

Council Chambers  
October 1, 2007 7:00 p.m.

**A meeting of Guelph City Council**

Present: Mayor Farbridge, Councillors Beard, Billings, Burcher, Farrelly, Findlay, Hofland, Kovach, Laidlaw (arrived at 7:05 p.m.), Piper, Salisbury and Wettstein

Absent: Councillor Bell

Staff Present: Mr. H. Loewig, Interim Chief Administrative Officer; Ms. T. Sinclair, Assistant City Solicitor; Mr. J. Riddell, Director of Community Design & Development Services; Mr. S. Hannah, Manager of Development & Parks Planning; Mr. A. Hearne, Senior Development Planner; Ms. M. Castellan, Senior Development Planner; Ms. T. Agnello, Deputy City Clerk; and Ms. D. Black, Assistant Council Committee Co-ordinator

**DECLARATIONS UNDER MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT**

Councillor Kovach declared a possible pecuniary interest with regard to 308 Stevenson Street North because family members own property in the vicinity and she did not discuss or vote on the matter.

1. Moved by Councillor Piper  
Seconded by Councillor Findlay  
THAT Sections 16.(4)(i), 16(4)(ii), and 16(5) of Procedural By-law Number (1996)-15200, as amended, regarding the recording of votes for all motions other than procedural, be suspended for this meeting of Council.

Carried

**PLANNING PUBLIC MEETING**

**308 Stevenson Street North: Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment (ZC0713)- Ward 2**

Ms. M. Castellan, Senior Development Planner, advised this zoning amendment is to allow the construction of a semi-detached dwelling, a new detached dwelling and to allow for a specialized regulation for minimum lot frontage due to the “flag lot” configuration. The proposal also includes the demolition of the

existing detached house. She stated that some of the concerns raised by the public to date include the building design & height, the driveway location and traffic impact.

Mr. Bruce Donaldson was present representing the owner of the property. He provided hand out material for the public present and council members and staff. He explained the flag lot and semi-detached dwelling would meet with provincial guidelines and stated that meetings with staff have resulted in this format of the property. He believes the existing screening of the property would be more than sufficient and the proposed development will fit into the neighbourhood.

Ms. Diane Blair, a resident of the area, was present and raised the concern that the development would be very close to her building and was concerned that because of the height of the building, people would be looking down onto her property and she would lose her privacy. She also stated the location of the driveway would create traffic concerns especially if cars were parked along the front. The property being in a school zone and safety of the children was also raised. She then stated that the noise and traffic levels will increase and create a negative impact on the neighbourhood. Her other concern was that the other large lots in the area may also be severed in the future and thus create a much denser neighbourhood.

Laura Gatto on behalf of Lucy & Guido Gatto, owners of property in the vicinity of the property, stated they are not opposed to the development of the lot but believe a semi-detached building does not conform to the existing neighbourhood. She stated they also were concerned about the raised bungalow looking over them as well and suggested smaller bungalows would be more suitable. Stevenson Street is very busy already and they are concerned about the increase of traffic.

Staff was requested to provide maps that would show setbacks on adjacent houses, and the location of the buildings on Skov and Pleasant in order to provide a visual of how close the building will be to the adjacent buildings and property. Staff was also requested to arrange an opportunity for the residents to meet with the builder/owner/staff to come to an agreement. Staff was asked to provide information on the City's direction with respect to flag lots and general policies for same.

Council was advised that the compatibility will be addressed in the staff report and building design conditions will be invoked. Staff clarified that the entrance is a private drive and not a roadway.

Mr. J. Riddell

2. Moved by Councillor Burcher  
Seconded by Councilor Salisbury  
THAT Report 07-90 dated October 1, 2007 regarding a Zoning By-law amendment for the property municipally known as 308 Stevenson Street North from Community Design and Development Services be received.

Carried

**35 Mountford Drive: Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment (ZC0714) – Ward 1**

Mr. S. Hannah, Manager of Development & Parks Planning advised that this application proposes to change the existing institutional zone to a specialized residential apartment zone to permit a 129 unit townhouse and apartment style condominium development. A portion of the subject lands are also proposed to be rezoned from an institutional zone to a community park zone as a reconfiguration of the adjacent parkland. The development includes a total of 84 stacked townhouses and 45 apartment units with common parking areas that total 175 spaces. A total of 27 parking spaces for the public park are also part of this proposal and a six metre wide secondary emergency access to Watt Street that would also be utilized as pedestrian access are also a part of this proposal. He stated that the applicant has had several meetings with the neighbourhood over the past couple of months and that a site plan was provided in June at the neighbourhood meeting. Staff will be addressing a number of issues as a result of the previous meetings including: density, traffic impacts, safety and parking issues and how it will interface with the park and compatibility with adjacent properties. The proposal will be evaluated against general residential density and urban design objectives. He also said that park configuration and servicing – particularly storm water management and sewer capacity are being addressed. He then informed Council that Mr. Jim Fryett and Mr. Jan Tatura are also present to address the issues and provide information.

