

# STAFF REPORT



TO City Council

SERVICE AREA Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment

DATE December 2, 2013

**SUBJECT Statutory Public Meeting for Proposed Official Plan Amendment 54: Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan**

REPORT NUMBER 13-62

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

Statutory Public Meeting - To provide information about proposed Official Plan Amendment 54 for the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan.

### KEY FINDINGS

The public release and circulation of the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan in October 2012 resulted in over 40 responses that helped shape Official Plan Amendment 54. OPA 54 reflects much of this input and continues to support the City's updated Official Plan policies and builds on the Local Growth Management Strategy, Community Energy Initiative, and recent economic development strategies including Prosperity 2020 and the Agri-Innovation Cluster Strategy. The natural heritage system and cultural heritage resources remain foundational to the future development of the lands through the inclusion of policies that address the protection, conservation and enhancement of these resources and reinvigorating the historic reformatory. Land use designations supporting employment and residential uses have been adjusted and additional flexibility has been added to the built form policies to respond to input while maintaining the ability to meet population and employment targets for the secondary plan area.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Capital Budget approval has been given by Council for completion of the Secondary Plan at \$340,000. An FCM Green Municipal Fund grant will contribute \$142,252 towards the budget. The first FCM instalment of \$75,188.79 has been received.

### ACTION REQUIRED

Council will hear public delegations on the proposed amendment, ask questions of clarification and identify issues. The report is to be received and no decisions are to be made at this time.

## RECOMMENDATION

1. That Report 13-62 regarding proposed Official Plan Amendment 54 (OPA 54) for the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan from Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment dated December 2, 2013 be received.

## BACKGROUND

The City of Guelph initiated the preparation of a Secondary Plan for the Guelph Innovation District (GID) in early 2005. The draft Secondary Plan implements the City's Official Plan policies and builds on the Local Growth Management Strategy, Community Energy Initiative, and recent economic development strategies including Prosperity 2020 and the Agri-Innovation Cluster Strategy. The work has encompassed extensive public consultation and coordination efforts with the Province of Ontario who is the primary landowner within the GID, owning roughly half of the lands. Key project milestones have been the subject of various Committee and Council reports to receive Council support of foundational pieces leading to the development of the draft Secondary Plan. In addition, a number of community engagement opportunities have been provided to stakeholders throughout the development of the GID Secondary Plan policies (see Attachment 1 for GID Project Milestones).

An analysis of design precedents, public feedback on potential design elements, and a design charrette were instrumental in the development of the preferred design, vision, principles and objectives. A design booklet entitled "Guelph Innovation District Recommended Option Booklet", was produced and included as an attachment to PBEE Committee Report No. 11-104 dated December 12, 2011. The preferred vision, principles, objectives and design developed for the GID was supported by Council on January 30, 2012 (Council Report 12-18). The draft Secondary Plan was presented to PBEE on October 15, 2012 which was followed by a public open house on November 28, 2012.

### Location

The GID Secondary Plan area consists of a land area of approximately 436 ha located south of York Road, east of Victoria Road South, west of Watson Parkway South, and includes lands south of Stone Road (See Attachment 2 for GID Location map).

### Existing Official Plan Land Use Designation and Policies

The majority of the lands are currently designated as "Special Study Area" by the City's Official Plan, requiring the completion of a planning study to "examine future land uses, servicing, phasing of development, transportation and impact assessment on natural heritage features and cultural heritage resources." The draft Secondary Plan implements the City's Official Plan policies by providing a comprehensive land use plan for the GID area in conformity with new policy

# STAFF REPORT



directions incorporated through the update of the City's Official Plan, including growth plan targets. There are also a number of other land use designations within the GID Secondary Plan area which are proposed to be carried forward (i.e. existing service commercial and industrial designations) or are proposed to be redesignated (i.e. major institutional).

## REPORT

### **Purpose and Effect of OPA 54**

The Guelph Innovation District (GID) Secondary Plan is based on extensive planning work completed during 2005-2013 to determine a new use and appropriate land use policies for the former Guelph Correctional Centre and other lands, while ensuring growth management targets for the area are met. The GID Secondary Plan policies amend the current 2001 Official Plan and build on the Local Growth Management Strategy and associated OPA 39 and policy directions of the Official Plan Update (OPA 42 and OPA 48) with linkages to the Community Energy Plan and Economic Development Strategies (Prosperity 2020 and Agri-Innovation Cluster Strategy). The Secondary Plan references and enhances the policies introduced through the Official Plan Update. The GID Secondary Plan presents a vision, principles, land use designations and policies to guide development within the GID Plan area to the year 2031.

Attachment 3 provides the draft Official Plan Amendment 54 for the GID Secondary Plan.

### **Overview of Amendment**

OPA 54 replaces the existing land use designations and policies of the 2001 Official Plan (as amended) as they relate to the GID with new land use designations and policies by inserting a new subsection to Chapter 11 Secondary Plans entitled 'Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan.' The subsection contains a detailed set of land use and development policies to guide all future development within the plan area; support conservation, protection and enhancement of the natural heritage system and cultural heritage resources; promote best practices for sustainable infrastructure and community design to contribute towards the achievement of carbon neutrality; identify collector road alignments and active transportation opportunities; and provide a high level urban design direction to guide the creation of a unique and memorable place. The Secondary Plan includes four Schedules related to mobility, land use, built form elements and block plan areas.

The Secondary Plan consists of the following sections:

- Vision, Principles and Objectives;
- Natural and Cultural Heritage;
- Energy, Servicing and Stormwater;
- Mobility;
- The Public Realm;

- Land Use and Built Form; and
- Interpretation and Implementation.

The policies generally follow the structure of the Official Plan Update (OPA 42 and 48) and make references to and/or enhance the policies of the Official Plan.

Definitions and policies may be repeated where they directly relate to the GID, given the status of OPA 42 which is currently under appeal and OPA 48 which is awaiting provincial approval are not in full force and effect.

## **Description of Secondary Plan Sections**

Each Section of the GID Secondary Plan is described below followed by a summary of revisions made since the release of the draft in October 2012.

### **Section 11.2.2 Vision, Principles and Objectives**

The GID Secondary Plan policies begin with the guiding vision, principles and objectives for the GID, formulated as part of an extensive public engagement process as outlined in Attachment 1. The vision focuses on the creation of a compact, mixed use community providing meaningful places to live, work, shop, play and learn. The employment area is intended to be innovative and supportive of an urban village connecting residential areas with compatible employment uses. The area respects and supports the rich natural and cultural heritage resources of the area including the stunning Eramosa River Valley and the historic Reformatory Complex. The mix of uses, prioritization of active transportation modes (pedestrian and cyclist), and protection of natural and cultural heritage features, all contribute to the achievement of carbon neutrality targets for the GID.

The following six (6) principles provide the foundation for the policies of the Secondary Plan and are the basis of the objectives:

- Protect What is Valuable;
- Create Sustainable and Energy Efficient Infrastructure;
- Establish a Multi-modal Pedestrian-focused Mobility System;
- Create an Attractive and Memorable Place;
- Promote a Diversity of Land Uses and Densities; and
- Grow Innovative Employment Opportunities.

### **Section 11.2.3 Natural and Cultural Heritage**

The Natural Heritage System and cultural heritage resources are important identifiable elements within the GID that are to be conserved, protected and enhanced as the area develops. The importance of the Eramosa River Valley and its associated natural heritage elements, including the topography of the site, are key policy drivers. Recognition is also given to the Provincially Significant Earth Science ANSI (Area of Natural and Scientific Interest) located east of the Eramosa River. The cultural heritage policies cover cultural heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and public views and public vistas. Specific references are made to both the historic Reformatory Complex and the Turfgrass Institute Building (G.M Frost Centre). The protection of the Turfgrass Institute Building is encouraged; the policies contained within the Official Plan further support the



conservation and protection of this resource. The natural heritage system and cultural heritage resource policies build upon and/or rely upon the Official Plan policies introduced by OPA 42 and 48, respectively.

Appendix A identifies cultural heritage resources along with the cultural heritage landscape within the GID. The Appendix also includes the Natural Heritage System (for context), existing and proposed roads, the Eramosa River and other waterbodies, site contours, proposed river crossing and existing built forms as reference elements to provide context. The Natural Heritage System is shown for contextual reasons given the connections between natural and cultural heritage elements and their importance to shaping future development within the GID.

### **Section 11.2.4 Energy, Servicing and Stormwater**

Innovative and integrated approaches to land use planning, urban design, energy planning, sustainable servicing and stormwater design are essential to work towards the achievement of carbon neutrality. In particular, policies that address the mixing of uses, close proximity of residential land uses with compatible employment opportunities, density of development, prioritization of an active transportation network, and the layout of road networks to support solar orientation, provide the foundation for the use of renewable energy sources, district energy systems and reduced energy demand. Development within the GID will rely to a large extent on the policies contained within the City's Official Plan, as amended by OPA 48 in terms of Community Energy. Connections to the City's Community Energy Plan are made along with support of water conservation efforts and stormwater management initiatives including Low Impact Development (LID).

### **Section 11.2.5 Mobility**

A multi-modal pedestrian-focused mobility system is supported to prioritize active transportation (walking and cycling) and public transit forms. The use of transportation demand management is essential to support the carbon neutral vision of the GID. The transportation system is designed to be continuous and connected; providing essential and effective linkages between land uses and activities. Parking policies reinforce the carbon neutral vision of the GID by encouraging shared parking arrangements, supporting on-site parking reductions and priority parking for carpool vehicles, alternative energy vehicles, car-shares, scooters and motorcycles; where appropriate.

Schedule A: Mobility displays the existing arterial roads along the perimeter of the site, rail line, trail network, proposed active transportation links (including a new river crossing), proposed transit stops and two proposed collector roads (College Avenue East extension and New Street 'A' linking Victoria Road South with Stone Road East). Existing local roads are shown along with two proposed local roads (one connecting Victoria Road South with New Street 'A', and another one south of Stone Road East).

The layout for the majority of anticipated local roads will be established through the development approval process. The policies address the desire for a single loaded perimeter local road along the west side of the Eramosa River Valley that would follow the Natural Heritage System and maintain public access and open views of the river corridor. Consideration of the potential for a local road connection from York Road to Dunlop Drive through the historic Reformatory Complex is also referenced in the policies.

### **Section 11.2.6 The Public Realm**

The public realm policies address the design and development of publicly owned spaces and the relationship of the built and natural environment to these spaces. Policies for streets are supportive of active transportation modes (walking and cycling) by ensuring the design of safe, accessible, functional and attractive pedestrian-oriented environments that balance the motor vehicular needs of the road network. Mid-block pedestrian and bicyclist connections are supported as a means to interconnect all modes of travel including the City's trail network.

Parks and open space policies support the creation of two new parks (a neighbourhood park and a community park), shown symbolically on Schedule B: Land Use to meet the active and passive recreational needs of the residents and employees of the GID. The neighbourhood park will be located within the residential lands north of College Avenue E. and the community park will be located within the Employment Mixed-use 1 lands to the south. Parks and open space are to occupy prominent locations within the GID, recognizing their ability to serve as gathering places for the immediate and surrounding area. Final locations, size and design considerations will be determined in accordance with the policies of the Official Plan and through the development approvals process.

Additional public realm considerations include: tree canopy coverage; linkages between parks and open spaces, the trail network and stormwater management facilities; public art; and community engagement opportunities such as community gardens.

### **Section 11.2.7 Land Use and Built Form**

The land use and built form policies of the Secondary Plan along with Schedule B: Land Use, provide the framework for the pattern of development including land uses and built form (e.g. building type, density and height). This layout of land uses is informed by the Vision, Principles and Objectives of the Secondary Plan and supported by the other policies of the Secondary Plan and Official Plan. The land use policies support the Official Plan targets for population and jobs, minimum separation distances between sensitive land uses and existing industrial uses, and the conservation of natural and cultural heritage resources.

The population and employment target ranges of 3,000 – 5,000 people and 8,000 – 10,000 jobs provided in the draft GID Secondary Plan were determined through the City's growth plan strategy work. The background work to the GID Secondary Plan

# STAFF REPORT



refined the target range through detailed design and built form objectives. OPA 54 policies present a target of 4,400 people and 9,100 jobs which contributes to the City's overall population target of 175,000. The refined target is based on the vision and built form objectives and policies for the GID which are focused on the development of a compact, mixed use community that will predominately serve as the home of innovative, sustainable employment uses with an adjacent urban village connecting residential and compatible employment uses. These policies guide the location, amount, type and form of residential and employment development permitted within the GID. The residential and employment lands within the greenfield area of the GID are required to be planned and designed to contribute toward the achievement of the overall greenfield area density target for the City. As such, the GID is planned to achieve an overall minimum density target that is not less than 90 persons and jobs combined per hectare. In comparison the City's urban growth centre is planned to achieve an overall minimum density target that is not less than 150 persons and jobs combined per hectare.

The land use structure works with the topography of the site and includes collector roads, a proposed river crossing, nodes at intersections of arterial and collector roads, and flexible land use permissions to support a mix of employment, residential and commercial uses. The natural heritage system designation is included for context as per OPA 42 which is currently under appeal but does not form part of the GID Secondary Plan OPA.

The layout of land uses on Schedule B is supported by a modified grid and block pattern that facilitates a compact, transit-oriented community while ensuring flexibility within the road network to accommodate a range of traffic volumes and types, and providing greater efficiency with respect to the provision of municipal services. The transit-oriented design locates density at nodes at the intersection of arterial and collector roads and promotes connections between residential and employment uses thereby reducing trip generation and parking requirements.

The policies and land use schedule include land use categories specific to the GID and existing land use designations, reflecting new designation terminology introduced by Council adopted OPA 48. The existing land use designations include Open Space and Park, Major Utility, Industrial, Service Commercial, and Neighbourhood Commercial Centre.

The following new land use categories are introduced for the GID area: Adaptive Re-use, Mixed-use Corridor (GID), Employment Mixed-use 1, Employment Mixed-use 2, Residential and Glenholme Estate Residential Area.

## **Adaptive Re-use:**

The cultural heritage landscape and built heritage resources of the historic reformatory complex, located in the northeast portion of the site, are designated as Adaptive Re-use. The Adaptive Re-use designation is intended to support a wide range of uses to bring a new purpose to the cultural heritage resources that is

# STAFF REPORT



respectful of the existing built heritage form and cultural heritage landscape features. Permitted uses include institutional, educational, commercial, office, light industrial, residential, live/work and open space and park.

## **Mixed-use Corridor (GID):**

Lands designated Mixed-use Corridor (GID) are located at nodes and along arterial and collector roads. The designation permits medium and high density residential development and other uses that would support the GID's residential and employment population including commercial, entertainment, institutional, educational, and live/work. Schedule C: Built Form Elements reflects the establishment of a minimum height of four storeys and a maximum height of 6 storeys which is increased to 10 storeys within the identified nodes. Free-standing residential development is permitted with a minimum density of 100 units/ha and a maximum density of 150 units/ha. Development within the nodes and along the identified Main Street will be compact with retail and other service uses animating the ground floors of all buildings at the street edge.

## **Employment Mixed-use 1:**

The majority of employment land, outside of the Industrial and Major Utility designations, occurs within the Employment Mixed-use 1 designation primarily located north of Stone Road East, west of the Eramosa River with a smaller pocket south of Stone Road. The designation permits a mix of office, research and development, commercial and institutional uses along with live/work. The permitted uses are intended to be higher density and supportive of the area's role as a knowledge-based innovation centre.

Within the Employment Mixed-use 1 designation a specific area, south of the College Ave. E. extension, has been identified on Schedule B as subject to a special policy that may permit residential uses. The ability to permit residential uses would be subject to the satisfaction of criteria specifically related to the achievement of population and employment targets, density targets, compatibility with adjacent employment uses and demonstration that the lands are not required for employment uses over the long term.

## **Employment Mixed-use 2:**

The Employment Mixed-use 2 designation located at the southeast corner of the GID, permits the same uses as Employment Mixed-use 1 with the exception of residential uses (i.e. live/work). The built form policies are structured to provide a buffer for the residential areas south of Stone Road East from the Major Utility and Industrial uses north of Stone Road East.

## **Residential:**

Residential lands are designated north of the College Avenue East extension in the vicinity of the Turfgrass Institute. The predominant land use is medium density housing forms (apartments and townhouses) with a limited supply of low density housing forms (single and semi-detached dwellings). Additional uses include

# STAFF REPORT



live/work, community services, schools, child care centres, convenience commercial and parks. The maximum net density is 150 units per ha with a minimum net density of 35 units per ha. Heights set in Schedule C: Built Form Elements range from 2 to 5 storeys.

## **Glenholme Estate Residential Area:**

The Glenholme Estate Residential Area designation applies to the majority of the existing estate rural residential development located at the southeast corner of the GID along Glenholme Drive. The designation would recognize existing estate residential uses and allow limited infill residential development on interim private services. The policies only permit the following uses: single detached dwelling, accessory apartment and home occupation. Minimum lot size requirements are set and only existing lots that are 1.0 ha in size or greater may be considered for severance. The new policy also specifies that the City may impose conditions such as requiring proponents to enter into an agreement with the City related to ongoing operation and maintenance of interim private services and the requirement for the property owner to connect to full services when they become available at their own expense. (See page 11 of this report for further information about the policies for Glenholme Drive.)

## **Proposed Park:**

Schedule B identifies the proposed general location of two new parks with a symbol. Specific policies regarding park space are included in the Public Realm section of the GID Secondary Plan and open space and park policies of the Official Plan. In general the City's Official Plan does not designate all municipal park spaces since they are permitted in all designations. The conceptual location of the future neighbourhood and community parks will be finalized through the development approvals and park planning process and will be further refined with consideration to the City's recreational needs at the time of development. The conceptual design of future parks and the enhancement of existing parks will involve community consultation.

## **Built Form Elements**

Schedule C: Built Form Elements, provides a height schedule in the Secondary Plan which is supplemented by the height and density policies contained within the Plan. Height regulations within the GID are based on protecting public views, making use of existing grades, and to allow for transit supportive development, and recognizing transportation capacity. Key public views are illustrated in Appendix A and include western views towards the downtown and north-eastern views towards the historic reformatory complex and Eramosa River Valley. These views are planned to be protected through the development approvals process.

## **Section 11.2.8 Interpretation and Implementation**

The Secondary Plan concludes with policies for the actions and tools that will be used to implement the plan. The GID Secondary Plan is also subject to the

# STAFF REPORT



interpretation and implementation policies of the Official Plan and the Zoning By-law will implement the policies and schedules of the GID Secondary Plan. Future development within the GID will be coordinated through Block Plans. The block plan approach ensures that lands are developed comprehensively in an orderly, cost efficient and timely manner, and that the development of each block plan area contributes to achieving the overall GID population, employment and density targets. Schedule D: Block Plan Areas illustrates four block plan areas. Each Block Plan Area has a population target, employment target, residential density and employment density to achieve. The residential density target is set at 75 units per net hectare for three of the Block Plan Areas. Employment density targets for each Block Plan Area range from 85 jobs per net hectare for Block Plan Area 3 up to 135 jobs per net hectare for Block Plan Area 1. Block Plan Area 4, which includes the area designated as Adaptive Re-use, has an employment target of 500 jobs and no set residential or employment densities, to ensure maximum flexibility given anticipated development challenges in repurposing the extensive cultural heritage resources on site. The Zoning By-law will regulate the mix of uses within each block plan area. The completion and approval of a block plan will be required prior to the approval of any development application within the block plan area.

The GID Secondary Plan includes policies for the establishment of a design review committee and the use of height and density bonusing within the nodes identified within the Mixed-use Corridor (GID) designation, in exchange for priority community benefits, including benefits from carbon neutrality.

The Secondary Plan policies will be further supported by a GID Implementation Strategy, alternative development standards and additional studies that may be required prior to block plan approval. The GID Implementation Strategy will be critical to further articulate, coordinate and activate the implementation of the Secondary Plan, specifically components of the Plan related to achieving carbon neutral development. The implementation strategy will identify carbon neutrality targets and describe a range of mechanisms, tools and initiatives that may be used to achieve the identified targets. The additional studies that may be required include a stormwater management assessment analysis and district energy feasibility study.

The policies direct the City to take a partnership approach with the Province and other key stakeholders to work towards the effective and efficient development of the lands which encompasses assessing: site/servicing development models for priority areas including the extension of College Avenue East; development of research and development clusters with post-secondary institutions; redevelopment of the historic reformatory complex; and coordination of marketing and business development efforts targeting knowledge based innovation sector businesses.

The Secondary Plan also includes key definitions to support the policies.

# STAFF REPORT

## **Summary of Public Input and Refinements made to Draft Secondary Plan**

The GID Draft Secondary Plan was presented to PBEE Committee on October 15, 2012 and circulated for comments. A public open house was held on November 28, 2012 which included display panels, a staff presentation and opportunities to ask questions of project team members. Attachment 4 contains the comments received from the public, stakeholders and agencies. Staff's response to comments is included as Attachment 5. The policies presented in the previous section reflect staff responses to comments received as well as changes made as a result of an internal review of the draft Secondary Plan.

The following general themes emerged from the comments and are discussed below:

- Support for the Natural Heritage System, Cultural Heritage Resources and Energy Policies;
- Glenholme Drive Development;
- Land Use Mix and Built Form Flexibility; and
- Implementation.

## **Support for the Natural Heritage System, Cultural Heritage Resources and Energy Policies**

### **Comment Summary**

A number of comments were received in support of the vision and general policy direction of the GID Secondary Plan. The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport wanted to ensure the former use of the lands were recognized and that new development would be integrated within the existing natural and cultural heritage resources and not the other way around. Support was also given to energy initiatives including water conservation and solar collection opportunities that will be managed by the development approval process and the City's Water Conservation Strategy. A specific request was made to mandate rainwater collection and reuse.

### **Staff Response**

Policies have been reworded to clarify and reinforce the intent to work with existing site conditions, including the Natural Heritage System and cultural heritage resources and connect new development with these resources. The Secondary Plan policies provide guidance and support to existing tools and processes including the City's Water Conservation Strategy and development approval process. The request to mandate rainwater collection and reuse could not be accommodated since it falls outside of the City's legislative authority although it is encouraged in ICI development. The policies also support implementation of the City's Water Conservation and Efficiency Strategy.

## **Glenholme Drive Development**

### **Comment Summary**

Residents of Glenholme Drive have requested that new policies be included in the Secondary Plan to allow infill development on private water and wastewater

# STAFF REPORT



services. In addition they requested to be removed from Phase 4 of the phasing strategy and placed in Phase 1 so development could occur immediately.

## **Staff Response**

A number of residents have been requesting the right to intensify the development of their lands since they were annexed into the City in 1993. The draft Secondary Plan released in October 2012 continued to require new development to be on full municipal services as per the Official Plan and Provincial Policy Statement. In response to staff's presentation of the draft Secondary Plan, Council passed the following resolution on October 22, 2012:

"THAT Committee Report No. 12-89, dated October 15, 2012 from Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment, regarding the Guelph Innovation District Draft Secondary Plan be received;

AND THAT the correspondence regarding the Special Residential Area received by the Planning & Building, Engineering and Environment Committee be referred to staff to explore alternative servicing prior to the scheduled January, 2013 Statutory Public Meeting for the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan;

AND THAT staff consider how flexibility can be incorporated into the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan regarding the development of the Specialized Residential Area."

Numerous meetings have been held with the residents along with Planning, Engineering, and Water Services staff to find an appropriate response to the residents' concerns and to Council's direction. The area along Glenholme Drive is an isolated small cluster of existing low density residential estate lots on private individual services. It is essentially rural style development at the edge of the City annexed into the City over 20 years ago. There are no short or medium term plans to service the area and the residents are looking for a minor infill opportunity that they would have been provided prior to the annexation. In the latest meeting with the residents, staff discussed a policy approach that appeared to satisfy residents' concerns and also minimized staff concerns with allowing an interim change in servicing direction for the Glenholme Drive area.

The revised policy would permit limited infill development on interim private services subject to specific criteria to minimize the amount of additional residential growth and respect the existing character of development in the area. The development criteria allow the residents to meet their needs while minimizing the City's increased risk due to the allowance of interim private services which is not permitted or supported elsewhere in the City.

## **Land Use Mix and Built Form Flexibility Comment Summary**

The majority of comments received on the draft GID Secondary Plan dealt with proposed land uses and the perceived flexibility of built form policies. Specifically, Infrastructure Ontario expressed concerns with the limited range and balance of



# STAFF REPORT



residential development and the amount of lands designated for employment purposes. As part of their comments they submitted a revised land use schedule (accompanied by an employment land analysis) and proposed:

- 1) increase in area of the residential designation to extend south of the proposed extension of College Avenue E., reducing the amount of lands designated Employment Mixed-use 1 almost in half;
- 2) revisions to the location, size and configuration of the proposed two new park spaces and;
- 3) reductions in the amount of Mixed-use Corridor(GID) lands.

In regards to built form policies, comments suggested increases to the maximum heights particularly within identified nodes to a maximum of 12-15 storeys. One respondent suggested heights similar to those permitted within the Downtown, i.e. 18 storeys. Additional flexibility was also requested with planned setbacks on public streets. The feasibility and likely uptake of floor space index (FSI) bonusing in areas designated Mixed-use Corridor (GID) was also questioned given the requirement to incorporate a vertical mix of uses where any single use would not occupy more than 60% of the building. A request was made to expand the functionality of the proposed new bridge crossing over the Eramosa River so that it would also provide a single vehicle lane to accommodate transit buses in addition to active transportation modes (pedestrians and bicyclists). The need for a strong commitment to develop good transit service early in the development of the community was also stressed.

In subsequent discussions with Infrastructure Ontario the inclusion of a heritage schedule was also questioned given the status of cultural heritage resources (i.e. the determination of Provincial heritage resources have yet to be finalized).

## **Staff Response**

Schedule B: Land Use has been revised in response to Infrastructure Ontario's concerns. A limited amount of additional residential lands have been included north of the College Ave. E. extension and a new policy has been added that may permit additional residential development within the Employment Mixed-use 1 area south of the College Ave. E. extension and north of the local road shown as "New Street B". These additional residential uses may be permitted subject to the satisfaction of criteria specifically related to the achievement of development targets, compatibility with adjacent employment uses and an assessment of the availability of employment lands.

The proposed land use schedule, density and height policies have been assessed to ensure that the growth plan target range for the GID (8,000 – 10,000 jobs and 3,000 – 5,000 people) can be accommodated. In addition, the City's employment lands strategy and local growth management strategy assumed both corporate business park and prestige employment development west of the Eramosa River, not only employment development at a higher job density as shown in the employment land analysis submitted by Infrastructure Ontario, which did not

# STAFF REPORT



provide an analysis of both employment and population targets.

Additional flexibility has been included in the built form policies by increasing heights to 10 storeys for nodes within the Mixed-use Corridor (GID) designation, in line with the maximum heights of the Official Plan, and maximum setbacks for public streets have been increased. In addition the FSI bonusing policies have been removed and replaced with a policy requiring a mix of uses at the ground floor with increased height requirements for the first storey to provide flexibility for various uses at street level.

The need and justification for a pedestrian/bicyclist crossing of the Eramosa River is essential to achieve the vision, principles, objectives, land use and transportation policies of the GID Secondary Plan which prioritize active transportation and connecting the “urban village” with development on the east side of the Eramosa River. However establishing a link for transit use will require further study and justification involving ridership targets and transit operation alternatives. The differences in cost and river system impacts between a pedestrian/bicyclist crossing and a vehicular bridge will also need to be considered. The potential for a vehicular bridge will be assessed as part of the block planning for the area.

In response to comments about the status of cultural heritage resources, the resources have been removed from the Schedules and are identified in Appendix A to the Secondary Plan. Appendix materials serve as a reference document and not as Official Plan policy. This allows discussions to continue regarding protection of the cultural heritage resources which are subject to existing Official Plan policies.

## **Implementation Comment Summary**

Concerns were expressed with the phasing policies, in particular Infrastructure Ontario wanted the policies deleted altogether given the challenges of a long-term development view needed for the limited and specialized employment market in comparison to the relatively short term uptake of the residential market. Concerns were expressed that the marketplace would be unduly constrained, frustrating development interests.

The City’s Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC) expressed concerns on the lack of management guidance for the Natural Heritage System due to the absence of a current subwatershed study for the lands.

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport suggested a definition for “adaptive reuse”.

## **Staff Response**

The phasing policies and Schedule were removed and replaced with a block plan approach. A block plan approach better suits the implementation of the Secondary Plan policies, especially since phasing policies were not needed to deal with servicing issues but rather to ensure the development of a mix of uses and the

---

# STAFF REPORT



achievement of overall GID residential and employment targets. The block plan approach will serve to provide additional detail between the Secondary Plan policies and the submission of development applications and would allow for monitoring of development targets within the GID. The block plan requirements are similar to the City's Official Plan policies which require urban design master plans prior to development within nodes.

A block plan approach will help ensure lands are developed comprehensively in an orderly, cost efficient and timely manner, given the innovative and flexible nature of the proposed policies combined with not knowing how many and what form of future development applications may be submitted. The Zoning By-law will establish the required mix of uses within each block plan area. The completion and approval of a block plan will be needed prior to the approval of any development application. The block plan will demonstrate conformity with the policies and schedules of the GID Secondary Plan and will include items such as: detailed road pattern; parks, open space and urban square details; conformity with employment and population growth targets; and conformity with built form and site development policies. An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) will also be prepared as part of the block plan which is intended to address EAC's concerns.

Schedule D: Block Plan Areas establishes four distinct block plan areas within the Secondary Plan. Provincial lands would fall into three of the four proposed block plan areas. One area would encompass lands owned by the Province east of Victoria Road S, north of the proposed extension of College Avenue east (including mixed-use corridor lands on the south side of the College Avenue extension) and west of the Eramosa River (including Turfgrass Institute lands). The second block plan area would encompass lands owned by the Province east of Victoria Road S, south of the mixed-use corridor along the proposed extension of College Avenue east and west of the Eramosa River (including former detention centre site). The two block plan areas essentially separate the residential and mixed-use corridor lands along and north of the College Ave. E. from the employment lands south of College Ave. E. This allows the residential and mixed-use corridor lands to be comprehensively planned and developed at a separate time from the employment lands. The third block plan area includes Provincial lands east of the Eramosa River (including the historic Reformatory Complex). The fourth block plan area encompasses lands owned by a number of private landowners located south of Stone Road, east of Victoria Road S.

A definition for "adaptive reuse" was added to the GID Secondary Plan OPA.

## **Summary of Revisions by Section**

As noted previously, revisions have been made to the draft Secondary Plan in response to comments received from the public, stakeholders and agencies. In addition an internal review of the draft Secondary Plan was undertaken. Many of the changes from the internal review provide greater clarity and consistency between existing City and Provincial policies and initiatives including the City's

Official Plan Update. A summary of revisions by section, which have not already been outlined in this report, are presented below.

## **Section 11.2.2 Vision, Principles and Objectives**

### **Revisions**

Revisions were made to the Vision, Principles and Objectives to improve alignment with terminology within the Secondary Plan policies and with the Official Plan Update. Some revisions also improve clarity and remove unnecessary duplication. The revisions do not constitute substantive changes to the context or essence of the principles or objectives.

## **Section 11.2.3 Natural and Cultural Heritage**

### **Revisions**

The draft Secondary Plan's Heritage Schedule was removed and replaced by a simplified Appendix A, which is not part of the Secondary Plan policies, in response to comments received. Cultural heritage policies are subject to the City's Official Plan policies and procedures in terms of conservation and protection.

The policies have also been streamlined to remove specific policies regarding Significant Natural Areas and Natural Areas, species at risk, and surface water features and fish habitat since OPA 42, the City's Natural Heritage System remains under appeal.

Minor revisions have been made to improve alignment with terminology between the Secondary Plan policies and the Official Plan Update, for clarity, and to remove unnecessary duplication with Official Plan policies.

## **Section 11.2.4 Energy, Servicing and Stormwater**

### **Revisions**

Revisions were made to improve alignment with policies in the Official Plan Update (OPA 48) and Downtown Secondary Plan (OPA 43). The policies continue to strongly support energy planning and water and wastewater servicing initiatives.

Stormwater policies beyond those contained in OPA 48 have been minimized. The GID Secondary Plan Implementation policies in section 11.2.8 recognize the development of a stormwater management assessment analysis that establishes water quality, water quantity and natural environment objectives and stormwater management design requirements for development in the GID as part of the block plan process.

