
First Meeting of the Community Advisory Committee

In support of Guelph's Growth Management Strategy

Agenda

Opening Remarks

- Welcome and session overview
- Introductions

Review of Advisory Committee Terms of Reference

- 'Operational charter' walk through — mandate, role, procedures
- Meeting conduct principles
- Questions

Project Overview

- Presentation re: project objectives, components, process and timelines
- Questions

Key Context — Participant Input

- Project-related 'hopes and fears'
- Study essentials

Looking Ahead and Open Forum

- The next meeting and next steps
- Additional participant input: comments, ideas, issues

Public Comment

- Opportunity for 'observer' questions/comments

Closing Remarks and Adjournment



G. L. Pothier Enterprises Inc.
2197 Galloway Drive
Oakville, Ontario, Canada L6H 5M1

tel: (905) 844-5174
fax: (905) 844-7368
em: glenn@gipi.com

Meeting notes from:

The Inaugural Meeting of the
Guelph Growth Management Strategy
Community Advisory Committee

Meeting Date/Location:

May 4, 2006/Guelph City Hall: Committee Room C

Facilitator: Glenn Pothier, President, GLPi

Meeting Purpose

As the first meeting of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC), this session was introductory in nature and was designed to:

- Initiate the activities of the CAC
- Establish ground rules and key principles to guide the work of the CAC
- Explore and confirm the purpose/role of the CAC
- Provide an overview of the Growth Management Strategy Project: context, objectives, components, process and timelines
- Surface CAC member input re: ‘hopes and fears’ for the initiative, issues that are ‘study essentials,’ and consultation-related ideas
- Provide an overview of the agenda for the upcoming CAC meeting and next steps
- Provide an opportunity for members and observers to ask questions/offer comments on issues of their choosing

Summary of Meeting Highlights

Opening Remarks

- Glenn Pothier, the independent meeting facilitator, called the group to order.
- Glenn Pothier welcomed all participants and observers, and thanked them for their attendance/participation.
- CAC members and City staff/project team representatives introduced themselves — including some remarks from City of Guelph CAO Larry Kotseff who reiterated the importance of the project and thanked participants (on behalf of the Mayor and the City as a whole) for their involvement.
- Glenn Pothier provided an overview of the session agenda — followed by an invitation for comments and questions, prior to confirming the agenda items.

Review of the Advisory Committee Terms of Reference

- Glenn Pothier described a number of ground rules and key principles to guide the work of the CAC and the conduct of meetings, which were confirmed and accepted by the group. These will serve as the foundation for subsequent meetings.

- Glenn Pothier then walked the group through the CAC’s Terms of Reference (in essence, the group’s operational charter that was distributed in advance of the meeting). The key roles of the group were described as:
 - Dialogue and information exchange
 - Input on and joint exploration of key issues, concerns, challenges, opportunities
 - Review and comment on project materials, tools, reports (i.e. to serve as a sounding board)
 - Facilitate effective/efficient project completion

- In addition, the following key points were affirmed:
 - The CAC does not have decision-making authority — its focus is on information/perspective sharing
 - The CAC will not be issuing statements as a collective to the broader public or others
 - The work of the CAC will be transparent (meeting summaries will be available to the public; public may attend meetings as observers)

- Following some questions of fact/clarification and related comments (see below), the Terms of Reference was accepted by the group. The goodwill of the group and the willingness to be forward-looking/constructive was evident and much appreciated.
 - *Question:* Can we share project-related information with our respective organizations — given that some of us are here as representatives of larger groups — to get their input and comment?
 - *Answer:* Yes, information can be shared with your respective organizations, but we ask that you do this judiciously and not distribute it too widely. Most, if not all of the items we will discuss in the CAC meetings will be in draft form and must be treated as such. It would be unwise and unfair to the public to share draft materials. An important role of the CAC is to help us refine draft documents to ensure that they are strategically sound and understandable.

 - *Comment:* The CAC needs to look at growth within a larger framework — all members should have a common understanding of the range of growth initiatives of concern to the City.
 - *Response:* In fact, our next meeting is designed to ensure this — it will feature a series of presentations by our project consultant and City staff covering various issues and initiatives of interest to this project.

