



August 31, 2021
Our File: 105172

City of Guelph
1 Carden Street
Guelph, ON N1H 3A1

Attention: Mr. Chris DeVriendt

Re: 20 and 37 Cityview Drive North
Draft Plan of Subdivision (File No. 23T-12502),
Zoning By-law Amendment (File No. ZC1208)
Response Letter

Dear Mr. DeVriendt,

In response to the comments received from the City of Guelph, we offer the following responses:

CITY OF GUELPH (Internal Memo dated October 12, 2017 from Jyoti Pathak)

Trail Grading:

Comment 1: The trail design needs to meet FADM guidelines of longitudinal/running slope of max. 5% and cross slope of 2% max.

- a) Drawing number 8 – Trail Plan and Sections include trail section having a longitudinal slope of 8 – 8.1%. This drawing needs to be revised to grade the trail longitudinally at 4% or less.
- b) Drawing number 3 doesn't label longitudinal slope on the trail. The drawing needs to be revised to indicate proposed longitudinal slope along the trail.

Response: *The trail has been revised to have slopes of no more than 4% where feasible in accordance with the Facility Accessibility Design Manual. Where it was not feasible to provide a slope of 4%, slopes of 5-6% has been provided.*

Comment 2: The trail design needs to meet trail operations standards to have 0.6 m wide (minimum) mowed grass strips, at 2% cross slope, along both of the edges of the entire 2.5 metre wide trail length. This would create a table surface (max 2% cross slope) width of minimum 3.7 m. (0.6m +2.5m +0.6m).

- a) 0.6 m wide mowed grass strips along both of the edges of the trail are not shown on any of the drawings. All the drawings (1, 2, 3, 8 and 9) containing trail need to be revised to include 0.6 m wide mowed grass strips.

Response: *The trail has been revised to include a 0.6m grassed strip on both sides of the entire trail.*

Comment 3: The trail design needs to include drainage swale on the higher side of the trail and in between the retaining wall and the trail.

- a) Add swale/swales on drawings number 1, 2, 3, 8 and 9.

Response: *A swale has been included on the high side of the trail and in between the retaining wall and the trail.*

Comment 4: A trail link is missing on the drawing number 8.

a) Add trail link to connect into the planned trail to the north directly behind the residential lots.

Response: *A trail link has been provided to connect the trail to the planned trail to the north. Due to grading constraints this trail cannot be designed as an accessible trail.*

Comment 5: There should be a consideration for not providing any retaining walls within the proposed public open space.

Response: *Where retaining walls are necessary, they have been provided on private property.*

CITY OF GUELPH INFRASTRUCTURE, DEVELOPMENT AND ENTERPRISE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS (Internal Memo dated October 24, 2017 from Adele Labbe)

Environmental Planning Comments:

1. Woodlands:

Comment 1: The EIS Addendum does not take a clear position in determining whether the westerly ELC plantation CUP 3-3 qualifies as Significant Woodlands. This determination is important because it sets the stage for level of protection and policy application. Please clarify.

Response: *To be addressed by others under separate cover.*

Comment 2: The EIS Addendum concludes that the easterly plantation is not considered significant woodland because it is not on a steep slope and does not support any noteworthy flora or fauna. In addition to those considered in the EIS, ecological functions to consider when evaluating the significance should also include: proximity to other woodlands or other habitats as well as water protection, as outlined in Table 7-2 of the Natural Heritage Reference Manual. In addition, the EIS also indicates that there is potential habitat for bat species-at-risk and therefore can't truly conclude whether or not the easterly plantation provides noteworthy animal species. Please consider these specific functions and provide confirmation as to whether the easterly plantation CUP3-3 should be considered significant or not. If it is determined to be significant, it is staff's position that the City's Core Greenlands System policies would allow consideration for removal and replacement (no net loss), which the NHS policies that are no in effect would not.

Response: *To be addressed by others under separate cover.*

2. Tree Compensation:

Comment 1: The EIS addendum indicates that a little over 1000 trees need to be compensated for with the proposed plan. Please confirm whether this number includes anticipated removals to facilitate the apartment block on the east side of the site. Furthermore, please provide a concept plan which illustrates how the trees can be compensated for on site, using a no net loss principle with respect to canopy cover and including a 3:1 tree replacement ratio that recognizes the City practice does not include accounting for regular landscaping as compensation (i.e., trees that would have been planted regardless of compensation for tree loss, such as street trees). Staff suggest that there is not adequate space on site to compensate for the canopy loss and that off-site compensation should be considered through providing cash-in-lieu, or providing a specific off-site compensation project that can be scoped into the EIR. Staff have previously indicated that there is a potential compensation project at Grange Road Park which is within the same ecological unit (i.e., Clyde Creek Subwatershed) and could include increasing the size of an already Significant Woodland within the City's NHS.