## **Section 11.2.5 Mobility**

### **Revisions**

Policies have been revised and reordered to improve alignment with terminology used in the Secondary Plan and Official Plan Update, improve clarity and remove unnecessary duplication. In particular Main Street references were clarified to recognize it as an identified design treatment of the new collector road extending

College Avenue E. into the GID. Policies were also modified to make connections to the block planning process. Table 1 changes reflect the treatment of Main Street as a type of collector, increased flexibility for planned setbacks and alignment of right-of-way widths with the current Official Plan. Schedule A: Mobility has been simplified by the removal of existing built form, cultural heritage resources, and nodes. The Schedule includes an additional active transportation link near New Street 'A', north of Main Street and adds a new proposed local road south of Stone Road.

## **Section 11.2.6 The Public Realm Revisions**

The key revision to public realm policies is the inclusion of specific policies dealing with two new park spaces and their symbolic identification as proposed parks on Schedule B: Land Use. The parks were previously identified as a land use designation in the draft GID Secondary Plan. The parks have been shown symbolically with accompanying policies to provide greater flexibility to determine their location and configuration in the development approvals process. The importance of the Trail Network as both a recreational and active transportation resource was also reinforced, recognizing the trail system's support of a carbon neutral vision and public realm facility for communicating and celebrating the GID's natural and cultural heritage resources. Other changes involved improving alignment and clarity with other policies in the GID Secondary Plan and the Official Plan.

## **Section 11.2.7 Land Use and Built Form Revisions**

Schedule B: Land Use has been revised to make minor refinements to lands designated Residential, Mixed-use Corridor (GID), and Employment Mixed-use 1 in response to comments from Infrastructure Ontario. In addition greater flexibility has been added to many of the land use designations. The area of the Residential designation north of the College Ave. E. extension has been expanded and the area of Mixed-use Corridor (GID) and area of Employment Mixed-use 1 have been reduced. The Mixed-use Corridor (GID) lands have been realigned in a more linear fashion along the College Ave. E. extension. A new policy has been added that may permit residential uses within the Employment Mixed-use 1 area south of the College Ave. E. extension and north of the local road shown as "New Street B" on Schedule A: Mobility.

As previously stated, rather than designating lands Open Space and Park, on Schedule B: Land Use, the two new proposed park locations have been identified with a symbol.

Additional flexibility has been included in the built form policies by increasing maximum heights to 10 storeys for nodes within the Mixed-use Corridor (GID) designation, in line with the Official Plan. The maximum FSI and FSI bonusing policies for the Mixed-use Corridor (GID) designation have been removed and replaced with a policy requiring a mix of uses at the ground floor.

Cultural heritage resources have been removed from Schedule B: Land Use Schedule and are now only identified in Appendix A.

The Special Residential Area (GID) policies for the Glenholme Drive area have been replaced with a new designation entitled Glenholme Estate Residential Area that allows limited new development on interim private services.

## **Section 11.2.8 Interpretation and Implementation**

### **Revisions**

The most significant change is the removal of the phasing policies and schedule and the introduction of block plan policies accompanied with a new schedule in their place.

Policies related to architectural technical guidelines and site plan requirements, for low rise development have been removed.

### **Next Steps**

Following the Statutory Public meeting, staff will review all comments received and prepare a final GID Secondary Plan OPA for Council's consideration.

## **CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN**

**City Building - Strategic Direction 3.1:** Ensure a well designed, safe, inclusive, appealing and sustainable City.

**City Building - Strategic Direction 3.2:** Be economically viable, resilient, diverse and attractive for business.

## **DEPARTMENTAL CONSULTATION**

Community and Social Services (Culture and Tourism; and Parks and Recreation)

Corporate and Human Resources (Legal and Realty Services)

Finance and Enterprise Services ( Community Energy; and Economic Development)

Operations, Transit and Emergency Services (Guelph Transit; and Public Works)

Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment (Building Services; Engineering Services; Solid Waste Resources; Wastewater Services; and Water Services)

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Capital Budget approval has been given by Council for completion of the Secondary Plan at \$340,000. An FCM Green Municipal Fund grant will contribute \$142,252 towards the budget. The first FCM instalment of \$75,188.79 has been received.

## **COMMUNICATIONS**

A comprehensive public consultation process has been followed throughout the development of the Secondary Plan including a public design workshop to explore design options and preferences for the lands. An informal open house on the draft Secondary Plan was held on November 28, 2012, shortly after its release in October 2012. Infrastructure Ontario continues to be an active participant along with the Grand River Conservation Authority who have both agreed to provide in-kind support as part of the FCM Green Municipal Fund Grant. Heritage Guelph, the City's

---

# STAFF REPORT



Municipal Heritage Committee, will continue to be consulted on heritage matters. The City's River Systems Advisory Committee and Environmental Advisory Committee were also consulted for comment. Public and stakeholder consultation will continue throughout the Secondary Plan process.

The Notice of Public Meeting was advertised in the Guelph Tribune on November 7 and 14, 2013 and mailed out to our project contact list. Information on this project continues to be updated on the City's website, [www.guelph.ca/innovation-district](http://www.guelph.ca/innovation-district).

## ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1: Guelph Innovation District Project Milestones
- Attachment 2: GID Location Map
- Attachment 3: Proposed Official Plan Amendment 54: Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan Amendment
- Attachment 4: Comments submitted by the public, stakeholders and agencies
- Attachment 5: Comments and Response Table

Attachments 3-5 are available on the City of Guelph website at <http://guelph.ca/plans-and-strategies/guelph-innovation-district-york-district-lands>. Click on the link for the December 2, 2013 OPA 54 Public Meeting Report with attachments.

### Report Author

Joan Jylanne  
Senior Policy Planner

### Approved By

Melissa Aldunate  
Manager of Policy Planning and Urban Design

---

### Approved By

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

---

### Recommended By

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

# STAFF REPORT

## Attachment 1: Guelph Innovation District Project Milestones


<b>PHASE ONE – BACKGROUND REPORT</b>		<b>2005</b>
First Public Consultation Meeting – Royal Canadian Legion	Introduce Project	January 25, 2005
Phase I Consultant Background Report	Background Report Produced	March 17, 2005
<b>PHASE TWO – LAND USE CONCEPTS</b>		<b>2005-2007</b>
Community Workshop – Turf Grass Institute	Review and assist in development of land use concepts	April 6, 2005
Phase II Consultant Report	Preferred Land Use Scenario Report Produced – 7 land use options presented with 12 evaluation criteria	Nov. 24, 2005
Presentation of Preferred Scenario to Committee	PET Report 10-128 York District Study Phase 2 – Preferred Land Use Scenario Report released publicly but no action taken	Dec. 12, 2005
Council Information Report	York District Study Update	January 18, 2007
Public Information Session – Royal Canadian Legion	Review Phase II	February 1, 2007
Special Committee Meeting	CDES Report 07-25 York District Land Use Study Process	March 23, 2007
Council Resolution	THAT the “York District Preferred Land Use Scenario” be received and used as the basis for the development of a final land use strategy for the York District lands; AND THAT the York District Study Phase 3 workplan be endorsed as presented in Schedule 3 of Community Development & Environmental Services Report No. 07-25. AND THAT the area defined as “lands south of Stone Road” be recognized as a “Specialized Area”.	April 2, 2007
<b>PROVINCIAL AUTHENTICITY WORK</b>		<b>Apr.–Nov. 2007</b>
Special Information Session: York District Lands	Introduce Provincial work to public	April 12, 2007
Roundtable Meetings	Four roundtable groups gather to develop ideas for York District lands A – Research, Development and Innovation B – Light Manufacturing, Office & Retail C – Residential and Mixed-Use D – Culture, Design and Creative Enterprise	Spring – Summer 2007
Public Town Hall 1	Public review of roundtable ideas for York District	June 18, 2007
Public Town Hall 2	York District ideas presented based on roundtable work and public input from Public Town Hall 1 Meeting	August 7, 2007
Authenticity Report Released	Final Report and Appendices released	Nov. 19, 2007
<b>PHASE THREE – LAND USE AND SERVICING FINAL REPORT</b>		<b>2007 +</b>
Information Session for Landowners South of Stone Rd. – Waste	Update landowners south of Stone Rd. on the process and allow opportunity to share views	Dec. 10, 2007



# STAFF REPORT

Innovation Centre Meeting Room		
Urban Design Charrette	Input into the development of land use concepts for the area, including range of land uses	April 5, 2008
Committee Information Report	CDES Information Report 08-84 presented Hybrid Land Use Plans and Phase III update	July 11, 2008
<b>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PAUSE - STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE GUELPH AGRI-INNOVATION CLUSTER</b>		<b>2009 - 2010</b>
Community Workshop	Presented work completed and introduced key connections between the Secondary Plan, Local Growth Management Strategy, Community Energy Initiative, Natural Heritage Strategy, Prosperity 2020, and Strategic Plan for the Guelph Agri-Innovation Cluster	June 18, 2009
Council Workshop	Discussed draft vision, planning and design principles, and governance issues for the lands	February 8, 2010
Council Information Report	Council Information Report 11-61 Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan Update	July 7, 2011
Community Design Workshop	Two design scenarios presented which were a composite of potential design elements to reflect in the development of the lands	Sept. 15, 2011
Design Charrette	Design session held for city and consultants to consider feedback from public design workshop and forge a consensus on design elements to carry forward in the preferred design.	Oct. 18, 2011
Committee Report	PBEE Report 11-104 Presented vision, principles, preferred design and implementation strategy.	Dec. 12, 2011
Council Report	Council Report 12-18 Supplementary report updating design	Jan. 30, 2012
Committee Report	Release of draft Secondary Plan	October 15, 2012
Public Open House	Open house on draft Secondary Plan.	November 28, 2012

## Attachment 2: GID Location Map



# ATTACHMENT 3: Proposed Official Plan Amendment No. 54

## AMENDMENT NUMBER 54 TO THE OFFICIAL PLAN FOR THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF GUELPH:

### GUELPH INNOVATION DISTRICT SECONDARY PLAN AMENDMENT

#### INDEX

##### PART A - THE PREAMBLE

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

	PAGE
Title and Components .....	1
Purpose .....	2
Background .....	2
Location .....	4
Basis of the Amendment .....	5
Summary of Changes to the Official Plan .....	5
Public Participation .....	6

##### PART B - THE AMENDMENT

The Amendment describes the additions, deletions and/or modifications to the Official Plan of the City of Guelph, which constitute Official Plan Amendment Number 54.

	PAGE
Format of the Amendment.....	8
Implementation and Interpretation.....	8
Details of the Amendment.....	8
ITEMS 1 and 2 Amendments to the Policies .....	8
ITEM 3 Addition of new Section 11.2 entitled 'Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan' .....	10
ITEMS 4 - 10 Amendments to Schedules .....	56

##### PART A - THE PREAMBLE

##### TITLE AND COMPONENTS

This document is entitled 'Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan Amendment' and will be referred to as 'Amendment 54'. Part A - The Preamble provides an explanation of the amendment including the purpose, background, location, basis of the amendment, summary of changes to the Official Plan and public participation, but does not form part of this amendment. Part B - The Amendment forms Amendment 54 to the Official Plan for the City of Guelph and contains a comprehensive expression of the new, deleted and amended policy and includes revised Official Plan Schedules and new Schedules within the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan policy section.

## **PURPOSE**

The purpose of Amendment 54 is to incorporate the GID Secondary Plan into the City's Official Plan by deleting the existing land use policies that apply to the GID lands and adding a new Section to the Official Plan that includes the new policies, schedules and corresponding definitions for the GID Secondary Plan.

Specifically, Amendment 54:

- Incorporates the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan into the Official Plan by adding a new subsection to the Secondary Plan Chapter including policies and Schedules;
- Removes Official Plan policies that refer to the need for a planning study for the former Guelph Correction centre lands; and
- Revises existing Schedules to incorporate the new Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan policies and associated Schedules into the Official Plan.

## **BACKGROUND**

The City of Guelph initiated the preparation of a Secondary Plan for the Guelph Innovation District (GID) in early 2005. The majority of the lands are currently designated as "Special Study Area" by the City's Official Plan, requiring the completion of a planning study to "examine future land uses, servicing, phasing of development, transportation and impact assessment on *natural heritage features* and *cultural heritage resources*." There are also a number of other land use designations within the GID Secondary Plan area which are proposed to be carried forward (i.e. existing service commercial and industrial designations) or are proposed to be redesignated (i.e. major institutional). The Secondary Plan implements the City's Official Plan policies.

The Secondary Plan was completed in three phases.

### **Phase I and II**

The Phase I Background Report and Phase II Land Use Concepts Report were completed in 2005, through the consulting services of planningAlliance. In April 2007 Council directed staff to use the "York District Preferred Land Use Scenario" contained in the Phase II report as the basis for the development of a final land use strategy for the GID. The preferred land use concept recognizes the existing employment uses at the City's Waste Resource Innovation Centre, Cargill Meat Solutions, PDI (Polymer Distribution Inc.) and a variety of existing commercial uses along York Road, Victoria Road S. and Watson Parkway S. In addition, the residential uses south of Stone Road East, west of Watson Road South are recognized. The land use scenario focuses on additional employment lands, with institutional uses recommended for the former Guelph Correction Centre lands.

The Province is the major landowner within the GID and has been working with the City in coordinating work to reposition the lands since the closure of the former institutional uses. In 2007, the City paused work on the GID to provide the Province with an opportunity to conduct its own research and public consultation process. This work culminated in the release of a report completed by Authenticity for the Province which presents a mixed use business park, live/work development scenario for the lands.

### **Phase III**

In April 2008, two hybrid land use concepts for the area were presented to the public at an urban design charrette which drew upon elements from both the Phase II Land Use Concept Report and Authenticity Report. The hybrid introduced the concept of an urban village on the west side of the Eramosa River in the vicinity of the Turfgrass Institute building, with

the majority of future development still focused on employment uses. Employment mixed-use was recognized on the west side of the Eramosa River, east of the proposed urban village, while industrial uses were located on the east side of the Eramosa River, recognizing Cargill Meat Solutions and the Waste Resource Innovation Centre. Neighbourhood commercial centres and service commercial uses were identified at the northern corners of the site recognizing existing land uses. The lands of the former Guelph Correction Centre continued to be shown as institutional. Two options were proposed on the southeast corner – residential and industrial employment. An information session was held with landowners south of Stone Road on the process and provided an opportunity to share views regarding the future development of the area.

Work was paused during 2009-2010 to allow the City's Economic Development Department to complete a strategic plan for the *Guelph Agri-Innovation Cluster* and to consider governance models for the development of the lands.

Since the initiation of the Secondary Plan a number of strategic municipal documents have been completed including the Community Energy Initiative, Prosperity 2020, Strategic Plan for the *Guelph Agri-Innovation Cluster*, and the City of Guelph Local Growth Management Strategy. In addition, the City has revised its Official Plan in response to the Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and has adopted a Natural Heritage System as part of the City's Official Plan. The strategic importance of these lands has grown as a vital means to enable the City to meet its sustainability goals and objectives included in the above strategic initiatives.

A community workshop was held on June 18, 2009 to present the work completed along with connections to the above initiatives.

A Council Information Session on July 19, 2011 was held to discuss alternative designs for the Guelph Innovation District and the potential use of a Development Permit System (DPS) as the planning implementation mechanism for the final design.

The Council session was followed by a public design workshop on September 15, 2011 that presented two design scenarios for the lands which were a composite of potential design elements.

On October 18, 2011 an all day design charrette was held by invitation for city and consultant experts to consider feedback from the public design workshop and forge a consensus on what design elements should be carried forward in a preferred design scenario.

In December 2011 the preferred design vision, principles and implementation strategy was released and subsequently approved by Council with a few changes on January 30, 2012. The work included an analysis of design precedents, public feedback on potential design elements, and a design charrette. A design booklet entitled "Guelph Innovation District Recommended Option Booklet", was produced. This work was approved as support for the development of the Secondary Plan.

The draft Secondary Plan was released on October 15, 2012, followed by a public open house on November 28, 2012.

A Public meeting of Council was held on December 2, 2013.

The GID Secondary Plan policies amend the current 2001 Official Plan and build on the Local Growth Management Strategy and Official Plan Update (OPA 39, OPA 42 and OPA 48). The Secondary Plan references and enhances the policies introduced through the Official Plan Update, including directions from OPA 42, the City's Natural Heritage System.

## LOCATION

The lands subject to Amendment 54 are shown on Figure 1 below:




Figure 1

## **BASIS OF THE AMENDMENT**

Amendment 54 amends the existing 2001 Official Plan and sets out policies for the Guelph Innovation District. It addresses the necessary changes to ensure that the City's policies and mapping, related to the Guelph Innovation District, conform with recent amendments to the City's Official Plan as a result of the City's Official Plan update process, including growth plan needs and other matters of provincial interest.

The basis for the policy and mapping amendments come from the draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan along with a number of policy documents and initiatives as summarized in the Background Section and consideration of public stakeholder input.

## **SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO THE OFFICIAL PLAN**

The following is a summary of OPA 54:

### Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan Policies

The purpose of Amendment 54 is to incorporate the GID Secondary Plan into the City's Official Plan by deleting the existing land use policies that apply to the GID lands and adding a new Section to the Official Plan that includes the new policies, schedules and corresponding definitions for the GID Secondary Plan. The policies of this new section begin with the guiding vision, principles and objectives for the GID, formulated as part of an extensive public engagement process. Other policies address: natural and cultural heritage; energy, servicing and stormwater; mobility; the *public realm*; land use and built form; and interpretation and implementation. The policies generally follow the structure of the Official Plan Update (OPA 42 and 48) and make references to and enhance the policies of the Official Plan. Definitions and policies are on occasion repeated, given the status of OPA 42 which is under appeal to the OMB and OPA 48 which still requires final approval from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. The section contains a detailed set of land use and development policies that guide all future development within the GID plan area; support conservation, protection and enhancement of the natural heritage system and cultural heritage resources; promote best practises for sustainable infrastructure and community design working towards *carbon neutrality*; identify collector road alignments and active transportation opportunities; and provide a high level urban design direction to guide the creation of a unique and memorable place. The policies conclude with a description of the actions and tools required to implement the plan.

### Schedules

New Schedules have been included as part of the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan regarding mobility, land use, built form elements, and block plan areas. A number of amendments are made to the existing Official Plan schedules to recognize the completion and integration of the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan.

### General Modifications

In order to integrate the GID Secondary Plan into the Official Plan a number of changes are required to the general Official Plan schedules. In addition, policies that currently apply to the GID lands in the Official Plan are deleted because they are replaced by the GID Secondary Plan. Instead of revising the Official Plan Glossary, definitions are included within the GID Secondary Plan to add clarity to terms used in the policies that will eventually come into full force and effect with the approval of OPA 48.

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The development of proposed Official Plan Amendment 54 has involved significant community stakeholder engagement that included public meetings, stakeholder meetings, open houses and workshops.

### Background Studies

As outlined in the background section of the Official Plan Amendment, numerous studies and initiatives have been completed with public input in support of the preparation of Official Plan Amendment 54.

The background studies include:

<b>PHASE ONE – BACKGROUND REPORT</b>	<b>2005</b>
Consultant Report York District Land Use + Servicing Study: Background Report	March 17, 2005
<b>PHASE TWO – LAND USE CONCEPTS</b>	<b>2005-2007</b>
Consultant Report York District Land Use + Servicing Study: Phase II Report - Preferred Land Use Scenario	November 24, 2005
PET Report 10-128 York District Study Phase 2 – Preferred Land Use Scenario	December 12, 2005
Council Information Report York District Study Update	January 18, 2007
CDES Report 07-25 York District Land Use Study Process	March 23, 2007
<b>PROVINCIAL WORK</b>	<b>2007</b>
Authenticity Report and Appendices York District Lands – Guelph, Ontario	November 19, 2007
<b>PHASE THREE – LAND USE AND SERVICING FINAL REPORT</b>	<b>2007 +</b>
CDES Information Report 08-84 Hybrid Land Use Plans and Phase III Update	July 11, 2008
Council Information Report 11-61 Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan Update	July 7, 2011
PBEE Committee Report 11-104 GID Secondary Plan – Preferred Design	December 12, 2011
Consultant Booklet GID Recommended Option Booklet	December 12, 2011
Council Report 12-18 Supplementary Report: Stakeholder Feedback – GID Secondary Plan – Preferred Design	January 30, 2012
PBEE Committee Report 12-89 GID: Release of Draft Secondary Plan	October 15, 2012

### Public Engagement

In December 2011/January 2012 the preferred design, vision, principles and implementation approach for the draft GID Secondary Plan was made public and presented at PBEE Committee and Council. Council supported the foundational material as the basis for completion of the GID Secondary Plan.

On October 15, 2012 the GID Draft Secondary Plan was presented to PBEE Committee and circulated for comments. A public open house was held on November 28, 2012 which included display panels, a staff presentation and opportunities to ask questions of project team members.



The GID Draft Secondary Plan underwent a circulation period with agencies, landowners and other stakeholders which included presentations to interested groups including GWDA, RSAC, and EAC to present the draft Plan and solicit feedback. A series of meetings were also held with Infrastructure Ontario, as the primary landowner.

A draft Official Plan Amendment was released on November 7, 2013. Council held a statutory public meeting in accordance with the *Planning Act* on December 2, 2013 to hear public input and comments regarding the draft Official Plan Amendment.

[results of OPA 54 public consultation to be inserted in final OPA]

### **Explanatory Note:**

#### OPA 42, OPA 48 and OPA 54

OPA 54 is designed to integrate with the City's five year Official Plan update. The Official Plan update was conducted in three phases; each of which amends the 2001 Official Plan. Phase 3 of the Update, OPA 48, represents the overall policy update to the Official Plan, which includes restructuring the Plan and the introduction of new policy terms and designations. OPA 48 was adopted by Council in June 2012 and is awaiting provincial approval.

Phase 2 of the Update, OPA 42, introduced the Natural Heritage System and associated land use designations and schedules to the Official Plan and at the same time deleted and replaced terminology related to the Greenlands System in all sections and schedules of the Official Plan with the new Natural Heritage System. OPA 42 was appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board and remains under appeal at the anticipated time of adoption of OPA 54.

OPA 54 anticipates OPA 42 and 48 being in full force and effect and includes policies, land use designations and definitions from these amendments as follows:

- a) OPA 54 reflects changes to terminology that were introduced by OPA 42 (such as using the term 'natural heritage strategy' or 'natural heritage system' rather than 'greenlands system', and Significant Natural Area or Natural Area instead of Core Greenlands and Non-Core Greenlands). For transition purposes, where there are references to defined terms introduced by OPA 42, or to the related policies introduced by OPA 42, the existing Official Plan terms and their related policies will be deemed to apply until such time as OPA 42 is in effect. References to terms currently used in the Official Plan as undefined terms (such as reference to "natural heritage system" as an undefined term) shall continue unaffected.
- b) Certain schedules included in OPA 54 display land use designation and mapping changes introduced through OPA 42. These are displayed for context and illustrative purposes only. For transition purposes, the existing land use designations and policies of the 2001 Official Plan will continue to apply until such time as OPA 42 is in effect.
- c) OPA 54 reflects changes to terminology that were introduced by OPA 48 (such as using the term 'renewable energy systems' rather than 'renewable energy'). For transition purposes, where there are references to defined terms introduced by OPA 48, or to the related policies introduced by OPA 48, the existing Official Plan terms and their related policies will be deemed to apply until such time as OPA 48 is in effect.
- d) OPA 54 designates land with the "Major Utility" designation that was introduced by OPA 48. For transition purposes, the policies for the "Special Study Area" land use

designation in the existing Official Plan are deemed to apply to lands designated as "Major Utility" by OPA 54 until such time as OPA 48 comes into full force and effect.

- e) The intention is that the policies for the GID in Section 9.9.1 introduced through OPA 48 would be deleted and no longer relevant.

## **PART B – THE AMENDMENT**

### **Format of the Amendment**

This section (Part B) of Amendment 54 sets out additions and changes to the text and mapping in the Official Plan. Sections of the Official Plan that are being added or changed are referred to as "ITEMs" in the following description. Entire sections to be deleted are described, however, the text is not shown in strike-out. Entire sections to be added are described and the new text is shown in regular font type (i.e. as it would appear in the Official Plan with titles appearing in **bold**). Text to be amended is illustrated by various font types (e.g. ~~struck-out~~ is to be deleted and **bold** text is to be added). *Italicized* font indicates defined terms. Terms that are displayed in a text box are subject to OPA 42 and are currently under appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board or OPA 48 and are currently awaiting provincial approval.

### **Implementation and Interpretation**

The implementation of this amendment shall be in accordance with the provisions of the *Planning Act*. The further implementation and associated interpretation of this amendment shall be in accordance with the relevant text and mapping schedules of the existing Official Plan of the City of Guelph and applicable legislation.

Amendment 54 should be read in conjunction with the existing 2001 Official Plan as amended by the OPAs that have come into force since 2001 and Amendment 42 (currently under appeal to the OMB) and Amendment 48 (currently awaiting provincial approval) which are available on the City's website at Guelph.ca or at the Planning Services office located at City Hall, 1 Carden Street, Guelph, ON.

### **Details of the Amendment**

**ITEM 1:** The purpose of 'ITEM 1' is to delete policies 7.17.1, 7.17.1.1 a) to g), 7.17.1.2 and 7.17.1.3 within Section 7.17 Special Study Area, General Policies and to renumber 7.17.2. The policies are no longer required and the policies of the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan will provide direction to the development of the lands.

#### **Section 7.17 Special Study Area is hereby amended to delete sub-section 7.17.1 and renumbering sub-section 7.17.2 as follows:**

~~7.17.1 — A 'Special Study Area' designation applies to lands that are situated within the general area comprising the Guelph Correctional Centre and Wellington Detention Facility, the City's wet/dry waste management complex, the Eramosa River valley, and lands to the south of Stone Road, (east of Victoria Road). This 'Special Study Area' designation is outlined on Schedule 1.~~

~~7.17.1.1 The designated 'Special Study Area' is located within an area of the City where there are a number of future land use uncertainties. The matters creating uncertainty include:~~

- ~~a) The closing of the Guelph Correctional Centre and the Wellington Detention Facility in the central area of this designation;~~
- ~~b) Lands within the 'Special Study Area' are located within the "Arkell Springs Water Resource Protection Area" and special land use considerations are required to protect this major water source for the City;~~
- ~~c) The majority of these lands — lands north of Stone Road — are within a Stage 3 servicing area of this Plan, (see subsection 4.2). This staging area requires the completion of a secondary plan prior to *development* occurring in the area;~~
- ~~d) An aggregate operation to the south of Stone Road has ceased operation and a future land use for this area is required;~~
- ~~e) Significant *natural* and *cultural heritage* features exist in the area, and careful land use planning is required to minimize impacts;~~
- ~~f) A major industrial operation — an abattoir, meat packing and processing plant — is located centrally to this area and creates potential land use compatibility issues;~~
- ~~g) The City's wet/dry waste management facility and associated Subbor waste processing operation, which is also centrally located in the area, is undergoing expansion and requires special consideration to fit into the surrounding area.~~

~~7.17.1.2 A planning study completed by the City shall examine future land uses, servicing, phasing of development, transportation and impact assessment on *natural heritage features* and *cultural heritage resources*. The overall intent is to derive a holistic land use plan for the area.~~

- ~~1. Existing uses of the area shall be permitted to continue in accordance with the provisions of the implementing *Zoning By-law* in effect on December 17, 2001.~~
- ~~2. Changes in land use, lot additions and expansions of existing non-residential uses may be permitted without amendment to this Plan provided that the *development* proposal does not compromise the potential outcomes or original rationale for undertaking the intended planning study.~~

~~7.17.1.3 The completion of the land use concept for this study area will be a prioritized planning action of the City.~~

7.17.21 A 'Special Study Area' designation applies to lands known municipally as 200 Beverley Street. This 'Special Study Area' designation is outlined on Schedule 1.

7.17.2-1.1 The City has initiated a review of land use options for this property. The future use of this property will be determined through a public consultation process. To implement the preferred land use, changes to the Official Plan designation and Zoning By-law may be initiated by the City at a later date. The Official

Plan and Zoning By-law amendments will require a public consultation process in accordance with the Planning Act.

7.17.2-1.2 The completion of the land use review for this property is a high priority for the City.

**ITEM 2:** The purpose of 'ITEM 2' is to delete policy 4.2.5.5 f). The policy is no longer required and the policies of the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan will provide direction to the development of the lands.

**Policy 4.2.5.5 f) is hereby deleted as follows:**

~~f) **Phase 2.b (East of Victoria Road):**~~

~~i. A gravity sanitary sewer outlet for this area could be provided by construction of a trunk sewer along the Eramosa River valley, connecting to the upper limit of the existing Eramosa River trunk. Alternatively, the sanitary sewer outlet for this area could be provided by construction of a pumping station and forcemain;~~

~~ii. Connection to the existing trunk watermain located on Stone Road.~~

**ITEM 3:** The purpose of 'ITEM 3' is to add a new Section 11.2 entitled 'Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan'.

**Chapter 11 is hereby amended by adding the following new section "11.2 Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan":**

# 11.2 GUELPH INNOVATION DISTRICT

## SECONDARY PLAN

DRAFT

## 11.2>

# INTRODUCTION

The Guelph Innovation District (GID) Secondary Plan establishes a detailed planning framework consisting of a Vision, Principles and Objectives and Policies and Schedules to guide and regulate future development of the GID Planning Area. Users of this Secondary Plan should refer to the comprehensive Official Plan for general city-wide policies applicable to the GID.

The GID Planning Area comprises lands bounded by York Road to the north, Victoria Road South to the west and Watson Parkway South to the east and extending south to Stone Road East, also inclusive of lands south of, and immediately adjacent to, Stone Road East.

DRAFT

# 11.2.1> VISION, PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTIVES

## 11.2.1.1 A Vision for Guelph's Innovation District

The Guelph Innovation District (GID) is a compact, mixed use community that straddles the Eramosa River in the City's east end. The GID will serve predominately as the home of innovative, sustainable employment uses with an adjacent urban village connecting residential and compatible employment uses. The urban village is meant to be an identifiable, pedestrian oriented space, with street-related built form that supports a mix of medium and high density commercial, residential and employment uses. Important land use connections are also envisioned between the GID, as an innovation centre, the University of Guelph, as a knowledge-based research centre and the Downtown, as the City's civic hub and cultural centre, supporting the emergence of a University-Downtown-GID trinity of innovation spaces.

The GID is at once highly energetic and intimately familiar, because it showcases an entirely new approach to planning, designing, and developing urban places, and at the same time, reflects Guelph's history and celebrates the rich heritage resources of the district, including the stunning river valley, dramatic topography and views, and historic Reformatory Complex.

The GID is attractive, pedestrian-focused and human-scaled. It provides a mix of land uses at transit-supportive densities, offers meaningful places to live, work, shop, play and learn, and supports a wide range of employment and residential land uses. It protects valuable natural and *cultural heritage resources* while fully integrating them with the new community, features sustainable buildings and infrastructure, and works *towards carbon neutrality*. It makes needed connections between all modes of transportation, but in a manner that prioritizes pedestrians, cyclists and transit users over drivers, and stitches the GID into the overall fabric of the City. It is exciting and new and feels like it has been part of the City for a long time.

## 11.2.1.2 Principles and Objectives

### *Principle 1: Protect what is Valuable*

Creating a place that respects the Natural Heritage System and *cultural heritage resources*, making citizens stewards of the resources for current and future generations.

#### *Objectives*

- a) Preserve and enhance the extensive Natural Heritage System, including the Eramosa River Valley which is designated as a Canadian Heritage River.
- b) Respect the existing topography and sightlines, including *public views* and *public vistas* of the Eramosa River, Downtown and the historic Reformatory Complex.
- c) Ensure compatible public access opportunities to the Natural Heritage System and *cultural heritage resources* and promote their celebration, especially river

- vistas and edges, the Provincially Significant Earth Science *Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI)*, and the historic Reformatory Complex.
- d) Connect surrounding land uses with the Natural Heritage System and *cultural heritage resources* and provide opportunities for compatible research, educational, recreational and urban agricultural uses.
  - e) Ensure that significant *built heritage resources* and significant *cultural heritage landscapes* are conserved.

### **Principle 2: Create Sustainable and Energy Efficient Infrastructure**

Building infrastructure that is efficient, focuses on renewable energy sources, and supports an integrated energy distribution system that enables a carbon free lifestyle.