- *Comment:* We should consider rolling this Advisory Committee into an implementation committee — given that we’re all going to be learning a lot over the course of this project and investing a lot of time and energy in the process.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]

Project Overview

- Craig Manley (staff member, City of Guelph) provided an overview presentation — covering project context, objectives, components, tools (GuelphQuest), process and timelines. Glenn Pothier spoke to the component of the presentation relating to communication, outreach and consultation. A hardcopy of the presentation was available to all participants.
- The presentation was followed by a number of questions and comments:
 - *Comment:* The language that is used in planning is extremely important and the words used by the project team and the Advisory Committee should be clearly defined and understood. For example, the difference between public participation and consultation is important. Also, there is a difference between outreach and feedback.
 - *Response:* Yes, it is important that terminology be precise and that words be well defined and understood.
 - *Question:* It sounds as though the overall project process has been mapped-out in some detail — are the components, phases and sequencing a given?
 - *Answer:* Yes. The terms of reference for the project have been spelled out and approved by Guelph City Council.
 - *Question:* Some of the material presented seems to imply certain development scenarios reflecting/mirroring the province’s approach to growth. Are there only three options?
 - *Answer:* There are hundreds of options, but we will choose three on which to focus. As outlined in the project Terms of Reference, they are: current growth patterns, more compact growth and highly compact growth. We will be looking at a variety of options and sub-options.

- *Comment:* We should get input from youth (high school and university students) during the consultation process given that some from this group may choose to live in Guelph and experience the outcomes of this growth management process.
 - *Response:* We can and should look at involving youth in the process — it has been done in other jurisdictions. The membership of the CAC is already determined so we will not be involving youth in this group. People 18 years of age and over will be included in our upcoming survey of residents and we can look at doing focus groups with different youth segments.

- *Comment:* I like the idea of using GuelphQuest to assist with the visualization of potential growth decisions/directions.
 - *Response:* GuelphQuest should make growth planning and management more accessible and understandable to the broader public — we intend to use it as an educational tool to help inform dialogue and discussion.

Key Context — Participant Input

- Glenn Pothier asked the group a number of questions (see below) with a view to surfacing some initial input that can help shape the project. CAC members were invited to share their thoughts in the meeting or subsequent to it should additional ideas occur to them.

- Participants were first asked to identify some of their ‘hopes and fears’ for the project. The responses are noted in the following table (listed in no particular order):

Project-Related Hopes	Project-Related Fears
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the initiative will engage new City residents (particularly those in the South end) and others who do not typically get involved in civic issues • That Guelph — while acknowledging the importance of the Province’s Places to Grow initiative — will be able to tailor its growth plan to ensure what’s best for the City (and that the province will show some 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That there will be conflicting provincial rules and regulations that make effective growth planning/management difficult • That consultation will only occur with those who are of better health, higher socio-economic status and so forth — and not with the ‘less empowered’ • That the general public may feel overwhelmed by the complexity of the issues, challenges and

<p>flexibility should it be required)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the growth management strategy will be a meaningful, lasting document that can underlie long-term planning decisions — that the strategy will remain relevant over time and we won't start from scratch in the future • That downtown Guelph will be the heart of the City — that it is a focal point for both new and long-term citizens alike • That Guelph's growth-related decisions take into account the impact on surrounding townships — that there is a true spirit of consultation and partnership in this regard • That there is a willingness to take risks and make growth-related decisions that are innovative/creative • That the project process and growth strategy consider a variety of social, cultural, economic and other imperatives and that the outcome is 'doable' — and truly assists elected officials to make practical decisions • That there is substantive communication — that information and ideas are shared, and that the process stimulates/nurtures broad involvement 	<p>project process — there is a need to simplify if we are truly to engage the community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That infrastructure requirements will be identified in the plan, but the province will not provide sufficient funding for them • That we will invest in the creation of a solid local plan — that could raise community expectations — but then have the province dictate something different (which will result in unmet expectations and potential disappointment)
---	--