Response: *To be addressed by others under separate cover.*

3. Species at Risk:

Comment 1: To ensure no contraventions of the Endangered Species Act and because the ESA applies right up to the time of construction, the EIS Addendum recommends that the MNRF be consulted at the Environmental Implementation Report stage in order to determine whether any additional surveys for listed bat species are required. Because the proposed apartment block includes zoning lands that are treed and that could be habitat for bat SAR, Environmental Planning staff suggest that consultation with the MNRF Guelph District Office occur at this stage to allow the MNRF to contemplate the implications prior to the lands being zoned. The consultation could be limited to communicating to the MNRF the plan to consult in further detail as a condition of subdivision approval and/or after zoning.

Response: *To be addressed by others under separate cover.*

4. Water Balance:

Comment 1: The response to staff's previous concerns about the proposed deficit in recharge and increase in runoff are not satisfactory. The receiver of the water in this case is Clythe Creek, a coldwater tributary that is sensitive to change and baseflows which depend on groundwater and interflow. Furthermore, there are official plan policies which indicate that the water balance will match pre to post. Consider alternative stormwater design that incorporates a diversity of Low Impact Development techniques in effort to match the water balance and protect the natural environment.

Response: *We note that the City policies indicate that the site water balance "should" match post-development to pre-development. Where groundwater conditions and infiltration rates allow, lot level infiltration galleries have been provided. The recharge deficit under post-development conditions has been brought to 16% lower than under pre-development conditions. Due to low infiltration rates and groundwater conditions throughout the site a deficit of 16% is the closest to pre-development conditions we could achieve.*

Under the revised stormwater management design, the 2-year post-development flow rate to Clythe Creek has been brought as close as possible to the pre-development release rate. We note that the principal input to the Creek on the site are direct precipitation and the groundwater discharge and the very small reductions in inputs from surface drainage are insignificant and will not result in any negative impacts.

5. Thermal Impacts:

Comment 1: There are concerns with the reliance of a cooling trench to achieve thermal mitigation. Staff believe that alternatives should be examined to reduce risk of thermal impacts such as:

- Achieving a water balance in terms of meeting infiltration to reduce potential impacts to baseflows and temperature
- Achieving the water balance in terms of reducing the excess runoff volume through use of Low Impact Development techniques that may increase evapotranspiration and infiltration
- Consideration of alternative techniques including investigating of bottom draw, etc. Of interest would be an option to use night-time release mechanisms through the EIR. City staff would need to engage operations and maintenance staff for this option and could do so at a further point on the process.

Response: *The site recharge water balance has been brought to a deficit of 16% from pre-development conditions, due to the groundwater conditions and on-site infiltration rates, this is the best that could be achieved under post-development conditions. The cooling trench design has been revised to mimic that of another City approved cooling trench design.*

6. Trail Design:

Comment 1: Staff are not clear on whether or not the swale on the downslope/downstream side of the trail behind lots 62-78 is necessary given it conveys flows to a dissipation structure. Is there a way to dissipate flow along the entire trail length rather than concentrating it to disperse it again? This comment can likely be addressed at the EIR stage if the proponent is in agreement that: the proposed width of impact for the trail be kept a minimum and within the outer half of the buffer; and, that minor adjustments to the depth of lots 62-78 may be made at a further point in time, if necessary, in response to the detailed design.

Response: *Swale on the downstream side of the trail has been removed. Runoff generated in this area will sheet flow overland.*

7. Draft Plan:

Comment 1: Block 125:

- a) Revise the Draft Plan to remove proposed Block 125 from the floodplain entirely.
- b) Staff suggest that the western block limit be based on field visit and topography to minimize potential impacts to the Natural Heritage System in the long-term. Staff are available to visit the site in the field for focussed discussion regarding this prior to the next submission.

Response: *Block 125 has been removed from the draft plan.*

Comment 2: Block 127 includes a portion of the woodland. Is this portion of the woodland proposed to be removed? Please clarify.

