

4<sup>th</sup> SUBMISSION COMMENTS AND RESPONSE  
 190, 202, 210 and 216 Arkell Road  
 Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBLA)  
 July 2024

*Public Services – Park and Trail Development (Christina Vanelli) – July 11, 2023*

<i>Comment</i>	<i>Response</i>
<b>Parkland Dedication</b>	
<p>Payment in lieu of parkland conveyance will be required for this development in accordance with the Planning Act s.51.1 and City of Guelph Official Plan Policy 7.3.5.6.</p> <p>The subject site area is 2.57ha. The Draft Plan of Subdivision proposes 91 dwelling units. Excluding the Open Space Block 4 (0.862 ha), the total development area of 1.715 ha.</p> <p>In accordance with the Planning Act s.51.1 the rate of payment in lieu of parkland conveyance will be the greater of 5% of the equivalent of Market Value of the land, or 1 hectare per 1000 dwelling units; up to a maximum of 10% of the equivalent market value of the land (for sites under 5 ha).</p> <p>For this development the 1 hectare per 1000 dwelling unit rate will apply. The payment in lieu of parkland dedication amount is calculated at the equivalent market value of 5.31% of the land.</p> <p>An appraisal of the subject property will be required to determine the cash-in-lieu amount. The long form appraisal report shall be prepared by a qualified appraiser who is a member in good standing of the Appraisal Institute of Canada. The property owner is responsible for the cost and to arrange for the appraisal.</p>	<p>Noted. A condition of subdivision registration to be included to require appraisal and payment of cash-in-lieu.</p>
<b>City Trail Parcel</b>	
<p>Staff note that an alternative trail connection location utilizing the adjacent property at 220 Arkell Road has been proposed as the laneway parcel is shown as a trail conveyance on the application for Draft Plan of subdivision for 220 Arkell Road.</p> <p>It is the City's expectation that the owners of both 190-216 Arkell Rd and 220 Arkell Road will continue to coordinate with each other as the design stage progresses to establish grades at the property line and construction timelines for development to ensure that the trail connection is achieved.</p>	<p>The property owner is willing to work with the adjacent property owner of 220 Arkell Road to coordinate grading and detailed design to provide a trail connection using the laneway parcel of 220 Arkell Road.</p> <p>A condition of approval will address the review of the potential trail connection.</p>

<p><b>Environmental Impact Study</b></p>	
<p><b>Open Space Works and Restoration</b>  The City requires planting and seeding to enhance buffers and wildlife corridors, provide compensation for removed trees etc.</p> <p>Staff note that the EIS submitted contains text requiring detailed restoration and planting plans (including tree compensation details) as part of the EIR. (see pg.58 of Arkell Road Properties Environmental Impact Study, dated December 2021)</p>	<p>Noted. Detailed landscape and buffer planting plans will be prepared and included in the EIR, to be required as a condition of approval/through the site plan process.</p>
<p><b>Demarcation</b>  Demarcation of the open space lands conveyed to the City of Guelph is required. The final configuration of the fencing will be determined during the detailed design stage. The Environmental Implementation Report will include a demarcation plan.</p>	<p>Noted. Demarcation will be considered and included in the EIR and associated team reports/drawings.</p>
<p><b>Storm Water Management Area</b>  The City's standard stormwater management signs (per Development Engineering Manual) shall be provided for the stormwater management facility and their location(s) will be shown on the EIR drawings.</p>	<p>Noted. SWM info and signage will be detailed in the EIR.</p>
<p><b>Conditions to be met prior to execution of subdivision agreement</b></p>	
<p>1. The Developer shall be responsible for the cost of design and development of the <b>demarcation</b> of all lands conveyed to the City in accordance with the City of Guelph Property Demarcation Policy. This shall include the submission of drawings and the administration of the construction contract up to the end of the warrantee period completed by an Ontario Association of Landscape Architect (OALA) member for approval to the satisfaction of the Deputy CAO of Public Services. The Developer shall provide the City with <b>cash or letter of credit</b> to cover the City approved estimate for the cost of development of the demarcation for the City lands to the satisfaction of the Deputy CAO of Public Services</p>	<p>Noted. To be added as condition for detailed design prior to subdivision registration.</p>
<p>2. The Developer shall be responsible for the cost of design and implementation of the <b>Open Space Works and Restoration</b> in accordance with the "Environmental Implementation Report" to the satisfaction of the Deputy CAO of Public Services. This shall include the submission of drawings and the administration of the construction contract up to the end of the warrantee period completed by an Ontario Association of Landscape Architects (OALA) member for approval to the satisfaction of the] Deputy CAO of Public Services. The Developer shall provide the City with <b>cash or letter of credit</b> to cover the City</p>	<p>Noted. To be added as condition for detailed design prior to subdivision registration.</p>