- Participants were next asked to fill-in the 'blank' in the following sentence: 'If this project does not look at [BLANK], we will be missing something important.' The following responses were noted (listed in no particular order):
 - An interim review by Council — so that we do not get to the end of the project only to be told that that the plan is deemed unworkable
 - The question of how do you form a sustainable community — we cannot avoid issues regarding ecological limits, cultural limits, etc.
 - The possibility of fewer/no manufacturing jobs in the region/Canada and the potential impact of this on Guelph's economy

- The potential impact of Guelph’s strategy on adjacent municipalities/townships — a Guelph-appropriate strategy needs to consider the City’s neighbours
 - That status of a variety of City projects and initiatives, including those that are infrastructure-related
 - Funding for infrastructure
 - The price of gas and energy security generally
 - The issue of governance — including shifts in power-sharing and the way decisions are made, alternative forms of governance (i.e. not government), the roles and responsibilities of public and private interests, and design/implementation-related alternatives
 - Lessons already learned from both within and outside of the Guelph community — there have been various growth and development-related experiences over the years and examples of what does/does not work are available to us
 - Changing demographics and related trends, i.e. impacts of increasing seniors population, additional immigration
 - What we collectively value about the City — and what we want to encourage through future growth
- Finally, participants were asked for any initial thoughts about the best means of consulting with and ‘plugging into’ the community in strategically appropriate ways. The following responses were noted (listed in no particular order):
 - There is an opportunity to make use of a range of neighbourhood associations that are already established — they have various perspectives and they are an underutilized resource
 - Get the word out about the project through local media and the variety of City communication vehicles
 - Revisit the approaches used as part of SmartGuelph — a variety of techniques were used to communicate information and gather input
 - Use the City’s website and consider blogs as a technique to feed into a dynamic decision-making process that allows for regular input
 - Online questionnaires that allow people to contribute responses on key issues — the questions could be updated regularly to keep pace with the substantive topics of greatest interest to the project
 - Consider media partnerships with local newspapers (Tribune, Mercury) and the local cable TV provider — for example, a sequenced series of stories on key topics that help disseminate information and that help elicit community input (something similar was successfully executed in Waterloo Region)
 - Communicate with those in the Counties — have Council delegations, use the local media who serve these areas — and make people aware of the opportunities for input
 - Outreach to and through different cultural and other types of groups (seniors, youth, etc.)

- Get on the agendas of local service clubs (e.g. Rotary) and engage them in the process
- Hold ‘town-hall’ style meetings in both the City and township
- Use tax bill inserts
- Work through existing networks, associations, lay leaders, key influencers and intermediaries, etc.
- Create web linkages to other sites of interest (e.g. AMO is a good source of information about and municipal input on Places to Grow)
- Do not call the project a ‘study’ — it sounds too academic, unappealing and lacking in action/real outcomes

Looking Ahead and Open Forum

- The next CAC meeting date is scheduled for May 24/06 (7:00-9:30 P.M. at the Italian-Canadian Club). It will be a joint meeting of the CAC and Guelph City Council/senior staff.
- The meeting will provide some baseline information about key City growth-related planning initiatives that must be considered in the context of this project. The session is an important means of ensuring that there is a common foundation of knowledge on which to build and a joint understanding of key issues.
- A number of CAC members indicated an interest in knowing more about planning and growth-related issues. To this end, Jim Riddell (Guelph’s Director of Planning and Development Services) kindly offered — on behalf of the staff in his Department — to provide interested CAC members with any base information about planning, growth-related issues and/or provincial initiatives.
- Glenn Pothier asked whether CAC members or the project team had any further business to add to the meeting agenda. No items were identified.
- Glenn then asked for any additional comments or questions that CAC members would like to raise:
 - *Comment:* We need to make sure that this project is brought to the public in a well thought-out and thorough manner. Otherwise, some members of the public will just focus on one aspect of Places to Grow or some other document — they won’t see the big picture. The issues need to be explained in a very ‘big picture,’ easy-to-understand way.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]