The Manager of Development and Parks Planning explained that they are looking at reducing the car ratio because it is anticipated not all tenants will have a vehicle and they are considering a car co-op for this area as well. Outdoor usage such as a common area for social interaction and a playground are also under consideration.

In response to questions raised from the letter from Guelph Non-Profit Housing with respect to easement issues, Council was advised these issues will be resolved before a recommendation would come forward from staff. He stated that conveyance of property and parking issues associated with the park will also be addressed.

Mr. Jim Fryett, Architect addressed Council to provide further information on this application and he stated Mr. Jan Tatura of Options for Homes and Sarah Austin of Gamsby & Mannerow, were also present and could address site servicing issues. He advised that their drawings are at the schematic design stage after consultation with the city and neighbours. The required parking needed would be 167 spaces at a ratio of 1.28. The units are smaller units for first time buyers and many would not have an automobile. He believes a severance of land would be involved in this application. He told Council that an open accessible approach to the park is being taken and boundaries and buffers would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

Mrs. Sherry Ellis, representing the residents within the area was present to state that the neighbourhood did not object to the development but had concerns regarding the impact of the increased traffic flow onto Mountford Drive and the impact on water pressure and storm sewer management. The neighbourhood are happy about the provision of park parking but have concerns with having just one proposed driveway. She advised that vandalism, alcohol and drugs in the park could potentially get worse with this development. She also stated that residents at a higher elevation than the park already have limited water pressure and sewage back ups and wondered how this issue will be addressed with the added demands this development would bring. She also raised the issues of hazardous winter driving on the hill on Mountford Drive and trying to exit onto Eastview Road; especially during peak periods.

Mr. Bill Gardner was present to summarize concerns expressed at the neighbourhood meetings and concurred with Mrs. Ellis. He stated the number of units was a concern due to traffic impact, and water demand. There was also the issue of the building height being out of character and obtrusive for the street frontage. He enquired whether the City could do something with the intersection at Victoria Road and Cassino Avenue if this development occurs in order to address the increase traffic flow that would result. He addressed the following parking issues: poor segregation of park parking and visitor parking for the development and the low ratio of parking spots. He would like the City to study whether two entrances can be provided, if safety at the entrance can be assured, and whether parking may not be enough for future needs and if the parking arrangements for the park and development are adequately segregated. He felt the signage on the property is premature and should not be up until the zoning amendment has been approved.

Ms. Ruth Ann Finnigan, a resident in the area, was present to express concerns with regard to the roadway going into the parkway. She would like the assurance of a privacy buffer between her property and the park. She stated that visibility is an

issue at the entranceway, especially in the winter. She advised that the road is treacherous in winter conditions. She also expressed concern that the 27 spaces for the park will not be sufficient and when the ball diamond is in use, cars are parked all down the road further inhibiting visibility. She believes a shared vehicle issue is great idea but wonders how it will work in reality.

Mr. Daniel Green, a resident within the vicinity of the proposal, stated that he had the same concerns as the previous delegations. He reiterated that the height of the units is an issue and he would like to see less number of units. He stated that he hopes the development will be high quality and energy efficient units and decent landscaping for privacy and view. He also agreed that the developer's signage is premature.

Ms. Kim Genesis, a resident of the area shared her concerns around the density of the development and the density of the neighbourhood of moderate income housing in the area. She also noted parking as an issue, and she would like a facelift of the park itself and assurances that the property will be maintained.

Council requested staff to review the road maintenance level and determine if the development would change its designation. It was also requested that staff give more thought to the general layout to avoid the single loaded road surrounding the development.

Staff advised that the signage on the property is in compliance. Staff also advised they will be examining how to balance the intensification with the existing neighbourhood.

Council requested comprehensive traffic information, a map showing the grading and the height of the building to provide a better understanding of exactly how the development fits with the adjacent properties.

3. Moved by Councillor Findlay  
Seconded by Councillor Burcher

Jim Riddell

THAT Report 07-87 dated October 1, 2007 regarding an application for a zoning by-law amendment for property municipally known as 35 Mountford Drive from Community Design and Development Services be received.