Response: *Block 127 has been removed from plan and has been included with the open space/ wetland block.*

Comment 3: As per the comments above regarding trails, it should be noted that detailed design may influence the lot depth of proposed lots 62-78.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Comment 4: As per the water balance comments above, if necessary, revise the Draft Plan to provide space to meet the water balance.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

CITY OF GUELPH ENGINEERING AND CAPITAL INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES DEPARTMENT COMMENTS (Internal Memo dated November 1, 2017 from Jim Hall)

Slope Stability

Comment 1: We had not received any response on our previous comments 1 -3 and/or updated information regarding slope stability analysis conducted by Naylor Engineering Associates. The lots 77 and 78 proposed alignment of the trail is located on and east of the steep slopes (ref. Figure 3, EIS Addendum-2). The slope stability may be affected by proposed changes due to the trail alignment on the slope. Please, provide steep slope and setback information of the grading plan and conduct an updated slope stability analysis considering proposed changes on the slope. - ***Please provide full slope stability calculations/details: provide details for all three sections, provide the details of the calculations (printouts/results from Slope/W), include sections showing the critical slope failure and***

calculated factor of safety, etc. Please provide additional information on the assumptions made for the soil parameters: which were taken from boreholes/testing vs. local experience and literature values? Provide additional justification/basis for assumed values. Given the topography and proposed changes, is analysis of the slope through the SWMF/rail corridor necessary (please provide your engineering judgement/advice and include in the report as appropriate). Note that if not, it should be referenced in the report along with the rationale for not completing the analysis.

Response: *An updated slope stability analysis for lots 62-78 (now 65-79), and the slope through the SWM and rail corridor has been provided. Slope and setback information has been provided on the revised grading plans. The Total Development Setback previously provided by Naylor Engineering has been verified to be 7.0m off of the Top of Slope by Englobe Corp (Slope Stability Analysis, Dated December 14, 2020).*

Water Budget

Comment 2: The total recharge under post-development is estimated to be about 23% deficient. It is also mentioned that due to the seasonally high groundwater level and high silt content in the native soils infiltration structures cannot be constructed.

However, the proposed apartment block 109 soil appears to be conductive and groundwater is deep therefore is could be suitable for infiltration to compensate recharge component of water budget for subdivision. We had discussed this with the consultant at our last meeting, however, there are no discussions in the test of the report and there are no pre and post-development hydrological model or recharge targets provided for the Block 109. Please, provide pre and post-development recharge and runoff rates for the block including and additional amount of recharge to compensate for the lack of recharge proposed for the remainder of the subdivision.

Also the area around BH 105 may be suitable for infiltration because it has the 1 metre separation. – ***The report still does not appear to provide specific and detailed pre and post development recharge and runoff rates/targets for the apartment block. The report should also discuss water balance, and identify additional opportunities for addressing the deficient recharge volumes; as per the City of Guelph Official Plan policies and Development Engineering Manual requirements, post-development infiltration must strive for meeting pre-development conditions. In addition, the report should discuss impacts on the existing wetland(s) and water course(s) due to the concentration of, and increase in, surface runoff volume expected under post-development conditions.***

Response: *The proposed apartment block has been removed from the Draft Plan for the Cityview Ridge Subdivision. As discussed, lot level infiltration galleries have been provided, where suitable, to infiltrate rooftop runoff, these galleries have decreased the post development to recharge deficit to 16%.*

Comment 3: Section 4.7 of stormwater management report discusses water budget estimates based on hydrogeological investigation report (refer Section 5 – Appendix C). There are no detailed water balance analysis calculations provided in support of water budget estimates as requested in our previous comment #4. Please, provide detailed pre and post-development site specific monthly water balance analysis based on Thornthwaite method and demonstrate maintaining pre-development recharge and runoff rates to post-development rates. - ***Thornthwaite calculations were provided in 3rd submission but may require additional review/comments during detailed design. Site design does not maintain pre- to –post recharge and runoff rates, as required.***

Response: *Detailed monthly water balance calculations have been provided in the current submission. Infiltration structures have been provided at all locations possible. The post-development recharge deficit has been brought to 16%. We believe this is the closest we can get to maintaining a water balance from post-development to pre-development conditions.*

Comment 4: On-site infiltration tests should be done for potential areas of infiltration in order to design infiltration structures accordingly. ***The consultant's conclusion is based on borehole data only, not on-site testing. On-site testing has been requested, is appropriate for this type of in-situ soil condition, and is required as per the City of Guelph Development Engineering Manual. Please complete the required testing and incorporate the results in the next submission, updating the design/conclusions as required. Note that in-situ infiltration testing should be completed at various locations to support the final infiltration assumptions/design; for areas of recharge and for areas where recharge is deemed not feasible.***

Response: *Acknowledged. Permeameter testing has been completed throughout the site. The Permeameter Testing Report completed by CMT Engineering Inc. has been appended to the Preliminary Servicing and Stormwater Management Report.*

Comment 5: Resolved.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Stormwater Management Facilities