Public Comment

- Glenn Pothier reminded the group that in the interest of openness, transparency and accountability, any member of the public can attend a CCG meeting as an observer. He then asked whether any observer comments/questions were forthcoming at this time:
- *Comments:*
 - There was no mention of the Guelph Greenplan. It was designed with a lot of public input and covered similar items of concern. It should be considered.
 - ‘Peak Oil’ must be taken into consideration — fossil fuels will be gone or outrageously expensive in forty years .
 - Regarding community engagement, there is a huge list of people who were consulted as part of SmartGuelph and the Greenplan process. Contact information should be available for these individuals and groups — this resource should be used.
 - The governance study undertaken by Mr. Cuff included consultation with many different community groups — this list would also be an excellent resource.
- *Response:*
 - Thank you for the ideas and suggestions.

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

- Glenn Pothier thanked the group for their attendance and participation.
- The meeting was formally adjourned (having run from approximately 7:05 to 9:00 P.M.).

Attendance (names listed in alphabetical order)

CAC Members:

Laura Baily
Astrid Clos
Gary Cousins
Jan Craig
Chuck Cunningham
David Douglas
Lloyd Grinham
Bill Mungall
Fred Natolochny
Jim Riddell
Dan Schnurr
Ian Smith
Anne Waller
Chris White

Observers/Public:

Maggie Laidlaw

Project Staff/Consultant Team:

Craig Manley
Paul Kraehling
Christina Metherall

Facilitator:

Glenn Pothier, GLPi

Second Meeting of the Community Advisory Committee as a Joint Session with City Council/Senior Staff *In support of Guelph's Growth Management Strategy*

Agenda

Opening Remarks

- Welcome and session overview
- Introductions
- Confirming anticipated outcomes
- The three-minute recap

Situational Overview

- Meridian Planning presentation re: the Province's Places to Grow initiative
- Questions and answers

Key Municipal Growth-Related Initiatives

- City staff presentations on the following topics covering the current situation, implications for growth, options, issues/constraints/gaps:
 - City planning
 - Water supply, groundwater and wastewater
 - Solid waste
 - Energy
 - Piped and transportation infrastructure
 - Economic development
 - Financial considerations
- Each presentation to be followed by brief questions of fact/clarification

Key Themes and Looking Ahead

- Tying the 'threads' together
- Participant comments
- Next steps

Public Comment

- Opportunity for 'observer' questions/comments

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

Meeting notes from:

Second Meeting of the
Guelph Growth Management Strategy
Community Advisory Committee
Joint Session with City Council/Senior Staff

Meeting Date/Location:

May 24, 2006/Italian-Canadian Club

Facilitator: Glenn Pothier, President, GLPi



Meeting Purpose

The second meeting of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) was a joint session with City Council and Senior Staff and was designed to:

- Provide an overview of the Provincial growth initiatives;
- Provide an overview of the key municipal growth-related initiatives as presented by senior staff on a wide range of issues and topics;
- Provide an opportunity for members and observers to ask questions regarding the presentations by staff and obtain clarification on the various studies;
- Explore the key themes evolving from the studies.

Summary of Meeting Highlights

Opening Remarks

- Glenn Pothier, the independent meeting facilitator, called the group to order.
- Glenn Pothier, welcomed all participants and observers, and thanked them for their attendance and participation;
- CAC members and members of Council introduced themselves;
- Glenn Pothier provided an overview of the purpose of the meeting and what it was hoped would be achieved;
- Glenn Pothier provided an overview of the work done to date and reviewed the minutes from the May 4, 2006 CAC meeting;
- Glenn Pothier asked if the minutes from the May 4, 2006 were acceptable and there was acceptance of minutes.

Situational Overview

Meridian Planning presentation - Places to Grow

Bob Lehman, Meridian Planning Consultants Inc. provided an overview of the status of the Province's Places to Grow legislation:

- He noted the history of the legislation
- Once approved, municipalities have 3 years to bring their Official Plans into conformity
- The requirements represent a dramatic change in the context for planning
- The proposed plan outlines population/household/employment forecasts for Wellington County (which includes the City of Guelph)
 - Guelph will be responsible for a significant share of growth based on its historical share

CAC Meeting #2 - May 24/06

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the Agenda and presentation material for the meeting.