<p>approved estimate for the cost of the Open Space works and restoration for the City lands to the satisfaction of the Deputy CAO of Public Services.</p>	
<p>3. The Developer shall design and develop the <b>Storm Water Management Facility Landscaping</b> in accordance with the City's current "Design Principles for Storm Water Management Facilities" to the satisfaction of the Deputy CAO of Public Services and the City Engineer. This shall include the submission of drawings and the administration of the construction contract up to the end of the warrantee period completed by an Ontario Association of Landscape Architects (OALA) member for approval to the satisfaction of the Deputy CAO of Public Services. The Developer shall provide the City with <b>cash or letter of credit</b> to cover the City approved estimate for the cost of development of the Storm Water Management Facility Landscaping for the City lands to the satisfaction of the Deputy CAO of Public Services.</p>	<p>Noted. To be added as condition for detailed design prior to subdivision registration.</p>
<p>4. The Developer shall provide Public Services with a digital file in either AutoCAD DWG format or DXF format containing the following final approved information: parcel fabric, street network, grades/contours and landscaping of the park, open space and storm water management blocks.</p>	<p>Noted. To be added as condition for detailed design prior to subdivision registration.</p>
<p>5. The Developer shall install, at no cost to the City, chain link fencing, between Blocks 5 and 6, between Blocks 5 and 7, and between Blocks 2 and 7. The Developer further agrees that the fencing will be installed following grading operations of the subdivision in accordance with the current standards and specification of the City and to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Planning and Building Services. Further, all property lines must be accurately surveyed and clearly marked in the field prior to establishing all fence line locations. Fences shall be erected directly adjacent to the established property line within the City owned lands.</p>	<p>Noted. To be added as condition for detailed design prior to subdivision registration. (subject to revision to reflect most recent draft plan/block numbering).</p>
<p><b>Conditions to be met prior to registration of the plan</b></p>	
<p>6. The Developer shall place the following <b>notifications</b> in all offers of purchase and sale for all lots and/or dwelling units and agrees that these same notifications shall be placed in the City's subdivision agreement to be registered on title:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Purchasers and/or tenants of all lots or units abutting City owned lands are advised that abutting City owned lands may be fenced in accordance with the current standards and specifications of the City".</li> <li>• "Purchasers and/or tenants of all lots or units abutting City owned lands are advised that no private gates will be allowed into Blocks 6 and 7."</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. To be added as condition for subdivision registration.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purchasers and/or tenants of all lots are advised that the Stormwater Management Block has been vegetated to create a natural setting. Be advised that the City will not carry out routine maintenance such as grass cutting. Some maintenance may occur in the areas that are developed by the City for public walkways, bikeways and trails.”</li> <li>• “Purchasers and/or tenants of all lots are advised that the Open Space Block has been retained in its natural condition. Be advised that the City will not carry out regular maintenance such as grass cutting. Periodic maintenance may occur from time to time to support the open space function.”</li> <li>• “Purchasers and/or tenants of all lots or units are advised that the boundaries of the open space and stormwater management blocks will be demarcated in accordance with the City of Guelph Property Demarcation Policy. This demarcation will consist of black vinyl chain link fence adjacent to Blocks 6 and 7.” The Developer shall also send written notification of proposed demarcation types to any existing homeowners in lots adjacent to open space and stormwater management blocks.</li> <li>• “ The Developer shall also send written notification of proposed demarcation types to any existing homeowners in lots adjacent to open space and Stormwater management blocks.</li> </ul>	
<p>7. The Developer agrees to provide temporary signage describing the existing/proposed open space and required fencing on all entrance signs for the development, at the street frontage open space Block 6, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Planning and Building Services. The signage shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• advise prospective purchasers of dwellings in the area of the type of open space and/or level of maintenance of these parcels of land by the City;</li> <li>• clearly state that the maintenance of the open space blocks are the responsibility of the Developer until such time as the City accepts them, and</li> <li>• clearly state that all questions relating to the maintenance of the open space blocks shall be directed to the Developer.</li> </ul> <p>The signage shall be erected when rough grading on and adjacent to the building lots has begun and must be maintained by the Developer until acceptance of the Blocks by the City. The Developer further agrees that the proposed open space blocks, trails and fencing be identified on any marketing or promotional materials.</p>	<p>Noted. To be added as condition for subdivision registration.</p>
<p>8. The Developer shall <b>pay in-lieu of parkland conveyance</b> for the development, in accordance with the City of Guelph Official Plan Policies</p>	<p>Noted. To be added as condition for subdivision registration.</p>

<p>9. The Developer shall provide a satisfactory <b>long form appraisal report</b> prepared for the Corporation of the City of Guelph for the purposes of calculating the amount of payment in-lieu of parkland conveyance. The value of the land shall be determined as of the day before the day of the approval of the draft plan of subdivision. The long form 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 the Deputy CAO of Public Services. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if the long form appraisal provided by the applicant is not satisfactory to the Deputy CAO of Public Services, acting reasonably, the City reserves the right to obtain an independent appraisal for the purposes of calculating the amount of payment in-lieu of parkland conveyance</p>	<p>Noted. To be added as condition for subdivision registration.</p>
<p><i>Environmental Comments (Leah Lefler) – July 4, 2023</i></p>	
<p><i>Comment</i></p>	<p><i>Response</i></p>
<p><b>Preliminary Stormwater Management Report</b></p>	
<p>1. Opportunities to infiltrate runoff generated from rooftops in Block 3 should be explored.</p>	<p>The Block ID's have been updated on the most recent Draft Plan and Block 3 is now referred to as Block 2. Installation of infiltration galleries behind retaining walls is not considered good engineering practice. A retaining wall is required at this rear yard limit and therefore, we do not recommend installation of infiltration galleries within Block 2. We are recommending that runoff generated from rooftops in Block 2 is infiltrated in the SWM Facility.</p>
<p>2. Figure 5.4 illustrates that infiltration will occur during the winter months. Please confirm that infiltration during the winter months is the result of water infiltrating within the Torrance Creek PSW and not water infiltrating within the proposed end-of-pipe infiltration facility.</p>	<p>As confirmed by Ethan Barrand (January 12, 2024 - email attached), a winter by-pass valve is not required. Figure 5.4 in the Preliminary SWM Report illustrates that infiltration will occur year-round over the entire Site in post development conditions.</p>
<p>3. A surplus of 1,895 m<sup>3</sup>/yr in runoff directed to the wetland is proposed. The largest increases in runoff are proposed during summer months when swamps typically dry out, with runoff directed toward the wetland via a point source, which could result in localized death or dieback of trees. Opportunities to further reduce runoff should be explored.</p>	<p>Design revisions have now reduced the runoff surplus to 1394 m<sup>3</sup>/yr. On a monthly basis, pre-development runoff volumes are generally sustained.</p>

