



**WESTON
CONSULTING**
planning + urban design

**OFFICIAL PLAN AND ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENTS
Response Matrix to Comments as of September 26, 2021**

Weston Consulting File# 9373



Table of Contents:

City of Guelph	2
City of Guelph – Public Services Department	20
Guelph and Wellington Development Association	21
Upper Grand District School Board	21



**WESTON
CONSULTING**
planning + urban design

1354 Gordon Street, City of Guelph
September 26, 2021



City of Guelph		
	Comment	Action/Response
	Senior Development Planner Michael Witmer - (519) 822-1260 x2790 – October 26, 2020	
1.	Planning staff have concerns with the new proposed net density (184.1 units per hectare). This exceeds even the maximum net density in the High-Density Residential land use designation in the Official Plan (150 units per hectare). Recognizing the Neighbourhood Commercial Centre land use designation in the Official Plan did not contain a policy for maximum density at the time the applications were submitted, the ultimate net density for the site needs to be reduced to a more compatible and reasonable rate. For guidance, please refer to the current policies in the Official Plan (implemented through the Commercial Policy Review/OPA 69) for net density in the Neighbourhood Commercial Centre designation (100 units per hectare).	The Official Plan at the time of filing of the subject applications had no density restrictions and such new policies do not apply through application of the <i>clergy principle</i> . It was confirmed through discussions with Planning Staff in the City that the new policy limiting net residential densities on the subject lands does not apply to the proposed development. Therefore, the density policy of a maximum of 100 units per hectare included by OPA 69 does not apply to the proposed rezoning. See PJR Addendum.
2.	Please ensure traffic's comments provided to date are incorporated into the new site design. This includes planned improvements to the Gordon Street right-of-way that were identified through a recently approved Environmental Assessment. As previously noted, a right turn lane has been identified as a need on Gordon Street northbound to Arkell Road eastbound. In discussions with Engineering and traffic staff, the ultimate Gordon Street right-of-way in front of the subject lands (identified through the EA) is between 33.625m and 33.905m. Distance between the back edge of proposed sidewalk to new property line will be 0.3m.	COMMENT ADDRESSED Comment has been addressed in Revised Site Plan and Development Impact Transportation Study Update.
3.	The end elevations, especially the north elevation visible from the intersection of Arkell Road and Gordon Street needs further definition. It is appreciated there are balconies on this façade as well as a solid mid-vertical component, however, the exterior and edges require further design elements (i.e. glazing, articulation) to 'round the corners'.	COMMENT ADDRESSED Comment has been addressed in Revised Elevations
4.	The building angular plane to the Gordon Street and Arkell Road right-of-way should be reduced in parts so that no components exceeds 45°. There are portions on the elevations that currently exceed this.	The proposed development maintains the 45° angular plane from Gordon Street. The building generates a 47° angular plane to Arkell Road. The revised draft by-law



		provides relief from this requirement; the difference being insignificant.
5.	The function of the wrap around balconies on the south elevation is questionable. Will this continue through to detail design? It is important that the renderings presented at the Zone Change stage are realistic and as close as possible to what will ultimately be built on the site so Council and the public will have a clear expectation and understanding.	Acknowledged in the revised building elevations.
6.	Exterior amenity space facing Gordon Street (including elevated portions) may be affected or not feasible based on the results of the noise study. It is not preferable to include these areas as amenity space with a noise attenuation wall or feature as per typical noise study recommendations. Please reconsider the locations and overall provision of common amenity space and review with staff prior to submission.	COMMENT ADDRESSED Exterior amenity space is moved to the interior side yard.
7.	In terms of landscaping along Gordon Street, please keep in mind the overhead power lines and incorporate landscaping that will not impede existing infrastructure. It is still important and expected to plant street trees here.	Acknowledged. See revised Landscape Plan.
8.	The building has a clear 'bottom, middle and top' design components, which is a positive aspect. In particular, the bottom of the building and patio has a good interface with Gordon Street and the pedestrian realm. The ground level floor height should be higher than the upper storeys and contain glazing and clearly identifiable main entrances. Ground level commercial tenant space should be designed so that back of house operations are kept to the rear of the unit. All customer space open to the public should be kept along Gordon Street to avoid blank ground level facades or other undesirable modifications (i.e. glass being 'papered over' with vinyl murals or excessive spandrel). The commercial unit and main entrances facing Gordon Street are key. Please ensure these aspects continue through to detail design.	Acknowledged.
9.	The landscaped roof components are a positive design component. This may help with stormwater management and the site water balance.	Acknowledged
10.	The elimination of the gas station has allowed for an improved site design and parking layout. This is a positive change.	Acknowledged.
11.	Overall, Planning staff see the latest development concept as an improvement and step in the right direction from a design perspective.	Acknowledged
	Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise Environmental Planner – Jason Elliott - (519) 822-1260 x2563 – January 10, 2019	
1.	The FSR/SWM report proposes a significant pre to post infiltration deficit for the subject lands. Further, while not fully quantified, an increase in runoff to the PSW via the end-of pipe stormwater management pond near Vaughan	COMMENT ADDRESSED