#### *Objectives*

- a) Create a framework for the GID to work toward *carbon neutrality* and exceed the City's Community Energy Plan targets, building infrastructure that is efficient that focuses on renewable energy systems, and supports an integrated distribution system that enables a carbon free lifestyle.
- b) Support development of an integrated energy distribution system, which maximizes connections between energy generation opportunities (producers) and end users (provides opportunities for local energy generation, maximizes connections between generation opportunities and end users, and minimizes overall energy use).
- c) Support processes where the waste by-products/surpluses of one activity are used as resources by another (e.g. industrial ecology).
- d) Include efficient, long-term and community based strategies to conserve and manage energy, water, wastewater, stormwater and solid waste.
- e) Develop a model community that showcases sustainable, green, low impact development.
- f) Embrace innovation, establish best practices, and serve as a learning environment for other communities across Guelph and Southern Ontario.
- g) Support the reduction of waste from construction debris as a result of the demolition of buildings by promoting and encouraging the *adaptive reuse* of existing building stock.

### **Principle 3: Establish a Multi-modal Pedestrian-focused Mobility System**

Making connections that serve the community, allow current and future generations to walk or cycle to daily needs, and provide convenient transit services to access broader activities.

#### *Objectives*

- a) Integrate the GID with the City as a whole, with clear connections to Downtown, the University of Guelph campus, and nearby neighbourhoods.
- b) Provide a transportation system (streets, sidewalks, cycle paths, trails, and rail) that serves the GID, provides rational and efficient connections for all modes of transportation, and provides compatible public access to the Natural Heritage System, where appropriate.
- c) Provide a land use pattern, urban design policies and standards and supportive transportation system that connect us with our daily needs, including transit stops, within a 5-10 minute walk of most residents.
- d) Provide a transportation system that is designed to prioritize pedestrians, cyclists and transit users over drivers by incorporating alternative development standards (e.g. larger right-of-ways for pedestrians and cyclists) and providing an extensive pedestrian and cycling network with direct, safe travel routes, and



- convenient, affordable transit service which is integrated with the rest of the City.
- e) Create and enhance connections for pedestrians, cyclists and potentially transit users across the Eramosa River Valley to better connect uses and activities.
  - f) Integrate the current commercial rail line within the new community by including a potential transportation hub and commuting centre for the movement of people and goods.
  - g) Ensure that the capacity of existing and new streets is sufficient to support the GID, while managing traffic impacts on adjacent road networks and neighbourhoods.

**Principle 4: Create an Attractive and Memorable Place**

Creating meaningful places to bring people, activities, environment(s) and ideas together, creating a sense of arrival and inclusion.

*Objectives*

- a) Create a district of landmark quality with a strong and recognizable identity on par with the Downtown and the University of Guelph.
- b) Define gateways and community focal points on both sides of the Eramosa River to support the development of mixed use areas that are safe, coherent, vibrant, and comfortable.
- c) Create a cohesive, efficient and vibrant transition area that will provide common supportive uses and built form to connect the urban village and employment area while still maintaining the unique function and identity of each area.
- d) Respect the southeast residential neighbourhood through the design and inclusion of an appropriate transition area between the residential uses and the industrial and major utility uses to the north.
- e) Define a block and parcel fabric that knits uses together and encourages new buildings to define the edges of streets, parks, trails and open spaces to provide a friendly face to encourage social interaction, safety, and a human scale.
- f) Create an accessible network of public facilities, parks, and open spaces which serves the new community and surrounding neighbourhoods, and is integrated with the Natural Heritage System and *cultural heritage resources*.
- g) Encourage high quality urban and architectural design that responds to and respects the GID's unique setting, natural and cultural heritage, edges and adjacent uses.
- h) Create a memorable landmark for the GID that establishes its identity, including potential connections to landmarks within the Downtown and the University of Guelph campus.
- i) Increase the overall tree canopy cover, and encourage the use of native species and edible landscapes, where appropriate, in restoration areas, parks, and open spaces and along streets throughout the new community.
- j) Respect (and emulate where appropriate) the Beaux-Arts design of the *cultural heritage landscape* component of the historic Reformatory Complex.

**Principle 5: Promote a Diversity of Land Uses and Densities**

Mixing it up to create vibrant, resilient, and efficient spaces that make it possible, practicable, and beneficial to reduce our ecological footprint.

*Objectives*

- a) Create an integrated, compact, mixed use district that provides an opportunity for people to live close to job opportunities and supportive daily services.
- b) Achieve *transit-supportive* densities with human-scaled built form.

- c) Establish a mix of land uses, building types and tenures in the new community, providing accessible choices for living, working, shopping, playing and learning.
- d) Promote mixed use developments in appropriate locations that provide three or more significant uses, ideally in the same building, or if in separate buildings, within a walkable environment.
- e) Provide for a diverse cross section of residents with a mix of residential uses, building types and tenures in an urban village-type setting that is affordable, accessible and allows people to remain within the same neighbourhood as their needs change.
- f) Provide for a significant number and variety of jobs with a range of employment uses, building types, including those related to the development of a knowledge-based innovation cluster.
- g) Define a flexible block and parcel fabric that encourages evolution over time.
- h) Plan for a land use mix and densities which contribute to achieving the City's overall population, employment and density targets and the specific targets for the GID.

**Principle 6: Grow Innovative Employment Opportunities**

Grow innovative employment opportunities that support the knowledge-based innovation sector, within a compact, mixed use community.

*Objectives*

- a) Accommodate a significant share of Guelph's employment growth to 2031.
- b) Target the GID as a key area supporting the growth of a knowledge-based innovation cluster, which may include the agriculture, environment, information technology, advanced manufacturing, health and related science sectors, making connections to the Downtown and the University of Guelph campus.
- c) Nurture and capitalize on the GID as a recreational and tourist destination.
- d) Create a setting that reinforces the GID as a high density employment area that attracts provincially, nationally and/or internationally significant employment uses.
- e) Encourage employment uses within the historic Reformatory Complex that can showcase the site's *cultural heritage resources*.
- f) Support strategic and collaborative economic development partnerships within the GID, and local and regional community.
- g) Encourage a business environment by fostering learning and innovation within the GID.
- h) Encourage economic opportunities for the GID that contribute to innovative and sustainable employment uses that are compatible with a mixed use environment, including residential uses.
- i) Support existing industrial uses, recognizing their contribution to the City's overall employment, waste management services, and carbon footprint reduction.

# 11.2.2>

## NATURAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

The natural and cultural heritage policies shape and regulate the conservation, protection and enhancement of the Natural Heritage System and *cultural heritage resources* found within the Guelph Innovation District (GID). The policies below are informed by the Vision and supporting Principles which seek to reflect Guelph's history and celebrate the rich heritage resources of the district, including the Eramosa River Valley, dramatic topography and views, and historic Reformatory Complex.

### 11.2.2.1 Natural Heritage

1. As identified on Schedule B, a significant portion of the GID is within the Natural Heritage System and is subject to the Natural Heritage System policies of the Official Plan.
2. The Natural Heritage System within the site area includes features such as the Eramosa River Valley that are important for their environmental and social values. The GID works in harmony with the Natural Heritage System which forms the basis of the Secondary Plan through its integration by the provision of natural breaks, transitional areas and scenic *public views* and *public vistas* within the site.
3. Roads and trails will be designed along the edge of the Eramosa River Valley to provide opportunities for a public edge, *public views* and greater protection opportunities. The Natural Heritage System shall be protected, maintained, restored and enhanced so that it may fill its role as the centerpiece of the GID.
4. The City will identify and support opportunities to provide greater public access to the Natural Heritage System including examining potential for an *active transportation* link located central to the site, providing a direct connection between the western development and the Reformatory Complex to the east and linking trail systems subject to an *Environmental Assessment* or *EIS*.
5. The City shall control access to the Natural Heritage System through wayfinding and signage along public trails to minimize impacts on flora and fauna.
6. The Provincially Significant Earth Science *ANSI*, shown on Natural Heritage System Schedules of the Official Plan, within the GID presents opportunities for scientific and educational activities. These activities will be supported and showcased in conjunction with the adjacent trail network shown on Schedule A.

#### 11.2.2.2 Cultural Heritage

1. Appendix A shows *cultural heritage resources* for illustrative purposes only, along with the Natural Heritage System as designated in the Official Plan to highlight the interconnections between the Natural Heritage System, *cultural heritage resources* and *public views* referred to in the Secondary Plan policies. Appendix A does not constitute part of the Secondary Plan policies.
2. As identified on Schedule B, the eastern portion of the GID is predominantly designated as Adaptive Re-use within a *cultural heritage landscape* with *built heritage resources* in the historic Reformatory Complex. Land uses within the *cultural heritage landscape* boundary are subject to the provisions of the Cultural Heritage Resource policies of the Official Plan. Policies related to the Adaptive Re-use land use designation can be found in Section 11.2.6.3 of this Secondary Plan.
3. *Development* within the GID, on lands designated as Adaptive Re-use and/or adjacent to *cultural heritage resources*, should adopt an architectural vocabulary and design elements that are compatible with and respectful of the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes of the *cultural heritage resources* on site.
4. *Cultural heritage resources* including all features identified as provincially significant shall be conserved through long term protection mechanisms (e.g. heritage conservation easements).
5. A Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment and/or Conservation Plan will be required to ensure that the *cultural heritage resources* within the site will be conserved.
6. All land uses within the GID are subject to the provisions of the Cultural Heritage Resource policies of the Official Plan.
7. It is the intent of this Secondary Plan to conserve *cultural heritage landscapes*, such as the area delineated as the historic Reformatory Complex on Appendix A that have been modified by human activities and are valued by the community.
8. *Cultural heritage landscapes* and visual relationships to *built heritage resources* shall be conserved and monitored to allow for meaningful interpretation.
9. *Development* will respect the existing *cultural heritage resources* and important *public views* and *public vistas* in site design.
10. The retention and integration of the Turfgrass Institute Building (G.M. Frost Centre) into the GID community is encouraged.

#### 11.2.2.3 Topography

1. The topography associated with the Eramosa River Valley within the GID offers appealing vistas towards the historic Reformatory Complex as well as

the Downtown, providing a distinctive character to the area. Future *development* shall take advantage of favourable topography and *public views* and *public vistas* and minimize the need for re-grading on site, where possible.

#### 11.2.2.4 Urban Forest

1. The GID includes hedgerows, smaller wooded areas and individual trees that are part of the City's urban forest. *Development* and *site alteration* will identify opportunities for:
  - a) Protection, enhancement, compensation and/or restoration of the urban forest; and
  - b) Contributing to maintaining and increasing *canopy cover* in a manner that respects the *cultural heritage landscape* and associated *public views* and *public vistas*.

DRAFT

# 11.2.3> ENERGY, SERVICING AND STORMWATER

The energy, infrastructure and sustainability policies below contribute to the development of sustainable, green, low impact urban development within the GID. These policies are informed by the Vision and supporting Principles which seek to exceed Community Energy Plan targets, develop an integrated renewable and alternative energy generation and distribution system, and implement efficient, long-term, community-based strategies to conserve and manage energy, water, wastewater, stormwater and solid waste. These policies together with the mixed-use, *active transportation* and transit-oriented design policies for the GID will minimize the carbon footprint in the GID and increase the overall sustainability of development in the City.

## 11.2.3.1 General Policies

1. *Development* in the GID shall contribute to the City's overall carbon reduction targets as set out in the climate change policies of the Official Plan and the City's Community Energy Plan.
2. The City will encourage decreased energy usage and emissions from transportation through the provision of infrastructure that encourages walking, cycling, use of public transit and the use of low-energy vehicles. Reductions in vehicular trips will also result through the mixed use form of the GID which supports a live/work community.

## 11.2.3.2 Energy

1. *Development* within the GID shall be in accordance with the Energy Sustainability and Community Energy policies of the Official Plan and the following:
  - a) All *development* in the GID shall have regard for the goals and strategies of the City's Community Energy Plan;
  - b) Should the City, Guelph Hydro, and appropriate partners identify parts of the GID as potential *district energy* areas, new *development* shall be *district energy* ready subject to the City establishing *District Energy Ready Guidelines*;
  - c) The City shall work with Guelph Hydro and appropriate partners on the development of a *district energy* system for the GID if such a system is feasible for the GID; and
  - d) Where a *district energy* system has been established or is planned, new *development* will be encouraged and may be required to connect to the *district energy* system and new municipal buildings will connect to the *district energy* system.
2. *Development* in the GID will be encouraged to approach *carbon neutrality* in a cost-effective manner through gains in energy efficiency in built form and by sourcing additional needs from renewable energy sources such as wind, solar, and biomass energy.

3. Developers and owners of all new and existing buildings shall be encouraged to determine and label building energy performance subject to standards as may be adopted by the City.
4. Within the GID, a majority of the *available roof area* of new *development* will be encouraged to be dedicated to roof top solar technologies such as photovoltaic or solar thermal.
5. Retrofits for achieving energy efficiency will only be undertaken to a *built heritage resource* where it is demonstrated that retrofitting can be accomplished without compromising the heritage integrity of the building.

#### 11.2.3.3 Water and Wastewater Servicing

1. *Development* within the GID shall be in accordance with the Water and Wastewater Systems policies of the Official Plan.
2. *Development* within the GID will implement water and wastewater master plans and the City of Guelph Water Conservation and Efficiency Strategy as updated from time-to-time. Given the importance of "Innovation" for the GID, development is encouraged to demonstrate water efficiency measures.
3. Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (ICI) development shall be encouraged to decrease water use through the reuse and/or substitution of water demands via greywater reuse or rainwater harvesting. Developers shall be required to demonstrate the efficient use of potable water with any development application. A target of 250 litres per day, per employee, is proposed for the new ICI development.

#### 11.2.3.4 Stormwater

1. *Development* within the GID shall be in accordance with the watershed planning and water resources policies, and stormwater management policies of the Official Plan and the following:
  - a) Low Impact Development (LID) measures intended to minimize stormwater run-off and recharge groundwater, including but not limited to rainwater harvesting and reuse systems, bio-swales or water features, infiltration facilities, permeable pavement and green roofs, shall be encouraged; and
  - b) The City will explore opportunities to integrate LID measures into the *public realm* areas such as open space, amenity areas and right-of-ways, where feasible and appropriate.
2. *Development* within the GID shall address how pre-development standards may be achieved to maintain the hydrological cycle of the area under post development conditions. This will be achieved through the completion of a stormwater management assessment and/or analysis that includes, but is not limited to, the establishment of water quality, water quantity, water balance, erosion control and natural environment objectives and criteria. These analyses may be used in establishing stormwater management design requirements for *development* in the GID.

## 11.2.4> MOBILITY

The mobility policies strive to establish a multi-modal pedestrian-focused mobility system inclusive of an integrated network with roads, cycling facilities, sidewalks and paths designed, built and maintained with consideration for all users. The GID has been planned to encourage residents and employees to use *active transportation* and transit modes to support overall sustainability and *carbon neutral* objectives of this Secondary Plan. The mobility system must be comprised of: a network fully integrated with adjacent systems and destinations; sufficient transportation capacity within the network to absorb growth; and a long term plan for integration with the Guelph Junction Railway (GJR). The use of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) will assist the system in achieving the *carbon neutral* vision of the GID while offering an effective and efficient integrated transportation and recreational trail system.

### 11.2.4.1 General Mobility Policies

1. A legible network of public roads in a modified grid format will be established. This hierarchy of arterial, collector and local roads provide the general urban structure of the GID and the scale of future development blocks.
2. Wherever possible, public roads shall be aligned to respect the existing topography of the GID and minimize the need for site alteration.
3. All streets shall exhibit a high quality of streetscaping, landscaping, signage and amenities.
4. Consideration and provisions will be made for a future Active Transportation Link crossing over the Eramosa River as shown in Schedule A. If future development necessitates, controlled motorized vehicle access to this crossing may be considered for public transit. Any bridge crossing the Eramosa River will use the existing slopes and maintain, to the greatest extent possible, the topography of the Eramosa River Valley while ensuring that existing *Natural Hazards* are appropriately addressed and not further aggravated.

### 11.2.4.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

1. All roads shall provide for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods. In areas planned for both high levels of truck traffic and high levels of pedestrian and cyclist activity, special attention will be paid to the design of the roadways to enhance pedestrian and cyclist safety and comfort (e.g. consolidated truck loading/unloading areas). Where necessary, traffic calming measures shall be incorporated into the street design of the local street network.
2. The City shall work with transit providers, developers and businesses within the University-Downtown-GID trinity area to develop and implement TDM measures that aim to reduce motorized vehicular trips and promote the use of *active transportation* modes, public transit, car-sharing and/or carpooling.



#### 11.2.4.3 Active Transportation – Walking and Cycling

1. *Active Transportation* Links identified on Schedule A are paths, outside of the roadways, that provide a high level of service for *Active Transportation* as a component of the transportation network. *Active Transportation* Links connect cycling and transit systems enabling access to important destinations within and outside of the GID.
2. *Active transportation* shall be encouraged as a primary, safe, appealing and convenient mode of transportation to, from and within the GID. Pedestrian infrastructure shall be developed with sidewalks provided on both sides of all local streets in accordance with the policies of the Official Plan. A cycling network shall be incorporated into both the street network and city-wide trail system.
3. An *Active Transportation* network shall ensure access and integration of all transportation modes within the network inclusive of:
  - a) New pedestrian linkages to the river valley trail network, where feasible;
  - b) Dedicated bicycle lanes on both sides of collector and arterial roads or separated bicycle facilities on one or both sides of arterial roads, where possible; and
  - c) Bicycle rack and/or storage facilities conveniently located to facilitate access to a range of uses, transit stop locations and trail canoe launch and node locations.
4. Construction of cycling facilities, such as bicycle lanes, routes and/or cycle tracks shall align with the City's Cycling Master Plan guidelines for details regarding design standards.

#### 11.2.4.4 Public Transit

1. Proposed Transit Stops are shown on Schedule A. To maximize accessibility and transit capture potential, the GID has been planned to have transit stops and amenities within a 5 to 10 minute walk of all development.
2. Public transit and its related infrastructure and amenities, including bicycle rack and/or bicycle storage facilities, shall form an integral component of the mobility network.
3. Where appropriate, special paving treatments – including distinct visual and tactile materials – are to be incorporated at Proposed Transit Stops. These raised, visually contrasting surfaces should clearly delineate pedestrian connections between street corners, street edges and transit stops.
4. The future *Active Transportation* Link crossing the Eramosa River shall be designed to provide access to the Proposed Transit Stop along the existing GJR corridor.

#### 11.2.4.5 The Road Network

1. The road network serving the GID shall generally be designed in accordance with the road classifications and alignments identified in Schedule A.

#### 11.2.4.6 Arterial Roads

1. Arterial roads shall generally be designed and built in accordance with the standards outlined in Table 1 and the policies of the Official Plan.
2. Victoria Road South, York Road, Watson Parkway South and Stone Road East are arterial roads that provide access to and through the GID.
3. The City will improve York Road, Victoria Road South and Stone Road East according to relevant approved Environmental Assessments accommodating traffic generated by *development* of the GID.
4. Improvements to York Road will include an Environmental Assessment to determine the realignment of Clythe Creek.

#### 11.2.4.7 Collector Roads

1. Collector roads shall generally be designed and built in accordance with the standards outlined in Table 1 and the policies of the Official Plan.
2. A new collector road (New Street 'A') will provide a north-south link through the west side of the GID as shown on Schedule A and the following:
  - a) North of College Avenue East this collector road shall provide the primary connection to the GID's residential community. This segment of the collector road shall intersect with local roads, with the number and location of intersections to be determined through the Block Planning process; and
  - b) South of College Avenue East the collector road establishes the main spine for the GID's Employment Mixed-use 1 area.

#### 11.2.4.8 Main Street

1. A Main Street has been identified on the extension of College Avenue East into the site. The Main Street will function as a transition area between the lands designated Residential to the north and the Employment Mixed Use 1 lands designated to the south. The Main Street area will accommodate a range of transportation options but should be considered a "pedestrian and transit priority street" and shall generally be designed and built in accordance with the standards outlined in Table 1 and in accordance with the Main Street policies of the Official Plan.

#### 11.2.4.9 Local Roads

1. Local roads shall generally be designed and built in accordance with the standards outlined in Table 1 and the policies of the Official Plan. Local road alignments shall be determined through the Block Planning process.
2. An east-west local road (New Street 'B') is shown on Schedule A to provide mid-block access to the employment mixed use area by connecting Victoria Road South with the GID's new north-south collector road (New Street 'A').

3. A single loaded perimeter local road along the western edge of the Eramosa River Valley shall be considered to provide a public edge, opportunities for separated *active transportation* infrastructure, *public view* and *public vista* opportunities and greater protection opportunities of the Eramosa River Valley given single public ownership of the adjacent land.
4. Consideration shall be given to a potential connection from York Road to Dunlop Drive through the *adaptive reuse* area identified on Schedule B to increase public connectivity and access to the *cultural heritage landscape* and *built heritage resources* where appropriate and feasible.
5. A potential extension of New Street 'A' south of Stone Road East as shown on Schedule A will be determined through the Block Planning process.

#### 11.2.4.10 Parking

1. Wherever feasible, landowners are encouraged to enter into shared parking arrangements with adjacent uses and/or landowners. The shared parking approach takes advantage of different peak periods and reduces the overall additive peak hour use supply while also meeting the peak demands of individual uses. Occupancy Rates may be included as part of a shared parking table in the implementing *Zoning By-Law* and will be determined through the development approvals process.
2. The City may grant, on a site-by-site basis, suitable reductions in on-site parking requirements where off-site parking can be provided in proximity to principal building entrances, or car-share / carpooling, or transit pass arrangements are made, high levels of transit exist, or are planned, or affordable housing is proposed as per the parking policies of the Official Plan. A Parking Study and/or TDM Plan, prepared by a qualified professional, and provision of a binding parking lease agreement, shall be required by the municipality in order to evaluate and determine an appropriate reduction.
3. The provision of centralized shared parking opportunities will be considered as part of the Block Planning process.
4. Where parking is provided, priority spots for carpool vehicles, alternative energy vehicles (such as hybrids and electric cars), car-shares, scooters and motorcycles shall be allocated. Such provisions shall be determined through site plan approval.
5. Parking areas for non-residential uses shall generally be located at the rear or side of buildings. All parking areas shall incorporate landscaping features to screen views of parking areas to the street.
6. The City may consider cash-in-lieu parking strategy as part of the implementing *Zoning By-Law* which shall consider the following:
  - a) Cash-in-lieu options for mixed use areas with large institutional anchors;
  - b) Provision of underground, semi-underground or parking structures to facilitate shared parking demands; and
  - c) Shared parking standards considering anticipated land use mix.

**Table 1. Public Street Classifications and Characteristics**

Street Type	Arterial Roads	Collector Roads		Local Roads
		Main Street	Other	
<b>Street Names</b>	Victoria Road South, Stone Road East, York Road, Watson Parkway South	College Avenue East	New Street A	New Street B All others
<b>Right-of-way widths</b>	26m to 36m (As per OP)	26m	26 - 30m	18 - 20m
<b>Planned setbacks</b>	Varies (Up to 3m in Mixed-use Corridor areas)	Varies (1m to 3m for commercial displays and café seating)	Varies (1m to 3m for commercial displays and café seating)	Varies
<b>Travel Lanes</b>	Victoria Road South, York Road, Stone Road East, Watson Parkway South Lane requirements defined by EA process	2 lanes	2 lanes (up to 4 lanes at peak hours)	2 lanes
<b>Proposed Transit Stops</b>	Yes (Victoria Road South and New Street A; Victoria Road South and College Avenue East; Victoria Road South and New Street B; Victoria Road South and Stone Road East; New Street A and Stone Road East)	Yes (College Avenue East and Victoria Road South; College Avenue East and New Street A)	Yes (College Avenue East and New Street A; New Street A and Victoria Road South; New Street A and Stone Road East)	None
<b>Parking</b>	None (Except as may be permitted in accordance with the Official Plan)	Yes (both sides)	Yes	Yes (where appropriate)
<b>Pedestrian Amenities</b>	Minimum 1.8m sidewalks; 1.8m planting, lighting and furnishing zone  3.0 m multi-use pathway on east side of Victoria Road South	Minimum 2.0m sidewalks; 1.8m planting, lighting and furnishing zone	Minimum 2.0m sidewalks; 1.8m planting, lighting and furnishing zone	1.5m sidewalks on both sides
<b>Dedicated Bicycling Facilities</b>	Min 1.8m dedicated bicycle lanes, where possible.  3.0 multi-use path on east side of Victoria Road South and bike lane on west side of Victoria Road South to be refined during detailed design	Min 1.5m dedicated bicycle lanes	Min 1.5m dedicated bicycle lanes	None

## 11.2.5>

# THE PUBLIC REALM

The *public realm* policies shape and regulate two critical and inter-related elements: publicly owned spaces within the GID (including all roads, sidewalks, and trails, parks and open spaces), and the relationship of the built environment (including all buildings and hard infrastructure) to these public spaces. Many of the components of the Vision and supporting Principles for the Guelph Innovation District are related to and supported by these *public realm* policies, including: the creation of a pedestrian-focused and human-scaled environment; and the creation of a landmark quality community with defined gateways and focal points.

### 11.2.5.1 General

1. In addition to the policies of this Section, the *public realm* within the GID is subject to the general Urban Design policies of the Official Plan.

### 11.2.5.2 Streets

1. Public streets are the backbone of a strong *public realm*. All streets will be designed to function as attractive and accessible public spaces in their own right. Road design will balance the provisions of a safe, accessible, functional and attractive pedestrian-oriented environment with an acceptable level of motor vehicle traffic and the movement of goods along arterial and collector roads.
2. In general, streets shall incorporate a high degree of landscaping within the public right-of-way allowance, inclusive of: landscaped boulevards separating sidewalks from traffic including on-street parking lanes. Where landscaped boulevards are not feasible, street trees shall be provided and their design and placement shall sustain a healthy urban tree canopy.
3. New tree rooting technologies should be used within higher density areas such as the Mixed-use Corridor (GID) areas.
4. Opportunities for landscaping within the public right-of-way will be explored and implemented as a means to increase the area's tree canopy and contribute to stormwater management.
5. The design and placement of street lighting and signage standards will be coordinated to establish a consistent and cohesive identity for the GID. Pedestrian scaled lighting should also be incorporated, where appropriate, into the design of lighting standards within the District.
6. Wherever possible, driveway access to parking areas will be shared between adjacent properties in order to maximize landscaping opportunities within medians; and to minimize the potential for pedestrian and vehicular conflict where driveways and sidewalks intersect.

7. In consultation with landowners, the City may seek to establish conveyances, or alternatively the creation of public easements, for the creation of appropriately sized mid-block pedestrian and bicyclist connections, interconnecting arterial, collector and local roads, the trail network and *active transportation* links.
8. The design and layout of the street network shall generally be consistent with Schedule A.

#### 11.2.5.3 Parks, Public Open Spaces and Trail Networks

1. *Development* within the GID will include the creation of two new public park spaces, each with distinct roles and functions. The general location of new public parks are identified on Schedule B. City staff will secure and develop the new parkland through the development approvals process, making use of the provisions under the Planning Act to provide these park spaces over time.
2. The exact location and configuration of the new public parks will be determined through the development approvals process.
3. The public park spaces will be developed in accordance with the Open Space System: Trails and Parks policies of the Official Plan and the following specific policies:
  - a) A new neighbourhood park will be developed in a central location within the designated Residential lands north of the identified Main Street; and will serve as a focal point for active and passive recreation. Frontage along a local road is preferred with strong *active transportation* linkages and facilities included within/adjacent to the park space to make connections to the trail system.
  - b) A new community park that also includes neighbourhood park components will be developed in a central location within the designated Employment Mixed-use 1 lands south of the identified Main Street; and will serve as a focal point for active and passive recreation. Frontage along a collector road is preferred with strong *active transportation* linkages and facilities included within/adjacent to the park space to make connections to the trail system.
4. Buildings adjacent to park spaces will be designed to enliven and animate the edges of parks. Consideration shall be given to principal building entrances that front onto park spaces, where appropriate, while surface parking areas should not be situated flanking parks.
5. Parks and open spaces will support both active and passive activities.
6. Subject to additional detailed design, park spaces shall incorporate a suitable balance of hard landscaped, soft landscaped and designated open and playground areas to accommodate a range of active, passive, programmed and aesthetic functions.
7. Parks and open spaces will be designed as community and cultural hubs accommodating programmed and non-programmed activities and reflect

multi-generational and multi-use needs, providing spaces for both residential and employment populations.

8. Schedule A displays the existing and planned trail network. A Trail Network will be established for the GID, in accordance with the policies of the Official Plan, to serve as both a recreational and *active transportation* resource. The multi-purpose function of the trail system will support a *carbon neutral* vision and provide a *public realm* facility for messaging and celebrating the GID's natural and *cultural heritage resources*.
9. The City will increase the urban forest canopy coverage in parks and open space areas, where feasible and appropriate.
10. The City shall encourage linking parks and open space with the trail network and stormwater management facilities.
11. The City shall encourage and support community engagement opportunities through the design of parks and open space including community gardens, market opportunities, public art, etc.
12. Public art, along with interpretive signage, way-finding strategies and other techniques will serve as unifying elements for the GID.
13. The City shall encourage an integrated public art approach that ties together the natural and cultural significance of the District, with its future vision. The integration of public art in parks and open spaces shall be encouraged. Opportunities presented within the historic Reformatory Complex, trail network, parks and open space designations, and public lookout points and vistas should be considered as potential public art locations.
14. Public lookout points and vistas shall be accessible by multiple transportation modes.

#### 11.2.5.4 Mixed-use Corridor Policies

1. Through implementation of the built form policies within this Secondary Plan (Section 11.2.6.2), buildings within the mixed-use areas may be setback to preserve opportunities for the placement of small outdoor café and commercial display spaces.
2. Commercial and mixed-use buildings will be encouraged to incorporate sheltering elements for the comfort and amenity of pedestrians.

#### 11.2.5.5 Transit Stops

1. Transit Stops shall be designed to promote a sense of place and provide a high degree of user amenities which may include bicycle parking and/or bicycle storage facilities where appropriate.
2. Additional building setbacks and/or increased right-of-ways may be required through a draft plan of subdivision or site plan control for the provision of public benches, sheltered waiting areas, information displays, and landscaping treatments in the public right-of-way.

#### 11.2.5.6 Nodes

1. Nodes are identified at the intersection of collectors and arterial roads within the mixed-use designations in the GID. Nodes represent the confluence of many activities and uses. They are important gathering and meeting places, and the *public realm* should be designed to reflect their importance.
2. The design of buildings within and immediately adjacent to designated Nodes shall exhibit a high standard of architectural design.
3. The City will encourage and may require a high degree of transparency within the ground floors of all commercial and mixed-use buildings within the Nodes.

DRAFT



# 11.2.6>

## LAND USE AND BUILT FORM

The land use and built form policies shape and regulate the general pattern of development including permitted uses within the GID and the structuring of these uses within the built form (including building types, massing and height). The policies are informed by the Vision and supporting Principles.