- Intensification targets will be required at 40% of total annual growth within built-up areas by 2015
- Guelph's downtown is designated as an Urban Growth Centre; this area is expected to have 150 residents and jobs/hectare by 2031

Participant Questions and Comments:

- *Question:* Is there any relationship between the forecasts for municipalities and the subareas of the plan?
 - *Response:* No relation. It is unlikely there will be sub-area studies.
- *Question:* Can we have an intensification target other than 40%, because we are a single tier in the outer ring as defined by the Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal (MPIR)?
 - *Response:* Yes, Places to Grow provides the Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal (MPIR) with the authority to consider reductions to the target but we don't know how that will work yet. There is some flexibility for the outer ring municipalities (those outside of the defined GTA) to have an intensification target of less than 40%.
- *Question:* What is the status, or the latest information, on the Growth Plan?
 - *Response:* It has been to Cabinet and is nearing final approval.
- *Question:* Of the forecasted 125,000 new residents to this area by 2031, what proportion is expected to end up in Guelph?
 - *Response:* Paul Kraehling will deal with that in his presentation.
- *Question:* Is there detail in the Growth Plan regarding the definition of the 'built boundary'?
 - *Response:* There is a definition but what the Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal (MPIR) uses will be determined later. We have seen it generally defined as the area that has been built-on to date.
- *Question:* Can you clarify the definition of the Downtown Guelph growth centre. What is the boundary of downtown?
 - *Response:* The urban growth centre defined in Places to Grow is not intended to be the whole town - it is basically the downtown area only. This boundary will be defined by the Province.

Key Municipal Growth-Related Initiatives

City Land Use Planning Considerations Presentation

Paul Kraehling discussed:

- Historical growth in Guelph and planned growth projections

CAC Meeting #2 - May 24/06

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the Agenda and presentation material for the meeting.

- The difference between the Places to Grow population targets and the currently planned allocation of population to Guelph and surrounding areas
- Historical development across the City, current land use and future development areas (residential and non-residential uses)

Participant Questions and Comments:

- *Question:* Regarding the built boundary, is the Reformatory site in it?
 - *Response:* I don't know. Again, we will have to wait for this information from the Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal (MPIR). We are keeping tabs on what is happening in Hamilton with a similar site and to date it seems to have been left out.
- *Question:* I had heard they were using satellite photos to determine the built-up area. Are we just looking at land mass then to determine the boundaries?
 - *Response:* We have already talked with the Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal (MPIR) and they have said that they will define it as what is on the ground as of a certain date. We will work with them to ensure it is defined correctly.
- *Comment:* We have three years to catch up. I have a concern that three years will not allow transitional lands on the edge of the community to be considered.
 - *Response:* Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal (MPIR) is also looking at Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC) records regarding what buildings have already been built. This information will also be used to assist in setting boundaries for the 'built' area.
- *Question:* Why is there not a sub-topic on social, recreational, and/or cultural issues in the Local Growth Management Study (LGMS)? It is critical to have this included.
 - *Response:* There is a need to consider this but there are no specific studies in these areas at this time. We will look at these matters further.
- *Question:* Regarding population numbers, are we dealing with permanent residents? Are students factored into this equation?
 - *Response:* As a University town, it is a complexity that we must look at. We will be reviewing the population data to make sure it addresses this issue.
- *Comment:* In addition to population forecasts in Places to Grow, we should be looking at household growth as well. Household growth increases at a faster rate than population size (while population size has been increasing, household sizes have been decreasing) and has a greater impact on total development across the City. It is the number of dwellings built that will develop the City, not the population.
 - *Response:* Agreed. Households are a better reflection of land use on the ground, i.e. how much land will be needed to accommodate growth.
- *Question:* If I'm a developer and I bought land now outside the built boundary, once it is determined, am I stuck?

CAC Meeting #2 - May 24/06

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the Agenda and presentation material for the meeting.