	<p>St. will result from the proposal. To mitigate potential impacts to Hanlon Creek and associated wetlands, efforts should be made to maximize infiltration and minimize runoff. To this end, a water balance and LID techniques for the mixed-use site should be provided.</p>	<p>The previous FSR/SWM report did not accurately capture the level of imperviousness on the site, specifically the extent of an existing gravel storage area within the site. The previous land uses on the site also did not allow for any meaningful infiltration to occur. The revised design scheme and analysis notes that on an average annual basis, it is possible to match pre-development levels of infiltration and runoff from the site. A monthly water balance illustrating the above is included within the submission.</p>
2.	<p>The Supplemental Soil and Groundwater Investigation indicates high groundwater conditions on the site. To protect the groundwater regime, permanent pumping to the surface must be avoided. To this end, the approach for the underground parking must be outlined.</p>	<p>References are made to providing caisson cut-off walls for shoring, which can mitigate ingress of water into any excavations and/or by providing “tanked” structures that are designed to resist hydrostatic pressures and not rely on permanent groundwater evacuation. The exact methodology for the design and construction cannot be finalized at this time but permanent dewatering systems have not been accounted for in the discharges from this site.</p>
3.	<p>The elevations display a considerable amount of reflective surface in proximity to planned landscaped areas. To mitigate impacts to birds, the City of Toronto Bird Friendly Development Guidelines should be followed.</p>	<p>Acknowledged</p>
	<p>Infrastructure, Design, and Enterprise Services Senior Urban Designer - David de Groot - (519) 822-1260 x2358 - February 20, 2020</p>	
1.	<p>General Comments We continue to strongly encourage you to continue to talk to adjacent landowners and look for ways to consolidate access and work together as outlined in the Urban Design Concept Plans for the Gordon Street Intensification Corridor. The depth of the property (east-west) is shallow and based on the proposed layout, currently lacks the space required for adequate transitions, buffers and operational needs.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>



2.	Please include a cross-section from Arkell Road and from Gordon Street showing compliance to the 45 degree angular plane from the centreline of the road as required by the Zoning By-law. It appears that this requirement of the Zoning By-law is not being met. Can you also include an angular plane from the eastern property line? As per the Commercial Built Form Standards this should be applied beginning 10.5 metres above average grade and the requirement minimum setback (section 4.1.8). This is important information to help us assess the additional height requested from an urban design perspective.	Acknowledged. Cross-sections from both Arkell Road and Gordon Street are provided showing angular planes. Two degrees in Arkell Road plane requested in draft ZBA.
3.	We also understand the density proposed is above 100 uph at 139 uph.	Acknowledged. Revised concept is 172 uph.
4.	Based on the above, changes to the building layout and shaping will be required.	Acknowledged.
5.	Please submit a Pedestrian Wind Study based on the City's Terms of Reference (i.e. a letter of opinion): https://guelph.ca/wp-content/uploads/Terms-of-Reference-for-Wind-for-theCity-of-Guelph-Guidelines-19-05-27.pdf	This can be provided either after density and other issues are reviewed by City or at the Site Plan stage. The zoning does not lock in the design.
6.	<p>Urban Design Brief Comments Page 22 – 1.3 Urban Design Goals and Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please add a goal/objective that will speak to how the building will address both the Gordon Street and Arkell Road streetscapes including landscape/space for trees. • Please add a goal/objective around transition to adjacent development (both existing and planned). • Please add a goal/objective that addresses how the architectural design criteria will contribute to the overall Gordon Street character. • Revise the second bullet as follows: “Address the site’s strategic location at the intersection of two major streets with high-quality built form and strong pedestrian linkages from the intersection as a minor gateway” (Policy 8.4.7) 	Acknowledged. See Urban Design and Sustainability Brief.
7.	<p>Page 25—2.1 Development Concept</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section is missing a discussion regarding Common Amenity Area • Based on the current Zoning proposal of R.4A, the amount of Common Amenity proposed is not supported by staff. As proposed the CA would be 1960sqm, but only 189sqm is shown. See further discussion below. Revise plan. 	Acknowledged. The proposed rezoning of the subject property to a ‘Specialized Neighbourhood Shopping Centre Zone’ requires common amenity space in accordance with the R4A standards.
8.	<p>Page 25 – Transitions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transition between the gas station and residential on the property and planned residential to the east is not addressed. See further discussion below 	Not Applicable. Gas Station is removed in the revised proposal.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape buffering along the east property line is not adequate – most importantly the transition between commercial gas station and adjacent residential use needs to be better addressed. See further discussion below. 	
9.	<p>Page 25 -- Access, accessibility, circulation, loading storage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pedestrian circulation should be further developed. Please see further comments under “Comments on Submitted Design Concept”. 	Acknowledged
10.	<p>Page 29 – Lighting and Signage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lighting section should also address how lighting will be addressed between the gas station and residential uses on the site. 	Not Applicable. Gas Station is removed in the revised proposal.
11.	<p>Page 31 – Built Form</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please add that an entrance facing the intersection of Arkell/Gordon will be provided as well as establishing a rhythm of building entrances facing the streets. Based on the 45 degree angular plane requirements and Engineering comments, the massing of the building will need to be revised. See further discussion below. 	Acknowledged.
12.	<p>Page 33 – 2.2 Integration with the Public Realm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed landscaping along Gordon Street should incorporate less hardscape and planter boxes. Provide opportunities for foundational plantings, private patio/terraces, etc. to help soften the building façade and breakdown massing. Trees should be planted in adequate open, landscape beds in concert with other plantings. Steer away from too much hard surface along this area of Gordon Street. How the building lands at the corner and transitions out into a landscape that best addresses the intersection is critical. Grading solutions should aim to keep this area open and free of walls and/or obstructions and sightline conflicts. Opportunity for building access at the corner and/or a ‘flow out’ use from an adjacent commercial unit to help animate the public realm should be part of the overall design theory. 	<p>COMMENT ADDRESSED Please see the revised site plan and landscaping plan.</p>
13.	<p>Shadow and Pedestrian Wind Study Comments Please resubmit the Shadow study with the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The difference between the ‘Added architectural mass’ and the ‘Shadow projection’ is not distinguishable on the black and white copy submitted. Orient the shadow studies with true north pointing straight up. Ensure times are corrects. Note EDT (April, June and September). 	<p>COMMENT ADDRESSED Please see the revised Shadow Studies.</p>