Comment 6: Based on borehole BH103 information provided in geotechnical report the location appears to be within the proposed SWM pond footprint and monitoring data provided in hydrogeological report, confirm the seasonal high groundwater elevation at this location is about 344.44m (Refer Appendix B – April 8, 2008 and April 18, 2013). Both proposed SWM bottom elevation (i.e. 339.35m) and overflow weir level (i.e. 340.95m) are below the groundwater elevation, thus pond will be filled with groundwater and there will be no capacity available for runoff treatment. Please provide clay liner up to seasonal high groundwater level or suggest alternative mitigation measures, if any. - ***The revised report indicates a proposed clay layer only to 340.64, which was the indicated groundwater level on Aug. 6, 2006. Groundwater elevation measurements provided by GM in Appendix C indicate the highest gw @ 344.52 in the upper and 342.494 in the lower standpipes. Existing ground elevation is 344.44, future at this location is 339.35 within the pond, with pond spill-over elevation of 340.95, and elevation adjacent to the pond between 341.14 and 342.72. Please provide engineering judgement and justification for the SWMF design with regards to the observed seasonally high groundwater levels, ensuring the designed pond will have sufficient capacity.***

Response: *The clay liner has been revised to extend to an elevation equal to that of the top of bank, 341.15m, the clay liner will serve as a barrier between surface and ground water flows ensuring that there will be no capacity loss in the stormwater management facility.*

Comment 7: Resolved.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Comment 8: A stormwater conveyance channel has been proposed downstream of the Stormceptor (STC 14000) unit to convey major and minor stormwater flows generated from catchments B2a and B2c to the existing pond. Based on the information provided in the Table 9, the velocities of conveyance channel are too high for grass cover and may cause erosion and overtopping. There are several approaches to designing channel; either increase channel cross-section or the swale can be reinforced with rip-rap/turf reinforcement matting that can withstand a higher velocity. Alternatively, move settling basin at upstream of the channel to reduce velocity for settling particles. – ***channel now designed with turf stone surface and rip-rap at the upstream end of the channel. Flows downstream of stormceptor include unmitigated flows... shouldn't all flows be included in the pre-treatment?***

Response: *The stormceptor has been moved to capture all flows from Catchment B2c.*

Comment 9: The proposed 2m x 1m and 65m long cooling trench energy dissipation structure appears to be designed for 2 year – 100 year and Regional storm. The percentage reduction in velocity at outlet is estimated from 91-94.1%. The percentage factor of safety estimated for available heat transfer rates ranges from 3094-26617% more than the required rates that are due to assumptions made in selection of the input parameters and increasing effective area of the trench. Please, revise the design and provide profile showing ground and groundwater elevations; also, justify the proposed size of cooling trench could be able and effective under major flow events. - ***Some of the assumptions used for the design of the cooling trench do not appear to be consistent with anticipated site conditions (eg. ambient temperature of the stone medium, physical property assumptions, trench design). Some of the calculations shown in the appendix contain typos, are missing parameters, and don't appear to be consistent with the design parameters of the trench shown on the plans (eg. not accounting for void space from distribution pipe and/or accounting for more trench area than the steady-state water flow will see, heat transfer coefficient calculation inconsistent with documented equations, heat transfer rate not accounting for contact time, time to temperature equilibrium, etc.).***

In addition, and more importantly to the above comments, this style of cooling trench design has documented evidence of not performing as well as the theory suggests, as discovered through research and monitoring of near-by cooling trenches of similar design (Grange Hill subdivision & Hanlon Creek Business Park). Please review options for improving the design including deepening the trench, providing interaction with cooler ground water, lengthening the time of contact with the cooling medium, etc.

Response: *The design of the cooling trench has been revised to reflect that of other, effective, cooling trench designs in the City.*

Comment 10: It is our understanding that an energy dissipation structure and a cooling trench structure are different from each other. The energy dissipation structures are designed to provide frictional resistance to the flowing water in order to reduce the velocity. The kinetic energy dissipated due to the internal friction offered by a media (e.g. stone) to the flowing water that causes heat generation transferred to the media and surrounding atmosphere. On the other hand, cooling trenches are designed to mitigate thermal impacts of stormwater. The theory suggests the process of heat exchange between the surrounding media and comparatively warm water by increasing retention time through trench internal material (i.e. sand, gravels and larger stone) that provides the cooling benefits prior to discharging to receiving system. Please, justify. – ***Cooling trench design should be optimized for the more frequent storm events, up to the 25 year storm (please show sample calculation for the 25 year storm). Beyond this, cooling may not be necessary, and a secondary spill point with energy dissipation should be considered.***

