live in Greenfield areas, the most important being the land south of Clair Rd. to Maltby, which I'll discuss in more detail. The NHS policy is to strike a balance between protection and growth & development and also promote partnership with private landowners to promote good stewardship. My question is: Can it be done with this plan?
S12	Here I've shown the area that's going to be in the natural heritage system plus the green park on Clair Road West - 377 hectares or 45 % of the total area. The amount for residential development (blue Study Area + 22 ha in other) is 282 ha, about one-third of the total. The question is, is this the right balance? At 50 people/ha, there's room for only 14,000 people south of Clair Rd, including those that are already living there. Either the density has to be a lot higher than 50 per hectare or else you need more land to build on - or both.
S13	At a Council meeting last summer staff was directed to address protection of significant portions of the Paris/Galt Moraine. Opposed to that is the need for more building land. Where will it come from?
S14	One criterion to consider is the landform criterion. Most of the land south of Clair Road is on the Paris/Galt moraine except for small strips along Clair Road and Maltby and this area around the golf course. Since the criterion of significance selected was a 20 % slope, that means that any hill south of Clair Road with a 20 percent slope is in the NHS automatically. Is a hill really a natural heritage feature that needs to be preserved? Or is a hill really a very good flood-free place to build a house - as long as most of the trees are left - without endangering wetlands? Does landform criterion add much significant protection to that already provided by other criteria? In fact, the protection of landform itself appears to go well beyond the Provincial Policy Statement.
S15	This slide shows an overlay of the natural heritage system on the landform map. All the solid coloured areas here, which make up the NHS, are protected and all are on the Moraine and so protect a significant portion of the Moraine. When the linkages are included, the black areas left are the only ones protected solely by the 20% slope criterion - and that's only 40 ha (almost 1 ha of that is on our property).
S16	What has happened is that the overlay of so many NHS criteria has had unintended detrimental consequences, which then have been corrected by various band-aids. For example, filling in small gaps between protected areas with "restoration areas" or large gaps with linkage corridors just adds restrictions beyond those required in the core NHS. The policy for linkage corridors gave a

	range of 50 m up to ideally 100 m but almost all were made 100 m wide, which is the most restrictive choice. In fact, whenever a choice had to be made, it seems to have been almost always made in favour of more protection, i.e., it was more restrictive, meaning less room for residential development.
S17	My questions are; why choose the greatest restriction? It's difficult to remove later what is embedded into the official plan. Wouldn't it be better to choose flexibility and rely on site-specific environmental impact studies to place restrictions when development is planned, based on more accurate site-specific criteria?
S18	It seems to us to be a very broad brush approach, based on provisional data; many NHS criteria have been overlain producing unintended consequences, which have been corrected ad hoc by adding more protection; the overlay of the landform criterion is redundant; there are other redundant criteria too, also based on low accuracy data, like the wildlife criterion. Owners are not really partners - they have no decision-making ability about their own land; and the plan is too restrictive at this stage - flexibility needs to be built in to permit later adjustments where appropriate.
S19	Here are our proposed solutions to help address the building land shortfall: make the landowners true partners - the partnerships are not very equal when the landowners provide the assets and the City takes the voting shares. If landowners feel they are real partners they'll be willing to be good stewards and everybody benefits.
S20	With landowners as real partners, you can easily correct unintended consequences or errors that arise from the overlays if you permit the landowners (with an environmental impact study) to remove 10 % of their NHS property (10% is an arbitrary number for the purpose of illustration - it could be something else). 10 percent gains 32 hectares for development, which is not a great cost to the NHS and doesn't really alter its integrity but brings the landowners on side. An added solution is to eliminate the highly redundant landform criterion. If there's a slope stability problem, the environmental impact study and engineering can handle it and that would be 40 ha more for development, all on hills. That would raise the development area from 34 % to 43 % without damaging consequences to the NHS. I don't know whether 43% is the right number but that's easy to vary by playing with the 10% suggested or with the linkages.
S21	In summary, for general suggestions - eliminate the 20% slope landform criterion - let landowners develop 10 percent, or some other reasonable fraction, of the land they own that meets NHS criteria -opt for fewer restrictions in the official plan and use environmental impact studies to restrict at the development stage rather than in advance. - permit automatic revision of the NHS if later better data justify it or through the secondary plan process..
S22	There were also specific requests related to our property. These would return to our discretion, subject to a robust permitting and regulation process, 5 acres (2 ha) of the 75 that are being removed but 1 or 2 of those acres will be used for linkage corridors. Finally, we propose some combination of both general solutions and specific requests .
S23	Here is our contact information. If there is no time for questions now, I'll be happy to talk to you later, or please phone or email. My sister Eleanor lives in Hamilton and the other, Joan, lives in the house on the property we've been discussing.
S24	Thank you for your attention. I have a lot of additional detailed information that I could supply by email and I have handouts here with a somewhat extended text. If I can take questions now, I'll be happy to do so.



