Comment and Response Matrix - Pre-Submission Comments
316 Grange Road, Guelph
October 2026
PRE25-015D

Comment Number	Comment	Response
Development Planning, Eric Rempel		
1.	An amendment to the 1995 Zoning is not necessary, this can be removed.	Noted. The Planning Justification Report has been updated accordingly.
2.	Range of uses: note that the request should read that Section 6.3.1 and section 6.3.2 should apply to singles and semis respectively, not tables 6.3.1 and 6.3.2.	Noted. The Planning Justification Report has been updated accordingly.
3.	Maximum garage width of 6 metres for detached dwellings: Is this necessary to achieve a 2 car garage? 5 metres was included in the by-law specifically with the intent of permitting 2 car garages. Note that the definition of garage width relates to the width of the garage door, not the interior space of the garage itself. Staff recommend removing this site specific request, as it is not necessary to achieve the stated objective. **Garage width** means the width of the **garage** opening measured from the inside walls of the **garage** door frame. In the case of a multiple door **garage** including a divider between the **garage** doors, the width will include all **garage** openings and the divider.	Please refer to Planning Justification Report. The two single detached lots have narrow frontages and then widen to pie-shaped lots. They have lot depths that exceed 40 metres and lot widths of 12 metres within 11.3 metres of the street. Both lots are quite large (828.3 square metres, 537.6 square metres). The size and unique configuration of the lots support additional driveway and garage widths. A double car garage could be constructed without a significant impact on the streetscape. Accommodating additional garage parking spaces will contribute to parking availability on the lot and reduce pressure for on street parking. An On-Street parking plan will be provided as part of the detailed design stage. Further, additional parking for the single-detached dwellings will accommodate the ability to provide additional dwelling units for the two lots.
4.	Maximum driveway width of 6 metres for semi-detached and detached dwellings: Both a 5 or 6 metre wide driveways would effectively eliminate the possibility of any on-street parking by semis, as the gaps between driveways would be 3-5 metres depending on the driveway width. Driveway widths of 4.5 metres would allow for street parking, as the gap between driveways would be 6 metres. Additionally, the intention of the maximum driveway width is to ensure that the	The request to permit a driveway width of 6 metres for semi-detached dwellings has been removed. Please see comment above related to driveway and garage widths for the two single detached lots proposed.

Comment Number	Comment	Response
	frontage is not dominated by driveways. Staff are not supportive of any increase beyond the maximum permitted driveway width of 60% for semi-detached lots.	
5.	Note that 6 metre driveway widths are not necessary to park 2 cars side by side according to zoning requirements. Exterior parking spaces must have minimum dimensions of 5.5 metres long by 2.5 metres wide. A 5 metre wide driveway could accommodate two cars side by side	Please see response to comment #3.
Park and Trail Development, Mathieu Alain		
1.	**Parkland Dedication** In accordance with the Planning Act s.51.1 the parkland dedication rate will be the greater of 5% of the land, or 1 hectare for each 600 dwelling units, up to a maximum of 10% of the land (for sites under 5 ha). Parkland dedication was provided as part of the Creekside subdivision for lot 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12, and part of block 19, 20, and 23. The proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision proposes a development area of 2.668 hectares and a parkland dedication of 0.109 hectares. The parkland dedication amount of 0.109 hectares provided on the proposed development plan is satisfactory to Park and Trail Development and meets the intent of Planning Act s.51.1, City of Guelph Official Plan Policy 7.3.5.1.	Noted
2.	**Park Block Lot Frontage** The current draft plan subdivision has identified approximately 24.7 linear metres of lot frontage for a 0.109 ha park block. The amount of lot frontage proposed is satisfactory to Park and Trail Development.	Noted
3.	**Park Block Location** The proposed park block location is satisfactory to Park and Trail Development and complies with our policies.	Noted
4.	**Basic Park Development:** The Developer will be responsible for Basic Park Development. The Developer shall design the Basic Parkland Development in accordance with the Local Service Policy of the City of Guelph's Development Charges Background Study that is in effect at the time of the execution of the Subdivision Agreement. Basic Parkland Development includes:	Noted. To be included as condition of DPA.

