

Attachment 3: Summary of Public Comments and Staff Response

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
1	Yorklands Green Hub	November 28, 2013	<p>This group is promoting repurposing a portion of the Guelph Correctional Centre as a public self-sustaining education, demonstration and research hub that focuses on sustainable food production, wise water use and water protection, and renewable energy technologies.</p> <p>They have submitted an Expression of Interest to Infrastructure Ontario to secure long term access to a 36 acre parcel of land along York Road including sole use of the Superintendent’s House and the Gate House and partnered use of the Administration Building.</p> <p>The group believes that their vision aligns with the City’s vision and principles for the lands. They are requesting Council to work with them to ensure land and buildings are secured for the above outlined purposes.</p>	<p>The GID Secondary Plan provides a land use policy framework that addresses sustainable development, energy use, and cultural and natural heritage conservation protection and enhancement. The vision and guiding principles of the Secondary Plan embody complementary elements to the Yorklands Green Hub aspirations for a portion of the site. A significant portion of the lands of interest to the group are recognized as Significant Natural Area, as per OPA 42 and as cultural heritage landscape, identified in Appendix A to the Secondary Plan. The area outside of the Significant Natural Area is designated as Adaptive Re-use, which permits a wide range of uses recognizing that repurposing the structures are key to their protection. Subsequent implementation mechanisms, including the Block Plan process, development approvals process and economic development initiatives present other opportunities for the group’s interests to be realized. Staff agree that there is alignment between the Yorklands Green Hub’s interest for the lands and the Secondary Plan’s land use vision and principles for the site. However, development approvals may be required.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to this comment.</p>

2	Mario Venditti On behalf of 555 Stone Road E.	November 28, 2013	Requested the removal of the Employment Mixed Use 1 designation proposed for the lands. In place of the employment designation, requested the expansion of the proposed Mixed Use Corridor designation for the property and expansion of the Residential designation. Requested policies supporting residential townhouses. Also mentioned the 1993 annexation process and the corresponding South Guelph Secondary Plan which did not include employment or industrial land uses for these lands.	A Residential designation, that would permit low density housing forms, is not supported along Stone Road E. The GID area is primarily planned for employment uses with higher density development planned along Stone Rd. E. However, the entire property is proposed to be designated Mixed-use Corridor (GID) which permits employment uses and medium and high density multiple unit residential buildings and apartments. This change in designation results in an increased employment target and density, and an increased population target for Block Plan Area 3. <u>Recommendation:</u> Modifications to land use designations, building heights schedule and Block Plan Area targets.
3	Hugh Whiteley	December 2, 2013	Requested that the Secondary Plan establish a minimum setback of development of 30 m from the top of slope along the full length of the river corridor. Critical locations include Cargill Meat Solutions, Polymer Distribution Inc (PDI) and Eramosa River and College Avenue E. extension. Also requested that river crossings between Stone Road and Victoria Road be minimized. A general allowance for a river crossing is appropriate, however specifics should be made later in the planning process and dependent on necessity, utility and environmental soundness.	Policies related to rivers, river valleys and corridors are incorporated into the Natural Heritage System (NHS) section of the Official Plan which was approved by Council in July 2010 through OPA 42 and is currently under appeal. The NHS policies are not within the scope of the GID Secondary Plan policies. There is a 30 m buffer from the edge of the river to protect fish habitat. Significant Valleylands go beyond this distance and provides further protection. Any redevelopment of Cargill Meat Solutions or of the PDI lands would be subject to the development approvals