### 11.2.6.1 General Land Use Policies

1. Schedule B establishes the pattern of land use within the GID. Where land use designations are the same as those in the Official Plan, the policies of the Official Plan shall apply.
2. *Development* within the GID will offer opportunities for people to live and work in close proximity which has the potential to reduce vehicular trips and the GID's overall carbon footprint. A balance of live and work opportunities that provide for day and night activities shall be encouraged to ensure a vibrant destination community where people can live, work, play and learn.
3. The GID will be developed to support and accommodate emerging innovation businesses and other "green" energy industries that will contribute to the emergence of the GID as an innovation centre together with the knowledge-based research centre located within the University of Guelph and with the civic hub and cultural centre of Downtown. Large tracts of undeveloped land, proximity to the University and Downtown, scenic viewsheds, the cultural heritage resources of the area and strategic marketing to attract new businesses will advance this third cluster within the University-Downtown-GID trinity.
4. The GID will be comprised of a mix of land uses, housing and building types at a sufficient density to support *active transportation* and transit. The GID will be defined by the *public realm* including roads, sidewalks, and parks, open spaces and trails as established by the policies and Schedules contained within this Secondary Plan. Employment, residential and commercial will be the predominant land uses to the west of the Eramosa River, with residential uses concentrated within neighbourhoods north of College Avenue East.
5. Large-format, stand-alone retail commercial uses are not permitted within the GID. Small- and medium-scale retail commercial uses are encouraged within the mixed-use designations of the site to contribute to a Main Street type environment.
6. In order to contribute to achieving the City-wide population and employment projections and density targets, the GID is planned to achieve the following by the year 2031:
  - a) 9,100 jobs
  - b) 4,400 people

7. Residential and employment lands within the *greenfield area* of the GID will be planned to contribute toward the overall *density targets* for the *greenfield area* of the City over the long term. The *greenfield area* of the GID will be planned and designed to achieve an overall minimum *density target* that is not less than 90 persons and jobs combined per hectare.
8. The topography, landscape and natural and cultural heritage features associated with the Eramosa River are unique to the GID within the City of Guelph. Future road alignment, siting and massing of buildings, and design of development should enhance scenic views of the Eramosa River valley and *cultural heritage landscape* features associated with the historic Reformatory Complex, as well as views of Downtown, by:
  - a) Introducing a modified grid pattern of streets and designing future streets to respond to the natural open space and topographic conditions found on the site;
  - b) Generally providing a single loaded local road on the table lands adjacent to the natural heritage system in the Mixed-use Employment area on the west side of the River to allow public access to views of the Eramosa River;
  - c) Maintaining *public views and vistas* of the Eramosa River and *cultural heritage landscape* features from the Main Street area and residential areas to the north of College Avenue East; and
  - d) Maintaining *public views* of the Church of our Lady Immaculate in Downtown.
9. The predominant character of built form within the GID will be established by mid-rise residential and employment buildings with a limited number of taller buildings at strategic locations marking the Nodes. A range of building types and uses are encouraged, including residential and mixed-use buildings, townhouses, research, design and office complexes, manufacturing and live/work units.
10. A series of nodes will be developed within the GID, as identified on Schedule C and according to policies contained within Section 11.2.5.6. Higher density development within the site shall be organized at these nodes and associated transit stops.
11. Stormwater management facilities shall use land in a compact way, promote connectivity and be integrated within *development* as a component of the publicly accessible open space and park network by ensuring that:
  - a) Fencing around ponds is minimized in favour of shallow slope grading adjacent to pooled areas;
  - b) Where feasible, stormwater management facilities are integrated within connections between parks and natural heritage features; and
  - a) Open spaces and/or public right-of-ways are provided adjacent to the perimeters of stormwater management ponds.

#### 11.2.6.2 General Built Form and Site Development Policies

1. *Development* shall be planned and designed to:

- a) Consider future intensification opportunities within the site;
  - b) Enhance connectivity by incorporating multi-modal transportation systems;
  - c) Use sufficient block sizes in Residential and Mixed-use Corridor (GID) areas to achieve pedestrian-oriented development by generally establishing a maximum block length of 100-150 meters measured along the long axis of a street; and
  - d) Balance the needs of the businesses and residents through the use of public laneways, parking and open space within transitional areas.
2. Minimum and maximum building heights are indicated on Schedule C. It is planned that the tallest buildings will be located within nodes located at key intersections to provide focal points for the GID. Where heights have not been indicated on Schedule C, they will be established through the development approvals process.
  3. Where *public views and vistas* are identified, heights lower than the maximum building heights on Schedule C may be established through the development approvals process to maintain *public views and vistas* of the Eramosa River and the Downtown.
  4. *Development* will be of high quality architecture, landscape, and urban design and will make a significant contribution to creating a distinct character and identify for the residential and mixed-use neighbourhoods contained within the GID and will showcase the area's unique natural and cultural history.
  5. Definition of street edge is a priority; *development* within the GID shall create a rhythm and spacing of building entrances and appropriately sized storefronts to encourage pedestrian activity.
  6. Maximum building setbacks from the property line on public streets are included in Section 11.2.4, Table 1. Exceptions to setbacks established in Table 1 may be granted, through the development approvals process in the case of signature sites and public buildings that incorporate highly visible and accessible landscaped open space within the divergent setback.
  7. In addition to other policies of this Secondary Plan, blocks, buildings and structures will be organized to define a *public realm* including public streets and laneways, driveways and sidewalks that contribute positively to the character and identity of neighbourhoods, including:
    - a) Arranging blocks that maximize street frontage with buildings massed and articulated appropriately to minimize the scale of larger buildings and to add visual interest;
    - b) Arranging blocks to maximize solar gain along the long axis while minimizing shadowing of adjacent properties and buildings;
    - c) Providing visual overlook from new development to public spaces and including building entrances, active ground floor frontages and transparent building materials along the edge of public space;
    - d) Ensuring main building entrances are directly accessible from a public street, or a publicly-accessible courtyard physically and visually connected to the street;

- e) Minimizing impacts on vehicular, bike and pedestrian traffic on Arterial and Collector streets by providing vehicular access, ramps, servicing and loading access from local streets or laneways whenever possible and minimizing the number of driveway access points;
  - f) Providing vehicular access from rear laneways to detached, semi-detached and duplex houses, townhouses and live/work units to reduce the number of curb cuts and protect opportunities for soft landscaping and active uses at grade along street edges;
  - g) Defining transitional areas between uses in development blocks through provision of landscaped courtyards and other outdoor amenity space;
  - h) Visually enhancing surrounding public streets, parks and other public spaces through landscaped open space;
  - i) Designing sites, buildings and landscaping to encourage informal surveillance through strategies such as: clear sightlines into building entrances, parking areas, amenity spaces and site servicing areas; locating open spaces adjacent to public roads to improve the safety of parks through passive surveillance; providing low growing plant material along pedestrian walkways; and providing pedestrian-scale lighting in areas of pedestrian activity; and
  - j) Providing traffic calming features, including but not limited to, curb extensions, raised surface treatments, chicanes, and textured paving.
8. The GID shall be designed to accommodate the needs of persons with disabilities. Urban design considerations for a barrier-free environment should meet the Accessible Design policies of the Official Plan, at minimum, addressing the following:
- a) Pathways free of obstructions, including street furniture, signs, trees, shop awnings and advertising signs, etc. Obstructions should be placed outside the path of travel wherever possible;
  - b) Signage that is clear, glare-free, simple, easy to read and understand, and properly lit at night. The colour of signs should contrast with the surrounding surface, and the colour combinations red/green and yellow/blue should not be used to avoid confusing colour-blind persons;
  - c) Provide tactile cues such as guide strips to help a person with sight problems identify travel routes. Guide strips should be laid in a simple and logical manner, and should have a contrasting colour with the surrounding surface. The strips should be flush with the road surface so as not to hinder people with mobility problems; and
  - d) Outdoor accessible parking spaces should be located near accessible building entrances. Indoor accessible parking spaces should be located near accessible elevators, or as close as possible to exits.
9. To ensure an attractive streetscape and maximize opportunities for passive energy efficiency/*carbon neutrality*, architectural controls may be required to be developed through the Block Plan process to address detailed building design aspects such as: massing; passive energy efficiency matters; siting; grading; elevation articulation; garage articulation; materials colour, sustainability and quality; and roof design.
10. Residential dwellings shall be designed such that garages are not the dominant feature in the streetscape. Garages for all ground-related dwellings

shall generally be in the rear yard accessed by laneway or front driveway. This will allow for:

- a) Ground floor front porches, windows and front facing rooms to create a more attractive housing form and to enhance neighbourhood safety through casual surveillance;
- b) The creation of an attractive streetscape;
- c) Adequate space for street trees and front yard landscaping; and
- d) Additional opportunities for on-street parking in front of the units.

### 11.2.6.3 Land Use Designations

#### 11.2.6.3.1 Adaptive Re-use (GID)

1. The Adaptive Re-use area is designated on Schedule B. The Adaptive Re-use designation includes provincially *significant cultural heritage resources* where the conservation, rehabilitation, restoration, maintenance and re-use of *built heritage resources* and *cultural heritage landscapes* will serve as the focal point of new *development*. This designation permits a mix of uses including institutional, educational, commercial, office, light industrial, residential, *live/work* and open space and park in a form that respects the existing built heritage form, *cultural heritage landscape* features, as well as the relationships between cultural heritage resources considered for adaptive re-use and *redevelopment*.
2. *Development* shall be physically and visually compatible with and respectful of the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes of the cultural heritage resources on site. New additions or new construction to a *built heritage resource*, where permitted to facilitate *adaptive reuse*, shall conserve the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes.
3. Through the Block Plan process and/or the development approvals process, the mix of uses, zoning categories and appropriate regulations will be established to permit and control uses within the Adaptive Re-use designation.

#### 11.2.6.3.2 Mixed-use Corridor (GID)


1. Mixed-use Corridor (GID) areas are designated on Schedule B and include areas comprised primarily of vacant or under-used lands that are targeted for significant growth. These areas will consist of a mix of residential, commercial, *live/work*, institutional, office and educational uses within a highly compact form of development that will contribute to the creation of focal points and transition areas. High quality urban and architectural design and a well-connected, pedestrian-oriented, *public realm* in accordance with the policies of this Section and Section 11.2.5.4 of this Secondary Plan will define these areas.
2. The following uses may be permitted within the Mixed-use Corridor (GID) designation:
  - a) Commercial, retail and service uses;

- b) Office;
  - c) Entertainment and recreational commercial uses;
  - d) Cultural and educational uses;
  - e) Institutional uses;
  - f) Hotels;
  - g) *Live/work*; and
  - h) Medium and high density multiple unit residential buildings and apartments.
3. A consistent built form edge shall be established through maximum setbacks established in the implementing *Zoning By-law* in accordance with Table 1.
4. *Development* within the nodes identified on Schedule C and along College Avenue East within the identified Main Street area will be compact and mixed-use with a continuous built form edge containing the following:
- a) Retail and service uses, including restaurants and personal service uses, entertainment uses or professional offices and community or social services shall generally be required on the ground floors of all buildings at the street edge;
  - b) Building façades facing a public street shall be considered a primary façade. A minimum of one pedestrian entrance shall be provided for any primary façade;
  - c) Buildings on corner lots should be designed to have primary façades on both the front and side street;
  - d) Ground floor heights will generally be a minimum of approximately 4.5 metres floor to floor; windows shall correspond appropriately to the height of ground floors. Generally, a large proportion of the street-facing ground floor wall of new mixed-use buildings shall be glazed; and
  - e) Building heights shall contribute to a continuous street wall that has a minimum height of 4 storeys as shown on Schedule C.
5. The GID will be anchored by a mixed-use urban village at the intersection of the eastern extension of College Avenue East and an interior north-south collector that will offer a wide range of urban amenities and services. A signature site will be located at the intersection of College Avenue East and the proposed north-south Collector. A landmark building of high quality urban design and architectural detail located within the signature site will provide an anchor to the urban village. At grade, pedestrian-oriented, commercial amenities will be provided.
6. The following shall apply to all *development* located within the Mixed-use Corridor (GID) designation:
- a) Buildings with long façades shall be designed with architectural articulation and changes in material to create interesting building forms, compatible development which breaks up the visual impact of the massing. Articulated massing may include: building stepping/façade step-backs, layered massing (horizontal or vertical) and modulation and change in materials and colour;
  - b) The massing and articulation of buildings taller than five storeys shall provide appropriate transitions to areas with lower permitted heights, minimizing impact on the street level as well as shadow impacts. A

minimum step-back of 3m-6m shall be implemented at the 5th storey. The floorplates of floors above the fifth storey generally shall be a maximum of 1000 square metres. Figure 1 indicates the general built form that is to be achieved; and

- c) All buildings should be finished with high quality, enduring materials, such as stone, brick and glass.
7. For free-standing residential development, the maximum net density is 150 units per hectare and the minimum net density is 100 units per hectare.

Figure 1. Mixed-use Corridor (GID) development



### 11.2.6.3.3 Employment Mixed-use 1

1. The Employment Mixed-use 1 designation on Schedule B includes areas targeted for significant growth as a landmark area in the University-Downtown-GID trinity. These areas will permit a mix of uses focusing on higher density, innovation and sustainability which includes uses such as research and development, commercial, educational, institutional, limited residential uses (in the form of *live/work*) and entertainment uses that will serve to support the role of the business area as a knowledge-based innovation centre.
2. The following uses may be permitted within the Employment Mixed-use 1 designation:
  - a) Office and administrative facilities;
  - b) Research and development facilities;
  - c) *Live/work* uses;

- d) Cultural and educational uses;
  - e) Institutional uses;
  - f) Hotel and convention facilities;
  - g) Entertainment and recreational commercial uses;
  - h) Assembly and manufacturing of product lines requiring on-going research and development support;
  - i) Associated ancillary retail uses that are an integral component of the primary uses; and
  - j) Complementary or accessory uses may also be permitted. Such uses may include restaurants, financial institutions, medical services, fitness centres, open space and recreation facilities and *child care* centres.
3. Low density employment uses such as logistics and warehousing are not permitted.
  4. Where land use transitions from Residential and/or Mixed-use Corridor (GID) to Employment Mixed-use 1 areas, the following uses shall be priorities to ensure a compatible mix of uses: offices, *live/work* uses and entertainment and recreational commercial.
  5. *Development* in the Employment Mixed-use 1 designation will comprise a mix of street-related and campus form development. Campus form development is to consist primarily of prestige employment/research park uses and is to be concentrated north of Stone Road within Block Plan Area 2.
  6. Campus form development in the employment area is appropriate near open space and natural heritage elements (Eramosa River Valley) where a balance of site and building design can integrate landscape, topography, and other special features with site access requirements including roads, driveways, parking, and service and loading areas. Campus form development shall comply with the following:
    - a) Buildings should be oriented to maximize open space opportunities, providing a scale and pattern of development that supports pedestrian activities at grade between buildings while maximising solar gain; and
    - b) Where appropriate, building heights and massing should optimize views at-grade to the open space and natural heritage elements.
  7. Street related design consists of buildings that define street edges through established maximum setbacks and consistent landscape edge treatment and include:
    - a) Maximum setbacks as established in Table 1; and
    - b) Active at-grade uses with street access which could include retail, cafes and restaurants to connect public activity within the building, street and open space.
  8. Residential *development* may be permitted south of College Avenue East within the area identified on Schedule C subject to the following:
    - a) Demonstration of the achievement (or planned achievement) of the population, employment and density targets for Block Plan Areas 1 and



- 2 established in policy 11.2.7.3.3 and Table 2 to the satisfaction of the City;
  - b) Demonstration of the achievement (or planned achievement) of the *greenfield area density target* for the *greenfield area* of the GID established in policy 11.2.6.1.7 to the satisfaction of the City;
  - c) *Compatibility* with adjacent employment uses; and
  - d) Demonstration that the lands are not required for employment purposes over the long-term.
9. Where residential *development* is permitted within the Employment Mixed-use 1 designation in accordance with policy 11.2.6.3.3.8, *development* will be in accordance with the provisions of the Residential designation.
10. Through the Block Plan process and/or the development approvals process, zoning categories and appropriate regulations will be established to permit and control uses within the Employment Mixed-use 1 designation including locations for street edge and campus form development.
- 11.2.6.3.4 Employment Mixed-use 2
1. Employment Mixed-use 2 areas are designated on Schedule B. These areas will have a mix of uses including: office, commercial, educational and institutional, and, to a lesser extent, entertainment uses that will serve to support the role of the employment area as an important component of the *Guelph Agri-Innovation Cluster*.
2. The following uses may be permitted within the Employment Mixed-use 2 designation subject to the applicable provisions of this Secondary Plan:
- a) Research and development facilities;
  - b) Office and administrative facilities;
  - c) Cultural and education uses;
  - d) Institutional uses;
  - e) Entertainment and recreational commercial uses;
  - f) Associated ancillary retail uses that are an integral component of the primary uses; and
  - g) Complementary or accessory uses may be permitted. Such uses may include convenience commercial uses and community facility uses.
3. The following uses are not permitted within the Employment Mixed-use 2 designation:
- a) Residential;
  - b) *Live/work*; and
  - c) Logistics and warehousing.
4. The areas designated Employment Mixed-use 2 adjacent to Stone Road East between the Eramosa River and Watson Parkway South will serve as a transitional area to buffer the residential lands south of Stone Road East from the Major Utility and Industrial designated lands north of Stone Road East. Within the Employment Mixed-use 2 designation the following shall apply:

- a) Buildings will be oriented towards Stone Road East with sufficient front setbacks with landscaped open space;
  - b) Heights that provide sufficient screening of industrial uses from residential development south of Stone Road East will be established within the implementing *Zoning By-law*; and
  - c) Parking, loading and access will comply with policies established in this Secondary Plan and the general urban design policies of the Official Plan.
5. Through the Block Plan process and/or the development approvals process, zoning categories and appropriate regulations will be established to permit and control uses within the Employment Mixed-use 2 designation.

#### 11.2.6.3.5 Residential

1. Residential areas are designated on Schedule B. The predominant land use in this designation shall be medium density housing forms such as townhouses and apartments with a limited supply of low density housing forms such as single and semi-detached dwellings. The final range and distribution of these housing forms will be determined through the Block Plan and/or development approvals process and regulated through the implementing *Zoning By-Law*.
2. The following uses may be permitted within the Residential designation:
  - a) Multiple unit residential buildings, such as townhouses and apartments;
  - b) Detached, semi-detached and duplex dwellings;
  - c) Convenience commercial uses;
  - d) *Live/work* units;
  - e) Community services and facilities;
  - f) *Child care centres*;
  - g) Schools; and
  - h) Park space including urban squares.
3. Multiple unit residential buildings and *live/work* units shall be oriented towards a street with the main entrance to the building/dwelling unit accessible directly from a right-of-way.
4. The layout of local roads within residential areas shall consider orientation that facilitates maximum solar gain along the long axis of buildings.
5. The maximum net density is 150 units per hectare and not less than a minimum net density of 35 units per hectare. Minimum and maximum heights are indicated on Schedule C.

#### 11.2.6.3.6 Glenholme Estate Residential

The Glenholme Estate Residential area is designated on Schedule B. This designation includes lands containing existing low density estate residential uses on large lots that are currently serviced by private individual on-site water and wastewater services. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, it is anticipated that the existing residential uses will continue in their current form during the Secondary Plan period, with opportunities for minor limited additional estate residential infill *development* which is consistent with the

character of existing development. Existing and new *development* within this land use designation are subject to the following policies:

1. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Secondary Plan, only the following uses shall be permitted:
  - a) Single detached dwelling;
  - b) Accessory apartment; and
  - c) Home occupation.
2. Limited additional low density estate residential infill *development* may be permitted on existing lots that are 1.0 ha in size or greater, subject to meeting the following size criteria, and all other applicable policies of this Secondary Plan:
  - a) Minimum lot size of 0.4 ha for new and retained residential lots and an average lot size (of new lots and retained residential lots) of 0.7 ha.
3. New residential lots shall be configured and sized to maintain the character of the lot fabric of the area including frontage, setbacks, landscaped space and amenity areas and to ensure flexibility for the proper ongoing operation of private individual on-site services.
4. Notwithstanding the servicing policies of the Official Plan, new estate residential *development* within the Glenholme Estate Residential designation may be permitted with private individual on-site water and wastewater services as an interim measure until full municipal services are available.
5. As part of a development application the City may impose such conditions as are deemed appropriate to protect City and public interest, particularly with respect to protecting City drinking water supplies. The City may require proponents to enter into an agreement related to the ongoing operation and maintenance of interim private services, the requirement for the property owner to connect to full municipal services when they become available at their own expense, and other relevant matters.
6. *Development* within the Glenholme Estate Residential designation will be regulated through a site specific *Zoning By-law* amendment and shall be subject to site plan control.

#### 11.2.6.3.7 Open Space and Parks

1. Open Space and Parks areas are designated on Schedule B and are subject to the Open Space and Parks policies of the Official Plan and the applicable provisions of the GID Secondary Plan.
2. In accordance with the policies of the Official Plan, municipal parks and municipal recreation facilities are permitted in all land use designations.

#### 11.2.6.3.8 Neighbourhood Commercial Centre

1. As identified on Schedule B, a small portion of the GID, located at the southeast corner of York Road and Victoria Road South, is designated as Neighbourhood Commercial Centre and is subject to the Neighbourhood Commercial Centre policies of the Official Plan.

#### 11.2.6.3.9 Service Commercial

1. As identified on Schedule B, a small portion of the GID, located at the southwest corner of York Road and Watson Parkway South, is designated as Service Commercial and is subject to the Service Commercial policies of the Official Plan.

#### 11.2.6.3.10 Industrial

1. As identified on Schedule B, portions of the GID are designated as Industrial and are subject to the Industrial policies of the Official Plan.

#### 11.2.6.3.11 Major Utility

1. As identified on Schedule B, a significant portion of the east side of the GID is designated Major Utility and is subject to the Major Utility policies of the Official Plan.

#### 11.2.6.4 Compatibility: Major Utility and Industrial Uses

1. When considering development applications and *public realm* projects, there shall be regard to all applicable provincial and municipal policies, regulations and guidelines to ensure that *compatibility* will be achieved and maintained with regard to noise, vibration, dust, odour, air quality and illumination so as to achieve the goals of:
  - a) Preventing undue adverse impacts from proposed *development* on the City's Waste Resource Innovation Centre, designated Major Utility and the Cargill plant designated Industrial; and
  - b) Preventing undue adverse impacts on the proposed *development* from the City's Waste Resource Innovation Centre, designated Major Utility and the Cargill plant designated Industrial.
2. Sensitive land uses may be prohibited in the *Zoning By-law* or limited (through massing and siting, buffering and design mitigation measures) in areas in proximity to the Major Utility and Industrial designations to ensure *compatibility*. In addition, noise and air emissions reports shall be required and vibration and illumination reports may be required, in support of development approval requests. Such environmental reports are to specify how *compatibility* will be achieved and maintained between the Waste Resource Innovation Centre and Cargill and the proposed *development*, and may include measures aimed at minimizing impacts.
3. The City shall consult with the Ministry of the Environment, Cargill and the City's Waste Resource Innovation Centre during the development approvals

process and during the design process for public spaces in the vicinity of the Cargill plant and the City's Waste Resource Innovation Centre property to ensure *compatibility*.

DRAFT

# 11.2.7>

## INTERPRETATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation of this Secondary Plan will require a variety of tools and many actions on the part of the City, private landowners, institutions and others. This Section describes important tools and strategies to be used by the City in addition to the tools and strategies identified in the Official Plan. It also identifies initiatives and partnerships intended to implement key elements of this Secondary Plan and, in the process, encourage private development and investment in the GID. Many of the strategies build upon previous initiatives and current investments by the City.

### 11.2.7.1 Interpretation and Implementation Policies

1. Lands within the GID Secondary Plan area are subject to the interpretation and implementation policies of the Official Plan and the following specific policies.
2. Where the policies of this Secondary Plan conflict with those in the Official Plan, the policies of the GID Secondary Plan shall prevail.
3. The built form policies of the GID Secondary Plan respond sensitively to the topography and adjacent land uses. The primary intent is to ensure *compatibility* among buildings of different types and forms, the minimization and mitigation of adverse shadow and view impacts, and the creation and maintenance of an inviting and comfortable *public realm*. Nevertheless, the City recognizes the need to be somewhat flexible and allow for well-designed buildings that respond appropriately to the conditions of their site and surroundings and are consistent with the principles of this Secondary Plan. Where “generally” is used to qualify a built form policy found in Section 11.2.6.2 of this Secondary Plan, it is the intent that the policy requirement shall be met except where an applicant has demonstrated to the City’s satisfaction that site-specific conditions warrant considerations of alternatives, and that the proposed alternative built form parameters meet the general intent of the policy. Such exceptions shall not require an amendment to this Secondary Plan.

### 11.2.7.2 Design Review

1. The City may establish a design review committee, comprised of professionals with expertise in planning and urban design, architecture, engineering, landscape architecture and/or environmental design, or other advisory process, such as an architectural or urban design peer review process at the applicant’s expense, to assist in the review of significant development proposals and capital projects in the GID. In reviewing significant development projects within the GID, such a committee or process shall be guided by the policies of the GID Secondary Plan and applicable Official Plan

policies and shall consider the urban design, architectural, engineering, landscape and environmental design aspects of the proposal.

### 11.2.7.3 Block Plans

1. Block Plan areas are identified on Schedule D. These areas have been delineated based on existing boundaries such as roads and the Eramosa River, land ownership patterns and land use designations.
2. Block Plans will be developed for each of the identified Block Plan areas to specifically implement the policies of the GID Secondary Plan. The Block Plan process will establish a pattern of development which ensures that *development* will occur in an orderly, cost effective and timely manner. Actual timing of *development* will be managed through the City’s annual Development Priorities Plan in accordance with the managing growth policies of the Official Plan.
3. The Block Plan areas will be used for the purposes of monitoring and ensuring achievement of population, employment and density targets as well as capital programming and land assembly. The targets for the Block Plan areas are established in Table 2:

Table 2: Block Plan Area Targets

	Population Target	Employment Target	Residential Density (units/net ha)	Employment Density (jobs/net ha)
Block Plan Area 1:	3,200	1,350	75	135
Block Plan Area 2:	300	3,600	75	90
Block Plan Area 3:	800	1,000	75	85
Block Plan Area 4:	N/A	500	N/A	N/A

4. Block Plans are required to be developed to the satisfaction of the City and approved by the City for each of the identified Block Plan areas prior to approval of any development application within the corresponding Block Plan area.
5. Block Plans will be prepared in accordance with a Terms of Reference approved by the City. Block Plans will demonstrate conformity with the policies and schedules of the GID Secondary Plan and will include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following:
  - a) Road pattern (including location of new public and/or private streets and laneways and alternative street cross-sections where required);

- b) Layout of development blocks and stormwater management ponds and facilities;
  - c) Location, size and configuration of parks, open space and urban squares;
  - d) Density and distribution of housing types;
  - e) Architectural design controls;
  - f) Achievement of the population, employment and density targets established in Table 2;
  - g) Provision of municipal services;
  - h) Refinement of trail network and *active transportation* links;
  - i) River crossings (need and feasibility analysis);
  - j) General location of *public views and vistas*;
  - k) Evaluation of *cultural heritage resources* and methods of conservation; and
  - l) Conformity with the built form and site development policies of the GID Secondary Plan and the urban design policies of the Official Plan through the development of design guidelines for the area.
6. Draft plan of subdivision, *Zoning By-law* amendment and site plan applications, or any phases thereof, for properties subject to Block Plans shall demonstrate to the City's satisfaction that the proposed *development* is generally consistent with the applicable Block Plan and will contribute to meeting the principles, objectives and applicable policies and targets of the GID Secondary Plan. Block Plans may be amended through the development approvals process, provided the relevant policies of the GID Secondary Plan continue to be satisfied.
  7. An *Environmental Impact Study* will be prepared in accordance with a Terms of Reference approved by the City as part of the Block Plan process and will meet the Environmental Study Requirements of the City's Official Plan to the satisfaction of the City in consultation with the GRCA.
  8. The EIS will include the enhancement and restoration of existing surface water features and their riparian areas in order to support *fish habitat* and the improvement of water quality and quantity.
  9. The EIS will establish management objectives and stewardship and/or restoration recommendations for the respective block plan areas for the City's Natural Heritage System that is within the GID.
  10. The City may require the preparation of detailed *Environmental Impact Studies* in support of *development* applications. The need for additional environmental studies will be determined through the preconsultation process prior to the submission of *development* applications.
- 11.2.7.4 Height and Density Bonusing
1. *Development* within the nodes identified on Schedule C may be permitted additional height and density to a maximum of 12 storeys in accordance with the Height and Density Bonus Provision policies of the Official Plan.
  2. In addition to the community benefits outlined in the Official Plan, design elements that significantly contribute to the achievement of *carbon neutrality*



shall be considered community benefits when the City considers authorizing increases in height and density within the identified nodes in the GID.

#### 11.2.7.5 Special Studies and Future Initiatives

1. The City will prepare an Implementation Strategy for the GID to coordinate and manage the implementation of the policy directions related to the achievement of *carbon neutral development*. The Implementation Strategy will identify targets for *carbon neutrality* and describe a range of mechanisms, tools and initiatives that may be used by the City, landowners and developers to achieve the identified targets. The GID Implementation Strategy shall be incorporated into and refined through the Block Plan process.
2. Alternative development standards may be developed where appropriate to meet the objectives and policies of this Secondary Plan.
3. Additional studies may be required prior to or as part of Block Plan approval to implement *development* within the GID. These studies include but are not limited to the following:
  - a) A stormwater management assessment and/or analysis that includes, but is not limited to, the establishment of water quality, water quantity, water balance, erosion control and natural environment objectives and criteria. These analyses may be used in establishing stormwater management design requirements for *development* in the GID;
  - b) A Water and Wastewater Master Plan that establishes conceptual design and development standards for *development* in the GID; and
  - c) A *District Energy* Feasibility Study with Guelph Hydro and landowners to guide implementation and development of a *District Energy* System in the GID.

#### 11.2.7.6 Finance

1. The implementation of the policies of the GID Secondary Plan will be subject to the capital budget and financial policies and procedures approved by City Council, as well as the availability of funding or service provision from other levels of government.

#### 11.2.7.7 Partnerships

1. The City will work in partnership with the Province and other stakeholders towards the effective and efficient *development* of lands in accordance with the policies of this Secondary Plan, including assessing the following:
  - a) Site/servicing development models for priority areas including the extension of College Avenue East;
  - b) Development of Research and Development Clusters in partnership with the Post-Secondary Institutions;
  - c) *Redevelopment* of the Guelph Correctional Facility for uses permitted by the Adaptive Re-use designation, including assessing the feasibility for the possible extension of College Avenue East over the Eramosa River to provide pedestrian and transit connections to such development; and

- d) Coordination of marketing and business development efforts targeting knowledge-based innovation sector businesses and other related users within mixed-use employment areas.

#### 11.2.7.8 Definitions

1. In addition to definitions of the Official Plan, the following definitions are applicable in the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan:

**Active Transportation** means:

Modes of transportation, such as walking and cycling that: provide the personal benefits of fitness and recreation; are environmentally friendly; contribute to the personal and social health of neighbourhoods; and are readily available to a wide range of age groups within the community.

**Adaptive Reuse** means:

The alteration of *built heritage resources* to fit new uses or circumstances while retaining their heritage value and attributes.

**Available Roof Area** means:

The total roof area minus the area for mechanical equipment, roof top terraces and perimeter access restrictions.

**Carbon Neutral** means:

For the purpose of the GID, *carbon neutrality* refers to the indirect and direct carbon emissions emitted from the new buildings that will be developed within the GID boundary. Net zero carbon emissions will be achieved by balancing the annual amount of carbon released (by burning fossil fuels) with the equivalent amount that is sequestered and/or offset from on-site or off-site renewable energy.

The carbon emissions associated with transportation, waste, water and food generation/production will be addressed and reduced as a result of the "complete community" design of the GID. That said, these related emissions will not be included in the *carbon neutral* definition for the GID.

**Compatibility** means:

*Development* or *redevelopment* which may not necessarily be the same as, or similar to, the existing development, but can co-exist with the surrounding area without unacceptable adverse impact.

**District Energy** means:

A system that ties together distributed thermal energy generation and users through a local supply loop.

**Guelph Agri-Innovation Cluster** means:

The *Guelph Agri-Innovation Cluster* consists of two main subsectors, food and wellness and agri-business, which afford many niche opportunities for value creation that align strongly with the infrastructural strengths of the region. The report "Strategic Plan for the *Guelph Agri-Innovation Cluster*", dated March 3, 2010, completed by Hickling Arthur Low and Urban Strategies Inc. further defines the *Guelph Agri-Innovation Cluster*.

**Public Realm** means:

Public spaces such as public streets and rights of way, urban squares, parks, community trails, and open spaces.

**Public View** means:

A view toward important public and historic buildings, natural heritage and open space features, landmarks and skylines when viewed from *the public realm*.

**Public Vista** means:

Views that are framed through built form or between rows of trees when viewed from the *public realm*.

**Redevelopment** means:

The creation of new units, uses or lots on previously developed land in existing communities, including *brownfield* and *greyfield* sites.

In spite of the above definition, for the lands within the *Special Policy Area Floodplain* of this Plan, *redevelopment* shall include an addition which is larger than 50% of the total ground floor area of the original or existing building or structure.

DRAFT

# 11.2.8> SCHEDULES

Schedule A Mobility Plan


Schedule B Land Use

Schedule C Built Form Elements

Schedule D Block Plan Areas

Appendix A Heritage

DRAFT




The City of Guelph, its employees and agents, do not undertake to guarantee the validity of the contents of the digital or hardcopy map files, and will not be liable for any claims for damages or loss arising from their application or interpretation, by any party. It is not intended to replace a survey or be used for legal description. This map may not be re-produced without the permission of the City of Guelph. Please contact the City of Guelph's GIS group for additional information at 519-822-1260.