14.	A Pedestrian Wind Study to be completed.	This can be provided either after density and other issues are reviewed by City or at the Site Plan stage.
15.	<p>Comments on the Submitted Development Concept a. Comments on the Site Plan</p> <p>The 15 metre setback of the fuel station pump islands to the planned residential to the east is strongly supported and should be considered to be implemented in the Zoning By-law. This is consistent with the Commercial Built Form Standards.</p>	Not Applicable. Gas Station is removed in the revised proposal.
16.	Increase the amount of the common amenity space. Look for opportunities for internal and external space. Currently CA on the 8th floor is proposed – however, the roof top is noted in the SWM Report as storage. Internal space should also be provided. Find additional opportunities. See section 6.3 of the Built Form Standards for Mid-Rise Buildings and Townhouses for further guidance.	COMMENT ADDRESSED Outdoor and Indoor amenity spaces are appropriately provided at different floor levels.
17.	A minimum 1.5m sidewalk (2m wide is preferred) is warranted along the entire east side of the building to accommodate and support safe pedestrian circulation—especially between the rear-yard parking and commercial units facing Gordon Street.	Acknowledged.
18.	The transition from front to back of commercial/residential building will need to be explored further to ensure a barrier free connection (<4%) is provided (north side). Given this will be seen as the most natural access point from the at-grade parking to the doors of commercial and residential use, the connection will need to be wide, safe and inviting at all times of the day/night and seasons. Consider covered and/or heated walkway, the AODA/FADM guidelines for barrier-free travel and lighting, etc.	Acknowledged.
19.	Landscape buffering along the east property line is not adequate – most importantly the transition between commercial gas station and adjacent residential use. Space/ soil volume to accommodate large coniferous trees and plantings to help screen vehicular and commercial lights from neighbouring residential the City standard for this is 3m wide. This is an opportunity to work with adjacent property owners.	Not Applicable. Gas Station is removed in the revised proposal.
20.	Discussion of a mid-block connection in the Reports does not transition strong enough into the proposed design. There are no vistas/views, ends or points of interest along the space shown. Opportunity to make a space that helps transition the residential/commercial building to the gas station is needed too, as well as one that helps set up a strong visual east-west corridor for the area plan.	Acknowledged.
21.	How the building lands at the corner of Gordon/Arkeil and transitions out into a landscape that best addresses the intersection is critical. Grading solutions should aim to keep this area open and free of walls and/or obstructions and sightline conflicts. Opportunity for building access at the corner and/or a ‘flow out’ use from an adjacent	Please see the revised site plan and landscaping plan and FSSWM report.



	commercial unit to help animate the public realm should be part of the overall design theory. Currently, the grading plans shows a number of retaining walls. These should be revised. Generally retaining walls should not be located on the City's right-of-way.	
22.	The proposed landscaping along Gordon Street should incorporate less hardscape and provide opportunities for foundational plantings, private patio/terraces, etc. to help soften the building façade and breakdown massing. Trees should be planted in adequate open, landscape beds in concert with other plantings. Steer away from too much hard surface along this area of Gordon Street as the foot-traffic and lack of on-street parking doesn't support the need. The site would also benefit from more soft surface areas.	COMMENT ADDRESSED Please see the revised site plan and landscaping plan.
23.	Show additional building entrances. Specifically one should be shown facing the intersection of Arkell and Gordon.	COMMENT ADDRESSED Please see the revised site plan.
24.	There appear to be a number of engineering access standards issues such as aisle widths (i.e. should be 7m) and parking setbacks from access points that will affect the design. Please refer to the City's Development Engineering Manual on the City's website for further information. The additional land requirements along Gordon Street identified by Engineering will also result in changes required to the building placement.	Acknowledged
25.	When developing the overhead clearances for the garbage trucks please use the City's standards for municipal pick-up see the following document (Appendix D): https://guelph.ca/wp-content/uploads/Guidelines-for-SolidWaste-Collection.pdf	Acknowledged.
26.	b. Trees/Landscaping Tree Inventory – 38 regulated trees are proposed to be removed. This equates to 1597cm DBH using the Aggregate Caliper Calculation of the Tree Technical Manual. Compensation will be required through both the physical planting of trees on site as part of an approved Landscape Plan and a cash in lieu payment for those trees not accounted for.	Acknowledged
27.	The proposal to use a SWM Bio-retention Cell system west of the Gas Bar is interesting, if indeed it is an open, at-grade 'rain garden' system - subject to Engineering approval. If such a system was supported by City staff and there was an opportunity to extend this system further along Gordon Street to deal with more 'clean water' on the site, staff would appreciate further discussion and development. The prospect to manage water through this technology, could set a strong foundation for the design theory of the overall landscape plan and be a great educational tool for the public.	Not Applicable. Gas Station is removed in the revised proposal.
28.	Provide street trees along both frontages (12m o/c, 1m off property line), in concert with planting beds to help delineate the ROW, support the City's Urban Forest Management Plan to increase the urban tree canopy, and	Acknowledged. Please see the revised landscaping plan.