				<p>process which would include the preparation and approval of an Environmental Impact Study (EIS).</p> <p>The proposed OPA 54 policies support the development of one new river crossing which would provide linkage to the City's trail systems and serve as an essential active transportation link for pedestrians and bicyclists. The river crossing is shown conceptually as an active transportation link on Schedule A with a need and feasibility analysis being completed through the Block Plan process (11.2.7.3.5i).</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to these comments.</p>
4	Alex Drolc & Family	November 28, 2013	Support direction of "Glenholme Estate Residential" policies in Secondary Plan.	<u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to these comments.
5	Jeremy Warson, Infrastructure Ontario	November 28, 2013	IO expressed that they remain supportive of the vision for the area and pleased to see a number of changes in response to their comments on the draft Secondary Plan. However, they remain concerned with various sections including land uses proposed for provincially owned lands west of the Eramosa River. IO recommends that the mix between residential and employment be re-balanced with more land allocated for residential purposes based on marketplace conditions and forecasts. They also requested further assessment of the number of jobs contributed by the Guelph Correctional Centre lands to the GID's overall	The GID area has consistently been planned primarily for employment uses based on growth plan needs, economic development strategies and the recognition that this is one of the last remaining undeveloped areas within the City with the potential for employment growth within the City's existing urban boundaries. Proposed OPA 54 designated a sufficient and appropriate amount and location of lands as Residential to meet population growth plan targets for the GID. The ability to meet employment targets is seen as a greater challenge dependent upon the achievement of high

			<p>employment target which appears to be underestimated.</p>	<p>employment density forms, which require a strong implementation strategy including a significant level of public sector support/leadership as well as private sector involvement to achieve higher density R&D style parks envisioned for the GID.</p> <p>Watson & Associates Economists Ltd. Was retained to support staff's assessment of Infrastructure Ontario's request and others for reductions in the amount of land designated Employment Mixed-use 1, given the complexity and specialized nature of employment land development. The Watson review concluded that the employment function could be met on less land with higher densities in line with comparator research and innovation parks. As a result, the amount of land designated Employment Mixed-use 1 has been reduced, density targets adjusted and the amount of land designated Residential increased. Watson's assessment also underscored the importance of a strong implementation strategy and partnerships in developing higher density innovative employment clusters. To assist with meeting employment targets Institutional and Live/work uses were removed as permitted uses within the Employment Mixed-use 1 area. The employment target for Block Plan Area 4 was also increased.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>The boundary between Block Plan Area 1 and 2 has been revised so that all of the Residential lands are within Block Plan Area 1 along with the proposed new community park and transition area between lands designated Residential and Employment Mixed-use 1 north of New Street 'B'.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Modifications to land use designations, density targets and Block Plan areas.</p>
6	Kevin Thompson, Smith Valeriotte On behalf of 739 Stone Road E.	November 28, 2013	<p>Are not supportive of the proposed designation for the lands which preclude residential development which they feel is contrary to promises made to landowners at the time of annexation into the City from Puslinch Township in 1993. In addition they raised concerns with the lack of servicing policies for the subject lands and request that further exemptions be provided for private individual on-site water and wastewater services as an interim measure until full municipal services are available.</p>	<p>The lands are within the Natural Heritage System established by OPA 42 and are not subject to OPA 54. The owner may choose to conduct an EIS as part of a development application to determine if any development potential exists on site.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to these comments.</p>
7	Ken Spira	November 28, 2013	<p>Support direction of "Glenholme Estate Residential" policies in Secondary Plan.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to these comments.</p>
8	Cynthia Folzer	November 28, 2013	<p>Suggested that a strong commitment is needed for proposals including conservation of reformatory complex and carbon neutrality. Expressed concern with loss of farmland. Suggests a significant portion of the former reformatory farmlands should be reserved for organic farming along with the proposal for community gardens. Also suggests that residential housing should</p>	<p>The GID lands are located within the City's urban boundary and are not considered prime agricultural land. The City's Official Plan recognizes these lands as both Built-up Area and Greenfield Area within the City's Settlement Area Boundary. The City's Official Plan is consistent with the Province's Places to Grow legislation and sets strong policies in place ensuring the</p>