- *Response:* Places to Grow does deal with greenfield sites on the edges of the community - they are part of the areas where growth can be targeted. What may change with the new plan will be the built form and housing styles that can be developed. Developers will still invest.
- *Comment:* We don't want to forget cultural and social matters. We need to strengthen and emphasize need for social development. This is always a concern with myopic land use planning exercises. We need to make sure that social development is considered.
- *Question:* When you look at the Places to Grow growth targets for 2031 and consider the various potential shares of growth to the City versus the County, is there not a small difference in annual growth rates over the 25 year time frame?
 - *Response:* Yes, there would be a small difference on an annual basis; over 25 years there would be a population difference of 20,000.
- *Question:* Until approved, what template is being used to assess development applications?
 - *Response:* We are operating under the current Official Plan (OP) framework. We have regard to the principles of Places to Grow, but can't apply density targets on a site-by-site basis. Development applications should be assessed relative to the spirit of Places to Grow.

Water Supply and Ground Water Presentation

Dave Belanger discussed:

- Current City water use, sources and projected demand
- The recently completed Water Supply Master Plan with different options for future water supply, including water conservation and demand management, local surface water, new and current groundwater sources, and a pipeline to Lake Erie.
- Groundwater protection proposals

Participant Questions and Comments:

- *Question:* What is current ground/surface water ratio?
 - *Response:* Surface water is minimal. It is a small fraction - about 4,000m² out of 68,000m²/day.
- *Question:* If the whole city becomes a ground water protection zone, what will be done about pesticides?
 - *Response:* We will need to identify our critical aquifer recharge areas better. If we have dense clay over the aquifer (confined aquifer) we can worry less because water and dissolved pesticides will not be able to move quickly through the clay to the groundwater. If there is just sand over the aquifer

CAC Meeting #2 - May 24/06

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the Agenda and presentation material for the meeting.

(unconfined aquifer), water will quickly flow into the aquifer along with the dissolved pesticides.

- *Question:* How deep are the wells?
 - *Response:* Approximately 70m.
- *Question:* Should we be developing over recharge areas? What about the moraine south of Guelph?
 - *Response:* Any development of these areas much be done carefully to protect and maintain recharge rates. We will need to be careful and create permeable surfaces. We need to look at smart development. There needs to be monitoring and we need to have the appropriate programs in place

Wastewater Presentation

Cameron Walsh discussed:

- The Wastewater Master Plan (being initiated now) and defined current wastewater issues
- Current planning initiatives and the need for future expansions

Participant Questions and Comments:

- *Question:* Places to Grow assumes increased population to not only cities but to the rest of the County. Has the Wastewater Master Plan taken into account the wastewater needs of the surrounding areas (i.e., right now we take Rockwood's wastewater)?
 - *Response:* This issue has and will continue to be addressed. We know we are responsible for servicing surrounding areas.
- *Question:* How much has been done in terms of individual industry pre-treatment of wastewater? Is the City looking at this?
 - *Response:* On a cumulative basis, what can be removed is equivalent to up to 60,000 people. One industry can contribute a large amount of loading (in terms of organics). The pre-treatment of wastewater by an industry can free up a significant amount of wastewater treatment capacity.
- *Question:* Are we trying to link approaches between water and wastewater? There has been no mention of conservation programs.
 - *Response:* There are conservation programs existing and they will continue (demand management strategies).
- *Question:* What is our strategy to involve other communities in the study? What is the Regional area strategy? How will we involve the various parties?
 - *Response:* Agree. There is a need. We have an advisory group to assist in the formulation of the Wastewater Master Plan.

CAC Meeting #2 - May 24/06

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the Agenda and presentation material for the meeting.

- *Comment:* This issue should be noted. We would need to work with everyone to coordinate these programs. They might want their ‘own’ solution, but how will this affect others? (i.e., it might be fine to pump in Rockwood’s wastewater, but what impact would this have on waste loading to the river and to the people at the head of the Grand?)
- *Question:* Where does the Province come in regarding wastewater management? Will Places to Grow address this area?
 - *Response:* There is an indication that the Province may assist in conducting sub-area (multiple municipality) assessments respecting wastewater management. I know the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) wants the Province to set targets, and is looking for funding.
- *Question:* If we take the pipeline point of view, we would have more wastewater, and the Speed River would not have the capacity to accept it. Would we then have to pipe it back to the Great Lakes?
 - *Response:* It is an option.
- *Comment:* Wastewater approach looks at demand management options (i.e., marginal cost pricing, linking price to consumption, etc.), but there is no mention of this in the drinking water presentation.
 - *Response:* It was mentioned at the beginning of the presentation.