Produced using information under License with the Grand River Conservation Authority  
 © Grand River Conservation Authority, 2009 [2009].


Produced by the City of Guelph with Data supplied under Licence by Members of the Ontario Geospatial Data Exchange.

Legend			
	Secondary Plan Boundary		Existing City Trail Network
	Existing Arterial Roads		Proposed City Trail Network
	Existing Local Roads		Railway
	Proposed Collector Roads		Active Transportation Link
	Proposed Main Street		Canoe Launch and Node
	Proposed Local Roads		Proposed Transit Stops
	Proposed On-Street Bicycle Lanes		Waterbody



# CITY OF GUELPH OFFICIAL PLAN SCHEDULE A: GUELPH INNOVATION DISTRICT SECONDARY PLAN MOBILITY PLAN





Note: Stormwater management facilities are not shown; however, a number of stormwater management facilities will be required to service the GID development lands.

The City of Guelph, its employees and agents, do not undertake to guarantee the validity of the contents of the digital or hardcopy map files, and will not be liable for any claims for damages or loss arising from their application or interpretation, by any party. It is not intended to replace a survey or be used for legal description. This map may not be re-produced without the permission of the City of Guelph. Please contact the City of Guelph's GIS group for additional information at 519-822-1260.

Produced using information under License with the Grand River Conservation Authority © Grand River Conservation Authority, 2009 [2009].

Produced by the City of Guelph with Data supplied under Licence by Members of the Ontario Geospatial Data Exchange.

**Legend**

**Land Use Designations**


- Open Space and Park\*\*
- Glenholme Estate Residential
- Residential
- Mixed-use Corridor (GID)
- Employment Mixed-use 1
- Employment Mixed-use 2
- Major Utility\*\*
- Industrial
- Adaptive Re-use
- Service Commercial
- Neighbourhood Commercial Centre
- Significant Natural Area\*
- Natural Area\*
- Area Subject to Policy 11.2.6.3.3

**Infrastructure Framework**

- City Streets
- Future City Streets
- Existing Rail
- Waterbody
- P Proposed Park

\*For transition purposes, the existing land use designations and related existing policies of the Official Plan will continue to apply until such time as OPA 42 is in effect.


\*\*For transition purposes, the existing land use designations and related existing policies of the Official Plan will continue to apply until such time as OPA 48 is in effect.



**CITY OF GUELPH  
OFFICIAL PLAN  
SCHEDULE B:  
GUELPH INNOVATION DISTRICT  
SECONDARY PLAN  
LAND USE**








The City of Guelph, its employees and agents, do not undertake to guarantee the validity of the contents of the digital or hardcopy map files, and will not be liable for any claims for damages or loss arising from their application or interpretation, by any party. It is not intended to replace a survey or be used for legal description. This map may not be re-produced without the permission of the City of Guelph. Please contact the City of Guelph's GIS group for additional information at 519-822-1260.

Produced using information under License with the Grand River Conservation Authority  
 © Grand River Conservation Authority, 2009 [2009].


Produced by the City of Guelph with Data supplied under Licence by Members of the Ontario Geospatial Data Exchange.

Legend		Building Heights	
	Secondary Plan Boundary		2 min - 6 max Storeys
	City Streets		4 min - 6 max Storeys
	Future City Streets		4 min - 10 max Storeys
	Node		10m min - 6 max Storeys



**CITY OF GUELPH**  
**OFFICIAL PLAN**  
**SCHEDULE C:**  
**GUELPH INNOVATION DISTRICT**  
**SECONDARY PLAN**  
**BUILT FORM ELEMENTS**





The City of Guelph, its employees and agents, do not undertake to guarantee the validity of the contents of the digital or hardcopy map files, and will not be liable for any claims for damages or loss arising from their application or interpretation, by any party. It is not intended to replace a survey or be used for legal description. This map may not be re-produced without the permission of the City of Guelph. Please contact the City of Guelph's GIS group for additional information at 519-822-1260.

Produced using information under Licence with the Grand River Conservation Authority  
 © Grand River Conservation Authority, 2009 [2009].


Produced by the City of Guelph with Data supplied under Licence by Members of the Ontario Geospatial Data Exchange.

**Legend**

- - - Secondary Plan Boundary

**Block Plan Areas**


- Block Plan Area 1
- Block Plan Area 2
- Block Plan Area 3
- Block Plan Area 4



**CITY OF GUELPH  
 OFFICIAL PLAN  
 SCHEDULE D:  
 GUELPH INNOVATION DISTRICT  
 SECONDARY PLAN  
 BLOCK PLAN AREAS**








The City of Guelph, its employees and agents, do not undertake to guarantee the validity of the contents of the digital or hardcopy map files, and will not be liable for any claims for damages or loss arising from their application or interpretation, by any party. It is not intended to replace a survey or be used for legal description. This map may not be re-produced without the permission of the City of Guelph. Please contact the City of Guelph's GIS group for additional information at 519-822-1260.

Produced using information under License with the Grand River Conservation Authority  
© Grand River Conservation Authority, 2009 [2009].

Produced by the City of Guelph with Data supplied under Licence by Members of the Ontario Geospatial Data Exchange.

Legend		Cultural Heritage Resources (CHR)	
	Secondary Plan Boundary		Non-Listed CHR
	Roads		Municipally Listed CHR
	Railway		Provincially Listed CHR
	Pedestrian Crossings		Designated CHR (Part IV O.H.A)
	Existing Built Form		Cultural Heritage Landscape
	Public Views		
	Waterbody		
	Natural Heritage System*		
	Contours (0.5m intervals)		

\*For transition purposes, the existing land use designations and related existing policies of the Official Plan will continue to apply until such time as OPA 42 is in effect.



# CITY OF GUELPH OFFICIAL PLAN APPENDIX A: GUELPH INNOVATION DISTRICT SECONDARY PLAN HERITAGE




**ITEM 4:** The purpose of ITEM '4' is to reflect and refer to the completion of the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan.

**Official Plan Schedule 1, entitled 'Land Use Plan' is hereby amended by "greying out" the lands subject to the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan as depicted on the attached Schedule 1:**

DRAFT





**AREA TO BE GREYED OUT**

Refer to  
Downtown  
Secondary  
Plan

Refer to the  
Guelph Innovation District  
Secondary Plan

Lands annexed August 17, 2004, designated "Prime Agricultural" (County of Wellington Official Plan Schedule A3)  
Note: Annexation only shown on Schedule 1 Land Use Plan. All County of Wellington Official Plan relevant policies apply to these lands.

Silver Creek Junction  
See Policy Section 7.18

**Note:**  
Refer to Schedule 2 of the Official Plan for information concerning development constraints that may impact development proposals, i.e. regulatory flood plain lines, landfill constraints, water protection area constraints, etc.


The City of Guelph, its employees and agents, do not undertake to guarantee the validity of the contents of the digital or hardcopy map files, and will not be liable for any claims for damages or loss arising from their application or interpretation, by any party. It is not intended to replace a survey or be used for legal description. This map may not be re-produced without the permission of the City of Guelph. Please contact the City of Guelph's GIS group for additional information at 519-822-1260.

Produced using information under License with the Grand River Conservation Authority  
© Grand River Conservation Authority, 2009 [2009].

Produced by the City of Guelph with Data supplied under Licence by Members of the Ontario Geospatial Data Exchange.

**Legend**

- Railways
- Streets
- Future Streets
- ~ Watercourses
- City Boundary
- Township Boundary
- Land Use Designations
- General Residential
- Medium Density Residential
- High Density Residential
- Central Business District
- Intensification Area
- Mixed Use Node
- Neighbourhood Centre (10000m2)
- Neighbourhood Centre (4650m2)
- Service Commercial
- Commercial Mixed Use
- Mixed Office-Residential
- Industrial
- Mixed Business
- Corporate Business Park
- Major Institutional
- Institutional / Research Park
- Open Space
- Core Greenlands
- Non-Core Greenlands Overlay
- Special Policy Area / Floodplain
- Waste Management
- Reserve Lands
- Special Study Area
- Potential School Sites



**2001 Official Plan, December 2012 Consolidation as amended (June 2013)**

**CITY OF GUELPH  
OFFICIAL PLAN**

**SCHEDULE 1:  
LAND USE PLAN**




Projection: UTM 17N NAD83  
Produced by the City of Guelph  
Community Design and Development Services, Planning Services  
June 2013

**ITEM 5:** The purpose of ITEM '5' is to add the boundary of the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan and revise the South Guelph Secondary Plan boundary to exclude the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan Area on Schedule 1A (Secondary Plans & Water Features).

**Official Plan Schedule 1A, entitled 'Secondary Plans & Water Features' is hereby amended by adding the lands subject to the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan as depicted on the following mapping:**

DRAFT





The City of Guelph, its employees and agents, do not undertake to guarantee the validity of the contents of the digital or hardcopy map files, and will not be liable for any claims for damages or loss arising from their application or interpretation, by any party. It is not intended to replace a survey or be used for legal description. This map may not be re-produced without the permission of the City of Guelph. Please contact the City of Guelph's GIS group for additional information at 519-822-1260.


Produced using information under License with the Grand River Conservation Authority  
© Grand River Conservation Authority, 2009 [2009].

Produced by the City of Guelph with Data supplied under Licence by Members of the Ontario Geospatial Data Exchange.

**ITEM 6:** The purpose of ITEM '6' is to reflect and refer to the completion of the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan on Schedule 2 (Development Constraints).

**Official Plan Schedule 2, entitled 'Development Constraints' is hereby amended by "greying out" the lands subject to the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan as depicted on the following mapping:**

DRAFT




**AREA TO BE GREYED OUT**

Refer to Downtown Secondary Plan

Refer to the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan

**SCHEDULE 2**

- NATURAL HERITAGE FEATURES AND DEVELOPMENT CONSTRAINTS**
- PROVINCIALY SIGNIFICANT WETLANDS
  - AREAS OF NATURAL and SCIENTIFIC INTEREST (ANSI)
  - FLOODWAY (S.P.A. and 2-Zone Flood Plains)
  - LOCALLY SIGNIFICANT WETLANDS
  - SIGNIFICANT WOODLANDS
  - OTHER NATURAL HERITAGE FEATURES
  - AGGREGATE RESOURCE AREAS
  - LANDFILL CONSTRAINT AREAS
  - REGULATORY FLOOD LINE
  - ARKELL SPRINGS WATER RESOURCE PROTECTION AREA





**ITEM 7:** The purpose of ITEM '7' is to remove the lands south of Stone Road East, east of Victoria Road from the Proposed Secondary Plan Phasing, including the 2.b text as it relates to those lands on Schedule 4B (South Guelph Secondary Plan Area Phasing of Development) to reflect the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan completion.


**Official Plan Schedule 4B, entitled 'South Guelph Secondary Plan Area Phasing of Development' is hereby amended by removing the lands, from the Proposed Secondary Plan Phasing, including the 2.b text as it relates to those lands, subject to the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan as depicted on the following mapping:**

DRAFT





**Area to be removed  
from the Proposed  
Secondary Plan Phasing**



**SCHEDULE 4B:  
SOUTH GUELPH SECONDARY PLAN  
AREA PHASING OF DEVELOPMENT**


 **PROPOSED SECONDARY  
PLAN PHASING**



**ITEM 8:** The purpose of ITEM '8' is to revise Schedule 9A (Existing Road Network) to reflect completion of the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan.

**Official Plan Schedule 9A, entitled 'Existing Road Network' is hereby amended by "hatching out" the lands subject to the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan as depicted on the following mapping:**

DRAFT



CITY OF GUELPH OFFICIAL PLAN 2001  
 December 2012 Consolidation, as amended (June 2013)

Produced by the City of Guelph  
 Planning Services  
 June 2013

**Schedule 9A:  
 EXISTING  
 ROAD NETWORK**

- LEGEND:**
- EXPRESSWAY  
 4 LANE
  - ARTERIAL  
 6 LANE  
 4 LANE  
 4 LANE WITH CENTRE TURNING LANE
  - COLLECTOR  
 4 LANE  
 2 LANE  
 2 LANE WITH CENTRE TURNING LANE
  - HWY. X PROVINCIAL HIGHWAY


**Item 9:** The purpose of ITEM '9' is to revise Schedule 9B (Recommended Road Plan for Further Study and Environmental Assessment) to reflect completion of the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan.

**Official Plan Schedule 9B, entitled 'Recommended Road Plan for Further Study and Environmental Assessment' is hereby amended by "hatching out" the lands subject to the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan as depicted on the following mapping:**

DRAFT

HANLON EXPRESSWAY MAY BE EXTENDED TO LINK INTO HIGHWAY 7 PROPOSAL TO KITCHENER

WIDENING OF WOODLAWN ROAD TO 6 LANES BETWEEN HANLON EXPRESSWAY AND WOOLWICH ST. IS AN ALTERNATIVE TO HANLON EXPRESSWAY EXTENSION. (REFER TO POLICY No. 8.2.27)



ROAD SEGMENTS REQUIRING "SPECIAL STUDY" (SEE POLICY No. 8.2.28)

Refer to Downtown Secondary Plan


Refer Also to the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan

ALTERNATIVE ROAD CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT (REFER TO POLICY No. 8.2.27)

PROVISION FOR 4 LANE ROAD BEYOND YEAR 2011

**Schedule 9B:  
RECOMMENDED ROAD PLAN  
for FURTHER STUDY and  
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

- LEGEND:**
- INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS-PROVISION OF TURNING LANES
  - EXISTING ROAD WIDENING TO 4 LANES
  - ▬ NEW/ALTERED 2 LANE ROAD
  - ▬ NEW 4 LANE ROAD
  - ▬ PROPOSED ARTERIAL ROAD
  - ▬ PROPOSED COLLECTOR ROAD
  - ▬ UPGRADING TO FULL CONTROLLED ACCESS HIGHWAY
  - ◐ PARTIAL INTERCHANGE



CITY OF GUELPH OFFICIAL PLAN 2001  
December 2012 Consolidation, as amended (June 2013)  
Produced by the City of Guelph  
Planning Services  
June 2013

COLLEGE AVE. EXTENSION IS AN ALTERNATIVE IMPROVEMENT TO A FULL INTERCHANGE AT KORTRIGHT ROAD (REFER TO POLICY No. 8.2.27)



A FULL OR PARTIAL INTERCHANGE IN THE VICINITY OF KORTRIGHT ROAD OR IMMEDIATELY SOUTH IS AN ALTERNATIVE IMPROVEMENT TO THE COLLEGE AVE. EXTENSION (REFER TO POLICY No. 8.2.27)

LAIRD RD. IS A PERMISSIVE TRUCK ROUTE TO AND FROM THE HANLON EXPRESSWAY. WHEN COMPLETED, NO FURTHER AMENDMENT TO THE OFFICIAL PLAN SHALL BE REQUIRED TO INCORPORATE LAIRD RD. ONTO SCHEDULE 9A: EXISTING ROAD NETWORK AS AN ARTERIAL ROAD

**Item 10:** The purpose of ITEM '10' is to revise Schedule 9C (Bicycle Network Plan) to reflect completion of the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan.








**Official Plan Schedule 9C, entitled 'Bicycle Network Plan' is hereby amended by "hatching out" the lands subject to the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan as depicted on the following mapping:**

DRAFT



**SCHEDULE 9C:  
BICYCLE NETWORK PLAN**

**LEGEND:**

-  EXISTING ON-ROAD BIKE LANES
-  PROPOSED ON-ROAD BIKE LANES
-  PROPOSED ON-ROAD BIKE ROUTE
-  EXISTING OFF-ROAD SHARED USE PATH
-  PROPOSED OFF-ROAD SHARED USE PATH
-  EXISTING SPECIAL FACILITIES FOR BICYCLE NETWORK
-  PROPOSED SPECIAL FACILITIES FOR BICYCLE NETWORK

CITY OF GUELPH OFFICIAL PLAN 2001  
December 2012 Consolidation, as amended (June 2013)  
Produced by the City of Guelph  
Planning Services  
June 2013



Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Joan Jylanne  
**Sent:** November 9, 2012 11:44 AM  
**To:** 'John Vos'  
**Subject:** RE: Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan - City of Guelph

Thanks Blair. ...Joan

Joan Jylanne | Senior Policy Planner  
Policy Planning and Urban Design | Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment  
City of Guelph

T 519-822-1260 x 2519 | F 519-822-4632  
E [joan.jylanne@guelph.ca](mailto:joan.jylanne@guelph.ca)

[guelph.ca](http://guelph.ca)

---

**From:** John Vos [<mailto:John@lpplan.com>]  
**Sent:** November 8, 2012 12:17 PM  
**To:** Blair Labelle  
**Cc:** Joan Jylanne; [John@lpplan.com](mailto:John@lpplan.com); Victor Labreche  
**Subject:** Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan - City of Guelph

Dear Mr. Labelle,

Please accept the attached correspondence relative to our comments on the proposed Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan.

Please do not hesitate to contact our office if you have any questions or need additional information.

Thank you for your consideration of the attached.

Kind regards,

**John Vos, BES**  
**Assistant Planner**

**Labreche Patterson & Associates Inc.**  
*Professional Planners, Development Consultants, Project Managers*  
330 Trillium Drive  
Unit A1  
Kitchener, Ontario  
N2E 3J2  
Phone - (519) 896-5955  
Fax - (519) 896-5355

[www.lpplan.com](http://www.lpplan.com)

The information contained in this e-mail is intended only for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. Its contents (including any attachments) may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not an intended recipient you must not use, disclose, disseminate, copy or print its contents. If you receive this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and permanently delete the message.





**Labreche Patterson & Associates Inc.**

Professional Planners, Development Consultants, Project Managers

VIA MAIL and E-MAIL (blair.labelle@guelph.ca)

*Our File: P-375-09 K*

October 31, 2012

Mr. Blair Labelle  
City Clerk  
City of Guelph  
1 Carden Street  
Guelph, Ontario  
N1H 3A1

Dear Mr. Blair Labelle:

**Re: Proposed Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan  
City of Guelph**

---

We represent A&W Food Services of Canada Inc., McDonald's Restaurants of Canada Ltd., the TDL Group Corp. (operators and licensors of Tim Hortons Restaurants), and Wendy's Restaurants of Canada Inc. as well as their industry association, the Ontario Restaurant Hotel and Motel Association (ORHMA).

The ORHMA is Canada's largest provincial hospitality industry association. Representing over 11,000 business establishments throughout Ontario, its members cover the full spectrum of food service and accommodation establishments and they work closely with its members in the quick service restaurant industry on matters related to drive-through review, regulations, and guidelines.

We are providing this written submission to you on behalf of our clients after having reviewed the proposed draft Innovation District Secondary Plan to determine if the proposed policies contained within the Secondary Plan would apply to our clients' current and future operating interests. Please accept this as our written submission on the subject matter.

Based on our review we have not identified any concerns with the "Draft Innovation District Secondary Plan". However, we reserve the right to provide further comments on subsequent drafts of the document in advance of Council's final decision on this matter.

Please also consider this letter our formal request to be provided with copies of all future notices, reports, and resolutions relating to the proposed draft Secondary Plan for the City of Guelph.

Yours truly,  
Labreche Patterson & Associates Inc.



**Victor Labreche, MCIP, RPP**  
Senior Principal

Copy: *Joan Jylanne, Senior Policy Planner, City of Guelph*  
(via e-mail: [joan.jylanne@guelph.ca](mailto:joan.jylanne@guelph.ca))

*Marco Monaco, ORHMA*  
(via e-mail: [mmonaco@orhma.com](mailto:mmonaco@orhma.com))

*Leo Palozzi, The TDL Group Corp.*  
(via e-mail: [palozzi\\_leo@timhortons.com](mailto:palozzi_leo@timhortons.com))

*Leslie Smejkal, The TDL Group Corp.*  
(via e-mail: [smejkal\\_leslie@timhortons.com](mailto:smejkal_leslie@timhortons.com))

*Paul Hewer, McDonald's Restaurants of Canada Limited*  
(via e-mail: [paul.hewer@ca.mcd.com](mailto:paul.hewer@ca.mcd.com))

*Susan Towle, Wendy's Restaurants of Canada, Inc.*  
(via e-mail: [susan.towle@wendys.com](mailto:susan.towle@wendys.com))

*Darren Sim, A&W Food Services of Canada Inc.*  
(via e-mail: [dsim@aw.ca](mailto:dsim@aw.ca))

Guelph, Ontario.  
December 17, 2012

Mayor Karen Farbridge,

Dear Karen,

I have read and reread the Guelph Innovation District Draft Secondary Plan and while it contains a broad blueprint of what the district might be and, some of the vision statements are laudable, it lacks the futuristic thrust that I had hoped for. This draft plan does not reflect the unique opportunity this site provides and instead could apply to almost any tract of land anywhere. It does not capitalize on the many natural features found there nor does it build on the environmental strength of the University of Guelph. While it is true that several other Ontario universities (e.g. Ottawa, Waterloo, Western ) are developing significant environmental programs, none attain the level or diversity found in Guelph. We have an opportunity to give leadership to sustainable development and that opportunity should not be dismissed. The demands of climate change and its impact on life forms, the economy and our social wellbeing make urgent the need to rethink current practices. Conservation and resource utilization constitute a debt we owe to future generations. The critical time to act is now.

As you are aware, some years ago, Jack Milne, aware of the opportunities the York lands and buildings presented for the province and the city to take a leadership role in environmental stewardship, proposed the establishment of an Ontario Environmental Exhibition. The primary purpose was to focus on attracting industries, institutions and services in the broad environmental field. The "Exhibition" would be a catalyst, with permanent and rotating features which would make Guelph the epicenter of environmental activity. This would be a learning center where people from all walks of life, especially students, would learn and see firsthand the tactics, developments and procedures that could be employed to reduce our negative impact on the world around us. His thesis was that once aware of this they would respond in a positive way. This proposal has been supported by the Guelph Wellington Men's Club and in public meeting throughout the city. At the meeting held by Glen Murray, this environmental emphasis for the lands received the strongest support of the various emphases explored.

The Guelph Wellington Men's Club supports that part of the Draft Secondary Plan concerned with employment and education but we would like to see more emphasis on environment. Any scenario that looks to future prosperity must have major environmental considerations. The Draft Plan mentions energy and carbon neutrality but the site offers opportunities for a much greater range of improvements. Certainly on that side we could demonstrate solar, geothermal and wind turbine energy sources but we could also inform and demonstrate to the public such things as the potential for advances in fuel generating sources and how the emerging field of nanotechnology could revolutionize food production and medicine.


When the call for expressions of interest in two sites in the innovation district was sent out by the Ontario Government, the Men's Club was the first to bring this to the attention of Conestoga College and urge them to submit a proposal. They have and we

support it strongly. While this compliments the University of Guelph in many ways. It does not fulfill the need to educate the public on the urgent need for action to restore the integrity of our ecosystem.

We encourage the city to take a bolder, more forward looking approach that takes advantage of the resources available at this site and in our university so that it can become a leader, not a bystander, in sustainable community building.

I wish you a Merry Christmas and a rewarding New Year.

Yours truly,



Freeman McEwen

Cc

Bill Winegard  
Ken Hammill  
Jack Milne  
George Hughes  
Joan Jylanne  
Peter Cartwright  
Donald McKay

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Peter Cartwright  
**Sent:** November 15, 2012 10:20 AM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne; 'Mark Goldberg'  
**Cc:** Wayne Galliher  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan

Good morning Mark.

Parallel to the Secondary Planning process, Economic Development is working with the Province to develop an implementation plan, which in part will address the points that you have made about the attraction/retention of innovation and green industries. We have not yet addressed the potential for a screening process; however, in my opinion this is worthy of consideration. Thank you for this input.

For your information, the need for an implementation plan has been identified by Guelph City Council in the 2012 – 2016 Corporate Strategic Plan, and I anticipate it will be presented to Council within the first half of 2013.

Should you wish to discuss this initiative further please feel free to contact me.

Regards!

Peter Cartwright

---

**From:** Joan Jylanne  
**Sent:** November 12, 2012 11:41 AM  
**To:** 'Mark Goldberg'  
**Cc:** Wayne Galliher; Peter Cartwright  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan

Hi Mark,

Thank you for your comments. I have forwarded them to our Economic Development staff who are dealing with the attraction of emerging innovation and green energy industries.

The Secondary Plan will eventually be incorporated into the City's Official Plan via an Official Plan Amendment. Official Plan policies and schedules provide the foundational land use policies that zoning, consents and subdivision plans ultimately implement. At the Official Plan level generally only arterial and collector roads are shown on schedules. Local roads will be created through either a subdivision plan and/or consent. The local road network will ultimately create the block fabric in conformity with the policies of the Official Plan, i.e. GID draft Secondary Plan policy 6.3.7 b.

As for water conservation and industry attraction activities, the City's Official Plan is directional and is limited by planning legislation regarding what can be mandated. The City is strongly committed to its energy and water conservation strategies, and economic development strategies which will be instrumental in implementing the vision, principles and objectives for the Guelph Innovation District. In addition, Chapter 7 of the draft Secondary Plan presents implementation policies which include the development of a GID Implementation Strategy among other tools.

Please find attached a notice regarding the open house on the GID Draft Secondary Plan scheduled for November 28, 2012 at City Hall. Hope to see you there. ...Joan

Joan Jylanne | Senior Policy Planner  
Policy Planning and Urban Design | Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment  
City of Guelph

T 519-822-1260 x 2519 | F 519-822-4632  
E [joan.jylanne@guelph.ca](mailto:joan.jylanne@guelph.ca)

[guelph.ca](http://guelph.ca)

---

**From:** ] On Behalf Of Mark Goldberg  
**Sent:** October 15, 2012 2:33 PM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Cc:** Wayne Galliher  
**Subject:** Comments on Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan

Dear Joan,

Thank you for your letter of Oct. 10th, inviting comment on the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan. I am sending you my comments by email, as I was unable to attend the PBEE Committee meeting earlier today. I've copied Wayne Galliher on this as some of the comments are related to water conservation strategies.

Here are my comments:

- P. 10 Stormwater Management: Collection and reuse of rainwater that falls on buildings in the GID should be required as part of the City's water conservation strategy. 50% of residential water use is for flushing toilets and washing laundry. Accordingly, a 50% reduction in residential municipal water demand could be achieved by this design feature. It should also apply to commercial and industrial buildings in the GID. Rainwater collection and treatment systems are now commercially available, so that is not an impediment. In addition, mandating rainwater harvesting and reuse as a design feature will act to stimulate local growth of that green industry. It will also help to qualify the GID buildings for LEED certification.
- P. 21 General Land Use Policies, 6.2.3. It would be useful to have some discussion in this section around how emerging innovation and green energy industries will be attracted and retained. Also will there be a screening process to determine eligibility of businesses to be GID tenants? If so, what would it look like?
- P. 23-24 General Built Form and Site Development Policies. As mentioned above, rainwater collection and reuse should be mandated.
- In the same section, point b on page 24 suggests that blocks will be oriented to take full advantage of solar collection. However, it is not apparent from Sch. D, which shows some arteriole roads, that this policy will be reflected in planned subdivisions.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Plan.


Regards,

Mark Goldberg

--

Mark Goldberg Ph.D., DABT, C. Dir.  
Chairman of the Board of Directors  
PlantForm Corporation

Joan Jylanne  
 Senior Policy Planner  
 City of Guelph  
 1 Carden Street  
 Guelph, Ontario  
 N1H 3A1



December 17, 2012

Re: Property at 728 Victoria Road South  
 10.3085 HA - 25.471 Acres  
 Pidel Homes - Carm Piccoli  
 881350 Ontario Inc.  
 Operating as Cedar Towers

---

The purpose of this submission is further to our submissions dated January 10, 2012, and August 18, 2011, attached.

These submissions have clearly requested - Retail - Commercial, and High Density Residential as shown on the attached Plan.

The current concerns that we have are as follows.

1. Node

Section 5.3.6 Nodes are not defined.

Nodes are not a designation.

We are requesting clarification with respect to the Node and it's application to this property since it is not a designation in Schedule C, Land Use.

2. Corridor Mixed Use

The Corridor Mixed Use as shown in Schedule C has to be defined more precisely with respect to property fabric since this is a Secondary Plan which must reflect a more precise delineation of the designation.

3. Employment Mixed Use 1.

Section 6.4.12 provides for a range of Employment Uses, and a range of Residential Uses.

Does this permit Higher Density Residential Uses in the form of Condominiums and Apartments ?

4. Residential

Section 6.4.26 Residential areas permit a Wide Range of housing.

Does this designation permit Higher Density Residential in the form of Condominiums and Apartments. ?

5. Schedule E Phasing


Proposed phasing for this property is Phase 2.



We are requesting to be in Phase 1 since we are prepared to submit applications and plans when the Secondary Plan is approved.

In closing, we are prepared to attend further meetings with staff to discuss and resolve issues as outlined in this submission, and the 2 previous submissions.

Carm Piccoli

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Carm Piccoli', with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke underneath.

Mario Venditti HBA MA

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading 'Mario Venditti', written in a cursive style.

c.c Todd Salter

Jim Furfaro

Mario Venditti

City Administrator

January 10, 2012

Joan Jylanne  
Senior Policy Planner  
City Hall  
City of Guelph  
1 Carden Street  
Guelph, Ontario  
N1H 3A1

Re: Property at 728 Victoria Road South  
10.3085 HA - 25.471 Acres  
Pidel Homes - Carm Piccoli  
881350 Ontario Inc.  
Operating as Cedar Towers

The purpose of this submission letter is further to our meeting of Wednesday December 21, 2011 where I discussed the designation of these lands for Commercial - Retail ( 10 acres ) and the 15 Acres for High Density Residential Development

I am attaching the detailed submission that I and the owner ( dated August 18, 2011 ) have made to you with our request for the designation of these lands.

At this meeting it was clarified that Commercial and Residential Uses are permitted on these lands.

At that meeting it also appeared that Jim Riddell was receptive to these land uses at this prime corner.

I advised that this corner was specifically planned for these land uses in the 1993 Annexation of these lands as a Nodal Area with these higher Land Uses.

It appeared to me and the land owners present that Jim Riddell was open for further discussion and input with respect to these land uses.

I am therefore requesting that the Commercial - Retail and Residential Land Uses as outlined in my submission of August 18, 2011 be designated in the York District Secondary Plan.

We are also open for further meetings and discussion on this matter.

Carm Piccoli

Mario Venditti HBA MA

  
Mario Venditti

August 18, 2011

Joan Jylanne  
Senior Policy Planner  
City Hall  
City of Guelph  
1 Carden Street  
Guelph, Ontario  
N1H 3A1

Re: Property at 728 Victoria Road South Guelph  
10.3085 HA - 25.471 Acres  
Pidel Homes - Carm Piccoli  
881350 Ontario Inc.  
Operating as Cedar Towers

The purpose of this submission letter is to request that the above noted lands be designated as follows in the York District Secondary Plan.

The .10 acres ( the Corner ) fronting on Victoria Road and Stone Road East be designated for Commercial and Retail Land Uses.

The 15 acres on the rear of the property be designated for High Density Residential in the form of High Rise Condominiums, and Apartments.

The attached Diagram and Survey Plan is for your information, and outlines the 2 Land Uses as shown on the plans.

The Planning Rationale for the Commercial - Retail is that this is a Prime Nodal Corner located at the two Major Roads, Stone Road East, and Victoria Road.

There is sufficient land area to accommodate the Commercial - Retail Land Uses that would serve this area when the Residential Land Uses on the rear part of the property, and the Residential developments on the lands on Stone Road East to Watson Parkway are developed for Residential development.

Further, these land uses are desirable and compatible for for this location.


With respect to the Residential component, again this is desirable and compatible since the predominant land uses south on Stone Road from Victoria Road to Watson Parkway are all Residential with a range of Residential developments.

I would therefore request that the noted lands be designated for High Density Residential Development.


I am also enclosing a letter dated August 27, 2008 to Katie Nasswetter from my Planner Mario Venditti with respect to the noted land uses with respect to input to your Development Priorities Plan ( DPP ) for your information.

In closing, it is my FIRM POSITION that the LAND USES as put forward have been recommended since the 1993 Annexation of these lands, and that the LAND USES as I have requested be DESIGNATED in The York District Secondary Plan.


Cam Piccoli

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Cam Piccoli', written in a cursive style.

