

# Meeting Minutes



City of Guelph

## **Downtown Advisory Committee (DAC)**

May 17, 2018

City Hall, Meeting Room B

From 3:00 to 5:00 p.m.

Meeting Chair: Doug Minett

Stewart McDonough, Robert Routledge, Marty Williams, Will MacTaggart, John Leacock, Dorothe Fair, Jane, Ken Hamill, Steve Kraft, Dan Atkin, Doug Minett

## **Agenda Items**

**Item 1**, Declaration of Conflict of Interest

**Item 2**, Community Plan – Stewart

As part of these discussions, are these open wish lists? Or is it to put dollars to ideas?

SS – the intent is to adopt plan as basis for city planning moving forward – doesn't override the official plan, and we are lifting those priorities out of this as well.

Heritage Guelph

DAC

DGBA

Committee of Adjustment

These people have the ability to see where the public deals with existing City policy.

Provide feedback from what city staff are thinking, and then allow public to see feedback, and see where staff are aligned with public and where they are not.

Will there be a feedback loop – an interactive process where you go back to talk to people and get feedback.

I would like to see departmental feedback/points of view, that would be interesting.

We are trying to see if the data can be an open data set.

**Item 3**, Baker RFP Update – MJ

This would be accommodating casual/occasional spots.

Whatever new parking requirements come up with the development, it will be satisfied by the development.

WM – Baker has 250 now, we will add 250 (some added for library), and the remainder will be casual.

MW – occupied with someone without a permit. (i.e. non permit)

MJ – overall objective is to have a net gain in parking availability at end of development.

In RFP....

How can we get the rest of the programming (now weighted at 10%) better weighted in selection of the partner?

Is there internal evaluation document that defines that process that pushes mixed use up?

Seemed like the language in the development concepts portion was very much planning terms. It talks nothing about integration of St George's square (which is an essential component to this) – this integration isn't even mentioned in this document.

We are not seeing the mixed use component echoed strongly enough in the RFP.

**MJ to send copy of presentation to DAC.**

We can give macro-level idea of what the redevelopment costs will be. Won't likely be able to know how much land is recouped, degree of how much the city will bear, etc.

County is aware of our desire for the parking lot. Need to know final needs before we move this forward. City will not prematurely speak to the exact properties to acquire and when they will be acquired until we have a partner developer.

Check for next week another addendum to see more answers to questions.

Is there a face to face interview? No requirement to do that, not factored into the evaluation.

Unsuccessful candidates and petitioning the developing partner to incorporate ideas – do not have enough certainty through this process. The three we reject, there might be good ideas for the public realm, the RFP says they are proprietary. Does the \$20K give us any rights to pull ideas from unsuccessful bids? Can the good ideas be incorporated?

**MJ to find out**

Engagement of DAC as potential stakeholder –

Request to see the proposals

**Next Meeting:**

June 28, 2018 from 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.