Carried

**1820 Gordon Street: Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment (ZC0611) – Ward 1**

Mr. A. Hearne, Senior Development Planner, advised this application applies only to a part of the overall property at 1820 Gordon Street South and the purpose is to enhance the commercial

zoning on the lands to include additional retail uses to respond to the “Mixed Use Node” designation on the site. The amendment is also proposing to amend existing zoning regulations related to parking ratio, building height and front yard setbacks. The amendment includes the large commercial block proposed at the south east corner of the Gordon Street/Clair Road intersection which is approximately 13.3 acres and is occupied by the buildings associated with the former “Pergola Drive-In” private outdoor recreation establishment.

Council requested staff to address this property’s importance as a gateway into the city when determining setbacks and streetscapes.

In response to questions from Council, staff advised that they are communicating with transit with respect to what services will be available to this development and the surrounding area and that the street names are under consideration but not approved yet.

Mr. Gordon Drieger, on behalf of the applicant, was present to provide further information on this application and advised Ms. Christine Yee and Mr. Derek Paul for First Capital Realty were also present to answer questions if necessary. He advised that they are also the owner and developer of the shopping centre on the northeast corner of Clair and Gordon which is just over 13 acres of commercial property. Their intention is to proceed with Phase 1 of the Commercial Block. And the residential portion does not currently have an allocation and is tied up with water issues in that quadrant. He stated they have been working with staff to improve the plans and they are committed to lead certification of its development. They propose to add a retail store and a building supply store to provide a wider range of retail uses. He stated that this will be a “LEED” (Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design) development.

Discussion then ensued with respect to how the City will be able to move forward from permitted uses to prescribed uses. Staff advised they are working towards developing this, however, various City policies and documents must be considered during the process and it will take some time before recommendations could come before Council. Once a policy is set, it could be implemented only on applications coming in afterward, and not be retroactive as prescribed under *The Planning Act*.

Council requested staff to review the location of the loading docks, street elevation, urban design, sighting issues and address the issue of the large number of drive thrus being proposed.

Mr. J. Riddell

4. Moved by Councillor Billings  
 Seconded by Councillor Burcher  
 THAT Report 07-91 dated October 1, 2007 regarding a zoning by-law amendment for property municipally known as 1820 Gordon Street South from Community Design and Development Services be received.

Carried

**1 Creekside Drive: Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment (ZC0702)-Ward 6**

Mr. S. Hannah, Manager of Development & Parks Planning, advised the purpose of this application would be to permit the development of 8 lots for detached dwellings; with two lots being proposed with a minimum lot frontage of 15 metres on Creekside Drive and the remaining six lots with a minimum lot frontage of nine metres on Watson Road. The proposal would allow the owner to proceed with the creation of the eight single detached lots through future consent to sever applications to be considered by the Committee of Adjustment. He also stated no direct access from Watson Parkway would be provided to the proposed lots. Staff approves of this application and feels it would complete the Watson East Subdivision.

Ms. N. Shoemaker was present and spoke on behalf of the applicant of the proposal. She reiterated that at the time the Watson East Subdivision was begun, Watson Road ran through the property and could not be developed at that time, but the servicing was designed based on the current development.

Mr. J. Riddell  
 Mr. R. Henry  
 Mr. B. Stewart  
 Mr. B. Donaldson

5. Moved by Councillor Kovach  
 Seconded by Councillor Billings  
 THAT Report 07-88 regarding a zoning by-law amendment for the property known as 1 Creekside Drive from Community Design and Development Services dated October 1, 2007, be received;

AND THAT the application by Black, Shoemaker, Robinson and Donaldson Ltd. on behalf of Carson Reid Homes Ltd. for a Zoning By-law Amendment from the UR (Urban Reserve) Zone and P.1 (Conservation Land) Zone to the R.1B (Single Detached Residential) Zone and R.1D (Single Detached Residential) Zone affecting the property municipally known as 1 Creekside Drive and legally described as part of Lots 5 and 6, Concession 3, Division C and Part of Original Road Allowance between Lots 5 and 6, Concession 3, Division C, partly contained in Parts 1, 2 and 7, Plan 61R-9936 in the City of Guelph, be approved in accordance with the regulations and conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the Community Design and Development Services report dated October 1, 2007.

Carried

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 9:35 o'clock p.m.

Minutes read and confirmed October 15, 2007.

.....  
Mayor

.....  
Deputy Clerk