	screen undesirable views/uses, such as the gas station pumps, blank façades, and identify public/private spaces along the commercial/residential building.	
29.	The limits of the parking garage deck may impede trees and landscaping at grade. Consider how opportunities to accommodate might be sought through engineering techniques and solutions.	Acknowledged.
30.	Please provide a breakdown of the Landscape Open Area provided as well as Common Amenity Area. The R4.A requires a minimum Landscape Open Space of 40%. Please work towards achieving this and illustrate clearly on a drawing where these space are located on the property	Acknowledged. The proposed rezoning of the subject property to 'Specialized Neighbourhood Shopping Centre Zone' requires a 9% landscaping area. However, the proposed development has provided a 33% landscaping area to facilitate the residential use in the building.
31.	c. Comments on Elevations and Massing a. Ensuring the two buildings (i.e. the gas bar and the mixed-use building) have similar design language is supported by urban design staff.	Not Applicable. Gas Station is removed in the revised proposal.
32.	b. The massing of the building should be further shaped and simplified based on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per the Zoning By-law, 45 degree Angular Plane required from both the Gordon Street & Arkell Road. The transition to the east as outlined in the Commercial Built Form Standards (Section 4.1.8) should also shape the building massing. Considering a stepback of a minimum of 1.5 metres between the fourth and fifth floors to create an appropriate scale and massing of the building. Avoiding wrapping the balconies around corners to reduce the perceived massing and simplify the massing. Are there any ways to make the balconies facing Gordon Street appear less heavy? Recessed balconies integrated into the building massing represent the City's standard design direction. 	Please see the revised elevations and building mass model. Two degree increase in plane requested from Arkell Road.
33.	c. The Elevation facing Gordon Street should be revised and requires more discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion is required regarding the building materials. I am unclear about the material selection given the context of the building and its prominent location. As per the City's Built Form Standards: All buildings should be finished with predominantly natural and durable materials such as stone and brick (7.3.4). Further discussion about the windows. Could you simplify the window selections? As the buildings front onto a public street and is greater than 30 metres in length, building entrances should be located at regular intervals. Show additional building entrances to the commercial units. Specifically a commercial entrance should be shown facing the intersection of Arkell and Gordon. The 	Acknowledged. See revised Urban Design and Sustainability Brief.



	<p>precedents in the urban design brief show some good examples of this (e.g. page 14, 23). Consider including a canopy at the corner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop the first floor in more detail. Please think about location of the signage. Consider creating more of a rhythm of units/bays and building entrances. • Add a canopy to the gas bar pedestrian entrance facing Gordon Street. Elevations also need to be updated to show door locations. 	
34.	<p>Next Steps The Urban Design Brief should be revised based on the above comments. Look at alternatives to the building layout and massing to address the comments on the development concept. We would recommend a meeting to discuss changes to address the comments above.</p>	Acknowledged. See Revised Urban Design and Sustainability Brief.
	<p>Infrastructure, Development, and Enterprise Services Senior Development Planner - Michael Witmer - (519) 822-1260 x2790 - February 21, 2020</p>	
35.	<p>Setbacks In the Planning Justification Report, a possible consent to sever application is contemplated to separate the gas station from the mixed use building. In reviewing the conceptual site plan showing a possible new lot line, the mixed use building would be situated at a rear yard setback of 3.25 m and the gas station building would have a side yard setback of 1.75 m. These setbacks are both less than the minimum required setbacks in the R.4A Zoning. For reference, the R.4A Zone requires a minimum rear side yard equal to 20% of the lot depth or one half of the building height (whichever is greater), but in no case less than 7.5 m, and minimum side yard equal to one half the building height, but in no case less than 3 m. Please provide more details on these setbacks to the future lot line in the Planning Justification Report, including justification for any reductions. Further, update the proposed Zoning By-law accordingly to capture these additional site-specific zoning provisions.</p>	Not Applicable. Gas Station is removed in the revised proposal. The setback requirements for the proposed rezoning of the subject property to 'Specialized Neighbourhood Shopping Centre Zone' have been met except for the interior side yard. A Zoning By-law amendment application is filed to get relief from this requirement.
36.	<p>Demonstrate how the proposed gas station and associated fuel storage area complies with the CSA's 'Liquid Fuels Handling Code, 2017' and O.Reg. 217/01. In particular, please demonstrate that the overall locations of underground storage tanks, tanker truck delivery and refueling areas as well as all associated setbacks to adjacent land uses, including existing and proposed residential (i.e. the apartment units) are met.</p>	Not Applicable. Gas Station is removed in the revised proposal.
37.	<p>Angular Plane It is not clear if the mixed use building complies with the angular plane provisions in Section 4.16 of the Zoning By-law. Please provide a visual analysis on the proposed angular planes relative to both the centerlines of Gordon Street and Arkell Road. Note that Table 5.4.2, Row 10 refers to Section 4.16 of the Zoning By-law regarding Angular Planes.</p>	The proposed development maintains the 45° angular plane from Gordon Street. The building generates 47° angular plane to Arkell Road. A Zoning By-law amendment application is filed to get relief from this requirement.