Response: *The cooling trench calculations have been included for the 25-year design storm event. The revised cooling trench serves to reduce the temperature of the inflow from 36°C to 24°C, while achieving a safety factor of 1,178% for the 25-year design storm event. Additionally, the cooling, and dispersion elements of the structure have been separated.*

Neighbouring Wells

Comment 11: The active off-site private wells should be monitored to ensure that the proposed development does not impact well water quality or quantity. The program will be used for pre-development during construction and post-development monitoring. The adjacent development is also developing a monitoring program that the developer may want to coordinate with. – ***Please update City staff on the planned private well monitoring program.***

Response: *The development of the Cityview Subdivision between the subject lands and existing properties developed with wells along Cityview Drive should have more direct impact and their monitoring program will have addressed this issue.*

Noise Barrier Location

Comment 12: Resolved.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Additional comments from this review:

Comment 13: Please expand on the water and sanitary serviceability for this subdivision: the report indicates extending services through the existing SWMF block, and connecting into Cityview Drive however this may not be possible based on the depth of the sewer and the room available for sewer easements (as per City of Guelph standards). Also, existing servicing appears to route through proposed Lot 116 on Henry Court, under the proposed retaining wall: please verify and show the location of existing services in this area and ensure a sufficient clear block/easement is provided to protect City assets.

Response: *Servicing for this subdivision is to be through connections to extended services on Cityview Drive. Services are not to be extended through the stormwater management block or proposed lot 116.*

Comment 14: Please review and confirm imperviousness identified in various catchments in and around this subdivision phase. For example, catchments B2a, B2b and B2c are identified as having 42-46% impervious; however they seem comparable or more impervious than catchments in the eastern portion of the subdivision.

Response: *We have calculated the imperviousness of Catchment 201 to be 39%, given this we believe that the imperviousness used for Catchments B2a, B2b and B2c are accurate, if not conservative. Catchment 201 will remain identified as having an imperviousness of 65% to maintain a factory of safety in the design of the stormwater management facility.*

Comment 15: The engineering drawings identify sidewalks on both sides of every street, however City standards only permits a sidewalk on one side of roads with 18m right-of-way. When revising the design, please coordinate sidewalk locations with the City Planner and with the adjacent lands.

Response: *The engineering drawings have been revised such that there is only one sidewalk on 18m right-of-ways.*

Transportation Services

Comment 16: As per the 2014 Traffic Impact Study, the acceptable sightlines could be maintained only after adjustments were made to the vertical curvature along Cityview Drive at Street 1 for inbound and outbound traffic. We require the consultant to provide plans showing sightlines at this intersection. Should the plans illustrate any visual obstructions, remedial measures would be required to mitigate the impact.

Response: *The intersection of Street 1 and Cityview Drive has been eliminated. No sightlines analysis has been provided.*

Comment 17: We are concerned about the sharp turn on Street 4 at the southeast corner of the site. This turn should be designed in compliance with City's Development Engineering Manual.

Response: *The corner at Street 4 has been revised to be in compliance with the City's Development Engineering Manual.*

Comment 18: The consultant is suggested to explore a pedestrian connection from lower Henry Court to Cityview Drive. It would support shorter walking distance to the park block 126.

Response: *To be addressed by others.*

Comment 19: It is also anticipated that Traffic Engineer will require “no parking anytime” be installed and shall be provided on an on-street parking plan for our review and comment:

- a) within 15m of an intersection;
- b) within 15m of the termination of a cul-de-sac;
- c) within 15m of any pedestrian refuge island;
- d) on the inside curve (radius) of any horizontal curve with a radius of approximately 10m or less;
- e) on one side of any local street in the subdivision that is less than 9m in width curb-to-curb;
- f) along the frontage of a park block; and
- g) possibly along the divided entrance street, depending on the asphalt width curb-to-curb.

Response: *To be addressed by others.*

Transit Services

Comment 20: Please ensure the developer is informed that Transit has no current or future plan to offer service any closer than currently offered, Grange Rd. to the North and York Rd. to the South.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

CITY OF GUELPH PARKS PUBLIC SERVICES – PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT COMMENTS (Internal Memo dated August 25, 2017 from Jyoti Pathak)

1. Zoning Bylaw Amendment:

Proposed Zoning:

Comment 1: The following Proposed zoning for the park and open space blocks are satisfactory:

1. Block 126 - P.2 (Neighbourhood Park) Zone
2. Block 129 - P.1 (Conservation Lands) Zone and
3. Block 130 - P.1 (Conservation Lands) Zone and WL (Wetland) Zone

Show the existing wetland located at the north property line within Block 130 on the proposed zoning plan.