	With the removal of the winter by-pass valve, as noted above, there is no longer a point source of runoff being directed toward the wetland.
4. An infiltration surplus of 928 m <sup>3</sup> /yr is proposed. The Torrance Creek PSW has a recharge function. To further enhance recharge, a greater infiltration surplus may be considered to further reduce runoff.	See above, there are no further opportunities to provide infiltration.
<b>Environmental Impact Study</b>	
5. An EIS Addendum that assesses the potential for negative impacts based on the updated stormwater management design concept and monthly wetland water balance calculations is required.	Refer to the EIS Addendum (NRSI July 2024) that includes an updated analysis of the revised stormwater management approach and associated water balance information. No negative impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed stormwater management approach.
<i>Engineering and Transportation Services (Ethan Barrand) – June 30, 2023</i>	
<i>Comment</i>	<i>Response</i>
<b>Transportation Services</b>	
<b>Traffic and Transportation Planning Engineering</b>	
1. A scoped Transportation Impact Study (TIS) is required for the proposed subdivision. This was identified as a requirement by Staff in the first submission review in January 2019. We note that the requested TIS has not been submitted to date, however Staff are comfortable for the TIS to be completed at the detailed design stage if necessary. Please contact City staff for the TIS Terms of Reference. The primary purpose of the scoped TIS will be to determine the intersection control type on Arkell Road. Signalization could be triggered by converting the existing T-intersection to a 4-leg full intersection. Should signalization be warranted, the proponent is required to share the cost of design and construction. The TIS should take into consideration of the full buildout of residential development and the high school on the north side of Arkell Road.	Noted. Scoped TIS to be prepared at detailed design stage.
2. The City reiterates the request for a public right-of-way connection block to the adjacent property at 182 Arkell Road. This comment has not been adequately addressed with the current proposed 7 m easement through the parking area.  The connection block should be a minimum of 20 m to accommodate a local road ROW with sidewalks on both sides for future connection.	Based on email correspondence from Ethan Barrand (January 22, 2024, attached), it is understood that a potential easement connection is no longer required.

<b>Wastewater Services</b>	
3. Please relocate MH5A to private property as this is a private monitoring manhole.	The proposed roadway will be a Municipal Road. Therefore, MH5A will be municipally owned infrastructure located in a municipal ROW; not a private manhole.
<b>Development Review Engineering</b>	
<b>General</b>	
4. Please compress/optimize all PDF files before submitting: there should be no AutoCAD notes or other items included as comments in the PDF file as all required information should form part of the final compressed file. Please ensure all PDF documents are accessible as per the AODA, and appropriate headers/document structures are used to allow for navigation within the document, including linked elements within the TOC and lists of figures, tables and appendices. PDF files should also be unlocked to allow printing and commenting.	Noted.
5. A sidewalk is required on the north side of Arkell Road within the limits of this proposed plan of subdivision; design and construction of this section of sidewalk is at the cost of the developer, and this work should be shown on all submitted plans. The sidewalk is shown on the current submission however, please provide details for the proposed location of the sidewalk: are you working from an approved ROW cross section, or are you aligning this sidewalk with any existing sidewalk? Please show a more transitional connection to the existing sidewalk.	Noted that design and construction of the sidewalk is at the cost of the developer.  The sidewalk is offset by 1.5m from the property line as per the City of Guelph Typical Cross-Section for 30m right of ways.  A more transitional connection has been provided from the future 3.0m trail to the sidewalk at the existing bus pad.
6. Please remove any "future" verbiage on plans and documents related to the sidewalk fronting the property along Arkell, the trail to the east of the property and the Dawes Ave extension/connection. This work is to be completed by the Developer of the 190-216 Arkell Road property.	Revised as per comment.
<b>Draft Plan</b>	
7. We recommend rectilinear property lines at the rear and east of Block 3 for ease of drafting, and identification/demarcation.	The rear property line of Block 3 (now Block 2) is equivalent to the 30m wetland setback line as defined by the GRCA.

<p>8. Please show proposed property line radii at all curves/corners. Please identify the sightline triangles required at the intersection of Street 'A' and Arkeil Road, and provide appropriate property line radii, including the 30m wetland setback. Please show all curb and property line radii on the Draft Plan. A separate drawing showing road geometry including all required sightlines can be provided as an alternative to showing this on the Draft Plan. This must be shown on the draft plan or a separate drawing during the draft plan stage to ensure linework is feasible and will not be in conflict.</p>	<p>A separate drawing showing road geometry will be prepared to identify sightline triangles and property line radii at the detailed design stage.</p>
<p>9. Please update the draft plan, and all design and concept plans, such that the centreline of proposed Street 'A' aligns with the existing centreline of Summerfield Drive. Please provide evidence of this alignment on the draft plan. Upon review there is a callout, the line indicating the alignment appears to be missing.</p>	<p>The draft plan has been updated to show the centreline alignment of Street 'A' with Summerfield Drive.</p>
<p><b>Functional Servicing Report</b></p>	
<p>10. Section 5.3 paragraph 2: Please describe how the rear of Block 3 roof areas will be addressed, architecturally, can it be brought to the front of the building? Direct connections from the roof leaders to storm sewers are not accepted. Please review the possibility of a CWC sewer for the collection of Block 3 roof areas, can it be connected directly to the infiltration cell?</p>	<p>It is common for roof water to be brought to the front of housing units, if required. Architectural details will be finalized through detailed design.</p> <p>A two cell SWM facility with a wet cell and infiltration cell promotes groundwater recharge. The Torrance Creek Subwatershed Study identified an infiltration target of 150mm/year for the Site area. The proposed SWM strategy exceeds the infiltration target and therefore, we don't recommend the installation of a clean water collection sewer directly connected to the infiltration cell.</p>
<p>11. Figure 5.1 a) Monitoring MHs are required for both future blocks.</p>	<p>Future Site Plan applications will show MH's.</p>
<p>12. Figure 5.3 a) Combining the on-street units and future site plan units into one drainage area may complicate the future site plan approval process: if feasible these should be separated. This does not just include the building envelopes in the site plan, it includes the entire block.  b) All linear infrastructure should be placed in publicly owned blocks, and not placed within private property. Please adjust the property lines accordingly, in specific the</p>	<p>a) Revised as noted.  b) All linear infrastructure is now shown within lands to be publicly owned in the future.</p>