38.	Landscaped Open Space and Common Amenity Area Clarify whether the site statistics (i.e. landscaped open space) shown on the conceptual site plan are less the proposed land dedications to the City.	See revised Site Plan statistics.
39.	Provide a detailed breakdown of how landscaped open space statistic was determined (22%). This can include an overlay on the conceptual site plan showing the components of the site used in arriving at this number.	See revised Site Plan statistics.
40.	Overall, Planning staff feel the amount of common amenity space and landscape open space currently proposed is not sufficient or appropriate to support the proposed density and height of the mixed building. Please explore opportunities to significantly increase both common amenity space and landscape open space on the site. Refer to urban design comments for further details.	Acknowledged. The proposed revised rezoning provides common amenity area in accordance with the standard R4A Zone within the Specialized NC Zone.
41.	Parking and Drive Aisles As per the City's 2015 Facility Accessibility Design Manual (FADM), a development with 212 total parking spaces will be required to have a total of seven (7) accessible parking spaces. Of this, three (3) are to be 'Type A' – Van Accessible Spaces, and four (4) are to be 'Type B' – Accessible Spaces. The site plan and floor plans provided only show a total of 2 accessible parking spaces in front of the gas station retail building and none in close proximity to the mixed-use building.	A total of 159 parking spaces are proposed for the revised proposal. A ZBA is required for Visitor and Restaurant, Tavern Parking. See Parking Review for all matters.
42.	Section 6.7 of the Planning Justification Report summarizes the findings of the Parking Brief prepared by R.J. Burnside & Associates Ltd. This section of the PJR indicates that while the residential and gas station parking supply meet the minimum requirements of the Zoning By-law, the proposed parking supply for all other uses falls short of the minimum requirements. This is inconsistent with what the Parking Brief indicates. In Section 1.1 of the Parking Brief, it concludes by stating, "Based on the City's Zoning By-law, the proposed development will meet the Zoning By-law requirements." Please provide clarification as these two statements in the technical reports are inconsistent.	An updated Parking Review and a Planning Justification Report Addendum have been submitted to justify the new proposed parking spaces for the revised development proposal.
43.	Further to the above, the Table 3, the Zoning Compliance chart in the Planning Justification Report indicates that a site specific provision is required for parking for the retail and restaurant land uses. Referring again to the Parking Brief, it concludes that the development meets the minimum parking requirements in the Zoning By-law. Please clarify.	An updated Parking Review and a Planning Justification Report Addendum have been submitted to justify the new proposed parking spaces for the revised development proposal.
44.	The six parking spaces beside the 1 storey gas station building adjacent to the driveway entrance to Gordon Street are likely to experience conflict with queueing vehicles leaving the site as well as vehicles entering the site. Access to and from these spaces will be obstructed at times. Some or all of these spaces should be relocated or removed to ensure an efficient flow of vehicular traffic to and from the site to Gordon Street.	Not Applicable. Gas Station is removed in the revised proposal.



45.	<p>Net Density Section 11, Table 3 in the Planning Justification Report indicates the maximum density being requested is 135 units per hectare. Both the Official Plan Amendment and draft Zoning By-law indicate the net density being requested is 139 units per hectare. This is also referenced elsewhere in the Planning Justification Report and in other reports. Please clarify which maximum net density is being requested for the development and update the reports/draft by-laws where necessary.</p>	Not Applicable. The new revised development proposes 110 units on the subject property, resulting in a density of 172 uph.
46.	<p>Official Plan Amendment In addition for requesting an increase in maximum height from six to eight storeys, the proposed Official Plan Amendment is also requesting to recognize the proposed net density of 139 units per hectare. While the Official Plan did not have a policy regarding maximum net density for the Neighbourhood Commercial land use designation at the time the application was submitted, such policy was requested in the application. Section 10 of the Planning Justification Report does not discuss the site specific policy for the net density. Please provide further information on why such a policy is being requested in the Official Plan Amendment and further, provide justification on how it is consistent with provincial and local planning policies.</p>	Acknowledged. See PJR Addendum on revised design and justification for density.
47.	<p>Zoning By-law Regarding the proposed lot line between the mixed use building and gas station, an R.4A zone (General Apartment) may not be the most appropriate or best fit for the gas station on a standalone property. A commercial zone such as Neighbourhood Commercial would be more appropriate for the gas station lands. For further discussion.</p>	Not Applicable. Gas Station is removed in the revised proposal.
<p>Infrastructure, Development, and Environmental Engineering Environmental Engineer - Prasoon Adhikari - (519) 822-1260 x2496 - December 2, 2019</p>		
48.	<p>Comments 1. Based on the former use of the Site as an auto repair shop including the historical presence of a tank nest and pump islands and the current presence of five aboveground storage tanks; an RSC filing with the MECP is a mandatory requirement for the Site to be developed as a residential property.</p>	Acknowledged. Will be filed at Site Plan.
49.	<p>2. The Phase One and Two ESAs, completed in general accordance with the requirements of CSA Standard, do not meet the requirements for submitting RSC as defined by O. Reg. 153/04 (as amended) and the City of Guelph's "Guidelines for Development of Contaminated or Potentially Contaminated Sites (2016)".</p>	Acknowledged. A new phase one ESA is submitted. As per the recommendation provided by the phase one ESA, a phase two ESA and an RSC filing will be conducted at the site plan approval stage.
50.	<p>3. Both the Phase Two ESA and Supplemental Soil and Groundwater Investigation reports deemed Table 3: Full depth Generic Site Condition Standards (SCS) in a Non-Portable Groundwater Condition as the</p>	Acknowledged