Comment Number	Comment	Response
	a. Servicing (water, hydro, stormwater, sanitary) connected to a point just inside the property line, catch basins, culverts, manholes and other drainage structures; **b.** Utilities (electrical, fibre/phone, meter and meter boxes) connected to a point just inside the property line **c.** Clearing and grubbing, only where impediments that would inhibit the suitability of parkland exist; **d.** Any other associated infrastructure (minor bridges and abutments, guard and handrails, retaining walls) as required to bring the land to a suitable level for development as a parkland; **e.** Topsoil stripping, rough grading, supply and placement of topsoil and engineered fill to required depths and fine grading, and sodding; **f.** Where parkland is divided between more than one development application or is part of more than one phased application within the same development parcel, temporary perimeter fencing where there is no permanent fence; **g.** Permanent perimeter fencing to City standard adjacent to all abutting lands, and **h.** Temporary park sign(s) advising future residents that the site is a future park. Additionally: **i.** Material stockpiling is not permitted on parkland without the approval by the City of Guelph. **j.** Parkland shall be free of any contaminated soil or subsoil.	
5.	**Proposed Zoning** Park and Trail Development staff have no concerns with the proposed zoning and Zoning By-law Amendments.	Noted.
Environmental Planning, Ryan Hamelin		
1.	Required: The EIS does not sufficiently address the proposed Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report, the potential impacts to Hadati Creek, or the applicable Natural Heritage System policies. As noted in the EIS Terms of Reference approval letter from Leah Lefler dated October 29, 2025, "if an outlet to Hadati Creek is determined to be necessary, the EIS TOR will need to be expanded to include a water balance analysis." Table 5: Post-Development Catchment Areas	The requested additional information has been provided in the updated EIS included with this resubmission. Grading has been revised to direct drainage to Grange Road as an approved outlet.

Comment Number	Comment	Response
	and Runoff Coefficients in the Functional Servicing & Stormwater Report identifies Hadati Creek as the outlet for Catchment 203. Based on this information, a review of the proposed water balance and impact assessment is required, including a feature-based water balance, an assessment of quantity and quality controls for the outlet to Hadati Creek, and an erosion assessment to ensure there will be no impacts on the creek. This information can be provided through an EIS Addendum	
2.	Required: Section 7.1 of the Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report states: "Catchment 203 will drain to Hadati Creek then to the stormwater management facility as well". It's unclear how the water can flow to the stormwater management facility after entering Hadati Creek. Please review and revise as necessary.	The Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report has had Clarifications added to describe how the downstream SWM pond functions in relation to Hadati Creek.
3.	Required: The Post-Development Drainage figure lists two catchments as C204. Please review and revise as necessary.	Updated catchment numbering.
4.	Required: Tabe 5: Post-Development Catchment Areas and Runoff Coefficients in the Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report lists catchments EXT1 and EXT2. However, the Post-Development Drainage figure doesn't seem to list those catchments. Please review and revise as necessary.	Figure includes external catchments.
5.	Required: The Functional Servicing and Preliminary Stormwater Management Report makes several references to overland flow and flow within the Grange Road/Hagan Road right-of-way into Hadati Creek. Please confirm whether, under the proposed conditions, there is any uncontrolled flow, either directly or indirectly, into Hadati Creek. If uncontrolled flow is proposed, a policy review and analysis must be provided to demonstrate consistency with the Natural Heritage System policies and Development Engineering requirements. In general, uncontrolled flow into the Natural Heritage System is not supported.	Grading has been revised to direct drainage to Grange Road as an approved outlet.
6.	Required: Section 7.3 (Water Balance) in the Functional Servicing and Preliminary Stormwater Management Report must be updated to provide a detailed site-wide water balance, including a table comparing pre- and post-development infiltration, runoff, and evapotranspiration for the site as a whole.	Please refer to revised FSR and SWM report for updated water balance.
7.	Required: The Tree Inventory and Protection Plan (TIPP) does not provide sufficient detail regarding the proposed compensation for removed trees. An updated TIPP will be required that addresses the following comments.	A Tree Inventory and Protection Plan Update has been provided to address City comments regarding proposed compensation for removed trees.