Mario Venditti HBA MA

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Mario Venditti', written in a cursive style.

c.c Jim Riddell  
Jim Furfaro  
Mario Venditti  
City Administrator



HAND DELIVERED

August 27, 2008

Katie Nasswetter  
Senior Development Planner  
City Hall  
1 Carden St.  
Guelph, Ontario  
N1H 3A1

Re: Development Priorities Plan (DPP)  
Re: Property at 728 Victoria Road South  
Pidel Homes Carm Piccoli

---

Further to our meeting of Monday August 18, 2008 where I discussed 4 properties with yourself, this submission will deal with the property at the south east corner of Victoria Road and Stone Road.

\* 728 Victoria Road South - 25 acres

Pidel Homes Carm Piccoli

As discussed with you the 1993 Annexation of this property was specifically done in order to plan this corner for a mix of Land Uses.

These are Retail, Commercial, Office, Institution, and Residential.

The size of this property is 25 acres, and we are persuing a Mixed Land Use Designation in the York District Secondary Study and Process.

In several meetings with Joan Jylanne has assured me that the Residential component will be part of the recommended Land Use Designation for this property.

I am enclosing a plan that shows the size and the dimensions of the property, and a aerial photo that outlines the property with purple coloured lines.

With respect to the Residential aspect of this submission, the rear part of the property is about 10 acres in size.

We propse to develop this part of the property with High Density Residential Condominium Development.

The Development will be in High Rise Form.

This area would yield approximately 400 plus units when the concept plan is done for this area of the property.

We intend to prepare a development plan for the whole property in the near future, and we propose to develop the property in the near future as well.


In closing, this submission is made in order to have input to your Development Priorities Plan.

I would ask that you keep me informed on the DPP process, and that you add me to your mailing list, and any future Committee Meetings that deal with the DPP.

Mario Venditti HBA MA

cc Carm Piccoli Pidel Homes  
Joan Jylanne City Planning

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mario Venditti". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a prominent initial "M".



GUELPH INNOVATION DISTRICT DRAFT SECONDARY PLAN  
PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE—November 28, 2012

Thank you for attending the Public Open House. Please provide your comments here and drop them off before you go, or send to Joan Jylanne: [Joan.Jylanne@guelph.ca](mailto:Joan.Jylanne@guelph.ca)  
City Hall, 1 Carden Street, Guelph, ON, N1H 3A1.

Information regarding the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan process, including a copy of the draft Secondary Plan, is available at [guelph.ca/innovationdistrict](http://guelph.ca/innovationdistrict).

Name: Donna Ginter  
Email: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Which ideas and policies presented tonight did you like most?

- Although the Glenholm proposal was not presented, I think it is the most innovative idea
- Conestoga College using former jail building and surrounding landscape
- emphasis on active lifestyle and transportation

2. What issues need further consideration? Do you have ideas to address them?

- move special residential area from phase 4 to phase 1 as it does not require city services and is already in phases with the first ready to go
- add "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" after special residential area
- Change the employment mixed use area in the Stone East area to 2 from 1 and include a provision that it comply with values of "Glenholm"

3. Please provide any other thoughts you have.

- I have been to all 14 public consultations and see little participants input in the plan. Decisions seem to be made corporately or by consultants. Public consultations appear to be a waste of participants time and taxpayers money in this process

There has been consistent reference to "working with our partners" and yet the long established residential community in the SE corner of the GID has been ignored, bullied and treated as if their role is to be used by the city to meet all objectives of employment, land and natural heritage

\*\*\*Please provide any comments by December 14, 2012\*\*\*





**GUELPH INNOVATION DISTRICT DRAFT SECONDARY PLAN  
PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE—November 28, 2012**

Thank you for attending the Public Open House. Please provide your comments here and drop them off before you go, or send to Joan Jylanne: [Joan.Jylanne@guelph.ca](mailto:Joan.Jylanne@guelph.ca)  
City Hall, 1 Carden Street, Guelph, ON, N1H 3A1.

Information regarding the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan process, including a copy of the draft Secondary Plan, is available at [guelph.ca/innovationdistrict](http://guelph.ca/innovationdistrict).

Name: LIZ GRAY  
Email: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Which ideas and policies presented tonight did you like most?


PRESERVING HERITAGE - REFORMATORY BUILDINGS,  
2 LAKES + BOTH SIDES OF RIVER

2. What issues need further consideration? Do you have ideas to address them?

MAX HEIGHT 8 STORIES - WHY HERE + NOT DOWNTOWN  
CENTRE OF GUELPH.  
THIS IS WHERE THE 18 STORIES SHOULD BE  
YOU ARE NOT GOING TO SEE CHURCH OF OUR LADY FROM  
GIO AREA - THE 4 MONSTER BUILDINGS ALREADY APPROVED  
FOR DOWNTOWN WILL BLOCK IT (18 STORIES + 2 BONUS FLOORS)

3. Please provide any other thoughts you have:

IT IS A SHAME TO SEE GROUNDS AROUND TURF  
INSTITUTE GONE AFTER YEARS OF DEVELOPING THE PLANTS.  
ARE YOU NOT CONCERNED THAT RESIDENTIAL AREAS WILL  
COMPLAIN ABOUT SMELLS FROM CARGILL MEATS?



\*\*\*Please provide any comments by December 14, 2012\*\*\*



**GUELPH INNOVATION DISTRICT DRAFT SECONDARY PLAN  
PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE—November 28, 2012**

Thank you for attending the Public Open House. Please provide your comments here and drop them off before you go, or send to Joan Jylanne: [Joan.Jylanne@guelph.ca](mailto:Joan.Jylanne@guelph.ca)  
City Hall, 1 Carden Street, Guelph, ON, N1H 3A1.

Information regarding the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan process, including a copy of the draft Secondary Plan, is available at [guelph.ca/innovationdistrict](http://guelph.ca/innovationdistrict).

Name: Susan Mason  
Email: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Which ideas and policies presented tonight did you like most?

Carbon Neutral  
Environmental / Energy Plans  
Disability - Mobility

2. What issues need further consideration? Do you have ideas to address them?

Mixed Income Accommodation / Mixed Age / Ability  
Keeping costs down in balance with Carbon Neutral Goals

3. Please provide any other thoughts you have:

Would love to see more visuals / possibilities beyond vision statements.  
Communication that grounds the concepts for a "lay" person.

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Tara Kelly  
**Sent:** December 4, 2012 11:41 AM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** Glenholm Drive

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Sincerely,  
Tara Kelly

Joan Jylanne

---

From: Randy Shaw  
Sent: December 4, 2012 9:31 AM  
To: Joan Jylanne  
Subject: Request

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Randy Shaw Technical Sales

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Hattlefamily  
**Sent:** December 1, 2012 11:43 AM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Thank you,

Carole Ann Hattle

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Vic Walser  
**Sent:** November 30, 2012 11:02 AM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan

Hi Joan. I am writing to you to request that you change the "Special Residential Area" wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area to phase 1.  
Thank you

**Vic Walser**

Joan Jylanne

---

From: Samm Shaw  
Sent: November 30, 2012 9:28 AM  
To: Joan Jylanne

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Ron Van Hulst  
**Sent:** November 30, 2012 12:15 AM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** Change To Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan

Dear Joan

I am writing you regarding the change in the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan. The Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32), will require full municipal services to be required when residents who would like to develop their properties. I understand that the landowners in this area and Council support a self sustaining development and in order to promote a green living environment, I think the wording for the Special Residential Area should be changed to reflect that and that the area be moved into Phase 1 without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems.

Sincerely,

Ron Van Hulst



Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Nancy Gaunt  
**Sent:** November 29, 2012 7:25 PM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** Land at the end of Glenholm Drive re: Guelph innovation district secondary plan

Hello

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Thank you,

Nancy gaunt

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** November 29, 2012 5:37 PM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan

Dear Joan,

In review of the draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan, it looks like the Special Residential Area will require full municipal services. I thought this was a self sustaining development on private services? I would suggest that the wording for this area be changed to reflect private services being acceptable and see no reason why it should not be moved into Phase 1.

*Regards,*

**Steve Henry**

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Kathy Free  
**Sent:** November 29, 2012 5:23 PM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** assigning a land designation to land at the end of Glenholm Drive

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: “without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems” and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Joan Jylanne

---

From: Bacon, Janice  
Sent: November 29, 2012 3:39 PM  
To: Joan Jylanne

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Janice L. Bacon

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Rick LeGault  
**Sent:** November 29, 2012 3:13 PM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan - Changes

Joan,

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and waste water systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Rick LeGault, PMP

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** nick szijgyarto  
**Sent:** November 29, 2012 2:24 PM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** City of Guelph Land designation change in the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan

Joan

I'm suprised that the City of Guelph, which promotes the enviroment and "green" living is making a change to the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan requiring the residents who would like to develop their properties to use city water and wastewater systems. When there is so much development currently in the south end of town where the city is allowing homes to be jammed together and overtaxing the cities water and wastewater systems, it is refreshing to see properties using well systems for water and septic systems for wastewater. How more enviromentally friendly can you get than that.

Therefore I would like that you change the Special Rsidential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to INCLUDE the wording " without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area to Phase 1.

Sincerely,  
Nick Szijgyarto

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Jeff Crichton  
**Sent:** November 29, 2012 12:58 PM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** Re: Spira Property on Glenholm Drive, Guelph

Hi Joan - I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Regards, Jeff Crichton

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Matthew Hooker  
**Sent:** November 29, 2012 11:47 AM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** Special Residential Area Draft Change

Dear Joan,

In review of the draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan, it looks like the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32), will require full municipal services. I understand that the landowners in this area and Council support a self sustaining development and would suggest that the wording for the Special Residential Area be changed to reflect that and that the area be moved into Phase 1 without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems.

Sincerely,

Matthew Hooker OALA, CSLA



Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Barbara Piccoli  
**Sent:** November 29, 2012 11:20 AM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** Ken Spira

Hi Joan,

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Thank you

--  
Barbara Piccoli

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Ron Asselstine  
**Sent:** November 29, 2012 10:41 AM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** Word Change in Draft (Guelph Innovation Secondary Plan)

Dear Joan Jylanne: I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems", and move the Special Residential Area from Phase 4 to Phase 1. Thanking you in advance, Ron Asselstine/Guelph.

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** John Endicott  
**Sent:** November 29, 2012 10:25 AM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** Wording change

Joan,

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Sincerely,  
John Endicott

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Hoffman, Nancy  
**Sent:** November 29, 2012 9:48 AM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Thank you,

**Nancy M. Hoffman**

Joan Jylanne

---

From: Marta Redmond  
Sent: November 29, 2012 8:46 AM  
To: Joan Jylanne

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Thanks Marta Redmond

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Alex Droic  
**Sent:** November 29, 2012 8:43 AM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** GID feedback  
**Attachments:** PhaseMapeGID.jpg

Hello Joan,

Open house went well last night. Just wanted to send a few points of feedback:

1. Change the Special Residential Area land designation wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems"
2. Move the Special Residential Area from Phase 4 into Phase 1.
3. Modify the Existing Privately Serviced Area to include the 'red area' I have identified on the attached image. Only the strip south of Stone that is mixed use should be municipally serviced.

Thank you.

Alex Droic

COLLEGE AVE. E



STONE ROAD



QUELPH ANTONION RAILWAY



Phase 1



Phase 2



Phase 3



Phase 4



Existing Municipally Serviced Area



Existing Privately Serviced Area



Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Ken Spira  
**Sent:** November 28, 2012 3:50 PM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Cc:** Jim Furfaro; Bob Bell  
**Subject:** GID Open House

Joan,

I am unable to attend tonight's Public Open House at City Hall, however I did want to confirm my concerns with the Special Residential Area in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan.

I would ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording of 6.4.32 to include the wording: without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems. I would also request that the Special Residential Area be moved into phase 1 from phase 4.

**Ken Spira**



Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** The Dennis's [mailto:mark.dennis@cityofguelph.ca]  
**Sent:** November 28, 2012 5:26 PM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Mark Dennis

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Patrick Morris  
**Sent:** November 28, 2012 5:30 PM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** Glenholm Drive Re Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan

Hello Joan

We are the solicitors for Ken Spira, a resident on Glenholm Drive. In respect to the above draft plan, we suggest the following change:

That the wording of the plan include "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Wendy LEWIS  
**Sent:** November 28, 2012 5:31 PM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** Innovation District Plan

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording:

'without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Wendy Lewis

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Ed Newton  
**Sent:** November 28, 2012 5:48 PM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** Change request

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Edwin (Ed) Newton

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Brian McCulloch  
**Sent:** November 28, 2012 6:03 PM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** Fwd: I Could Use Your Help

Would you be so kind as to give consideration to this request.  
Brian

----- Original Message -----

**Subject:** I Could Use Your Help  
**Date:** Wed, 28 Nov 2012 22:12:04 +0000  
**From:** Ken Spir  
**To:** Ken Spii.

The City of Guelph is assigning a land designation to my land at the end of Glenholm Drive in the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan and I would like to get them to make a change to the current wording in the draft. I would appreciate it if you could take a minute and email Joan Jylanne ([Joan.Jylanne@guelph.ca](mailto:Joan.Jylanne@guelph.ca)) at the City with the following request.

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** SUSAN SHAW  
**Sent:** November 28, 2012 6:48 PM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32)

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Susan Shaw

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** November 28, 2012 7:30 PM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** Land Designation

Dear Joan,

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Thank you,  
Billy Schwartzenburg

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Bill Spira  
**Sent:** November 28, 2012 9:38 PM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** Land designation re-wording

Hi Joan,

Please receive the following request.

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

Thank You.

Bill Spira.



Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** David Spira [mailto:ds@cityofguelph.ca]  
**Sent:** November 29, 2012 8:19 AM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne  
**Subject:** Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

**David Spira**

Joan Jylanne

---

**From:** Earl Martin  
**Sent:** November 29, 2012 7:11 AM  
**To:** Joan Jylanne

I ask that you change the Special Residential Area wording (6.4.32) in the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to include the wording: "without the requirement to comply with the official plan policies for water and wastewater systems" and move the Special Residential Area from phase 4 to phase 1.

**Earl Martin**



400 Clyde Road, P.O. Box 729 Cambridge, ON N1R 5W6

Phone: 519.621.2761 Toll free: 866.900.4722 Fax: 519.621.4844 Online: www.grandriver.ca

December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2012

Joan Jylanne, MCIP, RPP  
Senior Policy Planner  
City of Guelph  
City Hall, 1 Carden Street  
Guelph, Ontario  
N1H 3A1

Dear Ms. Jylanne:

**RE: City of Guelph – Innovation District Draft Secondary Plan**

Thank-you for opportunity to comment on the City of Guelph Innovation District (GID) Secondary Plan. Comments provided by Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) staff are reflective of the information that was circulated to our office as part of the October 2012 release with focus on the "Recommended Option".

GRCA staff are supportive of the documentation and information provided. Comments with regards to the October 2012 documentation and implementation policies with respect to the Natural Hazard and Natural Heritage are included below. Please note that some of the comments are intended for further consideration and may only need to be addressed during the implementation and design stage.

**Comments:**

**Page 6 – Natural Heritage**

2.2.3 – In general we support the development of trails and walkways adjacent to river corridors and significant valley lands. The current trail system shown as part of the preferred option is mainly located within the flood plain area and slope hazard associated with the significant river valley and the Eramosa River. As part of the EIS completion, additional supporting information will be required in terms of addressing the Natural Hazard in relation to the trails system. Specific emphasis and supporting documentation may be required for the pedestrian foot bridge. GRCA staff would provide further comments and review of any proposed Terms of Reference (ToR) in support of the EIS.

**Page 8 – Topography**

Under Section 2.2.17 *"Any proposed bridge crossing of the Eramosa River will utilize the existing slopes and maintain the topography of the Significant Valleyland"*; we recommend adding "while ensuring that existing Natural Hazards are appropriately addressed and not further aggravated."

N:\Watershed Resources Planning\Resource Planning\WELLINGTON\GUELPH\Official Plan & Zoning By Law\Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan\GID Draft Secondary Plan (November 2012).docx

Page 1 of 7



ISO 14001 Registered

Canadian  
Heritage  
Rivers  
System



**Like Recommendations:**

Page 8 – Significant Natural Areas

2.2.20 We recommend the use of Native Species of plants as part of any landscaping criteria to be used as part of the site plan process.

Page 8 – Significant Natural Areas


We recommend that emphasis be placed on the inclusion of native plants to be incorporated into landscaping and any natural area enhancement.

Page 23,24 – 6.3 General Built Form and Site Development Policies

GRCA staff recommend that the sub-section or amendment to existing sub-sections be included to emphasize and encourage the use of Native (Local) species of landscaping. Specific emphasis may be suggested in areas adjacent to the Natural areas/River Valley Corridor to further promote enhancement.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Yours truly,



Fred Natolochny  
Supervisor Resource Planning  
Grand River Conservation Authority

FN/ng

Encl. – GRCA Regulation Map



## UPPER GRAND DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

**Jennifer Passy BES, MCIP, RPP**

*Manager of Planning*

Board Office: 500 Victoria Road N. Guelph, ON N1E 6K2

Email: [Jennifer.passy@ugdsb.on.ca](mailto:Jennifer.passy@ugdsb.on.ca)

Tel: 519-822-4420 ext. 820 or Toll Free: 1-800-321-4025

December 24, 2012

PLN: 12-49

File Code: R14

City of Guelph  
 Planning, Building, Engineering & Environment  
 Planning Services  
 1 Carden Street  
 Guelph, ON N1H 3A1  
**Attention: Joan Jylanne, MCIP, RPP, Senior Policy Planner**

**Re: Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan**

Dear Joan,

On behalf of the Upper Grand District School Board, thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan (October 2012).

The Board's initial interests in the GID were focused on secondary student needs. As you are aware, the Board has been engaged in discussions with Mr. Peter Cartwright with regard to the City's participation with the potential post-secondary campus on the GID land. The Board has identified a shortfall in secondary pupil places in the City of Guelph in the coming years. We continue to be interested in the post-secondary options being advanced on the GID land as they relate to the potential cooperation between the Board and Conestoga College and/or the University of Guelph either in the provision of infrastructure or academic programming.

As the plans for the GID have advanced, the inclusion of significant residential densities has necessitated further examination of potential elementary site/accommodation needs. While, the GID may provide a unique opportunity for the Board to establish a new secondary school closely aligned with post-secondary uses and in a unique environment which may serve the cooperative education/apprenticeship and other applied needs of students from the Guelph area, the need to provide an elementary school in this area is tied more closely to a potential population of students from within the GID.

The GID is relatively isolated from other residential neighbourhoods in Guelph, which creates a challenge for accommodating elementary aged students. Students from within the GID would not generally be within walking distance to another elementary school. This relative separation also provides a challenge to ensure that if a new elementary school were constructed, that a sustainable enrolment is available from within the GID.

At this time it is our understanding that the GID may accommodate between 3000-5000 persons. The composition of units to be constructed to accomplish this population range (i.e. single/semi/town/apartment) will ultimately determine the need for an elementary school site in the GID. Student yields are generally highest from singles and semis, and apartments generate the fewest students per unit.

We have reviewed the draft policies of the Secondary Plan and are largely satisfied that the Board's interest in possible future school sites can be accommodated within most designations.

### Upper Grand District School Board

• R.J. (Bob) Borden, Chair  
 • Mark Bailey, Vice-Chair

• Linda Busuttil  
 • Kathryn Cooper

• Marty Fairbairn  
 • David Gohn

• Susan Mozlar  
 • Bruce Schieck


• Lynn Topping  
 • Jennifer Waterston

Joan Jylanne  
City of Guelph  
December 24, 2012

It would be preferable to locate the secondary site within the Phase 1. Locating in Phase 1 is intended to ensure availability of the facility to meet the accommodation needs of the broader community when needed and when funding may be available. An elementary school site would be best accommodated within the residential area. Potentially locating an elementary school site in tandem with the Open Space and Park designations identified around the Guelph Turfgrass Institute building may allow the Board and City to share play fields, and cooperatively program these community elements.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. We look forward to continued dialogue with the City on this exciting project and involvement as this project advances beyond the Secondary Planning stage.

Sincerely,  
**Upper Grand District School Board**



Jennifer Passy, BES, MCIP, RPP  
Manager of Planning

cc: Ms. Janice Wright, UGDSB  
Mr. Peter Cartwright, City of Guelph

**From:** Adele Labbe  
**Sent:** December 13, 2012 4:01 PM  
**To:** April Nix  
**Cc:** Joan Jylanne; Vaille Laur  
**Subject:** EAC and GID

Hi April,

In November 2012 EAC received an information presentation from Joan regarding the GID Secondary Plan. Last night, the Committee deliberated about the Draft Secondary Plan. There was much discussion but a final motion was not put forth. The discussions included the following:

- The geology of the river valley in this area is significant and unique. This should be highlighted and celebrated in the GID Secondary Plan.
- The trail information does not reflect the informal trails which exist on the site today.
- The active transportation link is supported as it connects both sides of the river and promotes low impact mobility.
- Stewardship should be highlighted in the GID Secondary Plan. Interpretative signage, brochures and materials should be a priority.
- 3 big areas of concern from an environmental perspective (water quality and quantity and hence ecological function) are: Cargill, point source pollution from the Ward coming through Clythe Creek and the dam.
- A Subwatershed study wasn't undertaken and EAC hasn't reviewed any Natural Heritage information for the area.

The minutes, which won't be finalized until January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2013 will reflect the following general message:

Given the lack a Subwatershed Study, there is a lack of management guidance for the Natural Heritage System in this area. EAC strongly recommends that the Natural Heritage System (i.e., non-developable portion of the lands) of the GID lands be subject to a comprehensive Master Plan exercise. EAC requests to review the Natural Heritage Study which was prepared in support of the Secondary Plan. From this review, EAC could formulate a Terms of Reference for a Master Plan.

I am providing this information to you for discussion. Once you've had a chance to digest, let's talk further about how to best handle these comments. They are open to hearing staff's suggestions on how to best move this forward. I haven't quite wrapped my mind around how a master plan would be triggered... Just a reminder that the information I've provided is draft until EAC's minutes are finalized by the members in January.

Thanks,

**Adèle Labbé** | Environmental Planner  
 Planning Services  
 Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment  
 City of Guelph  
 T (519) 822-1260 x 2563 | F (519) 822-4632  
 E [adele.labbe@guelph.ca](mailto:adele.labbe@guelph.ca)

Ministry of  
Municipal Affairs  
and Housing

Municipal Services Office -  
Western

659 Exeter Road, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
London ON N6E 1L3  
Tel. (519) 873-4020  
Toll Free 1-800-265-4736  
Fax (519) 873-4018

Ministère des  
Affaires municipales  
et du Logement

Bureau des services aux municipalités -  
région de l'Ouest

659, rue Exeter, 2<sup>e</sup> étage  
London ON N6E 1L3  
Tél. (519) 873-4020  
Sans frais 1 800 265-4736  
Téléco (519) 873-4018



January 7, 2013

Ms. Joan Jylanne  
Senior Policy Planner  
Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment  
Planning Services  
City of Guelph, 1 Carden Street  
Guelph, ON N1H 3A1

Dear Ms. Jylanne,

Re: **Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan**  
**City of Guelph**

---

Thank you for your recent circulation of the above-noted matter.

It is understood the purpose of the Guelph Innovation District (GID) Secondary Plan is to establish a detailed planning framework consisting of a vision, principles, objectives, policies and schedules to guide and regulate future development of the GID Planning Area. The Vision for the GID is to create a compact mixed-use community in the City's east end to facilitate innovative, sustainable employment uses with an adjacent urban village connecting residential and compatible employment uses. The GID lands straddle the Eramosa River and are bounded by York Road to the north, Victoria Road South to the west, Watson Parkway South to the east and extending south to Stone Road East, including lands south and immediately adjacent to Stone Road East.

As discussed, the draft secondary plan was circulated to the Ministries of the Environment, Natural Resources, Infrastructure, Tourism, Culture and Sport and Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. Comments have been received from the Ministries of the Environment, Tourism, Culture and Sport and Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. If/when comments are received from the other partner ministries they will be shared under separate cover.

**Ministry of the Environment (MOE)**

MOE staff have reviewed the draft secondary plan and offer the following comments for the City's consideration.

**Section 6.4 Land Use Designations**

As drafted, the Adaptive Reuse policies for Employment Mixed Use 1 and Employment Mixed Use 2 encourage and permit a mix of land uses that include certain industrial uses. Specifics have not been provided as to how the City will ensure the uses will be compatible. It is suggested the City ensure adequate provisions exist within the City's Official Plan to ensure land use compatibility within the GID is not compromised.

---



### **Section 6.5 Special Policies**

Section 6.5 provides policy direction for those lands that will serve as a transitional buffer area between residential uses and the utility and industrial areas north of Stone Road East. MOE notes Section 6.5.3 suggests restrictive zoning be implemented to prohibit new sensitive land uses north of Stone Road East and further, Section 6.5.4 proposes to require the City to consult with the Ministry of the Environment and Cargill and the Waste Resource Innovation Centre during the development approval process of these lands and during the design process for public spaces in the vicinity of the Cargill plant and the Waste Innovation Centre property to ensure compatibility. The Ministry of the Environment has guidelines regarding land use compatibility. It is suggested the City utilize the guidelines and consult with MOE staff on an as needed basis.

In addition, MMAH staff note Section 6.5.3 states noise and air emissions reports shall be required and vibration and illumination reports may be required in support of development approval requests. It is suggested the City ensure these reports are identified in the City's complete application policies.

### **Section 7.5 Special Studies and Future Initiatives**

Section 7.5.4 appears to state that the City will conduct master plans to assess stormwater and water and wastewater requirements for the subject lands. While it is not mentioned, MOE assumes that the above-mentioned master plans will be undertaken and completed in accordance with the provisions of the MEA Class EA.

In summary and taking into consideration the nature of the policies contained in the Secondary Plan, the provisions that have been made to address the potential for land use compatibility, the vision of mixed use development, and the intent to undertake master planning (and presumably project-specific EA studies), MOE has no concerns with the draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan.

### **Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA)**

OMAFRA staff have completed a review of the above noted matter prepared by planningAlliance dated October 2012. As the subject lands are within the City of Guelph urban boundary OMAFRA has no comments or concerns from a Provincial Policy Statement and Growth Plan perspective regarding the proposed use of these urban lands as outlined in the draft Guelph Innovation District (GID) Secondary Plan.

However, it is important to note the lands subject to the draft secondary plan include the Guelph Research Station and these are provincially owned lands by the Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario (ARIO), an agency of OMAFRA. The Guelph Research Station lands are approximately 267 acres located west of the Eramosa River and include the Guelph Turfgrass Institute (GTI), turf research plots and agroforestry research. Research programs undertaken at the station are operated by the University of Guelph (U of G) under the OMAFRA - U of G Partnership Agreement. Other provincially held lands in the GID include the former Guelph Correctional Facility and the former Wellington Detention Centre. These lands are not owned by ARIO.

In 2010 the Province (as represented by the Ministry of Infrastructure and its agent, Infrastructure Ontario) and the City of Guelph signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) reflecting a commitment to work collaboratively towards implementing a long-term vision for these lands and to allow for future implementation of the GID. Staff from OMAFRA's Research and Innovation Branch are working closely with Infrastructure Ontario (IO), the Turfgrass Institute and the University of Guelph to develop a strategy for the future relocation of the turfgrass and agroforestry research from the Guelph Research Station. It is important to note this is an on-going process separate from OMAFRA's review of the GID Draft Secondary Plan under the province's one-window protocol.

### **Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS)**

MTCS' interest in the draft Secondary Plan relates to its mandate of conserving, protecting and preserving Ontario's cultural heritage, including archaeological resources, built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes.

Pursuant to Part III.1 of the Ontario Heritage Act, MTCS developed *Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* (Standards & Guidelines), which came into force on July 1, 2010. The *Standards & Guidelines* apply to property owned by the Crown in right of Ontario and by prescribed public bodies. The *Standards & Guidelines* provide for the identification of properties that have cultural heritage value or interest; and set standards for their protection, maintenance, use and disposal. All Ontario government ministries and prescribed public bodies are required to comply with the *Standards & Guidelines* in the management of properties in their ownership or under their control. Both Infrastructure Ontario and Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario are prescribed public bodies.

Of particular interest is provision F.5 of the *Standards & Guidelines* which stipulates that "in the case of a provincial heritage property of provincial significance, [ministries and prescribed public bodies shall] obtain the consent of the Minister of Tourism and Culture before removing or demolishing buildings or structures on the property, or before transferring the property from provincial control."

MTCS staff reviewed the draft Secondary Plan for the GID dated October 2012 and, given the above context, more detailed comments are attached which will help improve the document and support fulfilment of and obligations under the Standards & Guidelines.

### **Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MAH)**

#### **Section 3.4.3 Water and Wastewater Servicing**

Section 3.4.3 of the draft secondary plan requires developers to demonstrate the efficient use of potable water with any development application. As drafted, Section 3.4.3 appears to exceed the policy requirement of Section 2.2 (f) of the PPS. Section 2.2 (f) speaks to promoting (emphasis added) efficient and sustainable use of water resources, including practices for water conservation. Section 4.6 of the PPS allows planning authorities to go beyond the minimum standards established in specific policies, unless doing so would conflict with any policy of the PPS. The City is encouraged to ensure Section 3.4.3 does not conflict with the PPS or any other policy in the City's Official Plan.

#### **Section 3.5 Stormwater**

Section 3.5.4 requires development in the GID to comply with the recommendations and requirements of the City of Guelph Source Water Protection Plan and Section 3.5.6 speaks to the City minimizing the amount of chloride (salt) infiltration into groundwater through best management practices when applying salt to streets during winter months.

The application of salt is a prescribed threat under the *Clean Water Act* and most, if not all, source protection plans deal with this threat. The City is encouraged to ensure Section 3.5.6 is consistent with the source protection plan policies. Further, it is important to note the City's Source Water Protection Plan utilizes several tools to implement the recommendations and requirements of the Source Water Protection Plan. Prior to implementation, the Source Water Protection Plan needs to be approved by the Ministry of the Environment. As drafted, Section 3.5.4 requires development within the GID to comply with the recommendations and requirements of the Source Water Protection Plan regardless of whether the Source Water Protection Plan is in effect and force.

Further, Section 3.5.5 states infiltration stormwater best management practices that are to be located on private lands are to be listed on land title agreements. The City may wish to investigate whether best management practices can be registered on title.

**Section 5.2 Parks and Public Open Spaces (General Public Realm Policies)**

Section 5.2.10 states the secondary plan identifies two existing public park spaces and the creation of two new public park spaces, each with distinct roles and functions within the community. City staff are to secure and develop the new parkland through the development application process. Section 5.2.11 states the final park locations will be determined in accordance with the development process and if alternative park locations are deemed more appropriate then changes to the location can be made without an amendment to the secondary plan.

As drafted, Sections 5.2.10 and 5.2.11 appear to conflict. Section 5.2.10 appears to suggest public park spaces have been identified and the identification is based on distinct roles and functions the respective parks play within the community. Section 5.2.11 allows the park locations to be changed. It is unclear how this conflict will be resolved through the Official Plan Amendment process.


**Section 6.3 General Built Form and Site Development Policies**

Section 6.3.3 allows the implementing Zoning By-law to establish heights lower than the recommended heights in Schedule D to maintain viewsheds of the Eramosa River and the Downtown. Section 6.2.6 states the GID is planned to achieve 8,000-12,000 jobs and 3,000-5,000 people. If Schedule D is based on the jobs and people contained in Section 6.2.6, it is unclear how the City will ensure Section 6.2.6 is achieved.

Further, Section 6.3 contains general built form and site development policies. It is important to note there are certain requirements in the Building code that do apply to some of the proposed policy approaches that need to be into consideration while implementing this secondary plan. For example, Section 6.3.5 discusses setbacks of a building from the property line. The Building Code has setbacks for property lines that must not be exceeded. Further, the policies outlined in Section 6.3.7 need to consider that the distances from fire hydrants to building entrances may be of concern to the local fire department. It is recommended the City ensure established distances do not conflict with the Ontario Fire Code. A third example deals with Section 6.3.8 (d). It is important for the City to keep in mind that the Building Code has requirements for access to barrier free parking from barrier free entrances. Finally and with respect to Section 6.3.9, the City should ensure that roof designs are in compliance with Building Code requirements as there certain energy efficiency and fire-related matters regarding this topic.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan. We would be pleased to discuss any of these comments. If you have any questions, please telephone me at (519) 873-4695 or contact me by email at: [Dwayne.evans@ontario.ca](mailto:Dwayne.evans@ontario.ca).