<p>drainage network at the north of the site shall be in its own designated block. Preferably a block for the infrastructure east of Dawes Ave and the property lines being rectilinear on the west so that the outlet is solely on public property.</p>	
<p>13. Appendix F Drawing AG1.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Why is the road connection between the existing Dawes Avenue and the proposed Street A identified as future works? This work is required as part of this subdivision's works.</li> <li>b) Please show slope percentages for grade raises in "future ROW" area; max cross slope within a ROW is 2%.</li> <li>c) Grading design for western property line &amp; interaction with existing residential land use: Please include swales at the bottom of any terracing and the top and bottom of any retaining walls sufficient to direct flows to the outlet and not onto the adjacent property. This plan needs to show grading and natural features (such as trees) on the adjacent property, to the extent necessary to identify and show all required mitigation such as tree protection, erosion and sediment controls, etc. Proposed grading and structures must be feasible while protecting the adjacent property.</li> <li>d) Some additional grading details are required now to demonstrate storm water servicing: please provide enough information to show how the major system will be contained and directed to an appropriate outlet, specifically indicating areas of depressed curbs.</li> <li>e) A 0.6m mow strip is to be provided surrounding all public trails.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Revised as per comment.</li> <li>b) Revised as per comment.</li> <li>c) In existing conditions the topography south of the Subject Lands' south property line drains south. As shown on the Grading Plan, a small width of the embankment (1 – 2 m wide) drains uncontrolled to the south in the proposed conditions. However, this drainage pattern is maintained from existing conditions. Therefore, the Subject Lands development does not increase the overland flow runoff to the south. A retaining wall is required along the south property boundary to connect to existing grades.</li> <li>d) Revised as per comment. Depressed curbs are designed on the major overland flow path and are identified on the Area Grading Plan.</li> <li>e) Revised as per comment. A 0.6m mow strip adjacent to trails is shown in areas with steep embankments.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Stormwater Management Report</b></p>	
<p>14. Section 2.4.1: The design infiltration rate (factored) does not appear to be calculated as per the DEM requirements. Please update the calculations per the DEM and include the details in the report.</p>	<p>The infiltration rates have been calculated as per the DEM requirements. Reference is made to Appendix H of the Preliminary Stormwater Management Report for details of the methodology.</p>

15. Section 5.2: SWMF Design Concept does not meet the city or MOE design guidelines. Quality control not as per MECP, the pond should be designed to provide 80% TSS removal (design flow, settling velocity and length, length/width ratio, etc.) – additional discussion with city staff is necessary to understand the design implications.

**Additional comments received from Ethan Barrand on December 19, 2023:**

Infiltration:

Per discussions with the City's Source Water team and reviewing the SWM Master Plan Appendix E – Infiltration Allowances, given the site constraints we will allow the infiltration of road runoff from the local road. As such, the passive valve is not required on the outlet MH leading to the infiltration cell.

As the pond is partially located within a WHPA V=10, please ensure a clay liner will be installed in the pond. It is noted that this is a detailed design item, however, if a note can be included on the draft plan, it would be appreciated.

Infiltration in Blocks 1 and 2 should not include runoff from parking surfaces or sidewalks.

Maintenance Access:

The maintenance access is not required as the OGS and pond are located in a short distance from the ROW. Furthermore, the trail creates public safety concerns. As such, we only ask that a flat/gently graded area be included leading up to the infiltration cell to allow maintenance access in the future, while also ensuring a camera truck, etc. can reach MH 101 and MH102.

During detailed design the use of turf-stone will be explored in this flat/gently graded area.

Settling Velocities and TSS Removal:

Currently settling velocities within the SWM Pond correspond to normal or basic removal. However, the actual pond length is greater, can you please show what this length equates to for settling velocities? Can it be extended to achieve enhanced removal?

The SWMF Design has been revised according to subsequent correspondence with Ethan Barrand (January 12, 2024, email attached) as detailed in the following.

Noted, passive valve for winter by-pass is no longer shown.

Noted, a clay liner is now shown under the SWMF on Figure 5.2.

We confirm that infiltration galleries have been sized for clean water only.

The SWMF Design has been modified to eliminate the maintenance access. A flat/gently graded area is located near the infiltration cell to allow for future maintenance and MH101 has been repositioned to allow access from this gently graded area.

Noted.

The actual pond length is now 27.0m, which corresponds to an average settling velocity of 0.00001300m/s and provides enhanced mass removal as shown in Appendix D of our updated Preliminary SWM Report.

16. Infiltration

- a) Please indicate specific infiltration targets for individual blocks 1 and 2 within Section 5.4. Additionally, please provide an assumed percent impervious or runoff coefficient for blocks that are anticipated to be used at the site plan stages.
- b) As per the DEM, infiltration galleries are to be no deeper than 0.6m. Please revise accordingly.
- c) Section 5.4: please provide reasoning as to why the block 1 infiltration gallery is using infiltration rates based off TP-103 and not considering TP-101? There is a substantial different in rates between locations, consider using an interpolated rate.

- a) Specific infiltration targets and percent impervious have been added.
- b) The depth of infiltration galleries has been revised to a maximum of 0.6m as per the DEM.
- c) Based on the subsurface stratigraphy contacted across the site (in all boreholes, monitoring wells and test pits), the subsurface stratigraphy typically comprised sand or sand and gravel overlying a finer grained deposit of sandy silt / silt / silt till. Typically, the fine-grained silt deposit is located below elevation 326m, other than within the southeastern portion of the site only (near TP101), where the silt layer is much closer to the surface. This is illustrated in Cross-Section B-B' on Figure 8 of the Hydrogeological Assessment Report completed by MTE. Based on the testpit and borehole findings, the subsurface stratigraphy at the base of the infiltration gallery proposed in Block 1 (Elevation 334.5 +/-) is sand and gravel. This stratigraphic unit is most similar to the soil contacted in TP103 based on review of particle size distribution analyses as well as testpit and borehole logs. The siltier fine grained soil unit tested at TP101 would not be representative of the proposed location of the Block 1 infiltration gallery. Therefore, it is not appropriate to use an interpolated rate, as it is not expected that the silt will be located within 1.5m of the base of the infiltration galleries. It is also noted that this the proposed gallery in Block 1 is a fill area – the infiltration properties of the imported soil will be specified to ensure that the required infiltration rate is met, and this