Comment Number	Comment	Response
	a. The TIPP must clearly identify whether compensation will be provided through on-site planting, cash-in-lieu, or a combination of both. Details of the proposed compensation must be included in the form of a Vegetation Compensation Plan and/or a specified cash-in-lieu value. While on-site planting is the preferred form of compensation, based on the current site design, cash-in-lieu may be the only feasible option for this development. b. The compensation requirements must be consistent with the Guelph Tree By-law (2025) -21059 and the Tree Technical Manual. Norway Maple, Manitoba Maple and White Poplar are not listed as species exempt from the by-law and must be included in the compensation calculation. c. Please reevaluate which trees require compensation. The City of Guelph Tree By-law requires compensation for trees in poor condition unless they are classified as Hazard Trees. However, Hazard Trees must be assessed in relation to the existing context and surrounding land uses. Trees such as Tree #558 may not qualify as Hazard Trees based on the surrounding context of a hedgerow and farm field with no anticipated public interaction or associated safety risk. d. Note: Compensation is calculated as one Replacement Tree per 15 cm DBH removed. Where on-site compensation is not possible, a fee of$350 per Replacement Tree can be paid as cash-in-lieu. e. Note: Removal of trees located on City property or boundary trees shared with the City will require permission from an Urban Forester within the Parks Department. Environmental Planning can facilitate the necessary communication and approvals. f. Note: Removal or impacts to boundary or off-site trees will require permission from the owners.	
8.	Preliminary Draft Plan Comments Environmental Planning has provided the following preliminary Draft Plan comments. Detailed recommended Draft Plan Conditions will be provided once the Tree Compensation and Stormwater Management requirements are finalized and the Zoning By-law Amendment is supported. 1) Providing security or cash-in-lieu for tree compensation will be required as a draft plan condition once the tree compensation details have been confirmed.	Noted. To be included as condition of DPA.

Comment Number	Comment	Response
9.	2) Requirements to implement the recommendations of the Tree Inventory and Protection Plan will be included as draft plan conditions.	Noted. To be included as condition of DPA.
Engineering, Ethan Barrand		
1.	**Drawings** As per section 5.3 #6 of the City's Development Engineering Manual, update grading plan to show the tree protection. How will grading occur in or around these areas? Currently the swales are shown along the rear of the lots, however, there will be conflicts around trees being preserved.	Grading plans show tree protection zones and proposed swales do not encroach.
2.	As per section 5.3.1 #3 of the City's Development Engineering Manual, retaining walls are to be 0.15m inside property lines. Please update the wall along the side of lots 11 and 12. This revision can either be completed at detailed design, however, at this time, please add a note on the drawing stating the required 0.15m separation.	Retaining walls are offset 0.15m from property lines. Note has been added indicating that retaining walls will be offset 0.15m from the property lines.
3.	Infiltration galleries cannot be continuous across lot lines as it creates challenges with long term maintenance. Please revise accordingly.	Infiltration galleries are discontinuous and are offset 0.3m from each lot line.
4.	During detailed design, the temporary turning circle at the end of Kemp Crescent (Ph1) must be considered, specifically during construction of Ph2 – the City requires use of this turning circle for regular operational works.	A strategy will be developed, in partnership with the City of Guelph, to maintain City operation works while construction of the future road connection.
5.	A 1ft reserve must be included on the draft plan for lands fronting Grange Road. The 1ft (0.30m) reserve must wrap around the radii of Street A (ie. to the end of the radii – 9.0m into the property).	Reserves have been added to the draft plan.
6.	Proposed sanitary MH8 is to be shifted to 1m within the property line from Grange Road.	MH8 has been adjusted to be 1m within the property line from Grange Road.
7.	Please note, additional plans will be required at detailed design, including but not limited to a Composite Utility Plan. All requirements are outlines in section 5.2.4 of the City's Development Engineering Manual.	Additional plans, as outlined in section 5.2.4 of the City's Development Engineering Manual, will be provided during detailed design.
8.	**Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report** Please reference the Hydrogeological report within the FSR & SWM Report, noting the pre-liminary review of separation from the seasonal high groundwater elevation for both infiltration galleries and basement elevations.	Groundwater separation from infiltration galleries noted.
9.	Please provide sanitary and storm sewer design sheets during detailed design.	Preliminary Design Sheets have been provided.

Comment Number	Comment	Response
10.	Further information is required surrounding infiltration galleries. This information is required at this time as it is crucial in ensuring that the design is feasible and any draft plan revisions be made to support the design. Concerns with the infiltration gallery designs are as follows. a. As per section 5.7.8 of the City's Development Engineering Manual Infiltration rates must be calculated as per the TRCA/CVC Appendix C. It has been indicated that there are pockets of sand on-site, however, full calculations for factored rates must be completed at this time. b. Depths for bottom of infiltration gallery shall be noted, this not only is required for the in-situ testing to determine infiltration rates but also to ensure the 1.0m separation between bottom of gallery and SHGWL is met. c. If infiltration galleries are under the swales, how is stormwater to enter the galleries? It is anticipated that water will follow the path of least resistance, in this case that would be following the swale to the ultimate outlet or low point rather than infiltrating through the grass and topsoil. This will become a larger concern during saturated conditions. d. Ensure galleries are sized sufficiently to drawdown within 24 hours. e. What are the widths of the infiltration galleries? These are to be 5m from any foundation while also not obtaining a large portion of the rear-yards.	a. Please refer to revised Hydrogeological Report b. Details of the bottom of infiltration gallery have been included c. Grading promotes infiltration for smaller events while larger events will flow overland. d. Drawdown times are between 24-48 hours due to native soil conditions. e. Infiltration galleries have been detailed on the plans. However, the galleries will be 1m in width and have a minimum 5m separation from foundations
11.	Section 7.1 of the SWM Outlet notes that the development has an imperviousness of 67%, however, when reviewing the post-development drainage conditions, the runoff coefficients do not match Table 5-4 of the City's Development Engineering Manual. Please review and update both the report and drawing.	Runoff coefficients updated.
12.	As per Section 6.3.4 of the City's Development Engineering Manual, all modelling is to be completed in either MIDUS or PCSWMM. Please update Appendix D accordingly.	PCSWMM modelling to be provided in detailed design.
13.	Drainage must be controlled within the development and directed to Grange Road. In 2021, the owner's consultant (RJ Burnside) confirmed that the need for an easement through the 300 Grange Road property was not required, as such, the available flows were reached solely from the 300 Grange Road property. Please revise the design to capture all drainage internally. The features constructed in Hadati Creek were designed to a flow rate of 0.146 m3/s, which is being almost	Grading revising to direct all drainage to approved outlet.