Brownfields or Greenfields?

Consistency in City Planning

Comment on Guelph's Draft Official Plan

Kristi Mahy (BSc. Env.)



Benefits of Brownfield Development

- Rehabilitation and reuse of empty lands
- Intensification and revitalization of downtown
- Economic growth
- Efficient use of pre-existing infrastructure

The Pitfalls of Greenfield Development

- Loss of biodiversity and greenspace
- Negative impact on climate
- Cost of installing new infrastructure
- Large distance from population concentration & related business activity



Forward Thinking Planning

- Separate “employment lands” are becoming a thing of the past
 - Businesses looking to distinguish and innovate
- Creating vibrant, dense communities
- Efficient use of resources



Policy and Practice: Consistency

- Important to follow guidelines set out in Official Plan
- Emphasis on infill and intensification of downtown core
- Develop to encourage transit, walking and cycling, not car and truck traffic
- Reserve lands for agriculture and gardening within the city





May 10, 2010

Mr. Greg Atkinson
Community Design and Development Services
City Hall
1 Carden Street, 3rd Floor
Guelph, Ontario
N1H 3A1

Dear Mr. Atkinson:

As you know, Seaton Ridge Communities Ltd. Is planning a development at 146 Downey Road. Following a series of meetings and discussions with the developer, City planning staff and the adjacent community an agreement has been reached on a 45 unit residential condominium development that we believe will fit into our neighbourhood.

I understand that City Council will be dealing with the planning report recommending adoption of a by-law to implement the agreed upon development at its meeting on June 7, 2010. Since 146 Downey Road will be covered by a site-specific zoning by-law under the provisions of the in-force Official Plan, it would be inappropriate to re-designate the site as "Medium Density Residential" in the proposed Official Plan amendments. Any future developer should be bound by the same site-specific by-law, if, for whatever reason, Seaton Ridge were unable to develop this site.

I would like to formally request that the Official Plan designation for this site remain "General Residential".

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Beverly Smyth

We, Karen and Wayne Lee strongly oppose the amendment that changes the designation for 146 Downey Road from General Residential to Medium Density. Please record my opposition as a resident in Ward 6.

Karen Lee

As you know, Seaton Ridge Communities Ltd. is planning a development at 146 Downey Road. Following a series of meetings and lengthy, detailed discussions between the developer, City planning staff and the adjacent community, agreement has been reached on a 45-unit residential condominium development that we believe will fit well into our neighbourhood.

I understand that City Council will be dealing with the planning report recommending adoption of a by-law to implement the agreed upon development at its meeting on June 7, 2010. Since 146 Downey Road will be covered by a site-specific zoning by-law under the provisions of the in-force Official Plan, it would be inappropriate to re-designate the site as "Medium Density Residential" in the proposed Official Plan amendments. Any future developer should be bound by the same site-specific by-law, if, for whatever reason, Seaton Ridge were unable to develop the site.

As a resident of this neighbourhood, I would like to formally request that the Official Plan designation for this site remain "General Residential".

Thank you for your consideration,

Lynn and Luc Haman

To the City Clerk

Regarding Proposed Official Plan

To whom it may concern:

I am grateful to have this wonderful opportunity to facilitate the City in creating policy that will have direct bearing on Guelph's appearance, form and functionality. I wish to clarify comments I made at the last open house.