	<p>applicable criteria for the Site. However, the City relies on groundwater as its municipal water supply source and all land located in the City limits is within the 5-year time of travel wellhead protection area. As such, to ensure protection of the existing and future groundwater resources, the City deems its groundwater to be potable water, and does not allow the use of generic non-potable groundwater SCS under any circumstances. The applicable criteria for the Site is Table 2: Full depth Generic SCS in a Portable Groundwater Condition.</p>	
51.	<p>Recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to zone change approval, the Owner/Developer must submit the Phase One ESA completed per the requirements of O. Reg. 153/04, as amended in accordance with the City’s guidelines for the development of contaminated or potentially contaminated sites (2016). 	Acknowledged. A new phase one ESA is submitted with the revised applications.
52.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to Site plan approval, the Owner/Developer must submit a proof of RSC filling and acknowledgement along with the pertinent environmental reports (Phase Two ESAs, Remediation and/or Risk Assessment reports) used in filling the RSC for City’s records and reference. 	Acknowledged
<p>Infrastructure, Development, and Enterprise Services Environmental Engineer - Michelle Thalen - January 7, 2020</p>		
53.	<p>General</p> <p>All plans and reports are to identify the necessary 5 metre road widening along the Arkell Road frontage. This road widening has been identified in the City of Guelph’s Official Plan and all setbacks for zoning requirements are to be from this revised property line. This future land dedication will be deeded to the City at no cost prior to approval of either the Site Plan or the severance of the lands, whichever happens first. Please refer to the Official Plan, section 5.13, for further information.</p>	Acknowledged
54.	<p>Please revise the plans accordingly with the next submission ensuring that all structures, including retaining walls and underground parking, are relocated to within the revised development lands in accordance with the City of Guelph’s Development Engineering Manual (DEM) – refer to section 5.3.1.</p>	Acknowledged
55.	<p>Source Water Protection</p> <p>The subject property is located in a Wellhead Protection Area “C” (WHPA C) with a vulnerability score of 6 and is not located in an Issue Contributing Area. Source Water staff will wait until Site Plan to identify any requirements in order to have a better understanding of the intended use. Prior to site plan, please contact the Source Water Program Coordinator to do a Policy Applicability Review at 519822-1260 ext. 2543. A Risk Management Plan may be required for the gas station portion of the property depending on the quantity of fuel purposed.</p>	Acknowledged. Gas bar removed.



56.	In accordance with Grand River Source Protection Policy CG-CW-29, please provide 5 copies of a Salt Management Plan with a site plan submission as well as a Waste Survey Report (By-law (1996)-15202) in accordance with Grand River Source Protection Policy CG-MC-12.	Will be provided at Site Plan.
57.	<p>Traffic Services Staff from Traffic Services have reviewed the information provided and offer the following comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As per the TIS study, the access on Gordon Street is assumed to be less than 100 metres away from the intersection at Gordon Street and Arkell Road. However the concept plan dated August 27, 2019 shows the spacing distance is greater than 100 metres. Please confirm the location of this access by using the measuring method from City's Development Engineering Manual. The minimum spacing distance is 100 metres. 	The updated site plan illustrates the access on Gordon will exceed the City's standard for intersection spacing of 100 m.
58.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The access on Arkell Road is proposed to operate for right-in/right-out movements only. To effectively prevent motorists from making illegal left turns, a raised centre median must be installed on Arkell Road in front of this access. This centre median must extend 25 metres beyond the curb returns. City staff are concerned about the resultant blockage by this centre median which would directly impact the access at 1340 Gordon Street on the north side of Arkell Road. The proponent must seek an agreement from the property owner at 1340 Gordon Street with regard to the design and construction of this centre median. If an agreement could not be reached, the proponent must consider redesigning the site using a single access point to Gordon Street. This might have implications on the size of the development and the type of land uses, or else the egress traffic would experience long delays and traffic queues resulting in an unacceptable levels of service. 	The City initially commented about restricting the driveway to Arkell due to a high generating use i.e. the gas station on site. As the proposed development will now only include residential and limited commercial uses, the projected trips will decrease. In addition, the proposed driveway on Arkell will be for visitors only with limited parking available. The traffic expected to be coming in and out will be minimal. The updated TIS examines the proposed driveway on Arkell as a full movement and restricted left out only. In conclusion, the proposed driveway can function as a full movement.
59.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The intersection of Arkell Road and Malvern Crescent is missing from the study area. The study must include this intersection as per City's email correspondence dated April 18, 2019. 	As discussed with City staff, a full operation analysis for this intersection will not be needed. The update TIS demonstrated minimal impacts of the proposed development traffic at Malvern Crescent. Details are provided in Section 6.0 of the update TIS
60.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The background traffic from other developments will include all sites that were indicated in the 1300 Gordon Street TIS (dated December 2019). FYI, some relevant pages are attached; 	Acknowledged