Comment Number	Comment	Response
	fully achieved through the neighbouring development at 300 Grange Road with a flow rate of 0.112 m3/s.	
14.	Please review drainage from the rear of the property to Hadati Creek, as noted in the comment above, original designs covered flows directly to Grange Road with connections to Hadati Creek. These allowances are now being met, is there sufficient capacity in Hadati to accept the increase? Will there be any negative effects? Please provide further information surrounding existing and proposed features, how will the runoff pass the trail on Hadati Creek.	Grading revising to direct all drainage to approved outlet.
15.	**Noise Study** The study will need to be updated at detailed design to reflect the updated grading and confirmation of the final option and location of the 1.8m high noise wall for outdoor areas.	Noted.
16.	**Hydrogeological Report** As per section 5.8 of the City's Development Engineering Manual, four seasons of ground water monitoring is to be completed. Current report states that the monitoring is only completed from Oct '25 to Jan '26 and is expected to increase in the spring. Please continue monitoring in order to collect 12 full months of data.	An updated Hydrogeological Report is included with this submission.
17.	**Capacity Analysis** **Sanitary (Linear System)** The linear sanitary system was modelled from the existing sanitary maintenance hole fronting the proposed development, downstream to the waste water plant. At this time, the modelling met requirements set out within the City's sanitary capacity framework. Allocation to the linear system will be designated at time of an executed subdivision agreement.	Acknowledged.
18.	**Sanitary (Plant Capacity)** Servicing capacity needs were also assessed as part of the City's Water and Wastewater Capacity Allocation Model for 316 Grange Road. This evaluation included the assessment of servicing needs versus current unallocated servicing capacity of the City's Water Plant and Water Resources Recovery Center, respectfully. Outcomes of this evaluation show that sufficient capacity is available for the application at 316 Grange Road. With completion of this check, a hold of 82 units have been implemented in the City's plant capacity tracking model specific to this application effective, March 18th, 2026. In accordance with City Allocation	Acknowledged.

Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Policies this servicing capacity hold will be sustained for a period of 48 months, starting on the effective date.	
19.	**Water (Linear System)** Given the proposed development (including units, elevations and infrastructure), the following water modelling results are provided below. a. Under ADD conditions the pressure ranged between 51.7 and 72.2 psi. b. Under MDD conditions the pressure ranged between 50.9 and 70.5 psi. c. The available fire flow ranged from 82 – 121 L/s. Please consider the results shared above within the updated FSR, reviewing if these requirements meet City Guidelines.	Acknowledged.
20.	**Water (Plant Capacity)** Servicing capacity needs were also assessed as part of the City's Water and Wastewater Capacity Allocation Model for 316 Grange Road. This evaluation included the assessment of servicing needs versus current unallocated servicing capacity of the City's Water Plant and Water Resources Recovery Center, respectfully. Outcomes of this evaluation show that sufficient capacity is available for the application at 316 Grange Road. With completion of this check, a hold of 82 units have been implemented in the City's plant capacity tracking model specific to this application effective, March 18th, 2026. In accordance with City Allocation Policies this servicing capacity hold will be sustained for a period of 48 months, starting on the effective date.	Acknowledged.
21.	**Transportation Services** **Transportation Planning** **Draft Plan** Show the centerlines and their radii at all turning areas, including the Street A/Street B intersection, the curvature along Street A and the driveway on Grange Road. A minimum radius of 12m is required for fire trucks.	Updated.
22.	Property lines must incorporate an 8m radius.	Noted.
23.	**Traffic** **Traffic Impact Brief** The parking assessment should maintain consistency with the Draft Plan land use schedule. It is recommended to present parking calculations separately for each land use category (e.g., single detached, semi-detached, townhouse) for clarity.	A revised Transportation Impact Brief is included with this submission.