<p>d) Please review the infiltration gallery within block 2 and consider re-locating or adjusting to avoid any conflicts. It may be beneath utilities depending on the CUP at detailed design. Can it be located below the landscaped and asphalt area?</p> <p>e) How are post-development infiltration targets for the winter months so high? Please dis-include infiltration from the infiltration cell for winter months and note this in the report while providing updated wording, including months in which the cell will be off-line.</p> <p>f) Infiltration cell is acting similar to that of a pond, please design the side slopes as such.</p> <p>g) Please indicate what party would be responsible for controlling the by-pass to the gallery. Is there a less intrusive design that can be incorporated to allow for the bypass to be fully independent? Additional discussions may be required with City staff.</p>	<p>will be confirmed after soil import is completed through additional infiltration testing during construction.</p> <p>d) The exact location of the infiltration gallery in Block 2 will be determined through the Site Plan application process and can be shifted at that time if actual utility conflicts are anticipated.</p> <p>e) As confirmed by Ethan Barrant (January 12, 2024 - email attached), a winter by-pass valve is not required. As noted in S5.6.1 of the Preliminary SWM Report, infiltration is anticipated to occur over the winter months within pervious areas throughout the Site. The total on-site infiltration over the winter months is 1.5% of the annual infiltration volume and is therefore considered to be negligible.</p> <p>f) We are proposing 4H:1V slopes in areas of the infiltration gallery accessible to the public (i.e., adjacent to the access area). Since the remainder of the infiltration cell is not accessible, 3H:1V slopes should be acceptable. However, if needed, shallower slopes can easily be provided during detailed design as there is sufficient room in the SWM Block.</p> <p>g) A winter by-pass is no longer proposed.</p> <p>Please refer to the above response to 16 (c).</p>
--	--

<p><b>Additional comments received from Ethan Barrant on December 19, 2023:</b></p> <p>There are concerns with Block 2's infiltration rate using TP-103. This is quite far from the proposed infiltration cell. TP-101 should also be considered producing a lower infiltration rate.</p> <p>Please provide some additional clarity for TP102, 103 and 104 as to why additional testing was not preferred 1.5m below the infiltration base? For ease of reference, can you please note the elevation of the testing in regards to the base elevation of the infiltration cells?</p>	<p>All three areas represent a fill condition where the bottom of the proposed infiltration facility is above current grades.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1331 212 1839 453"> <thead> <tr> <th>Test</th> <th>Approx. Test Elev</th> <th>Bottom Infil. Facility</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TP102</td> <td>333.5</td> <td>335.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TP103</td> <td>333.2</td> <td>334.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TP104</td> <td>332.8</td> <td>334.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>As noted in S2.4.1 of the Preliminary SWM Report, imported material will have infiltration properties equal to or greater than the native material below at gallery locations.</p>	Test	Approx. Test Elev	Bottom Infil. Facility	TP102	333.5	335.3	TP103	333.2	334.2	TP104	332.8	334.2			
Test	Approx. Test Elev	Bottom Infil. Facility														
TP102	333.5	335.3														
TP103	333.2	334.2														
TP104	332.8	334.2														
<p><b>Hydrogeological Report</b></p>																
<p>17. Sections 3.6, 5.5 &amp; 7.3 (In-Situ Infiltration Rates):</p> <p>a) Is there more detail available concerning these field tests? From the basic description and limited data (data limited to location information in Figure 2 and results listed in Table 5.5), and based on the geological information included in the report, it does not appear the tests were completed as per DEM requirements.</p> <p>b) Design infiltration rates do not appear to be calculated in this report, however it should be noted that calculation must be as per the DEM, which requires use of the Credit Valley Conservation (CVC) Authority Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide 2010 Appendix C "Site Evaluation and Soil Testing Protocol for Stormwater Infiltration".</p>	<p>The infiltration rates have been calculated as per the DEM requirements. Reference is made to Appendix H of the Preliminary Stormwater Management Report for details of the methodology.</p>															
<p><b>Comments for later use (drafting conditions, detail design and/or site plan application)</b></p>																
<p>18. Subdivision will follow Assumption Model once draft approved.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>															
<p>19. Please include 0.3m reserves within Blocks 1 &amp; 3, and within the road block at the northern limit.</p>	<p>Shown on updated concept and draft plans.</p>															
<p>20. [As of April 25, 2019: Confirmation of the adequacy and availability of municipal servicing is not confirmed by the City of Guelph until such time as the Plan of Subdivision is registered. Any works completed by the Developer prior to the registration of the plan is at the Developer's sole risk.] The City of Guelph has reviewed this site for water supply</p>	<p>Noted.</p>															

<p>and distribution capacity: At this time there appears to be sufficient and adequate capacity in the City's existing water supply and distribution system to accommodate the currently proposed development. 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; if this scenario is expected, please contact the undersigned for more information.</p>	
<p>21. [As of April 25, 2019: Confirmation of the adequacy and availability of municipal servicing is not confirmed by the City of Guelph until such time as the Plan of Subdivision is registered. Any works completed by the Developer prior to the registration of the plan is at the Developer's sole risk.] The City of Guelph has reviewed this site for wastewater (sanitary) capacity: At this time there appears to be no downstream sanitary capacity issues to accommodate the currently proposed development.</p>	Noted.
<p>22. The consultant must review this site to ensure required basement separation from the shallow high ground water elevation, as per the DEM (2019).</p>	Noted.
<p>23. Please ensure the size and location of existing infiltration galleries on Arkell Road are shown on future engineering plans, and accounted for in the design. These are shown on the as-built engineering plans for this section of Arkell Road (See City of Guelph Drawing No. G-66B). The current design [as of Nov.2020] indicates additional flows to the existing infiltration gallery. Design and capacity still to be confirmed.</p>	Noted.
<p>24. The proposed density is supportive of nearby transit services, and commercial amenities are available within reasonable walking or cycling distances. The proposed street alignment encourages a future grid-network connection with Dawes Avenue, and aligns well with Summerfield. This is conducive to walkability and bicycling.</p>	Noted.
<p>25. The Urban Design Brief and other supporting documents do not acknowledge the proximity to the Active Transportation Network (ATN) which passes along Arkell just to the west before heading north toward Bathgate Drive. When complete, the ATN will permit users to travel across the city entirely off major roadways. The location of this proposed development is therefore well suited to encouraging more cycling amongst its occupants, consistent with the City's goals and objectives to increase cycling modal share. As a result, staff will want to see supporting amenities for bicycles included in the development. In the absence of private garages and driveways, the proponent will be asked during Site Plan to</p>	Noted. Supporting amenities for bicycles to be discussed and confirmed through site plan process.