Response: *Zoning has been amended to reflect P.2, P.1 and WL zoning as requested.*

2. Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision

Parkland Dedication:

Comment 1: The current draft plan of proposed subdivision proposes a development area of 17.68 ha and an undevelopable open space of 6.00 ha. The draft plan includes a 0.599 ha park block (Block 126).

Park block 126 is proposed to be an addition to the future park block just north of the subject property. The size of parkland dedication provided on the proposed draft plan in the form of Block 126 is satisfactory to Parks Planning & Development.

Response: *To be addressed by others.*

Park Block Location:

Comment 1: A centralized neighbourhood park (Block 126) is proposed in conjunction with the park block included in the adjacent draft plan proposal to the north to create a larger neighbourhood park between the two developments. The park size and location meets the following objectives:

1. A Park located within a service radius of 500 metres as identified in Section 7.12.11 of the City of Guelph Official Plan and Recreation, Parks & Culture Strategic Plan.
2. It is expected to contain the recommended sufficient tableland for a neighbourhood park (80%) and be well drained - Section 7.12.11 of the City of Guelph Official Plan.
3. The minimum size should be 1.0 hectare (2.5 acres) so that a variety of outdoor recreation activities may be accommodated.

Response: *Noted.*

Basic Park Development:

Comment 1: The developer will be responsible for the Basic park development. The basic park development will include clearing, grubbing, site grading, storm water drainage, topsoil and sodding of the Park block. The costs of the following items shall be direct developer responsibilities as a local service:

- Base parkland development of lands conveyed to the City in connection with development including, but not limited to, the following:
 - clearing and grubbing;
 - topsoil stripping and stockpiling, (Topsoil or any fill or soils shall not be stockpiled on parkland without the approval of the City);
 - parkland shall be free of any contaminated soil or subsoil;
 - servicing – water, hydro, stormwater, sanitary, electrical, fibre/phone, catch basins, meter and meter boxes to a point just inside the property line as per City's requirements. This includes providing a catch basin, manhole, access boxes and meter boxes within the park property; rough grading (pre-grading) and the supply of topsoil to the required depth as per City's requirements;
 - parkland shall not be mined for engineering fill and replaced with fill or topsoil;
 - parkland shall be conveyed free and clear of all encumbrances; all parks are to be developed to the locally accepted "basic park development" standard which includes all aspects up to fine grade, topsoil and sod; which is to be maintained up to park acceptance.
 - The park blocks shall be graded to meet approved parkland grade, including any associated infrastructure requirements (retaining walls, drainage, etc.) and sodded to minimize erosion and dust.
 - Temporary fencing may also be required where there is no permanent fence to prevent illegal dumping; temporary park sign advising future residents that the site is a future park. Perimeter fencing of parkland to the City's standard located on the public property side of the property line adjacent land uses (residential or non-residential) as required by the City, or other approval authority.

Response: *To be addressed by others.*

Park Block Lot Frontage:

Comment 1: The current draft plan of proposed subdivision has identified approximately 46.46 m of Lot Frontage along Street Number 4 and approximately 82 metres along Street Number 1 for the 0.599 ha park block 126.

Based on the size of the park, the amount of lot frontage proposed for park block 126 is satisfactory to Parks Planning & Development.

Response: *To be addressed by others.*

Phasing Plan:

Comment 1: The park block and the open space blocks should be included in the first Phase of subdivision development to ensure their availability for park and trail development at an early stage of the subdivision development.

Response: *To be addressed by others.*

3. Preliminary grading, drainage, Servicing and Stormwater Management:**Preliminary Park Block Grading:**

Comment 1: It appears that the park block can be designed to meet City standards for park block development. However the park block grading needs to be refined at the Environmental Implementation Report stage to be consistent with Section 7.12.11 of the City of Guelph Official Plan regarding recommended table land for a neighbourhood park (80%).

Response: *The grading of the park block has been designed as per section 5.3 of the City of Guelph's Development Engineering Manual.*

Park Block servicing:**Storm water drainage:**

Comment 1: Provide appropriate manholes/catch basins on the street in front of the park which will have the capacity to accept surface water drainage and storm pipe connections from the future park. The park is proposed to have 50% of the area as paved and 50% as grass.

Response: *Storm sewers and manholes have been provided adjacent to the park block which will accept stormwater via surface and pipe flow for the built-out condition. Additionally, the storm sewers have been appropriately sized for the park block with an imperviousness of 50%. At the detailed design stage, catchbasin locations will be determined.*

Electrical:

Comment 1: Provide electrical servicing for the park at the property line.

Response: *Will be included on the final subdivision design plans.*

Water:

Comment 1: Provide water service for the park at the property line.

Response: A water service for the park has been provided at the property line.