			<p>predominantly be for low income housing and that building heights should be limited to six (6) storeys.</p>	<p>City meets future growth needs within its current boundaries. The City's OP Update (OPA 48) supports community gardens in all land use designations except Significant Natural Areas.</p> <p>Residential housing within the GID is intended to meet the needs of a range and mix of households including affordable housing. The majority of the lands are subject to a maximum height of six storeys, with the exception of key higher density locations which have a maximum height limit of ten storeys.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to these comments.</p>
9	Bill Mungall, Guelph Hiking Trail Club	November 19, 2013	<p>Questions why the Secondary Plan policies duplicate the information from the City's Trails Master Plan rather than review or refine it. Also questions why the Secondary Plan leaves various resource management issues associated with the valleylands and related trails to a future master or management plan process. He requests that the Secondary Plan recognize the following two trail-related points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Torrance Creek Trail – Request that portions of a trail, recommended in the Torrance Creek Subwatershed Report, but excluded from the City's subsequent Trail Master Plan, be shown within the GID Secondary Plan. The proposed trail would connect the City's Carter well property with City lands south of the 	<p>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. The subsequent Block Plan process (OPA 54 policy 11.2.7.3.5), development approvals process and trail network implementation processes will further refine the trail network.</p> <p>In March 2012 the City completed a risk assessment of the potential trail options on the north side of the Eramosa River including a trail route that would involve a GJR Trestle Bridge underpass. This trail</p>

			<p>Barber well.</p> <p>2) Trail Link on North River Bank from Clythe Creek to Victoria Road – Request recognition of trail link along PDI lands and a short footbridge over Clythe Creek and under the GJR trestle bridge.</p> <p>Inquired about the future of the old railway spur bridge over the river and suggested that it has potential as a second pedestrian link across the river or as a possible pedestrian trail feature given the excellent views it offers.</p> <p>Requested that the Secondary Plan refocus on the earth science aspect of natural heritage and call for its recognition, celebration and interpretation.</p>	<p>route does not meet the City’s standards as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • insufficient height clearance during periods of high water level; • trail closure required during periods of high water level; • trail does not meet Guelph’s Facility Accessibility Design Manual 2013 (FADM) requirements; and • insufficient trail width (less than 0.75 m) along certain sections of the route. <p>However, the south side of the creek has been identified as a possible alternative location for a trail.</p> <p>The Guelph Junction Railway Company reviewed the potential of a trail crossing underneath the existing railway trestle bridge and concluded it could not be supported since there was not sufficient head room, the area is seasonally underwater and would place the public at risk. (See item 15 for further detail)</p> <p>The Provincially Significant Earth Science ANSI is specifically identified in the GID Secondary Plan (OPA 54 Objective 11.2.1.2 c) and policy 11.2.2.1.6) and is part of the City’s Natural Heritage System (OPA 42). The GID Secondary Plan also includes policies regarding messaging, celebration and community engagement within the public realm section (OPA 54 policy section 11.2.5.3)</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to these comments.
10	Victor Labreche, Labreche Patterson & Associates Inc. On behalf of the Ontario Restaurant Hotel and Motel Association and restaurant members	October 31, 2013	No concerns identified with proposed policies but reserve the right to provide further comments on subsequent policy drafts prior to Council's final decision on matter.	<u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to these comments.
11	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo Ltd On behalf of Loblaw Properties Limited	December 12, 2013	They are requesting clarification as to what constitutes "small and medium-scale retail commercial uses" in policy 11.2.6.3.2 since no caps are indicated in the proposed policy."	The intent of the retail space within the GID is to have a mix of uses with commercial uses serving the local area and being largely ancillary to the residential and employment designations. The policies do not allow large-format stand-alone retail uses (retail uses greater than 3,250 sq m (34,982.7 sq ft) as defined by the City's Official Plan. The City's OP uses the terms small-scale commercial and small-scale retail commercial without specific size limits which is the same treatment of terms given in OPA 54. In addition, the GID lands do not include a Community Mixed-use Centre as defined by the City's OP, which are subject to caps. However, an existing Neighbourhood Commercial Centre is recognized which would be subject to caps and the need for a market impact study if those caps were proposed to be exceeded beyond 10,000 sq m. of gross floor area, as per OP policy.