demonstrate how long-term secure bicycle parking can be accommodated for those units without garages and private driveways.	
26. We recommend early discussions with utilities to ensure adequate space for placing their infrastructure. A Composite Utility Plan (CUP) will be required for Detail Design stage.	Noted.
27. Guelph Hydro a) Hydro supply for this development will be supplied from Arkell Road. b) The hydro services for this development will be underground except for pad-mounted transformers. c) A minimum distance of 3.0 metres must be maintained between any dwelling units and pad-mounted transformers. d) A minimum distance of 1.5 metres must be maintained between any driveways/entrances and street light poles or pad-mounted transformers. Any relocations required would be done at the owner's expense. e) Low-profile, pad-mounted transformers may be located in boulevards provided the boulevard width is not less than 3.5 metres.	Noted. Details to be confirmed through site plan process.
28. 5m road widening along Arkell Road.	Noted. This is shown on the draft plan.
29. Trail grades proposed will need to be refined once the trail grades are approved. The trail may need to be refined at detailed design.	Noted.
30. Due to high ground water elevation, at the detailed design stage, sanitary sewers are to be designed in accordance with section 2.9 of the MECP Design Criteria.	Noted.
31. A detailed noise study will be required during subdivision detail design.	Noted. To be added as condition for registration.
32. The Owner/Developer must provide City with the final documentation of the water well decommissioning.	Noted. To be added as condition for registration.
33. Source Water Protection  The property is located in a WHPA-A and B with a vulnerability score of 10.  The property is not located in an Issue Contributing Area.	Noted. Section 59 Policy Applicability Review Form included with this resubmission.  Preparation of Salt Management Plan/Risk Management Plan to be added as condition for registration (if required).

<p>Please complete and return a Section 59 Policy Applicability Review form. If you require assistance in completing the form, contact the City of Guelph's Risk Management Official at: 519-822-1260 ext. 2368 or <a href="mailto:peter.rider@guelph.ca">peter.rider@guelph.ca</a></p> <p>In accordance with Grand River Source Protection Policy CG-MC-29, please provide a Salt Management Plan. (Please submit an electronic version)</p> <p>Note: Ensure that any private water supply or monitoring wells that are no longer in use are abandoned in accordance with O. Reg. 903.</p> <p>In accordance with Grand River Source Protection Policy CG-CW-37, the applicant will need to indicate what DNAPL (if any) or other potentially significant drinking water threats will be stored and/or handled on the property. A Risk Management Plan may need to be developed.</p>	
<p>34. Traffic and Transportation Planning</p> <p>Appropriate on-street parking plan to be provided and dimension the parallel parking spaces. As per DEM and draft zoning by-law parallel parking spaces should be 6.5m X 2.6m. Additionally, if on-street parking is proposed between the driveways, minimum of 7m clearance to be provided between driveways.</p> <p>Proposed development does not identify any appropriate control measure (pedestrian and vehicle) at the access/intersection with Arkell Road and Summerfield Drive.</p> <p>Design brief dated December 2021, noted that the loading and storage area will be detailed at the site plan approval stage. Site specific details and additional traffic geometric plans will be reviewed at site plan approval process.</p>	<p>Noted. Specific details regarding on-street parking to be determined through site plan process.</p>
<p>35. Transit Planning</p> <p>Proposed development is about 60m from an existing stop (6077 Arkell at Amos westbound) on Route 5 Goodwin, that currently connects to the University of Guelph and will instead connect to the Clair Maltby terminal in 2031. The new units will likely increase the average boardings at this stop to warrant at least the installation of a bench, if not a shelter. Request that developer provide funding for this.</p>	<p>Noted. To be added as condition for registration.</p>



<i>Urban Design (Prerit Kaji) – August 9, 2023</i>	
<i>Comment</i>	<i>Response</i>
<b>Comments on the Submitted Concept Draft Plan</b>	
Require a 6m setback along Arkell Road to accommodate trees on site after Engineering Road widening.	Noted. Concept Plan is updated to provide a 6.0 metre front yard setback along Arkell Road. Details regarding tree plantings to be coordinated as part of detailed design.
Require a separate Common Amenity space associated with Block 2. Common amenity area for combined cluster and stacked, back-to-back, or stacked back-to-back townhouses shall be calculated on a block-by-block basis using the applicable zone requirements. For Block 2 requirement is 160sqm. Considering location of Street A, it is not safe to expect crossing of pedestrians to access a centrally located amenity space.	Block 2 (now labelled Block 3) is extremely limited in size. The provision of a common amenity space on this block is not feasible.  Furthermore, Table 6.18, subnote 5 in the City's Zoning By-law states that buildings with less than 20 units are not required to provide a common amenity area. Block 3 proposes 16 units.
As proposed, in Block 1 one stacked town block is back lotting onto Street A and the rear yard is only 4m away from the property line. Please consider flipping and aligning with the public road and creating a street wall. Parking lot to be reconfigured along with location of Common Amenity area.	Back-lotted stacked townhouse block on Block 1 has been removed. Other stacked townhouse block within Block 1 which fronts Street A provides a minimum of 4.5 metres from the stairs, 7.0 metres from the building façade.
Need more information on area of triangular spaces marked as Common Amenity areas in Block 1. Verify if they satisfy zoning requirements.	Proposed triangular amenity area provides approximately 732 m <sup>2</sup> of common amenity area, which exceeds the minimum requirement of 10 m <sup>2</sup> per unit for this block (640 m <sup>2</sup> ).
Minimum of 50% of common amenity area must remain contiguous in one single area and width to depth ratio should not exceed 4:1.	All common amenity area is contiguous and the width to depth ratio of the triangular area does not exceed 4:1.
Given the development's size a children's play area should be shown within the common amenity area in accordance with Built form standards for Midrise buildings and Townhouses; Section 6.3.	The design of the amenity area can be explored through the detailed design stage once draft approval is issued for the plan of subdivision and/or during the site plan process.
Common Amenity spaces fronting Arkell and Street A will be subject to a noise study. This may require high, concrete noise walls as part of the mitigation measures. Staff would advise to avoid	Acknowledged. To be included as draft approval conditions.