61.	5. Parking study will be reviewed and commented by Planning staff.	Acknowledged
62.	6. We support the connection to the neighbouring property at 1388 Gordon Street as illustrated in the concept plan dated August 27, 2019;	Acknowledged
63.	7. Access curb radii cannot extend beyond the property line as shown on the easterly curb radii for the Arkell Road access.	This has been revised in the updated site plan.
64.	8. Please remove or modify the sentence on page 19, "Error! Reference source not found."	Acknowledged. The updated TIS has removed this sentence.
65.	<p>9. In the functional design plan, several design elements were missing and will be required to be shown to determine any road widenings on the subject lands for both Arkell Road and Gordon Street. The widenings may be beyond the 5 metres identified in the Official Plan for Arkell Road in order to accommodate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lane configurations on Gordon Street and Arkell Road with travel lanes, off-street bike lanes (as attached for Options 3-5 from Gordon EA) and sidewalks; • The recommended northbound right-turn lane at the intersection of Gordon Street and Arkell Road; • The raised centre median on Arkell Road as a right-in/right-out operation is proposed at the Arkell Road access; • The access to adjacent properties including 1340 Gordon Street, 32 Arkell Road, 1291 Gordon Street, 1388 Gordon, 1369 and 1373 Gordon Street; and • The access configuration with throat width of 9.0 metres and radii of 12.0 metres as per City's Development Engineering Manual; and throat depth of a minimum of 15.0 metres as per TAC manual subject to the queue analysis from Synchro simulations. 	<p>Acknowledged. The updated TIS included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommended northbound right-turn lane at Gordon / Arkell intersection • As mentioned in the previous response, the access on Arkell is proposed to be a full movement. As a result, a raised centre median was not considered. • The potential location for access to the adjacent properties is illustrated in the updated site plan.
66.	<p>10. In the Traffic Geometrics Plan, the following design elements must be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please adjust the access width and radii at this location so the swept path for a fuel tanker truck would only take the curb lane. The current Traffic Geometrics Plan shows the swept path would use two travel lanes on Gordon Street to make a right turn into the subject site; • To add swept paths for a fire truck; and • To add swept paths for a waste collection truck for on-site operation. 	<p>The access configuration is sufficient to accommodate the largest expected vehicle on site i.e. waste collection truck. As a gas station is no longer proposed, a maneuvering analysis was conducted for a waste collection truck (the largest expected vehicle on site). The analysis is provided in Appendix K of the update TIS. A maneuvering analysis was not conducted for</p>



		a fire truck as the site plan meets the requirement in the OBC.
67.	<p>11. Sustainable Transportation staff are supportive of the TDM recommendations listed in the TIS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the proximity of this site to a number of nearby amenities including grocery stores, commercial areas, and schools, Staff would like to see wayfinding signage indicating the time required to walk and cycle to these nearby locations (particularly the commercial lands at Gordon and Clair, and the University of Guelph). Please ensure a pedestrian connection is incorporated into the driveway access connecting 1388 Gordon to the proposed site. Given the location of this site on both the on-road cycling network and well serviced transit routes, Sustainable Transportation staff are supportive of the 15 parking space deficiency currently proposed. 	<p>Acknowledged. Currently, there is an existing wayfinding sign for the university on Gordon Street, south of Arkell (along the frontage of the site). This is sufficient, no other wayfinding signs are proposed.</p> <p>Acknowledged</p>
68.	<p>Municipal Services Watermain</p> <p>For future site plan submission please note the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the existing water service on Arkell Road is to be removed at the watermain; proposed water service to the apartment is to be split internally and the bulk meter is to be installed within the building; water service to gas station should avoid 90 degree bends; with reference to the FSR (section 3.2), if a new fire hydrant is required for fire protection, a new fire hydrant within the City's right-of-way is to be installed at the Developers expense. 	Acknowledged
69.	<p>Sanitary & Storm</p> <p>Please note that any proposed sewer services from Gordon Street will cross a large concrete encased utility duct that has caused historical conflicts with servicing. The consultant is to thoroughly investigate the utility locations on the east side of Gordon Street to ensure that horizontal separations are maintained. Daylighting the utilities is highly recommended and should be considered prior to completing the detailed servicing plans for future site plan submission.</p> <p>As the plan is showing a future severance, separate storm service laterals for each proposed property will be required.</p>	Acknowledged. No severance proposed.
70.	<p>Capacity</p>	Acknowledged. A Holding Provision has been added to the requested zoning for a



As highlighted in the preconsultation meeting held on October 17, 2018, there are known constraints within the south Guelph sewershed. The capacity of both the sewers and watermain adjacent to the proposed development were reviewed using the City's computer modelling and the results are as follows:

Water Supply and Distribution System

Sufficient (and adequate) capacity is available of the City's existing water supply and distribution system water main pressures, in our system to accommodate the development at the above noted property and no water capacity constraints can be expected for most scenarios according to the City's water system model.

However, there is potential for marginal water supply pressures in proposed development under certain conditions such as peak hour demand scenario at locations with elevation greater than 346 m height above mean sea level (AMSL) and average day demand scenario at locations with elevation greater than 339 m height AMSL in the existing water system.

Water pressure in the water mains in vicinity of proposed development under certain conditions such as peak hour demand scenario at locations with elevation at 346 m height above mean sea level (AMSL) could range from 38.0 to 42.0 psi (40 psi +/- 2.0 psi) and average day demand scenario at locations with elevation at 339 m height AMSL could range from 47.5 to 52.5 psi (50 psi +/- 2.5 psi) in the existing water system.

The referenced development would have no significant adverse impact to the City's water supply and distribution system. Minimum water service size should be 25 mm for residential and all other services sized appropriately for demand based on potentially low pressures.

Sanitary Sewer Wastewater Collection System

No capacity is available in the City's existing downstream sanitary sewers, to accommodate discharge of sanitary flows, in our system to accommodate the development, for the referenced type development, at the above noted property, for the above noted proposed development, according to the City's south end sewer shed Civica Infrastructure Clair-Gordon sanitary sewer wastewater collection system model. The referenced development may have significant surcharge adverse impact once it is connected to the City's downstream sanitary sewers.

Please note that the City of Guelph has identified in the Capital budget in two years time (2021) to commence construction of an oversized sanitary sewer or "superpipe" within Gordon Street that will be designed to alleviate the sewer surcharging. As such, staff will not be able to support rezoning of these lands until such time as sufficient sanitary sewer capacity becomes available in accordance with the policies found in the City's Official Plan (section 6.1) and Zoning By-law (Section 4.10).

sanitary superpipe. See revised FS&SWM Report.