4. Pedestrian Trail System

Preliminary grading and drainage design of the Pedestrian Trail System:

Open Space Blocks 127, 128, 129 and 130:

Comment 1: Demonstrate prior to the draft plan approval that a trail system within the open space blocks can be designed to meet City's current standards, Facility Accessibility Design Manual and Storm Water Management design guidelines. Normally a clear width of minimum 6 metre is required to accommodate a 2.5 metre wide trail with 0.6 metre minimum mowing strips along each side, drainage swale/swales and buffer planting adjacent to steep slopes.

Response: Trail design has been revised to include a 0.60m wide grassed strip on each side of the 2.5m wide trail. Longitudinal slopes have been designed to meet the City's Facility Accessibility Design Manual.

Comment 2: The grading and drainage design of the trail system within the Open Space Blocks 127, 128, 129 and 130 isn't satisfactory as the design doesn't meet the City trail standards and/or accessibility requirements. The trail design is to be modified as follows:

- a) **Clear width:** Provide a minimum 6 m clear trail width for a 2.5 metre wide trail.
- b) **Grass mowing strips:** Add 0.6 m wide mowing strips at a cross slope of 2% along both sides of the 2.5 m wide trail surface along the entire length of the proposed trail.
- c) **Buffer planting:** Add space for 1 m wide min buffer planting in between the outer edge of the grass mowing strip and the edge of the downward slope.
- d) **Drainage swale:** Provide drainage swale in between the proposed retaining wall and the grass mowing strip on the higher side of the trail. Retaining walls if provided along the trail system are to be located entirely on the private property.

Response: As per the email from Jyoti Pathak (dated October 12, 2017), pedestrian trails have been designed to be 2.5m wide with 0.60m wide grassed strips on both sides of the trail. Longitudinal slopes between 2% and 5% have been provided where feasible. The maintenance access for the stormwater management facility has been designed in accordance with section 5.7 of the City's Development Engineering Manual.

Accessibility:

Slope:

Comment 1: Trail shall have a running slope not steeper than 1:25 (4%) and have a cross slope not steeper than 1:50 (2%) and as specified under section 4.1.4 of the Facility Accessibility Design Manual.

Response: As per the email from Jyoti Pathak (dated October 12, 2017), slopes along pedestrian trails have been designed to be between 2% and 5%, where feasible.

Rest areas:

Comment 1: In all situations, rest areas shall be provided at a minimum of every 150m +/- 50m to accommodate challenging site conditions. An additional trail rest area shall be provided when trail lengths between 150 m and 300 m have two or more sections of trail with slopes greater than 4% and the length of those

sections add up to 100 m or more. Trail rest areas associated with slopes greater than 4% shall be located at the top. In certain circumstances additional rest areas may be required by staff to accommodate challenging site conditions. For trails with entrance(s) from adjacent roadways, consider providing a rest area for at least one trail entrance. Consider placing the rest area at the entrance that has the highest anticipated usage.

Response: *Trail alignment has been approved by the City.*

Comment 2: Show the full extent of the proposed trail system on the 'Trail Plan and Sections' (Drawing # 8 and 9).

Response: *Acknowledged, full extent of the trail system has been provided on the Proposed Trail Alignment Plan (GM BluePlan Engineering Limited, Drawing No. 9).*

Comment 3: Provide revised trail grading and drainage plans prior to the Draft Plan approval to demonstrate that the trail system can be designed to meet the current city standards and accessibility guidelines.

Response: *Acknowledged, trail grading and drainage plans have been provided.*

Comment 4: The engineering drawings will need to be further refined at the Environmental Implementation Report stage to be consistent with the Guelph Trail Master Plan, facility Accessibility Design Manual, Design Principles for Storm Water Management Facilities and City's current standards for trail development.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Comment 5: The rough grading and drainage work for trails will be completed prior to the registration of the draft plan.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

5. Environmental Impact Study - Addendum # 3

Tree Preservation:

Comment 1: Park planning doesn't support any tree preservation anywhere within the park block 126. Remove the text recommending tree retention on the park block within the Section 4.0 Review of Revised Draft Plan on pages 8 and 9. Remove the park block 126 and the proposed walkway block north of the Lot 62 from the proposed tree retention areas.

Response: *All trees will be removed from the park block as requested – see Memorandum provided by North-South Environmental Inc.*

Comment 2: The park block on the subject subdivision is proposed to become an addition to the park proposed just north of this subdivision. Both the park blocks will form one neighbourhood park. This park is proposed to become an active neighbourhood park which will serve two subdivisions. Preserving a hedgerow in the middle of the park will pose an obstacle to the desired park grades and the usable tableland will be significantly reduced; and will divide the park in two separate parts.