<p>such visual barriers and to resolve potential concerns, please reconfigure parking layout to accommodate CA space along the rear of stacked townhouses and along north property line of development. In other words, it appears there are alternative locations along the eastern property line. For Block 1 requirement is 640sqm.</p>	<p>Relocation of common amenity area to rear of stacks is not possible while achieving all other requirements.</p>
<p>Also, Common Amenity area shall be in any yard other than a required front yard or required exterior side yard.</p>	<p>Relocation of common amenity area to not be along exterior side yard is not possible while also achieving all other requirements.</p>
<p>Private amenity areas for ground level units in stacked townhouses, back-to-back townhouses and stacked back-to-back townhouses shall be a minimum of 10 m<sup>2</sup> in area and may be provided in the front yard on an unenclosed porch or balcony with no privacy screen. Private amenity areas for units below finished grade shall be a minimum of 10 m<sup>2</sup> in area and have a maximum 50% first storey projection above the below grade patio.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. This will be addressed at detailed building design.</p>
<p>Private amenity areas for above grade units in stacked townhouses, back-to-back townhouses and stacked back-to-back townhouses shall be a minimum of 10 m<sup>2</sup> in area, consist of a balcony and be defined by a wall or railing between adjacent units to a height of 1.8 m and a minimum depth of 1.8 m.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. This will be addressed at detailed building design.</p>
<p>Show a strong pedestrian circulation system that connects the pedestrians to the planned trail network. Avoid crossing roadways and internal drive aisles. Where required, include generous connections. Provide a minimum landscape buffer of 3m around the edge of surface parking areas for trees. The pedestrian circulation network requires further development.</p>	<p>For Block 1, pedestrian sidewalks are provided along both sides of the private drive aisle extending along the eastern side of the surface parking lot, as well as around the southern and western edges of the parking lot.</p> <p>A minimum landscape buffer of 3 m around the parking areas can be provided, and will be addressed during detailed design.</p>
<p>Create a more logical vehicular parking circulation after reconfiguring the parking lot, also consider how waste management will access the site.</p>	<p>Waste moloks are conceptually shown in the northeast corner of the parking area, and 12 m turning radii are shown on the concept plan to demonstrate that large trucks (including waste management trucks and emergency vehicles) can safely enter and exit the site.</p>
<p>Pedestrian sidewalks perpendicular to parking stalls should be wide (2m min) to ensure barrier-free access even when a vehicle overhangs the curb. Barrier-free curb ramps should also provide</p>	<p>2 metre wide pedestrian sidewalks can be accommodated where they are perpendicular to proposed parking stalls.</p>

<p>1.2m of clear, flat area at the top to allow users to travel past them without having to enter the slope.</p>	
<p>As part of the site plan process further detailed comments will be discussed including reviewing and finalization of building materials, landscaping materials and other site plan-level design elements will be completed through the site plan process. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lighting fixtures</li> <li>• Hardscape materials</li> <li>• Material types, colours</li> <li>• Railing materials and type</li> <li>• Type and material of benches</li> <li>• Long term bicycle storage for the stacked townhouses. Staff would like to see permanent bicycle storage on site that is protected from the weather and is secure. Sheltered bicycle parking should be integrated into the built form and not clutter the common amenity spaces.</li> <li>• Detail of common amenity areas</li> <li>• Detail of landscape areas</li> <li>• Rooftop mechanical screening details.</li> </ul>	<p>Acknowledged. Detailed design elements identified in this comment are more appropriately addressed through detailed site plan process and review.</p>
<p><b>Next Steps</b></p>	
<p>Look at alternatives to rearrange common amenity space to satisfy zoning requirements and restrict crossing of Street A to access Common amenity areas. Consider creating a street wall on eastern side of Street A, similar to On-street townhouses on western side. Consider removing Block 2 and integrate its units within Block 1 to create a pedestrian friendly street enclosure.</p>	<p>Block 3 does not require common amenity area in accordance with the Zoning By-law as it proposes less than 20 units. As such, crossing of Street A to access amenity area is no longer an issue.</p> <p>In order to provide a feasible common amenity area that meets the area requirements, the triangular amenity area as proposed in Block 1 is optimal and achieves the majority of the zoning requirements.</p> <p>Noise mitigation efforts can be recommended through the preparation of a Noise Study to assess the noise impacts from the proposed Street A. The recommended mitigation measures can be implemented through detailed design.</p>

<i>GRCA (Jessica Conroy) – August 17, 2023</i>	
<i>Comment</i>	<i>Response</i>
<b>Comments to be Addressed Prior to Detailed Design</b>	Noted.
<b>Engineering Comments</b>	
1. Catchment 204-1 is proposed to discharge to an existing infiltration gallery located in the boulevard adjacent to the Arkell Meadows subdivision SWM facility. The proposed grading indicates that additional flows are being directed to Arkell Road. Please confirm that the infiltration downstream system (infiltration gallery and receiving watercourse) have sufficient capacity.	A capacity check confirmed that the downstream storm sewer has capacity for 204-1 minor flows. Based on a review of available GRCA contour data and as-recorded plan and profile drawings, the drainage area to the gallery is approximately 2,600m <sup>2</sup> . The addition of catchment 204-1 is an increase in drainage area by 85m <sup>2</sup> , which equates to an increase of 3% of the existing drainage area. This increase is considered insignificant and should not negatively impact the existing gallery.
2. Catchment 204-2 hydrographs as well as C201-5,6 major hydrographs should be added to total flows to Torrance Creek Wetland Complex in the proposed conditions MIDUSS model.	Noted. The modelling will be updated to add 204-2 to the total hydrograph to the Torrance Creek Wetland complex.
<b>Ecology Comments</b>	
1. There seems to be inconsistency in the water balance numbers provided. It is indicated that both infiltration and runoff will increase, and it also appears that the sum total of recharge and runoff towards the wetland (125 mm/year) is less than the sum of the projected increases in site recharge (243 mm/year) and runoff towards the wetland (254 mm/year). Please provide more clarity on how these numbers were calculated	Refer to the updated EIS Addendum (NRSI July 11, 2024)
<b>Comments for Detailed Design</b>	
1. Details of lot level infiltration cells will need to be provided during detailed design. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The water balance calculations and hydrologic modeling will need to be updated based on the ultimate design of the infiltration cells.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to reduce the projected 35% increase in annual runoff towards the wetland.</li> </ul>	Noted.
2. Major and minor flow system details will need to be provided during detailed design.	Noted.
3. Grading details will need to be provided during detailed design.	Noted.
4. Erosion Control measures at outlets must be provided during detailed design.	Noted.
5. ESC plans will need to be provided during detailed design.	Noted.