71.	<p>Stormwater Management The Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report (FSSR) does not indicate how the groundwater surrounding the underground parking is to be dealt with. Is the parking structure/foundation being 100% waterproofed or is groundwater proposed to be pumped? Please confirm in next submission.</p> <p>Engineering staff have concerns with the overall site water balance and lack of information (monthly water balance) and mitigation on the mixed use area of the site around the post-development infiltration. This needs to be explored further and provided with the next submission to determine what practices can be included with development of this building considering the site constraints. City staff encourage the use of most types of Low Impact Development practices and consulting engineers can refer to the “Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide” authored by the CVC and TRCA for further design details and guidelines.</p> <p>Considering that each site is to be serviced independently, the stormwater management is also to be revised to meet the allowable outlet rate based on the pro-rated flows for each site/drainage area. Please update the FSSR accordingly.</p>	<p>Permanent dewatering systems are not contemplated. Groundwater can be managed by means of watertight shoring and/or waterproofed structures. The methodology for the construction will be confirmed as detailed designs are further developed.</p> <p>The design scheme has been modified and the water balance notes that pre-development levels of recharge can be provided.</p> <p>This comment no longer applies.</p>
	<p>Building Services Pat Sheehy - December 12, 2019</p>	
72.	<p>Factors to consider when drafting the by-law are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The property is to be zoned Residential. The canopy height for the gas bar would be limited to 3.6 metres under the accessory structure regulation. This will more than likely require relief 	Acknowledged. Gas bar removed.
73.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 4.22 of General provisions regulates enclosed operations in commercial zones. Since the proposed zoning is residential, a review of the applicability of this section should be done 	Zoning is now Specialized NC Zone.
74.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of the regulations for vehicle gas bars are found in the Service Commercial zone regulations and will need to be referenced in the amending by-law 	Not Applicable.
75.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If any parking is proposed within the building, recommend providing relief from Section 4.13.3.2.2 to reduce the size of an interior space from 3m x 6m 	Acknowledged. Currently, the proposed parking space dimension is 3m x 6m.



76.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• With the property again having residential zoning, may need to provide for relief of the parking near the convenience store from Section 4.13.2.2. to allow parking areas within 3 m of a building entrance (for the convenience store).	Not Applicable.
77.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There would also be a concern regarding the zoning (residential) and the restrictions found in the sign by-law for residential properties. This will need further discussion on the signage needs of the commercial building and gas bar	Acknowledged. Zoning is now Specialized NC Zone.



City of Guelph – Public Services Department		
Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Parks and Recreation Park Planner - Jyoti Pathak - (519) 822-1260 x2431 - October 30, 2019	
1.	Open Space Planning recommends payment in lieu of conveyance of parkland for the proposed development for an 8-storey mixed use building including 88 dwelling units and gas service station. Conveyance of parkland isn't recommended for the subject development as the application of the rate of conveyance of parkland at 30% of the development land would render the remaining portion of the development site impractical for development due to the small site area, less than a hectare.	Acknowledged
2.	The Developer shall be responsible for a payment in lieu of parkland conveyance for the entire development, in accordance with the City of Guelph Parkland Dedication By-Law 2019 - (20366) as amended by the By-Law 2019 - (20380) or any successor thereof prior to issuance of any building permits.	Acknowledged
3.	Prior to Site Plan approval, the Owner shall provide a narrative appraisal report prepared for The Corporation of the City of Guelph for the purposes of calculating the amount of payment in-lieu of parkland conveyance pursuant to s.42 of the Planning Act, to the satisfaction of the Deputy CAO of Public Services or their designate. The value of the land shall be determined as of the day before the day the first building permit is issued. The narrative appraisal report shall be prepared by a qualified appraiser who is a member in good standing of the Appraisal Institute of Canada, and shall be subject to the review and approval of City in accordance with the Parkland Dedication Bylaw. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if the appraisal provided by the applicant is not satisfactory to the City, acting reasonably, the City reserves the right to obtain an independent appraisal for the purposes of calculating the payment in-lieu of parkland conveyance.	Acknowledged



Guelph and Wellington Development Association		
Comment Number	Comment	Response
	President Carson Reid – November 26, 2019	
4.	The Guelph and Wellington Development Association supports this application and we encourage staff to expedite the processing of this file.	Acknowledged

Upper Grand District School Board		
Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Manager of Planning Jennifer Passy - (519) 822-4420 x820 – December 16, 2019	
1.	Please be advised that the Planning Department does not object to the proposed application, subject to the following conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That Education Development Charges shall be collected prior to the issuance of a building permit(s). 	Acknowledged
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The developer shall agree in the site plan agreement and condominium declaration that adequate sidewalks, lighting and snow removal (on sidewalks and walkways) will be provided to allow children to walk safely to school or to a designated bus pickup point. 	Acknowledged
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The developer shall agree in the site plan agreement and condominium declaration to advise all purchasers of residential units and/or renters of the same, by inserting the following clause in all offers of Purchase and Sale/Lease: <p><i>“In order to limit liability, public school buses operated by the Service de transport de Wellington-Dufferin Student Transportation Services (STWDSTS), or its assigns or successors, will not travel on privately owned or maintained right-of-ways to pick up students, and potential busing students will be required to meet the bus at a congregated bus pick-up point.”</i></p> 	Acknowledged



	<p>Further, the provision of a sidewalk or walkway from the apartment building entrance and connecting to the sidewalk on Arkell Road would allow students to walk safely to school or a designated bus pick-up location.</p>	
--	---	--