Response: *All trees will be removed from the park block as requested – see Memorandum provided by North-South Environmental Inc.*

Trail alignment:

Comment 1: Revise the trail alignment Figure 3 of the Addendum # 3 and modify as follows:

1. Show the missing trail section behind lots 66 to 62 and a connection along north of Lot 62 through a 6 m wide walkway block to Street No. 4. **Refer to the attachment # 1 for the proposed trail alignment.**

Response: *Proposed trail alignment has been designed as per the email from Jyoti Pathak (dated October 12, 2017) with 0.60m wide grassed strips on both sides of the 2.5m wide trail.*

Environmental Implementation Report:

Comment 1: An Environmental Implementation Report (EIR) will be required. The EIR will address the recommendations related to trail system and natural open space system, including detail design of the trail system; preparation of Landscape Plans and details to address demarcation, removal of hazard trees along the trail system and residential properties; clean-up of debris and waste; restoration; compensation and enhancement planting for opens spaces and buffers; invasive species management; design of educational/ interpretive and stewardship materials/ signage.

Response: *To be addressed by others.*

Landscape Plans:

Comment 1: Detailed Landscape Plans will include compensation, restoration and enhancement planting, property demarcation, signage, structures etc. as per the City's design standards and specifications. The landscape plans will be reviewed and approved in conjunction with the EIR. Developer will be responsible to implement the approved landscape plans and to deposit a security for the landscape works. The security will be partially released after the substantial completion of the works and fully released after the final approval at the end of two years warranty period as per the City's specifications.

Response: *Acknowledged, to be addressed in the detailed Landscape Plans.*

Trail Plans:

Comment 1: Detailed trail layout, grading and drainage plans showing trail design details such as signage, trail gates, structures, etc. will be provided in the Environmental Implementation Report consistent with Guelph Trail Master Plan standards. The trail design will be consistent with (Guelph Trail Master Plan) GTMP standards as appropriate to the site conditions and other City Guidelines i.e. Facility Accessibility Design Manual etc. The trail plan, design and construction will comply with all relevant regulations applicable to trail management made under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005.

Response: *Acknowledged, to be addressed in the detailed Landscape Plans.*

Trail rules signage:

Comment 1: There should be a recommendation on the desirable locations and content of trail rules signage to educate the users on expected behaviours while using the trails. Their locations, design and details will be shown on the EIR trail plans.

Response: *Acknowledged, to be addressed in the detailed Trail Plans.*

Open Space Works and Restoration:

Comment 1: The developer is required to seed and plant the open space to restore the disturbed areas, enhance buffers and to carry out other works as recommended through EIS and EIR. Provide management of the trees within natural open space behind the proposed residential lots including removal of hazard trees and invasive species.

Response: *Acknowledged, to be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report.*

Interpretive signage:

Comment 1: The environmental interpretive signage will be required along trail routes adjacent to the natural heritage features to provide resident education on the area's environmental features. Their locations, design and details will be shown on the landscape Plans.

Response: *Acknowledged, to be addressed in the detailed Landscape Plans.*

Demarcation:

Comment 1: City's standard black vinyl chain link fence is recommended to demarcate private lot lines along the park block and walkway block property lines and rear lot lines along adjacent protected Open Space/Natural Areas to limit encroachment.

The final configuration of the fencing will be determined during the detailed design stage and presented in the Environmental Implementation Report which will include a demarcation plan.

Response: *Acknowledged, to be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report.*

Stormwater Management Facility Signage:

Comment 1: City requires stormwater management pond educational and rules signs to be designed and installed at all stormwater management facilities (Blocks 127 and 128). Their design and locations will be approved by Parks Planning during EIR stage.

Response: *Acknowledged, to be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report.*

Please find enclosed the following documents for your review and approval:

- Engineering Drawings for the Cityview Ridge Subdivision (GM BluePlan Engineering Limited, Revision 8, Dated 08/30/21)
- Revised Preliminary Servicing and Stormwater Management Report (GM BluePlan Engineering Limited, August 2021), including Revised Water Budget, Cooling Trench Calculations.

Yours truly,

GM BLUEPLAN ENGINEERING LIMITED

Per:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Angela Kroetsch'.

Angela Kroetsch, P.Eng.
AK/pg

cc: Pratchi Patel, City of Guelph
Nancy Shoemaker, Black, Shoemaker, Robinson and Donaldson Limited
Carson Reid, Carson Reid Homes Limited
Bill Banks, Banks Groundwater Engineering Limited

W:\Guelph\105-2005\105172\Documents\Correspondence\105172 Response Letter_City of Guelph 5 - 2021-08-31.docx