Comment Number	Comment	Response
24.	A detailed pavement marking and traffic signage plan should be provided at the detailed design stage, in accordance with applicable Ontario Traffic Manual (OTM) guidelines and City of Guelph Linear Infrastructure Standards (LIS), including fire route signage requirements. Accessible Parking signage should be provided in accordance with the City of Guelph Facility Accessibility Design Manual (FDAM, 2015).	A detailed Pavement Marking and Traffic Signage Plan will be prepared at detailed design.
25.	**Environmental Engineering** Provide a reliance letter for the Phase One ESA.	A Reliance Letter for the Phase One ESA is included in this submission.
26.	**Wastewater** The storm lead from the park block to Grange Road. The 18.7m – 300mm diameter storm pipe appears to only have ~0.3m of clearance over the watermain and sanitary sewer. Please review and confirm this clearance and intent. If the required 0.5m of vertical clearance isn't provided to the watermain, what measures will be put in place during detailed design?	A section has been provided on C600 that shows the clearance between the services based on the information available to us.
27.	**Water Services** For detailed design. Confirm valves installed at all intersections as per DGSMSS	Valve details will be provided at detailed design.
28.	For detailed design. Ensure valve installed at connection point at Kemp and Grange	Valve details will be provided at detailed design.
29.	For detailed design. Ensure to follow MECP F-6-1 Procedures to Govern Separation of Sewer and Watermains	Service separation will be detailed at detailed design.
30.	**Hydrogeology Review** (s.3.1) The report must include a description and figures that represent the quaternary and bedrock geology, and physiographic report with the physiographic features represented.	Report updated to include additional details.
31.	(s.3.1) Water level measurements do not capture four seasons of data, however the report indicates that additional water levels will be collected in the spring. There is uncertainty in the water level measurements capturing maximum and minimum water level measurements due to the limited water level measurements and no use of data loggers. The consultant should ensure that additional and continuous water level measurements are collected prior the application approval. Should water level highs change for the currently reported conditions, updates to the design must be incorporated.	1-Year of water level monitoring completed. Report updated to include additional data.

Comment Number	Comment	Response
32.	(Figure Section) A site specific conceptual hydrogeological model should be developed based on the best available, published, geological and hydrogeological mapping, supplemented with site-specific hydrogeological information collected (maps should be provided in the EIS and the supporting hydrogeological report for the study site and include overlays of surficial geology and bedrock geology).	Conceptual hydrogeological model constructed as additional figure.
33.	(s 3.1) Surface water features are not described within the text of the report nor shown on a figure.	Report updated to include descriptions of nearby surface water features in text and figure.
34.	Water quality was collected ab BH4 and BH7 for pH, hardness, conductivity, chloride, nitrate and selected metals. The consultant should evaluate water quality if construction dewatering is required based on the planned discharge location (for example to the storm then compared water quality to the storm sewer by law).	No construction dewatering anticipated, as such, water sampling and quality assessment for dewatering discharge has not been included in scope of investigation.
35.	A description of the existing catchment areas, drainage patterns, watercourses and drainage basin boundaries must be included in the report. This includes the requirement of showing existing flows (quantity and quality) into and out of the natural features and areas, including rivers, creeks, lakes, ponds, springs, seeps and headwater features.	Catchment and drainage is to be provided by Crozier as part of the FSR. CVD reviewed the FSR and provided a summary in hydrogeological report.
36.	(Figure Section) A figure must be included that shows the existing catchment areas, drainage patterns, watercourses and drainage basin boundaries.	Catchment figures are part of the FSR, appended to hydrogeology report for reference.
37.	(s 3.1) Vertical hydraulic gradients should be calculated where available or a notation included in the report that vertical gradients cannot be calculated but are inferred with a rational.	VHG cannot be calculated. Rationale provided in updated report.
38.	(N/A) Identify surface water features and natural heritage areas in relation to the study area (map should be provided of the study area with overlay of the natural heritage areas).	Report updated.
39.	(N/A) The report must identify groundwater flux to any surface water or natural heritage features on site	Not applicable as there are no surface water or other natural heritage features on the subject property.
40.	(N/A) No Certificate of Property Use statement in report. Please indicate any existing CPUs or a statement confirming none exist.	Statement included in updated report.