				<u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to these comments.
12	Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA)	Received December 23, 2013 (December 2, 2012)	Recommend the removal of the reference to Special Policy Area Floodplain in the definition for <i>redevelopment</i> in section 11.2.7.8 of OPA 54 since the GID does not include any portion of Floodplain Special Policy area.	The GID does not include any portion of <i>Special Policy Area Floodplain</i> and the policies can rely on a definition for <i>redevelopment</i> that is aligned with the new definition adopted by Council through OPA 48 but does not include the qualifier for <i>Special Policy Area Floodplain</i> . <u>Recommendation:</u> Definition revised.
13	Upper Grand District School Board	January 27, 2014	Expressed possible need to accommodate elementary aged students given relative isolation of the GID from other residential neighbourhoods. Also noted possible secondary school accommodation options in the area with potential synergies of a post-secondary campus and the planned employment uses within the GID. Expressed concerns with Block Plan approach and policy focus on achieving population and employment targets and not on creating community. Questioned how the Upper Grand District School Board would be engaged in the review of Block Plans and what order the blocks would be developed.	Block Plans will be completed by landowners/developers and approved by Council. Stakeholders have opportunities through the developer and/or Council approval processes. There is no set staging/timing for the completion of Block Plans. The timing of this process is dependent on landowners. The entire City of Guelph is planned as a complete community while the GID policies support a wide range of employment and residential land uses that addresses growth plan needs and contribute to a complete community. <u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to these comments.
14	MHBC Planning Urban Design & Landscape Architecture On behalf of 728	January 29, 2014	Requested modification of the Employment Mixed-use 1 designation to a Mixed Use Corridor (GID) designation. Provided rationale for the change including location, size and configuration of the lands, flexibility	The conversion of Employment Mixed-use 1 lands to the Mixed-Use Corridor (GID) designation is supported. The GID area is primarily planned for employment uses with higher density development planned

	Victoria Road S.		<p>in use and ability to meet density and design objectives of the GID, and ability to still meet targets and density targets for Block Plan Area 3.</p> <p>Requested an increase in height from 6 storeys to 10 storeys for the lands designated Residential. Also suggested that height limits not be included in the OPA but left to Block Plan development, zoning by-law and design considerations.</p>	<p>along Stone Rd. E. The focus of employment lands in a campus-style business park form is to be concentrated on the north side of Stone Road E. which continues to be designated as Employment Mixed-use 1. There is merit in the detailed planning rationale provided by the consultants. The Employment Mixed-use 1 designation has been removed and the depth of the Mixed-use Corridor (GID) designation along Victoria Road S and Stone Road East has been expanded, with a modest expansion of the Residential designation. The combined Mixed-use Corridor (GID) and Residential designations will allow for a flexible mix of employment uses, and medium and high density multiple unit residential buildings and apartments. The change in designation results in increased employment and population targets for Block Plan Area 3.</p> <p>Heights included in the OPA were developed through a comprehensive design process considering the existing topography of the lands, protecting public views and allowing for transit supportive development, especially at nodes. The lands proposed to be designated Residential south of Stone Road E. are isolated and increasing the heights would not impact any identified public views and vistas. The removal of height limits would nullify bonusing provisions within the GID</p>
--	------------------	--	--	---

				<p>Secondary Plan which are key to incenting community benefits including carbon neutral approaches.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Modifications to land use designations, building heights schedule and Block Plan Area targets.</p>
15	Guelph Junction Railway Company	February 11, 2014	<p>The feasibility of a trail leading from the Victoria Road Bridge on the north side of the river going east and crossing the railway bridge to connect to Jaycees Park on York Road was assessed. It was determined that a trail/track crossing in this area would impede railway switching operations and place the public at risk. A site specific safety audit completed by MRC confirmed the findings so the proposal was dismissed. GJR also noted that a suggested trail crossing underneath the existing railway trestle bridge does not have sufficient head room, is seasonally underwater and would create liability issues and place the public at risk. The GJR recognizes the City desires a trail crossing south of the river and will work with the City in this regard.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to these comments.</p>
16	Jeremy Warson, Infrastructure Ontario	March 21, 2014	<p>Support direction of Secondary Plan policy revisions and expressed appreciation for ongoing efforts in working with Infrastructure Ontario to achieve a mutually acceptable plan.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to these comments.</p>