Sincerely,



Dwayne Evans  
Planner, MSO-Western

c.c Barb Slattery, MOE (Hamilton)  
Carol Neumann, OMAFRA (Elora)  
Penny Young, MTCS (Toronto)  
David Marriott, MNR (Guelph)  
Maya Harris, MOI (Toronto)  
Stephanie Costantino, MAH (Toronto)  
Jeremy Warson, IO (Toronto)

## Appendix for MTCs message to MMAH on the draft Secondary Plan – Guelph Innovation District

Please consider the following comments on the draft Secondary Plan for the Guelph Innovation District (GID)

REFERENCE	EXISTING TEXT	MTCs COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS	RATIONALE
1. Introduction Page 1	The purpose of the Guelph Innovation District (GID) Secondary Plan is to establish a detailed planning framework consisting of a Vision, Principles and Objectives and Policies and Schedules to guide and regulate future development of the GID Planning Area.	Change the order of the paragraphs, start with an intro and then the purpose.  The GID Planning areas comprises lands bounded by (...) The majority of the lands were under public ownership and used as a correctional centre since the 1900's. The majority of the lands were owned, at the time of the adoption of this Secondary Plan, by the Government of Ontario, the City of Guelph and private landowner.  The purpose of the GID (...) The Secondary Plan serves as a basis for the review of planning applications and constitutes Official Plan policy which will be used in conjunction with the other policies of the Official Plan.	The introduction should acknowledge the former use of the site.
2. 1.2 Principles & Objectives Page 2	Creating a place that respects natural and built heritage resources, making citizens stewards of the resources for current and future generations.	Replace "built heritage resources" with "cultural heritage resources".	Cultural heritage resources are more inclusive, as it also includes cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources. It is also consistent with the document.
3. 1.2 Principles & Objectives Principle 1: Protect what is valuable Page 2	b) Respect the existing topography and sightlines, including river vistas and views of both Downtown and the historic Reformatory Complex.	Clarify the location of vistas and views in a Schedule.	
4. 1.2 Principles & Objectives Principle 1: Protect what is valuable Page 2	c) Ensure compatible public access opportunities to the Natural Heritage System and cultural heritage resources, including those designated in the Official Plan, and promote their celebration, especially river vistas and edges, the Provincially Significant Earth Science Area of Natural and Scientific Interest, and the	Clarify the location of vistas and views in a Schedule.  Clarify if the location of the provincially significant Area of Natural and Scientific Interest is the same as 'significant natural area' in Schedule A.	

REFERENCE	EXISTING TEXT	MTCS COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS	RATIONALE
<p>5.</p> <p>1.2 Principles &amp; Objectives</p> <p>Principle 1: Protect what is valuable</p> <p>Page 2</p>	<p>historic Reformatory Complex.</p> <p>d) Integrate the Natural Heritage System and cultural heritage resources with surrounding land uses and provide opportunities for compatible research, educational, recreational, transportation and urban agricultural uses.</p>	<p>Reword this paragraph to indicate that new development will be integrated within the existing design and not the other way round.</p>	<p>The site's cultural heritage resources are not deemed as moveable items and will direct how new development is designed. Therefore new development must be integrated with what exists.</p>
<p>6.</p> <p>1.2 Principles &amp; Objectives</p> <p>Principle 1: Protect what is valuable</p> <p>Page 2</p>	<p>e) Ensure, where appropriate and feasible, the preservation and adaptive reuse of cultural heritage resources, including the historic Reformatory Complex and associated cultural heritage landscape.</p>	<p>It is not clear what the meaning of 'appropriate and feasible' is. The PPS, 2005 states that "significant built heritage resources and conserved." MTCS recommends the use of the same language as in the PPS.</p> <p>Use the term conservation instead of preservation.</p> <p>There is a need to acknowledge the cultural heritage of the Eramosa River as part of the Grand River Watershed, a designated Canadian Heritage River.</p> <p>There may be some cultural heritage resources in the Guelph Research Station property.</p> <p>Another provision could also be added.</p> <p>Suggested wording: "Apply best efforts to arrange for an alternate use of the built heritage resources that requires minimal or no change to its heritage attributes (adaptive reuse)."</p>	<p>Definition of Conserved (PPS, 2005): means the identification, protection, use and/or management of cultural heritage and archaeological resources in such a way that their heritage values, attributes and integrity are retained. This may be addressed through a conservation plan or heritage impact assessment.</p> <p>Definition of Preservation (Parks Canada Standards &amp; Guidelines): involves protecting, maintaining and stabilizing the existing form, material and integrity of an historic place or individual component, while protecting its heritage value.</p> <p>MTCS understands that heritage and archaeological assessment reports were done for the Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario (ARIO)-owned property, the Guelph Research Station. MTCS also understands that IO and ARIO will consult with the City on this.</p>
<p>7.</p> <p>1.2 Principles &amp; Objectives</p> <p>Principle 2: Create Sustainable and Energy Efficient Infrastructure</p>		<p>Add the following: "Council shall support the reduction of waste from construction debris as a result of the demolition of buildings by promoting and encouraging the adaptive reuse of existing building stock."</p>	<p>There is no mention of heritage, adaptive reuse and its environmental benefits. One of the main environmental benefits of reusing buildings is the retention of the original building's "embodied energy". New buildings have much higher embodied energy costs than buildings that are adaptively reused.</p>
<p>8.</p> <p>1.2 Principles &amp; Objectives</p>	<p>e) Build new connections for pedestrians, cyclists and potentially transit users across the Eramosa River valley to better connect uses and</p>	<p>Some crossings in the form of bridges already exist. It is not clear whether there are new connections to replace the bridges or if there will</p>	<p>It is understood that most, if not all, of the cultural heritage resources will be retained. Therefore, it should be made clear that new</p>

REFERENCE	EXISTING TEXT	MTC'S COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS	RATIONALE
<p>Principle 3: Establish a Balanced Mobility System Page 3</p>	<p>activities:</p>	<p>development will add to what exists.</p>	<p>This idea is not fully worked out, or shown on the schedules.</p>
<p>9.</p> <p>1.2 Principles &amp; Objectives Principle 4: Promote a health diversity of land uses and densities Page 4.</p>	<p>h) Create a memorable landmark area/structure to serve as a beacon/partner to the Church of Our Lady Immaculate in Downtown.</p>	<p>This provision is unclear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the Secondary Plan recommending a structure that will be visible from downtown, as the Church is from the former Correctional Centre?</li> <li>Is it a building or monument?</li> <li>Provision 6.4.9 indicates that would be in the "urban village" zone.</li> <li>There may be some cultural heritage resources in the Guelph Research Station property, if so, how would it impact upon the resources? And what principles are in place to guide its design?</li> </ul>	<p>[Parks Canada S&amp;Gs] – Standard 11 - Conserve the heritage value and character-defining elements when creating any new additions to an historic place or any related new construction. Make the new work physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from the historic place.</p> <p>*Parks Canada, 2010. <i>The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada</i>. Accessed on January 3, 2013 at: <a href="http://www.historicplaces.ca/en/pages/standards-normes.aspx">http://www.historicplaces.ca/en/pages/standards-normes.aspx</a></p>
<p>10.</p> <p>1.2 Principles &amp; Objectives Principle 4: Promote a health diversity of land uses and densities Page 4</p>	<p>i) Respect (and emulate where appropriate) the Beaux-Arts design of the cultural heritage landscape component of the historic Reformatory Complex.</p>	<p>It is not clear what the City would like to achieve. Suggested wording: "New developments on the site should adopt an architectural vocabulary and design elements that are compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from the heritage property."</p>	<p>"Cultural heritage resources" is more inclusive, as it refers to built heritage resources; cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources. It is also consistent with the document.</p>
<p>11.</p> <p>1.2 Principles &amp; Objectives Principle 6: Grow Innovative Business and Employment</p>	<p>e) Encourage employment uses within the historic Reformatory Complex that can showcase the site's built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscape.</p>	<p>Clarify how this principle fits into Section 6.4 (Land Use Designations – Adaptive Reuse). Replace "built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes" with "cultural heritage resources".</p>	

REFERENCE	EXISTING TEXT	MTCS COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS	RATIONALE
12.	<p>Opportunities Page 5</p> <p>2.1 Intent Page 6</p> <p>(...)The policies below are informed by the Vision and supporting Principles which seek to reflect Guelph's history and celebrate the rich heritage resources of the District, including the Eramosa River valley, dramatic topography and views, and historic Reformatory Complex.</p>	<p>There is a need to acknowledge the cultural heritage of the Eramosa River as part of the Grand River Watershed, a designated Canadian Heritage River.</p> <p>There may be some cultural heritage resources in the Guelph Research Station property.</p>	<p>The Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario (ARIO) owned property should be referred to as the Guelph Research Station. Guelph Turfgrass Institute is only part of the activity on the station. The research station also includes agroforestry research. The main building should be referred to as the G.M. Frost Centre.</p> <p>MTCS understands that heritage and archaeological assessment reports were done for the Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario (ARIO)-owned property, the Guelph Research Station. MTCS also understands that IO and ARIO will consult with the City on this.</p> <p>Canadian Heritage River System: See: <a href="http://www.chrs.ca/Rivers/Grand/Grand-F_e.php">http://www.chrs.ca/Rivers/Grand/Grand-F_e.php</a></p>
13.	<p>2.2. General Natural and Cultural Heritage Policies Page 6</p> <p>2.2.7 The Provincially Significant Earth Science ANSI shown on schedule 4A within the District presents opportunities for important low impact scientific and educational activities.</p>	<p>There was no Schedule 4A attached. Please clarify the location.</p>	
14.	<p>2.2. General Natural and Cultural Heritage Policies Page 7</p> <p>2.2.8 As identified on Schedules A and C, the eastern portion of the District is predominantly designated as Adaptive Re-use within a cultural heritage landscape with built heritage resources in the historic Reformatory Complex. Land uses within the cultural heritage landscape boundary are subject to the provisions of the cultural heritage resource policies found in Section 4.8 of the Official Plan. Policies related to the Adaptive Re-use land use designation can be found in Section 6.4 of this Secondary Plan.</p>	<p>There is a need to acknowledge that the former Guelph Correctional Centre was identified as a provincial heritage property of provincial significance.</p> <p>There is a need to acknowledge the cultural heritage of the Eramosa River as part of the Grand River Watershed, a designated Canadian Heritage River, as well as the views and vistas mentioned in the river valley</p> <p>There may be some cultural heritage resources in the Guelph Research Station property.</p> <p>Delete: "built heritage resources".</p>	<p>Cultural heritage landscape can also include built features and archaeological sites. Definition</p>



REFERENCE	EXISTING TEXT	MTC'S COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS	RATIONALE
15.	2.2 General Natural and Cultural Heritage Policies Cultural Heritage Page 7	2.2.9 Ontario Heritage Trust or the appropriate authority will be requested to hold heritage conservation easement(s) for all features identified as provincially significant.	<p>The City of Guelph Official Plan (consolidated version September 2012) does not have Section 4.8. Cultural Heritage Policies are found in Section 3.5.</p> <p>of Cultural Heritage Landscape (PPS, 2005): means a defined geographical area of heritage significance which has been modified by human activities and is valued by a community. It involves a grouping(s) of individual heritage features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites and natural elements, which together form a significant type of heritage form, distinctive from that of its constituent elements or parts. Examples may include, but are not limited to, heritage conservation districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, and villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, railways and industrial complexes of cultural heritage value.</p> <p>Under the <i>Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties</i>, Provision F.2, states that if a provincial heritage property is to leave provincial control, ministries and prescribed public bodies shall use best efforts to the extent possible in law to ensure the ongoing, legally binding protection of the property's cultural heritage value in any sale or other disposal agreement.</p> <p>Provision F.5, states that in the case of a provincial heritage property of provincial significance, ministries and prescribed public bodies shall obtain the consent of the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport before removing or demolishing buildings or structures on the property, or before transferring the property from provincial control. That is the case for the former Guelph Correctional Centre property.</p>
16.	2.2 General Natural and Cultural Heritage Policies Cultural Heritage Page 7	2.2.10 A conceptual plan shall be required as part of a Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment to ensure that the cultural heritage resources within the site will be conserved and incorporated into any future design intent.	<p>Definitions from the 'Official Plan – September 2012 Consolidation'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Built Heritage Resource Impact Assessment</i>: Built Heritage Resource Impact Assessment means a study conducted prior to development</li> </ul>

REFERENCE	EXISTING TEXT	MTC'S COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS	RATIONALE
		<p>Suggestion wording: A Heritage Impact Assessment and/or Conservation Plan will be required to ensure (...)</p> <p>As in Commitment 8, new development must work around what exists, not vice versa. Recommend removing "and incorporated into any future design intent".</p>	<p>redevelopment to investigate the potential impact of development on built heritage resources. This type of study will determine how a particular development should proceed and what actions or measures are required to minimize adverse impact on built heritage resources. It does not address cultural heritage landscape or archaeological sites.</p> <p><i>Built Heritage Resource</i>: means a building, structure, landscape, monument, installation (or a group of them) or visible remains, which meets the designation criteria adopted by the Guelph Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee (LACAC) and which is included in the City of Guelph Inventory of Heritage Structures as it is completed and as it may be amended. All buildings, structures, landscapes, monuments, installations or visible remains constructed prior to 1930, but not limited to those constructed prior to 1930, shall be considered to be built heritage resources until considered otherwise by the Guelph LACAC.</p> <p><i>Cultural Heritage Landscape Resource</i>: means groups of features made by people. The arrangement of features illustrates noteworthy relationships between people and their surrounding environment. They can provide the contextual and spatial information necessary to preserve, interpret or reinforce the understanding of important historical settings and changes to past patterns of land use. Cultural heritage landscapes include such groups of features as neighbourhoods, townscapes and farmscapes.</p>
17.	2.2 General Natural and Cultural Heritage	2.2.11 All land uses within the District are subject to the provisions of the cultural heritage	The City of Guelph Official Plan (consolidated version September 2012) does not have Section

REFERENCE	EXISTING TEXT	MTCS COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS	RATIONALE
18.	<p>2.2 General Natural and Cultural Heritage Policies Page 7</p> <p>2.2.12. It is the intent of this Secondary Plan to conserve cultural heritage landscapes, such as the area delineated as the historic Reformatory Complex on Schedule A that have been modified by human activities and are valued by the community.</p>	<p>4.8. Cultural Heritage Policies are found in Section 3.5.</p> <p>If provision 2.29 is changed (cultural heritage resources shall be conserved through long-term protection mechanisms) then there is no need to include this provision. In addition, the cultural heritage landscape boundaries may be larger than what is in Schedule A.</p>	
19.	<p>2.2 General Natural and Cultural Heritage Policies Page 7</p> <p>2.2.13 New development shall preserve and enhance the cultural heritage landscape character through integrating cultural heritage resources, landscape elements and important views in site design.</p>	<p>Reward to say that new development will integrate with the existing cultural heritage resources.</p>	
20.	<p>2.2 General Natural and Cultural Heritage Policies Page 7</p> <p>2.2.14. For archaeological resources, prior to site alteration or soil disturbance relating to a Planning Act application or a Site Alteration application under the Municipal Act, any required archaeological assessment shall be approved by the Province of Ontario and the City, indicating there are no further concerns for archaeological resources within the subject area.</p>	<p>Archaeological resources is italicised on one instance, but not in another. This should be consistent throughout the document.</p> <p>Additionally, the province does not approve archaeological assessments; therefore this entry should be removed.</p> <p>Include a map to indicate areas of archaeological potential within the district.</p> <p>Suggested wording: Where an archaeological assessment has not been done, (...) OR</p> <p>Suggested wording: The Secondary Plan area has some areas of archaeological potential as defined in Schedule x. Areas of archaeological potential are areas that could contain archaeological resources. The identification and evaluation of such resources are based upon archaeological fieldwork undertaken in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act.</p> <p>Archaeological assessment will be required prior to the submission of any planning application.</p>	<p>Consultant archaeologists submit their archaeological assessment reports to MTCS as a condition of their license. When reviewing a report, MTCS may send review letter(s) to a consultant archaeologist requesting further assessment and/or revisions to the report if provincial standards have not been met. Once a report has been entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Report, the ministry will send a letter to the consultant archaeologist.</p> <p>Archaeological assessments have been conducted by the Province for the former Guelph Correctional Centre, the former Wellington Detention Centre and the Guelph Research Station properties.</p>

REFERENCE	EXISTING TEXT	MTC COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS	RATIONALE
21.	<p>2.2 General Natural and Cultural Heritage Policies Cultural Heritage Page 7</p> <p>2.2.15 Encourage the retention and integration of the Turfgrass Institute Building into the Guelph Innovation District community. New development shall have regard for the building form, material and existing views towards the Turfgrass Institute. Where feasible, landscape features associated with the Turfgrass Institute are to be incorporated within the planned public open space and park adjacent and south of the building.</p>	<p>It is our understanding that the Turfgrass Institute building (or the G.M.Frost Centre building) has been listed on the municipal register, i.e. has the potential to have cultural heritage value. Please clarify whether the municipal heritage committee has looked at whether this property meets Ontario Regulation 9/06.</p> <p>Revisit the proposed wording in this provision to address the PPS direction that cultural heritage resources shall be conserved.</p> <p>A provision associated more with the natural features of the cultural heritage landscape could also be added: Preserving vegetation – such as trees, shrubs, grasses and other living plant material that is important in defining the overall heritage value of the landscape.</p>	<p>The Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario (ARIO) owned property should be referred to as the Guelph Research Station. Guelph Turfgrass Institute is only part of the activity on the station. The research station also includes agroforestry research. The main building should be referred to as the G.M. Frost Centre.</p> <p>There may be some cultural heritage resources in the Guelph Research Station property. The Secondary Plan may need to acknowledge that.</p> <p>The Planning Act requires that all decisions affecting land use planning matters "shall be consistent with" the PPS, 2005. This is higher test than the former "shall have regard to."</p>
22.	<p>2.2 General Natural and Cultural Heritage Policies Topography Page 7</p> <p>2.2.16 The topography associated with the Eramosa River Valley within the Guelph Innovation District offers appealing vistas towards the historic Reformatory Complex as well as the Downtown, providing a distinctive character to the area. Future development shall take advantage of favourable topography and vistas and minimize the need for re-grading on site, where possible.</p>	<p>Clarify the location of vistas and views in a Schedule.</p>	
23.	<p>2.2 General Natural and Cultural Heritage Policies Urban Forest Page 8</p> <p>2.2.24 The Guelph Innovation District also includes hedgerows, smaller wooded areas and individual trees that are part of the urban forest. Development and site alteration will identify opportunities for protection, enhancement and restoration of the urban forest and contribute to maintaining and increasing canopy cover.</p>	<p>See also 5.2.18 – increase, where feasible and appropriate.</p> <p>Need to add a disclaimer about impacts on the cultural heritage landscape and associated views and vistas.</p>	
24.	<p>3.3 Energy Page 10</p> <p>3.3.4 Within the GID, 100% of the available roof area will be encouraged to be dedicated to roof top solar technologies such as photovoltaic or</p>	<p>Include a disclaimer about impacts on heritage buildings and landscape. Or Suggest wording: Retrofits for achieving energy</p>	

REFERENCE	EXISTING TEXT	MICS COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS	RATIONALE
25.	<p>5.2 General Public Realm Policies</p> <p>Additional Considerations</p> <p>Page 19</p>	<p>5.2.22 The City shall encourage an integrated public art approach that tells a multi-purpose thematic story tying together the natural and cultural significance of the District, with its future vision. Seize opportunities presented within the historic Reformatory Complex, trail network, parks and open space designations, and lookout points and vistas as potential public art locations.</p>	<p>Under the <i>Standards &amp; Guidelines</i>, provision E.6. states that ministries and prescribed public bodies shall ensure that cultural heritage value or interest of a provincial heritage property is appropriately interpreted and presented to communicate its meaning and to enhance public understanding and enjoyment.</p> <p>An example from the London Psychiatric Hospital Secondary Plan (Policy 20.4.3.6. (iv)) states:</p> <p>d) The therapeutic landscape setting and its physical and visual relationships to the historic buildings shall be conserved and monitored to allow for meaningful interpretation of the cultural heritage resources. The following measures shall be taken to facilitate interpretation of the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The establishment of an interpretive centre to tell the story of the site and of mental health care in Canada. A possible location for such a use is the administrative wing of the Infirmary building;</li> <li>• The creation of an interpretive walk, which would tell the story of the site and explain the function of the therapeutic landscape as people move through it;</li> <li>• A prominent street within the property should be named after Dr. Richard Bucke (superintendent, 1877-1902), if possible;</li> <li>• Interpretive signage, public art, way finding strategies and other techniques may be considered.</li> </ul>
	<p>efficiency will only be undertaken to a heritage building where it is demonstrated that retrofitting can be accomplished without compromising the heritage integrity of the building.</p> <p>See also previous comments (Comment 7) on Section 1.2 regarding adaptive reuse of heritage buildings.</p>	<p>There is an opportunity for interpretation and commemoration of the site.</p> <p>Suggested wording in addition to the proposed provision: The cultural heritage landscape and visual relationships to built heritage resources shall be conserved and monitored to allow for meaningful interpretation. Interpretive signage, public art, way-finding strategies and other techniques may be considered.</p> <p>Please note that the former Reformatory Complex includes lands that are used by the Guelph Research Station, Cargill and municipal properties.</p>	

REFERENCE	EXISTING TEXT	MITCS COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS	RATIONALE
26. 6.2 General Land Use Policies Page 21	6.2.3 The District will be developed to support and accommodate emerging innovation businesses and other "green" energy industries that will serve to support the emergence of the District as an innovation centre together with the knowledge-based research centre located within the University of Guelph and with the civic hub and cultural centre of Downtown. Large tracts of undeveloped land, proximity to the University and Downtown, scenic viewsheds and the cultural buildings and landscapes of the historic Reformatory Complex and strategic marketing to attract new businesses will serve to advance this third cluster within the University-Downtown-GID trinity.	Replaces "the cultural buildings and landscapes of the historic Reformatory Complex" with "the cultural heritage resources of the area".	Cultural heritage resources are more inclusive, as it also includes cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources.
27. 6.2 General Land Use Policies Page 22	6.2.7 The topography, landscape and natural and cultural heritage features associated with the Eramosa River are unique to the District. Future road alignment, siting and massing, and design of development should enhance scenic views of the Eramosa River valley and cultural heritage landscape features associated with the historic Reformatory Complex, as well as views of Downtown, by (...)	Clarify what the cultural heritage features associated with the Eramosa River are.	
28. 6.2 General Land Use Policies Page 22	6.2.8 The predominant character of built form within the District will be established by mid-rise and employment buildings with a limited number of high-rise buildings at strategic locations marking the Nodes and gateways. A range of building types is to be encouraged, including mid- and high-rise residential and mixed use buildings, townhouses, research, design and office complexes, manufacturing and live/work units.	The height range provided does not appear to have been established for mid- and high-rise buildings. The placement and height of new buildings may impact the cultural heritage resources; therefore, it is recommended that the height be made explicit for each type of building style.	
29. 6.4 Land Use Designations	6.4.1 Adaptive Re-use areas are identified in Schedule C. These include areas containing provincially significant heritage resources where the conservation, rehabilitation, restoration, maintenance and re-use of historic buildings and	Replace "historic buildings and landscapes" with "built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes". Please clarify the relation of proposed land uses	Built heritage resources include buildings and structures e.g. bridges. It is also consistent with the definition in the City's Official Plan.

REFERENCE	EXISTING TEXT	MTCs COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS	RATIONALE
30.	<p>Page 25</p> <p>landscapes will serve as the focal point of new development. They shall have a mix of compatible uses including institutional, educational, commercial, office, light industrial, residential, livework and open space and park in a form that respects the existing built heritage form, cultural heritage landscape features, as well as the relationships between cultural heritage resources considered for adaptive reuse and redevelopment.</p>	<p>between provision 6.4.1 and provision 1.2 – Principle 6 – item e.</p> <p>Suggested wording: Apply best efforts to arrange for an alternate use of the property that requires minimal or no change to its heritage attributes (adaptive reuse).</p>	
30.	<p>6.4 Land Use Designations</p> <p>Page 25</p> <p>6.4.2 Within the GID, initiatives shall be considered to ensure that new construction, adaptive re-use and development are sympathetic and complementary to existing cultural heritage attributes of the historic context, including street patterns, building setbacks and building mass, height, and materials.</p>	<p>See comments (Comment 10) on provision 1.2 – Principle 4 – item j</p>	
31.	<p>6.4 Land Use Designations</p> <p>Page 25</p> <p>6.4.3 The adaptive reuse of built heritage resources shall ensure that the original building fabric and architectural features are retained and that any new additions will complement the existing building.</p>	<p>Merge the two provisions 6.4.2 and 6.4.3. and add some provision about the landscape.</p> <p>Suggested wording: "Conserve the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes when creating any new additions to a heritage property or any related new construction. Make the new work physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from the heritage property."</p>	<p>(Parks Canada S&amp;Gs) – Standard 11 - Conserve the heritage value and character-defining elements when creating any new additions to an historic place or any related new construction. Make the new work physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from the historic place.</p> <p>MTCs Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Built Heritage Properties (Spring 2007).</p>
32.	<p>7.8 Definitions</p> <p>Page 35-36</p> <p>7.8.1 In addition to definitions of the Official Plan, the following definitions are applicable in the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan.</p>	<p>Include definition for "adaptive reuse".</p> <p>Suggested wording: "Adaptive reuse" means the alteration of heritage buildings and structures to fit new uses or circumstance while retaining their heritage attributes.</p> <p>Alter means to change in any manner and includes to restore, renovate, repair, or disturb. Alteration has a corresponding meaning. (Definition, Ontario Heritage Act)</p>	

REFERENCE	EXISTING TEXT	MTCs COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS	RATIONALE
33.	<p>Schedule A: Natural and Cultural Heritage Heritage Schedule Page 39</p> <p>Legend: Cultural Heritage Resources: Non-listed CHR, Municipally listed CHR, Provincially Listed CHR and Designated CHR Cultural Heritage Landscape Natural Heritage System: Significant Natural Area</p>	<p>MTCs recommends that this map be revised to identify the properties (former Guelph Correctional Centre) as heritage properties. There may be some cultural heritage resources in the Guelph Research Station. It will be the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value (whether in an OHT heritage conservation easement or in a municipal designation) that will inform which attributes are identified.</p> <p>The nomenclature (non-listed, provincially listed) is not clear.</p> <p>There is a need to include the views and vistas that are associated with the cultural heritage value (different from scenic views).</p> <p>See previous comments on Archaeology.</p>	<p>There may be some cultural heritage resources in the Guelph Research Station property – see Comment 6. In addition, there a number of cultural heritage resources in the former Guelph Correctional Centre (e.g. bridges) that are not in the map. Not all buildings have been identified as being of cultural heritage value. The map does not acknowledge all the views and vistas.</p>
34.	<p>Schedule B: Mobility Mobility Schedule Page 41</p> <p>Cultural Heritage Resources</p>	<p>The cultural heritage resources include built heritage and cultural heritage resources. The map only acknowledges the built form. The cultural heritage landscape as well as the views and vistas can have an impact on the mobility schedule as well.</p> <p>There may be some cultural heritage resources in the Guelph research Station, especially around the proposed street "A". If the resources are confirmed, it is not clear if an impact assessment would be done before in order to propose that or how the heritage attributes will be incorporated and/or avoided.</p>	
35.	<p>Schedule C: Land Use Page 43</p> <p>Legend Cultural Heritage Resources Cultural Heritage Landscape</p>	<p>The map depicts only the built heritage resources as cultural heritage resources. Please note that the term cultural heritage resources also include cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources. In addition, built heritage resources include structures (e.g. bridges, fences, railway tracks/ties) not only buildings. MTCs recommends that the properties be identified as heritage properties.</p>	



REFERENCE	EXISTING TEXT	MITCS COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS	RATIONALE
36.	Schedule D: Height Page 45	<p>There may be some cultural heritage resources in the Guelph Research Station property. If so, please clarify whether some proposed residential use in property may impact on the resource(s).</p> <p>Although the legend has information about open space and park, the map does not depict that.</p> <p>Clarify the difference between "Open Space and Park and Existing Natural Areas" versus "Significant Natural Area and Natural Areas" (Schedule A and C)</p> <p>Include information about the natural and cultural heritage in this map as well, similar to the Mobility map.</p> <p>Include information about the views and vistas.</p> <p>Some of the new tallest buildings (in the Guelph Research Station property) are being proposed on the highest elevations in the plan area. There may be some cultural heritage resources in the Guelph Research Station property. It is not clear if an impact assessment was undertaken before to determine potential impacts on the views and vistas. It may conflict with some provisions regarding the protection of views and vistas to and from the innovation district area and downtown.</p>	

Ministry of  
Municipal Affairs  
and Housing

Municipal Services Office -  
Western

659 Exeter Road, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
London ON N6E 1L3  
Tel: (519) 873-4020  
Toll Free 1-800-265-4736  
Fax: (519) 873-4018

Ministère des  
Affaires municipales  
et du Logement

Bureau des services aux municipalités -  
région de l'Ouest

859, rue Exeter, 2<sup>e</sup> étage  
London ON N6E 1L3  
Tél. (519) 873-4020  
Sans frais 1 800 265-4736  
Télééc (519) 873-4018



January 17, 2013

Ms. Joan Jylanne  
Senior Policy Planner  
Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment  
Planning Services  
City of Guelph, 1 Carden Street  
Guelph, ON N1H 3A1

Dear Ms. Jylanne,

Re: **Draft Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan  
City of Guelph**

Further to our comments dated January 7, 2013, we wish to offer the following additional comments for the City's consideration.

**Ministry of Infrastructure (MOI)**

As you are aware, the City's Official Plan Amendment 39 (OPA 39) for conformity with the Growth Plan was approved by MMAH in 2009 and is in effect. MOI staff reviewed the draft secondary plan within the context of the Growth Plan and OPA 39. MOI is pleased to see that the City reflected the Growth Plan-related policies in OPA 39 in the draft secondary plan.

MOI commends the City of Guelph on its draft secondary plan as it reflects the overall vision of the Growth Plan. In particular, MOI is supportive of the following policy objectives:

- Creating a pedestrian-friendly and transit-supportive environment;
- Establishing provisions for natural and cultural heritage resources including adaptive re-use;
- Directing the preparation of a carbon neutral strategy for the Guelph Innovation District (GID); and,
- Encouraging parking strategies such as shared parking arrangements, reductions in on-site parking requirements, and priority spots for carpool, alternative energy vehicles, car-shares, scooters and motorcycles.

Policy 2.2.5.1(a) of the Growth Plan requires that major transit station areas and intensification corridors will be designated in official plans and planned to achieve increased residential and employment densities that support and ensure the viability of existing and planned transit service levels.

Policy 2.2.6.10 of the Growth Plan requires that, in planning lands for employment, municipalities will facilitate that development of transit-supportive, compact built-form and minimize surface parking.


In the draft secondary plan, the objectives of Principle 5 propose "to create an integrated, compact, mixed use District that provides an opportunity for people to live close to job opportunities and supportive daily services". The objectives also propose to "achieve transit-supportive densities with human-scaled built form". Schedule B in the draft secondary plan proposes transit stops along Victoria Road South, the western boundary of the plan area. In addition, Schedule C proposes to designate lands adjacent to Victoria Road South as "Employment Mixed Use 1". Draft policy 6.4.14 in the secondary plan proposes that the maximum floor space index (FSI) in the Employment Mixed Use 1 Designation shall generally be 0.6.

As noted above, the proposed floor maximum space index of 0.6 is expressed as a maximum for the Employment Mixed Use 1 land use designation. The City should ensure this policy would not limit the City's ability to achieve transit supportive densities and a more compact built-form given this land use designation's proximity to proposed major transit stops and nodes. This would be in keeping with Policies 2.2.5.1(a) and 2.2.6.10 of the Growth Plan and the Principle 5 objectives contained in the draft secondary plan. As well, the City should ensure that any development planned in the draft secondary plan area will contribute towards the achievement of the City's overall intensification and density targets.

Further, please find attached some suggestions from which the City's draft secondary plan could benefit (see Appendix A). MOI is supportive of the draft secondary plan and the attached suggestions are meant to be helpful to the City as it further develops and implements the plan. MOI has no further comments on this matter.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please telephone me at (519) 873-4695 or contact me by email at: [Dwayne.evans@ontario.ca](mailto:Dwayne.evans@ontario.ca).