Of every single Guelph resident, one universal statement can be said. It is the nature of our bodies to decline and/ or age. Confronted with disease, disability, or dying, most people, in my professional experience, choose to remain in their own home, independent, as long as possible rather having to be placed in a retirement home, group home or long term care facility. However, that basic choice of independence relies upon community-based health care providers routinely and, often, daily coming to the home. Professional health care workers such as doctors, social workers, physiotherapists, occupational therapists, nurses, dieticians, speech-language pathologists, and personal support workers all have to have clear access to residents.

Unfortunately, a significant impediment is the lack of available parking for health care providers at housing complexes. Designated visitor parking is often full, if it is available at all. Consequently, health care providers frequently must waste precious time searching for a park spot, often some distance away then lugging whatever heavy equipment and supplies with them. If no parking can be found, health providers are left with somehow securing temporary permission to park.

Fortunately, this situation is easily remedied by the City. Please write policy requiring housing complexes, like apartment buildings, to create designated parking close to the main entrance.

Sincerely,

Michele Vindum MSW RSW

Mayor Farbridge, Councillors and Planning Staff:

Further to our telephone and email discussions with Mr. Greg Atkinson, we are writing to comment on the draft official plan.

(a) We are the registered owners of the northwest commercial/residential corner at College & Gordon. We are pleased to note that the draft official plan has shown this area as 'neighbourhood mixed use centre'; however, we would like clarification that the boundary of this designation includes, our contiguous holdings at this corner (both 363-369 Gordon Street as well as our additional holding at 1 College Avenue, immediately to the west of the corner.) Furthermore, the Old University CIP recommended that the corner be expanded to the north and west and accordingly, the draft OP should be specifically amended to reflect this. Can you please confirm by return mail or by memo in the OP the inclusion of these two properties in the boundary of this 'neighbourhood mixed use centre' as well as the intent to expand the corner as directed in the CIP.

(b) Again with respect to the same property, we note that the draft OP contains provisions for road widening at this corner. We are strongly opposed to any such widening. Any widening on the west side of Gordon Street or the north side of College would cause a severe and permanent loss of value, use and functionality of this important small neighbourhood site. Furthermore, any widening would be at the expense of the existing sidewalk, making it dangerous for pedestrians. Any road widening contemplated at this corner must therefore be taken on the east side of Gordon or south side of College.

(c) There is a provision for road widening at Victoria approaching Eramosa Road and Eramosa approaching Victoria Road. We would respectfully submit that the city has just completed reconstruction at this intersection and that reference be made in the OP specifically excluding any contemplated road widening at this intersection, or alternatively be taken from the City park on the northwest corner.

Please give us written response to our queries herein. Thank you.

Yours truly,

Robert Mason

Mason Real Estate Limited

To the Guelph City Council:

I am writing in respect to Schedule 7 of the draft Guelph Official Plan update. Residents of many neighbourhoods, particularly throughout the older parts of the City, are extremely frustrated by the City's lack of progress in implementing effective traffic calming measures. Road classification is part of the backbone to good traffic calming.

The example that concerns me most is Regent Street. The update in the OP provides an opportunity to reclassify it as a Local road. There are several reasons why it should not be classified as a Collector.

1. It is significantly narrower than the desired width for Collectors (which is a minimum of 8.5 metres of pavement). I wonder if in determining the width of Regent St city staff have incorrectly considered the two separate Regent Streets to be one street. Note that "lower" Regent is 5-10 metres below the elevation of "upper" Regent, and separated by a huge concrete wall. These two separate streets should not be considered to be one street. Is lower Regent proposed to be a collector as well? It neither leads from anywhere, nor goes anywhere, except to about 5 residences.

2. According to the OP, on collectors "direct access to private property may be permitted, but controlled to avoid traffic hazards." Nothing is being done to control traffic hazards for the residents of (upper) Regent St. Because it is on a hill, drivers are generally accelerating to climb it, or speeding down it. Regent is a short stretch of straight road, and it is difficult for residents exiting onto it from their driveways to see approaching vehicles in time.

3. It is very dangerous for pedestrians (and there are a lot of them) crossing at the corner of Regent and Grange. There is no sidewalk at the top of the stairs on Grange, so pedestrians have to cross at that corner. But there is no crosswalk to allow them to cross safely. Traffic volume and speeds are high as is common on collectors, and non-regulated; pedestrians do not have enough time to cross safely.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Meg Thorburn