<p>6. For Street A encroachment into the wetland buffer per section 7.5.2 of the EIS (NRSI December, 2021), enhanced ESC controls and landscape compensation plans for this area must be provided during detailed design.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>We advise the applicant that a permit pursuant to Ontario Regulation 150/06 will be required from the GRCA prior to any development or site alteration within the regulated areas on the property. The GRCA permit will be made a condition of draft plan approval.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

**From:** [Ethan Barrand](#)  
**To:** [Ken Hanes](#)  
**Cc:** [Valentina Lazic](#)  
**Subject:** RE: 190-216 Arkell - follow up discussions  
**Date:** January 22, 2024 2:42:52 PM

---

Some people who received this message don't often get email from ethan.barrand@guelph.ca. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi Ken,

Further to the previous email, I've clarified additional items below.

Infrastructure in Block 1:

- This can be moved to the east, so that infrastructure is solely in the future dedicated open space block. Any future maintenance of infrastructure is to be completed solely from the open space block, please keep this in mind during design.

182 Arkell Access:

- After additional discussions between City staff, the "Potential easement connection to future development at 182 Arkell Road" can be eliminated from the design.

Neighbouring concerns:

- The City Planner is to pass along these concerns to the developer. One big item is the construction of the retaining wall – this has also been comments on by City staff during previous submissions. Please ensure the wall is constructable and maintainable from the subject property, without disrupting features of the neighbouring property.

I hope the above assists with your design. Please feel free to reach out if needed.

Kind regards,

**Ethan Barrand, P.Eng.**  
Development Engineer  
Engineering and Transportation Services  
**City of Guelph**  
519-822-1260 extension 2250  
Mobile 226-820-6386  
[Ethan.Barrand@guelph.ca](mailto:Ethan.Barrand@guelph.ca)  
[guelph.ca](http://guelph.ca)  
[@cityofguelph](https://www.facebook.com/cityofguelph)

---

**From:** Ethan Barrand  
**Sent:** Friday, January 12, 2024 2:30 PM  
**To:** 'Ken Hanes' <KHanes@mte85.com>  
**Cc:** 'Valentina Lazic' <vlazic@mte85.com>  
**Subject:** RE: 190-216 Arkell - follow up discussions

Thank you for the virtual meeting yesterday. As mentioned, I am summarizing the main points below.

Infiltration:

- Per discussions with the City's Source Water team and reviewing the SWM Master Plan Appendix E – Infiltration Allowances, given the site constraints we will allow the infiltration of road runoff from the local road. Such, the passive valve is not required on the outlet MH leading to the infiltration cell.
- As the pond is partially located within a WHPA V=10, please ensure a clay liner will be installed in the pond. It is noted that this is a detailed design item, however, if a note can be included

on the draft plan, it would be appreciated.

- Infiltration in Blocks 1 and 2 should not include runoff from parking surfaces or sidewalks.

Maintenance Access:

- The maintenance access is not required as the OGS and pond are located in a short distance from the ROW. Furthermore, the trail creates public safety concerns. As such, we only ask that a flat/gently graded area be included leading up to the infiltration cell to allow maintenance access in the future, while also ensuring a camera truck, etc. can reach MH 101 and MH102.
- During detailed design the use of turf-stone will be explored in this flat/gently graded area.

Settling Velocities and TSS Removal:

- Currently settling velocities within the SWM Pond correspond to normal or basic removal. However, the actual pond length is greater, can you please show what this length equates to for settling velocities? Can it be extended to achieve enhanced removal?

Neighbouring concerns:

- The neighbour is concerned with this development. I am meeting with the resident next week and will be passing along concerns that I would like MTE to formally address either in the overall response matrix or under separate cover.

I hope the above helps. Please reach out if you'd like to discuss any other items prior to submittal.

**Ethan Barrand, P.Eng.**

Development Engineer

Engineering and Transportation Services

**City of Guelph**

519-822-1260 extension 2250

Mobile 226-820-6386

[Ethan.Barrand@guelph.ca](mailto:Ethan.Barrand@guelph.ca)

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

[Facebook.com/cityofguelph](https://www.facebook.com/cityofguelph)

[@cityofguelph](https://www.facebook.com/cityofguelph)

---

**From:** Ethan Barrand

**Sent:** Tuesday, December 19, 2023 12:57 PM

**To:** Ken Hanes <[KHanes@mte85.com](mailto:KHanes@mte85.com)>

**Cc:** Valentina Lazic <[vlazic@mte85.com](mailto:vlazic@mte85.com)>

**Subject:** 190-216 Arkell - follow up discussions

Hi Ken,

Following up to our discussions, please see the below:

Comment 12.b. – after some quick discussions with staff, the simplest response here is, please place infrastructure in publicly owned blocks. As such, please provide the infrastructure at the north end of Street 'A' within its own designated block.

Comment 14 – Upon further review, I will offer some additional comments

- Thank you for the clarity and memo noting the step method
- There are concerns with block 2's infiltration rate using TP-103. This is quite far from the proposed infiltration cell –TP-101 should also be considered producing a lower infiltration rate.
- Please provide some additional clarity for TP102, 103 and 104 as to why additional testing was not preferred 1.5m below infiltration base? Perhaps this is areas where the fill is to be placed and the current testing elevation is already 1.5m below infiltration base? For ease of reference, can you please note the elevation of the testing in regards to the base

elevation of the infiltration cells.

Comment 15 – prior to commenting, can you please provide the overlay of the WHPA vulnerability scores?

Please let me know if you'd like to discuss further or have any concerns with these comments, I can make myself available for another call.

Kind regards,

**Ethan Barrand, P.Eng.**

Development Engineer

Engineering and Transportation Services

**City of Guelph**

519-822-1260 extension 2250

Mobile 226-820-6386

[Ethan.Barrand@guelph.ca](mailto:Ethan.Barrand@guelph.ca)

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

[Facebook.com/cityofguelph](https://www.facebook.com/cityofguelph)

[@cityofguelph](https://www.instagram.com/cityofguelph)

-----  
This e-mail message (including attachments, if any) is intended for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender and erase this e-mail message immediately.