Sincerely,



Dwayne Evans  
Planner, MSO-Western

c.c Barb Slattery, MOE (Hamilton)  
Carol Neumann, OMAFRA (Elora)  
Penny Young, MTCS (Toronto)  
David Marriott, MNR (Guelph)  
Maya Harris, MOI (Toronto)  
Stephanie Costantino, MAH (Toronto)  
Jeremy Warson, IO (Toronto)



One Dundas Street West, Suite 2000, Toronto, ON M5G 2L5  
1, rue Dundas Ouest, bureau 2000, Toronto, ON M5G 2L5

April 11, 2013

The City of Guelph  
Planning Services Division  
City Hall  
1 Carden Street  
Guelph, ON  
N1H 3A1

Attention: Ms. Joan Jylanne  
Senior Policy Planner

Dear Ms. Jylanne:

**Re: Guelph Innovation District  
Comments to Draft Secondary Plan, dated October 2012**

Infrastructure Ontario (IO) and its planning consultant (GSP Group Inc.) have reviewed the October 2012 version of the draft Secondary Plan for the Guelph Innovation District (GID) and offer comments in the sections below.

We support the general policy directions and principles created for the GID community, however there are some concerns with respect to the proposed policies and draft land use schedule.

We have found the ongoing working relationship with City staff through this Secondary Plan exercise to be very helpful as it relates to future land use for the provincial land holding within the GID. You will find that most of our comments below were previously raised by GSP Group at one of our recent working meetings.

**Comments on Proposed Policies**

**1. Section 3.3 Energy**

The City wishes to implement a District Energy (DE) System for the GID if such a system is feasible for the community. Moreover, all new buildings within the GID are required to connect to the DE System if it is available. However, Section 3.3.1d) indicates that "buildings can be excluded from mandatory connections should they exceed the energy efficiency of the DE plant and have a lower carbon intensity."

**Comment:**

We ask that the City explain the intent of this proposed policy, particularly when it is our understanding that exceeding the energy efficiency of the DE plant could be relatively easily obtained.

**2. Section 4 Mobility**

Table 1, Public Street Classifications and Standards, identifies road widths and building setbacks.

**Comments:**

It is our opinion that the setbacks contained in Table 1 are too restrictive and that setbacks in the order of 1 to 3 metres are more appropriate along the major roadway, providing some variation in the streetscape and flexibility for such uses as restaurants and cafes which may desire outdoor seating space.

Table 1 also contains direction on parking along the major roadways. We note that the Arterial Road Category (Victoria Road and Stone Road) will have no parking along the edge of the roadway. While we understand the desire to move through traffic along these roadways, the Secondary Plan's objectives to create vibrant communities and promote a mix of uses within the mixed use corridors, does require on-street parking to support grade related commercial activity. It is possible to create parking lay-bys along the two travel lanes in order to support the adjacent development.

It is our opinion there are two areas in which the transportation or mobility section requires strengthening. An important component of the GID is a creation of linkages between development on the east and west sides of the river. While the Land Use Plan illustrates an "Active Transportation Link" across the river linking the former Guelph Correction Centre (GCC) on the east side of the river with the end of the College Avenue extension, there is no commitment in the Secondary Plan that this bridge crossing be built early in the development process in order to integrate the various neighbourhoods in the GID. Further, we encourage the City to consider upgrading this bridge from a simple pedestrian crossing to provide a single vehicle lane so as to accommodate transit buses. The provision of good public transit throughout this community will be necessary to achieve this sustainability objective and support the proposed densities.

Similarly, it is our submission that the Secondary Plan must provide a strong commitment to develop good transit service to the GID early in the development of the community. The City promotes the linkage and synergies possible between the University of Guelph, Downtown and the new GID. Those synergies and linkages will be more easily achieved with good transit service that connects the major nodes in the central and east sides of the City, including a connection to the multi modal transit hub in Downtown Guelph.

### 3. Section 6.3 General Built Form and Site Development Policies

- a) Section 6.3.2 indicates that building heights are guided by Schedule D of the Secondary Plan with a maximum building height of 8 storeys at major intersections or nodal locations. The policy adds that “additional height will be located within nodes located at key intersections and at the urban village to provide focal points for the District”.

**Comment:**

It is requested that the maximum heights be specified in the Secondary Plan and that at these nodal locations building heights in the 12 to 15 storey range are appropriate.

- b) Section 6.3.10 indicates that garages shall generally be in the rear yard accessed by a laneway or front driveway.

**Comment:**

We request clarification as to whether the City is accepting and promoting public rear lanes and further that the City make a firm commitment to creating alternative development standards to minimize land consumption and cost of municipal infrastructure.

### 4. Section 6.4 Land Use Designations

- a) Section 6.4.6 provides minimum and maximum FSI for a corridor mixed used area. The FSI can be increased to 4.0 from 3.0 if it can be demonstrated that buildings incorporate a vertical mix of uses where any one use does not occupy more than 60% of the building.

**Comment:**

Within the context of the GID, it is extremely difficult to create viable development with this particular mix of uses. Ground floor commercial activity with residential above is likely the predominate form and

---

composition that can be expected in this location and as such Section 6.4.6a) should be deleted.

- b) Section 6.4.8 indicates that along College Avenue East, retail and service uses “shall generally be required on the ground floors of all buildings at the street edge.”

**Comment:**

While this is a desirable objective, it will not be possible to have ground floor commercial uses in every building along this street given that there is over 1,000 metres of street frontage. As such, this policy should be deleted or altered to encourage ground floor commercial uses.

- c) Section 6.4.10 contains text and a graphic promoting a built form with a minimum building step back of 3 metres at the 5<sup>th</sup> floor.

**Comment:**

It is our opinion that a step back at the 5<sup>th</sup> floor on buildings with a maximum height of 8 storeys is not necessary nor creates attractive and implementable built form. Stepping back from a podium is appropriate with tower forms of development but is not required for mid-rise building forms that are promoted in the Secondary Plan. As such, this Policy and accompanying graphics should be deleted from the Secondary Plan. Built form and other design guidance should be contained in design guidelines prepared for the community if they are not presently covered by the City’s general design documents.

- d) Section 6.4.25 indicates that the residential areas are to be medium density housing forms such as townhouse apartments and “a limited supply of low-medium housing forms such as single and semi-detached dwellings.” It further notes that the final distribution of building type policies will be determined through a development process and regulated through the implementing zoning by-law.

**Comment:**

The Secondary Plan is based on the principle that multiple unit or attached building forms are more energy efficient than detached and therefore, more supportive of the carbon neutral thrust of the Community Plan. However, without a more appropriate balance of housing, the housing desires of the community are not being met and that a “complete community” with a range of housing types and

---

therefore households cannot be achieved. The focus on multi-unit housing forms creates a particularly narrow community demographic.

**5. Section 7.3 Phasing**

- a) The policies of Section 7.3.2 indicate that the Zoning By-law will establish a required mix of uses to be incorporated into the community on a phased basis to achieve the overall GID residential employment targets and further that targets are met within each phase prior to the release of additional lands for development.

***Comment:***

The two principal uses on the west side of the GID, residential and employment, will be absorbed at different rates and are dependent on a number of factors that are different for each of the principal uses. Tying the development to the phasing of each component will unduly constrain the workings of the marketplace and frustrate development interest. We strongly believe the market for the type of employment envisioned for the GID is much more limited and specialized than the residential market and will require a long-term development view. As such, this policy should be deleted.

- b) Section 7.4.1 with respect to height in nodal areas.

***Comment:***

This policy does not correspond to the Height Map of Schedule D and should be clarified. It would be more appropriate if the number of storeys were identified rather than absolute height limits in metres to provide some flexibility at the design stage.

**6. Schedules**

The various schedules in the Secondary Plan show a watercourse on the north side of the GCC building complex. We believe this illustration should be modified as there is a large storm sewer conveying flows in this area.

Moreover, Schedule A incorrectly identifies the gymnasium of the GCC, a relatively new structure, as a cultural heritage resource of provincial significance.



---

## 7. Land Use

IO is recommending that the mix between Residential and Employment on lands west of the Eramosa be re-balanced.

We have had a number of discussions with City staff with respect to the appropriate mix and location of the principle land uses for the community.

After much consideration and review of market conditions and forecasts, we are suggesting the following modifications be made to the Land Use Schedule on lands west of the Eramosa River to Victoria Street.

- a) Convert the small employment area north of the College Avenue to residential (with the caveat that appropriate studies to be completed demonstrating compatibility with surrounding uses);
- b) Convert part of the employment lands south of College Avenue to residential; and,
- c) Limit the corridor mixed use areas to Victoria Road, Stone Road and College Ave.

We believe these suggested changes will continue to support the City's vision for land use in this area, as described in the Secondary Plan, and in several municipal strategic documents, including:

- **City of Guelph Employment Lands Strategy 2, April 2010 – Watson & Associates Economists Ltd.**
- **City of Guelph Growth Management Strategy, 2009 - City of Guelph**
- **Strategic Plan for the Guelph Agri-Innovation Cluster, March 2010 – Hickling Arthurs Low Corporation.**
- **City of Guelph – Prosperity 2020 – Strategic Directions for Economic Development and Tourism, March 2010 – Malone, Given Parsons Ltd**

As we had previously indicated at several of our working meetings, we believe the proposed land area allocated for residential use will be insufficient to meet a critical mass needed to support a complete neighbourhood community.

We believe our recommendation to increase land area for residential use and decrease land area for employment use will not impact the City's

planned target of between 8,000 to 10,000 jobs and 3,000 to 5,000 people for the GID.


GSP Group has determined that the City can meet these employment and residential targets under our proposed modifications to the land use schedule, and would be in keeping with the vision for a higher density, innovation-oriented form of development in the Employment Mixed Use 1 land use area.

Please find attached our suggested modification to land use schedule, along with supporting analysis by GSP's Group.

---

Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft Secondary Plan and provide comments. We would be pleased to meet to discuss these matters at your convenience.

Yours truly,




Jeremy Warson, MCIP, RPP  
Senior Project Manager, Development Planning  
Infrastructure Ontario

Cc: Christina Beja, Senior Vice President, Infrastructure Ontario  
Anil Wijesooriya, Vice President, Infrastructure Ontario  
Michael Coakley, Senior Planner, Infrastructure Ontario  
Glenn Scheels, Principal, GSP Group Inc.


# Guelph Innovation District

Modified Plan for Discussion Purposes

December 19, 2012



- Secondary Plan Boundary
- Infrastructural Framework**
  - Arterial Roads
  - Collector Roads
  - Trail Network
  - Proposed Pedestrian Crossings
  - Proposed Major Transit Stops
  - Existing Rail
  - Active Transportation Link
  - Node
  - Existing Built Form
  - Cultural Heritage Resources
  - Cultural Heritage Landscape
  - Waterbodies
- Land Use Designations**
  - Natural Heritage System\*
  - Significant Natural Area\*
  - Open Space and Park
  - Special Residential Area
  - Residential
  - Corridor Mixed Use
  - Employment Mixed Use 1
  - Employment Mixed Use 2
  - Major Utility
  - Industrial
  - Adaptive Re-use
  - Service Commercial
  - Neighbourhood Commercial Centre



\*NHS as per council adopted OPA 42, currently under appeal.  
 Note: Stormwater management facilities are not shown; however a number of stormwater management facilities will be required to service the GID development lands.

---

April 11, 2013

The City of Guelph  
Planning Services Division  
City Hall  
1 Carden Street  
Guelph, ON  
N1H 3A1

Attention: Ms. Joan Jylanne  
Senior Policy Planner

---

Dear Ms. Jylanne:

**Re: Guelph Innovation District  
Comments to Draft Secondary Plan, dated October 2012**

Infrastructure Ontario (IO) and its planning consultant (GSP Group Inc.) have reviewed the October 2012 version of the draft Secondary Plan for the Guelph Innovation District (GID) and offer comments in the sections below.

We support the general policy directions and principles created for the GID community, however there are some concerns with respect to the proposed policies and draft land use schedule.

We have found the ongoing working relationship with City staff through this Secondary Plan exercise to be very helpful as it relates to future land use for the provincial land holding within the GID. You will find that most of our comments below were previously raised by GSP Group at one of our recent working meetings.

### **Comments on Proposed Policies**

#### **1. Section 3.3 Energy**

The City wishes to implement a District Energy (DE) System for the GID if such a system is feasible for the community. Moreover, all new buildings within the GID are required to connect to the DE System if it is available. However, Section 3.3.1d) indicates that "buildings can be excluded from mandatory connections should they exceed the energy efficiency of the DE plant and have a lower carbon intensity."

**Comment:**

We ask that the City explain the intent of this proposed policy, particularly when it is our understanding that exceeding the energy efficiency of the DE plant could be relatively easily obtained.

**2. Section 4 Mobility**

Table 1, Public Street Classifications and Standards, identifies road widths and building setbacks.

**Comments:**

It is our opinion that the setbacks contained in Table 1 are too restrictive and that setbacks in the order of 1 to 3 metres are more appropriate along the major roadway, providing some variation in the streetscape and flexibility for such uses as restaurants and cafes which may desire outdoor seating space.

Table 1 also contains direction on parking along the major roadways. We note that the Arterial Road Category (Victoria Road and Stone Road) will have no parking along the edge of the roadway. While we understand the desire to move through traffic along these roadways, the Secondary Plan's objectives to create vibrant communities and promote a mix of uses within the mixed use corridors, does require on-street parking to support grade related commercial activity. It is possible to create parking lay-bys along the two travel lanes in order to support the adjacent development.

It is our opinion there are two areas in which the transportation or mobility section requires strengthening. An important component of the GID is a creation of linkages between development on the east and west sides of the river. While the Land Use Plan illustrates an "Active Transportation Link" across the river linking the former Guelph Correction Centre (GCC) on the east side of the river with the end of the College Avenue extension, there is no commitment in the Secondary Plan that this bridge crossing be built early in the development process in order to integrate the various neighbourhoods in the GID. Further, we encourage the City to consider upgrading this bridge from a simple pedestrian crossing to provide a single vehicle lane so as to accommodate transit buses. The provision of good public transit throughout this community will be necessary to achieve this sustainability objective and support the proposed densities.

Similarly, it is our submission that the Secondary Plan must provide a strong commitment to develop good transit service to the GID early in the development of the community. The City promotes the linkage and synergies possible between the University of Guelph, Downtown and the new GID. Those synergies and linkages will be more easily achieved with good transit service that connects the major nodes in the central and east sides of the City, including a connection to the multi modal transit hub in Downtown Guelph.

### 3. Section 6.3 General Built Form and Site Development Policies

- a) Section 6.3.2 indicates that building heights are guided by Schedule D of the Secondary Plan with a maximum building height of 8 storeys at major intersections or nodal locations. The policy adds that "additional height will be located within nodes located at key intersections and at the urban village to provide focal points for the District".

**Comment:**

It is requested that the maximum heights be specified in the Secondary Plan and that at these nodal locations building heights in the 12 to 15 storey range are appropriate.

- b) Section 6.3.10 indicates that garages shall generally be in the rear yard accessed by a laneway or front driveway.

**Comment:**

We request clarification as to whether the City is accepting and promoting public rear lanes and further that the City make a firm commitment to creating alternative development standards to minimize land consumption and cost of municipal infrastructure.

### 4. Section 6.4 Land Use Designations

- a) Section 6.4.6 provides minimum and maximum FSI for a corridor mixed used area. The FSI can be increased to 4.0 from 3.0 if it can be demonstrated that buildings incorporate a vertical mix of uses where any one use does not occupy more than 60% of the building.

**Comment:**

Within the context of the GID, it is extremely difficult to create viable development with this particular mix of uses. Ground floor commercial activity with residential above is likely the predominate form and

---

composition that can be expected in this location and as such Section 6.4.6a) should be deleted.

- b) Section 6.4.8 indicates that along College Avenue East, retail and service uses “shall generally be required on the ground floors of all buildings at the street edge.”

**Comment:**

While this is a desirable objective, it will not be possible to have ground floor commercial uses in every building along this street given that there is over 1,000 metres of street frontage. As such, this policy should be deleted or altered to encourage ground floor commercial uses.

- c) Section 6.4.10 contains text and a graphic promoting a built form with a minimum building step back of 3 metres at the 5<sup>th</sup> floor.

**Comment:**

It is our opinion that a step back at the 5<sup>th</sup> floor on buildings with a maximum height of 8 storeys is not necessary nor creates attractive and implementable built form. Stepping back from a podium is appropriate with tower forms of development but is not required for mid-rise building forms that are promoted in the Secondary Plan. As such, this Policy and accompanying graphics should be deleted from the Secondary Plan. Built form and other design guidance should be contained in design guidelines prepared for the community if they are not presently covered by the City’s general design documents.

- d) Section 6.4.25 indicates that the residential areas are to be medium density housing forms such as townhouse apartments and “a limited supply of low-medium housing forms such as single and semi-detached dwellings.” It further notes that the final distribution of building type policies will be determined through a development process and regulated through the implementing zoning by-law.

**Comment:**

The Secondary Plan is based on the principle that multiple unit or attached building forms are more energy efficient than detached and therefore, more supportive of the carbon neutral thrust of the Community Plan. However, without a more appropriate balance of housing, the housing desires of the community are not being met and that a “complete community” with a range of housing types and

---

therefore households cannot be achieved. The focus on multi-unit housing forms creates a particularly narrow community demographic.

**5. Section 7.3 Phasing**

- a) The policies of Section 7.3.2 indicate that the Zoning By-law will establish a required mix of uses to be incorporated into the community on a phased basis to achieve the overall GID residential employment targets and further that targets are met within each phase prior to the release of additional lands for development.

***Comment:***

The two principal uses on the west side of the GID, residential and employment, will be absorbed at different rates and are dependent on a number of factors that are different for each of the principal uses. Tying the development to the phasing of each component will unduly constrain the workings of the marketplace and frustrate development interest. We strongly believe the market for the type of employment envisioned for the GID is much more limited and specialized than the residential market and will require a long-term development view. As such, this policy should be deleted.

- b) Section 7.4.1 with respect to height in nodal areas.

***Comment:***

This policy does not correspond to the Height Map of Schedule D and should be clarified. It would be more appropriate if the number of storeys were identified rather than absolute height limits in metres to provide some flexibility at the design stage.

**6. Schedules**

The various schedules in the Secondary Plan show a watercourse on the north side of the GCC building complex. We believe this illustration should be modified as there is a large storm sewer conveying flows in this area.

Moreover, Schedule A incorrectly identifies the gymnasium of the GCC, a relatively new structure, as a cultural heritage resource of provincial significance.



## 7. Land Use

IO is recommending that the mix between Residential and Employment on lands west of the Eramosa be re-balanced.

We have had a number of discussions with City staff with respect to the appropriate mix and location of the principle land uses for the community.

After much consideration and review of market conditions and forecasts, we are suggesting the following modifications be made to the Land Use Schedule on lands west of the Eramosa River to Victoria Street.

- a) Convert the small employment area north of the College Avenue to residential (with the caveat that appropriate studies to be completed demonstrating compatibility with surrounding uses);
- b) Convert part of the employment lands south of College Avenue to residential; and,
- c) Limit the corridor mixed use areas to Victoria Road, Stone Road and College Ave.

We believe these suggested changes will continue to support the City's vision for land use in this area, as described in the Secondary Plan, and in several municipal strategic documents, including:

- **City of Guelph Employment Lands Strategy 2, April 2010 – Watson & Associates Economists Ltd.**
- **City of Guelph Growth Management Strategy, 2009 - City of Guelph**
- **Strategic Plan for the Guelph Agri-Innovation Cluster, March 2010 – Hickling Arthurs Low Corporation.**
- **City of Guelph – Prosperity 2020 – Strategic Directions for Economic Development and Tourism, March 2010 – Malone, Given Parsons Ltd**

As we had previously indicated at several of our working meetings, we believe the proposed land area allocated for residential use will be insufficient to meet a critical mass needed to support a complete neighbourhood community.

We believe our recommendation to increase land area for residential use and decrease land area for employment use will not impact the City's

---

planned target of between 8,000 to 10,000 jobs and 3,000 to 5,000 people for the GID.


GSP Group has determined that the City can meet these employment and residential targets under our proposed modifications to the land use schedule, and would be in keeping with the vision for a higher density, innovation-oriented form of development in the Employment Mixed Use 1 land use area.

Please find attached our suggested modification to land use schedule, along with supporting analysis by GSP's Group.

---

Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft Secondary Plan and provide comments. We would be pleased to meet to discuss these matters at your convenience.

Yours truly,



Jeremy Warson, MCIP, RPP  
Senior Project Manager, Development Planning  
Infrastructure Ontario

Cc: Christina Beja, Senior Vice President, Infrastructure Ontario  
Anil Wijesooriya, Vice President, Infrastructure Ontario  
Michael Coakley, Senior Planner, Infrastructure Ontario  
Glenn Scheels, Principal, GSP Group Inc.

## River System Advisory committee

Submission – August 8, 2013

### **Guelph Innovation District (York District Lands)**

Recommendations for consideration in the development of the Secondary Plan

#### **Background**

Planning for the development of the Innovation district provides an exceptional opportunity to consider and apply the goals and objectives of the River Systems Management Plan. The area under consideration is of a level of complexity similar to that which the River Systems Study addressed when it considered the future of the city's river system. The site is of significant environmental importance, is located such as to have a significant potential as a connectivity hub, has a rich history that relates strongly to the character of the city, has an informally developed range of uses that has great potential to be expanded to the benefit of the entire community.

The River System Management Plan is applicable to the city's river system including the main rivers, adjacent lands and tributaries. These are all represented in the Innovation District.

The River Systems Advisory Committee (RSAC) encourages the City to look at environmental impacts and opportunities, in addition to the built environment. The focus of the planning to date appears to be on the built, rather than the natural environment. Finding an appropriate balance between these site aspects is especially important on York District Lands.

The following goals are part of the River System Management Plan:

1. Environmental Integrity
2. Continuity of Connection
3. Compatible Riverside Development
4. Use

This report was prepared on the basis of site visits and a thorough review of the documents available on the development of the secondary plan as well as a presentation made to the committee by City staff.

The River System Advisory Committee has prepared the following suggestions, and has categorized them based on the Goals and Objectives from the River System Management Plan.

We strongly recommend that the secondary plan for this site include and address the following:

#### **Goal 1 - Environmental Integrity**

#### **a. Need for more information**

The mapped locations of streams and water bodies on the site does not appear to be accurate, especially as it relates to the network of small buried creeks and minor tributaries to Clythe Creek. We have attached another map of Guelph's natural heritage systems for your reference. It includes mapping of surface water systems on site. This attached map shows some locations of surface water flow on site but it is not comprehensive and should be relied on as one source only.

Given the complexity of the site hydrology (and possibly hydro geology), we suggest that existing conditions be well understood to help in planning for ecological restoration and enhancement opportunities and improvement in fish and wildlife habitat (with the exception of the Canada Goose). We note the seasonal flooding of the baseball diamond and the effect of high creek flows on recreational use.

There may be opportunities for the creation or improvement of wetlands on site. Understanding the magnitude, frequency, timing and duration of stream baseflows and associated shallow groundwater levels is recommended to understand the complexity of the site, as well as such opportunities for restoration. There exists great potential to improve aquatic habitat at this site, including increasing water flow and removing impoundments so that groundwater inputs can help mitigate any thermal warming.

Have locations of landfill sites in the area been identified and will they have an impact on secondary plan elements? We note that there seems to be historic landfill use along the lower reaches of Clythe and Stevenson Creeks.

The major ponds on site do not appear to be addressed. Information on depth, water quality, water sources and flow, fishery status and possible enhancement, suitability for swimming and boating would greatly benefit planning for the site.

Will a tree cover inventory be completed? We recommend that redevelopment reduces impacts on existing trees and forested areas.

#### **b. Issues and opportunities that should be addressed**

We note that there are numerous opportunities to on the site to improve the ecological integrity of the Eramosa River system by improving water quality flowing off the site, through possible creation of wetland habitat, through day lighting some reaches of the small tributaries on site, through planting of riparian vegetation and the reduction of grassed fields adjacent to water course.

**c. Base Flow** Much of the site is currently old field and there are several areas where agro forestry is practiced. We encourage the identification of opportunities to restore forests (to improve natural infiltration will help maintain creek and river base flow) and to build on the existence of cultural forests on site.

#### **d. Water Quality and Stormwater Management**

We note that there are numerous opportunities to improve water quality in the Eramosa River tributaries through enhanced stream bank vegetation.

Low impact development (LID) procedures should be applied across the site for storm water management, as identified within the secondary plan document. In addition, the role of existing swales, headwater drainage features (0 or 1<sup>st</sup> order), and shallow topographic depressions within the landscape should be considered and, where feasible, replicated in proposed designs (e.g., through rough grading or micro-grading, bioswales etc.) as such features promote infiltration and/or attenuate the downstream hydrograph.

The large ponds seem to have been used for garbage disposal by people for decades. Physical clean up of the ponds may be required, especially given the potential for re-use.

Reducing the volume of additional runoff of a site due to increasing impervious cover is important to minimize impacts to receiving watercourses. The City's focus on promoting LID to minimize the volume of stormwater runoff is fully supported by RSAC. RSAC also encourages the City to maximize water quality treatment at the source and through a 'treatment train', to reduce 'end-of-pipe' treatments.

#### **Restore Natural Channels**

The complexity of the surface water systems on the site creates challenges, especially given the historic cultural adaptations of these watercourses. There are numerous water control structures - weirs, dams and bridges. Removal of some of these structures should be considered while balancing the need for cultural and heritage preservation.

Restoring natural channels would enhance fish passage and improve water quality for downstream reaches and may also improve natural channel functions and processes. Although the quality of the fish habitat on site is not clear, it appears to be an important element to the site.

There are several locations where stream are buried or channelized on the site. The redevelopment of the site provides excellent opportunities to day light (open and restore) some reaches of these streams. These streams could be integrated within any proposed development plan and enhance the aesthetics of the property.

Historically the wetlands along Watson Road were used for manually filling fire trucks. One of these wetlands seems to be in a state of rapid transformation. Another one seems to be highly managed. Opportunities for enhancement or improvement of these wetlands could be considered once the site hydrology is better understood.

#### **f. Connecting Links**

We encourage the increase, across the site, of ecological connectivity through riparian and forested linkages.

### **g. Additional Issues Related to Environmental Integrity**

Invasive Species, such as European Buckthorn are widely present on sections of the site. The assessment and management of invasive species across the site would be appropriate.

### **Goal 2 Continuity of Connection**

#### **a. Continuous Public Access**

We are encouraged to see the potential for a pedestrian bridge across the Eramosa River and an integration of City and area trail systems. A crossing of the Stevenson/Clythe Creeks immediately upstream of the Eramosa could also be built into long-term plans to provide access to the north side of the Eramosa River, west of the site. There are trails running east from Victoria road, on the north side of the Eramosa River to the Stevenson/Clythe Creek outlet. These trails, though informal, do not seem to be identified in existing plans. Long-term trail connectivity should be addressed.

#### **b. Protect and Enhance Views**

There are a number of areas of significant limestone cliffs on both sides of the Eramosa River. RSAC suggests that these interesting local geological features be highlighted and preserved and built into plans wherever possible.

#### **c. Provide a series of Destinations**

RSAC sees this site as presenting tremendous opportunity for a community destination and we would like to see this opportunity maximized. We wonder about opportunities for swimming – there are very few places for people to swim in Guelph in surface water systems. This has the potential to be an excellent location. There are a number of other recreational opportunities for the site, several of which are already being done – fishing, dog walking, picnicing, organized sports, boating, winter activities and sports, other cultural amenities.

Areas along the river are currently used for picnicing. These should be maintained and enhanced.

We note that waste management is a problem on the site currently, much of it related to the use of the site by people fishing and walking dogs. Pet waste is a problem in addition to garbage.

We expect that the use of this site by the public is significant. We wonder if surveys on the use of the site have been conducted to date, and if they could be used to assist in plans for the future of the site.

### **Goal 3 – Compatibility of River Site Development**

As a general comment, the Eramosa River flow through the middle of York District Lands and multiple tributaries of the river flow through the site as well. The compatibility of development and re-development of the site on both sides of the Eramosa River should be considered. We see this as an excellent opportunity to incorporate best practices in the integration of the built and natural

environment, and encourage thoughtful, creative and innovative use of the site that consciously addresses the rivers and natural features of the site.

#### **Goal 4 Use**


##### **a. Variety of Uses**























































We understand that the approximate location of the Turf Grass Institute building was historically used by First Nations people, probably as a camp site. These may have been the Neutral People. We are unaware of any similar sites in the City of Guelph. This site provides an excellent opportunity to address this neglected component of our cultural history as well as providing a way to integrate the ideas of Guelph's diverse First Nations population into planning processes and decisions. We suggest involving local First Nations people in developing ideas for this site - perhaps to recognize past uses or to provide an area for First Nations cultural practices today and into the future. More research into the archaeological and cultural history of this site would be appropriate.

There is a sizeable Canada goose population on the site, especially near Clythe Creek. The cut grass adjacent to the creek provides excellent habitat for geese. Human wildlife conflicts with respect to geese will only increase as the site gets more use and attention and needs to be addressed – through policy, habitat management or other means.

The cultural heritage of the site is unique and important to Guelph's history – the buildings, the land uses, the stone walls and structures. We encourage interpretative signage, or other means to maintain linkages and understanding about the history of the site with modern site users.



Schools 

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Brent Avenue          | 30. St. Peter                    |
| 2. St. Patrick           | 31. Mitchell Farm                |
| 3. Waverley Drive        | 32. St. Francis of Assisi        |
| 4. Sunnyside             | 33. Taylor Evans                 |
| 5. Brighton Street       | 34. Gateway Drive                |
| 6. Edward Johnson        | 35. John McCree                  |
| 7. Holy Rosary           | 36. John Cahm                    |
| 8. John F. Ross          | 37. College Avenue               |
| 9. Ottawa Crescent       | 38. Centennial                   |
| 10. Laurine Avenue       | 39. College Heights              |
| 11. King George          | 40. St. Pons Goupil              |
| 12. St. George's         | 41. Priory Park                  |
| 13. St. John             | 42. University Village (closed)  |
| 14. St. James            | 43. Mary Phelan                  |
| 15. Sacred Heart         | 44. Fred A. Hamilton             |
| 16. Tyler                | 45. Jean Little                  |
| 17. Holy Trinity         | 46. St. Michael                  |
| 18. Central              | 47. St. Isaac Brock              |
| 19. St. Stanislaus       | 48. St. Paul                     |
| 20. Guelph Collegiate    | 49. Bishop Macdonell             |
| 21. Victory              | 50. Knight Hill                  |
| 22. Our Lady of Lourdes  | 51. Rickson Ridge                |
| 23. St. Bernadette       | 52. Westminster Woods            |
| 24. Jane Avenue          | 53. Ken Darby                    |
| 25. Sheldale Crescent    | 54. St. Ignace of Loyola         |
| 26. Willow Road          | 55. Guelph Montessori            |
| 27. St. Joseph           |   |
| 28. Polesy Roads         |   |
| 29. Westwood             |   |

# Natural Heritage Features of Guelph and Surround


0 1 Km 2 Km












Current version - December 31, 2011.

This map has been compiled using a variety of data sources including topographic maps, historical maps, air photos, digital geographical files, interviews and ground truthing. The following organizations have assisted in its completion: The Department of Geography, University of Guelph, The City of Guelph, The Grand River Conservation Authority and The Guelph International Resource Centre. Geographical information is continually changing. Features depicted on this map may have changed and new features may need to be added. If you would like to contribute information to the map, make suggestions or participate in designing the next version please contact the author. Produced and compiled by Jeremy Shute.


<sup>A</sup> Buried Creek: a natural watercourse that is probably still flowing at some times (ephemeral), or all (perennial) of the year and has been placed in culverts and buried.  
<sup>B</sup> Historic Creek: a natural watercourse that probably used to flow at this approximate location and may still be flowing at some times of the year.

Lake depth












-  Park
-  School
-  City water wells
-  Road
-  Rail line
-  Trail (formal)
-  Trail (informal)
-  Creek
-  Buried creek<sup>A</sup>
-  Historic creek<sup>B</sup>
-  Stormwater and/or natural pond

Elevation a.s.l.\*



\* a.s.l. = above sea level

Waterhed: Stevenson Creek = , Speed River =   
 Etimologia River = , Hadast Creek = , Pond Creek =   
 Silver Creek East = , Silver Creek West = , Imperial Creek = ,  
 Hanlon Creek = 



## Attachment 5: Comments and Response Table

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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