Solid Waste Presentation

Dean Wyman discussed:

- The current status of solid waste facilities, including the recent closing of the Wet Plant
- Future planning initiatives including the Solid Waste Strategic Plan and its core principles and methodology

Participant Questions and Comments:

- *Question:* With the recent closing of the wet composting facility, how long will it take to get a Provincial Certificate of Approval to find an alternate location for treatment of wet waste?
 - *Response:* I’m not exactly sure. It is dependent on the availability of Provincial staff to review and approve.
- *Question:* Before you can guarantee a second shift for the Dry facility do you not need to first have more materials?
 - *Response:* Yes we are looking for this in other municipalities. We have a full-time staff member who searches for other groups who are interested in sending their garbage to us.
- *Question:* Are we looking to process our own garbage or other people’s garbage?

CAC Meeting #2 - May 24/06

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the Agenda and presentation material for the meeting.

- *Response:* Both. To maximize use of the facilities we will seek other materials. We need to build capacity for the future, but accommodate other's waste until we reach maximum capacity. In the past we have had complaints that we haven't made full use of the facility.
- *Question:* "Regional Context" - Other than the Certificate of Approval where does the Province come into this? If Places to Grow is correct, we will have more waste and we can't expect to download this cost to the local area. Where should the waste go and who will pay for its disposal?
 - *Response:* There is no indication from Province that there is a change of heart in Provincial planning and funding for solid waste. However, Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) is trying very hard to lobby the Province, as we need to build more facilities and we will need more money.
- *Comment:* The earlier drafts of Places to Grow didn't mention solid waste. One of our comments was a need for consideration of solid waste in the future.

Energy Planning Presentation

Martin Lavictoire discussed:

- Rising energy prices and demand, including 'peak oil' predictions
- The Community Energy Plan methodology and the 5-year Action Plan

Participant Questions and Comments:

- *Question:* Urban design standards to promote energy savings - how intensive will these be within the Community Energy Plan?
 - *Response:* We will know once our consultant has completed the Community Energy Plan. We would like to see energy efficient standards for new subdivisions.
- *Question:* Are Planning and Building staff involved in the Energy Plan?
 - *Response:* They have been invited to participate. Information sharing is occurring.
- *Question:* The current standards respecting energy conservation in buildings are a little archaic. Are the City's Building Code provisions being revised to become up-to-date with the Energy Plan?
 - *Response:* We are at the initial stage of the process. We have just retained our consultant. Once we have a plan we can look at different options.
- *Comment:* The Building Code may actually be amended to consider energy use in design.
- *Question:* Based on peak demands, Ontario is facing a 10,000 Megawatt/day energy shortfall. This is substantial. What are we going to do about this?
 - *Response:* Energy consumption is very high and it is ever increasing; we need to assist in addressing this issue.

CAC Meeting #2 - May 24/06

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the Agenda and presentation material for the meeting.

Piped and Road Infrastructure Presentation

Don Kudo discussed:

- Current infrastructure assets for water distribution/storage, wastewater conveyance, storm water, and roads
- The timeline, phases, and activities of the Master Servicing and System Optimization Studies for Water Distribution/Storage and Wastewater Conveyance

Participant Questions and Comments:

- *Question:* In terms of servicing requirements, do you have two approaches to your strategies: one based on the City's growth projections and another based on the targets set by Places to Grow (i.e. growing quickly, or forced growth)?
 - *Response:* Yes we will look at different models for growth. Our current hydraulic models based on current development are up-to-date and can be calibrated to different growth forecasts.
- *Question:* Has there been a value calculated for the infrastructure deficit?
 - *Response:* Yes, but I don't have it here. I remember something about an \$8 million/year deficit estimated for roads (a rough estimate).
- *Question:* Are you looking at alternative standards and more sustainable options for reducing costs?
 - *Response:* There are questions of sustainability and cost we must look at. We don't have a process to look at further reductions in standards right now. There will be future opportunities to look at other options and address them.
- *Comment.* There are great examples from Europe we could look at.
- *Question:* Are there opportunities for Engineering and Planning to get together and develop a cost-effective method?
 - *Response:* Yes. We know there are examples of cost-effective methods and we will need to look at those.
- *Question:* Do you anticipate using a phased approach to providing infrastructure to address the Places to Grow growth forecasts? Will you look at different scenarios for growth?
 - *Response:* Yes, we will look at different models for growth. These will be considered in association with the current deficits we experience for maintenance of the systems.

Transportation Infrastructure Presentation

Rajan Philips discussed:

- Strategic transportation initiatives including the Guelph-Wellington Transportation Master Plan and Major Roadway improvements
- Implications of growth including the need for demand management and non-auto usage

CAC Meeting #2 - May 24/06

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the Agenda and presentation material for the meeting.

- The North Mainline Rail Service Strategy for inter-regional transit

Participant Questions and Comments:

- *Question:* Why are we looking to expand the Hanlon Expressway in the same time period in which we will be running out of oil, as explained by the ‘peak oil’ prognostication? Why are the energy issues not being considered, and why are the energy people not talking to the transportation people?
 - *Response:* I don’t know the answer to that.
- *Question:* What kind of inter-regional rail are we looking at?
 - *Response:* Light rail. We are looking at examples in Waterloo and Calgary. We are also looking at DMUs (Diesel Multiple Units).
- *Question:* If the Hanlon is going to perform a function in our local growth, then we need to think about transit-supportive development initiatives as part of urban form. How are transit initiatives going to support urban form?
 - *Response:* We need to look at balancing the transportation nodes and means of travel. Transportation drives land use and vice versa. Intensification will support transit. For example, transit can gain by using the Hanlon Expressway rather than over-capacity City roadways. The Ministry of Transportation (MTO) is emphasizing transit use.
- *Question:* Will transportation interconnectivity be considered?
 - *Response:* Yes.
- *Question:* Most of this presentation has dealt with transportation outside of the City. What about transportation inside of the City?
 - *Response:* Environmental assessments have been completed on many roadways within the City and these roadways are either under construction or awaiting future capital budgeting.
- *Comment:* Major corridors will be extremely important for rural areas.
- *Question:* Will there be a good linkage? Will there be good interconnectivity between rail and roads?
 - *Response:* Yes.
- *Question:* How do we justify building a new parking garage in the downtown now when we are moving to a non-car society? Why are we using part of our scarce downtown lands to stack a bunch of cars in a parking structure, rather than using the land to create buildings for intensification?
 - *Response:* A lot of this is in conflict, but it is not incompatible.

Economic Development Presentation

Peter Cartwright discussed:

- Current marketing initiatives and development trends

CAC Meeting #2 - May 24/06

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the Agenda and presentation material for the meeting.

- Short and long term land supply needs
- The Hanlon Creek Business Park, South Guelph employment lands, York District Study and the current Employment Land Needs Strategy

Participant Questions and Comments:

- *Question:* Why is there such an emphasis on the industrial sector (especially manufacturing and distribution) and warehouse development? One of the characteristics of these structures is that for the amount of land consumed and money spent, there is very low density employment land, and very high servicing requirements. This is possibly contrary to some of the strategies in Places to Grow and where Guelph might want to go. 80-90% of new jobs are in the service sector. For example, IT jobs are often higher-paying, very easy on services, and are high density. Why can't we be seeking these sectors?
 - *Response:* These are the trends and inquiries that are being received at this time. We are not getting the high tech inquiries. In the past, these (industrial developments) have been high consumers of land and services, but they may not necessarily require a high level of service or be low tech. For example, the Tim Hortons distribution warehouse is very high tech. Also, a lot of companies are looking at ways to be more sustainable, looking at using less land, and having less impact on services (i.e., looking at discharging wastewater in off peak hours). There is also interest by developers in obtaining LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) Green Building Rating System certification.
- *Question:* For the municipality to become a viable, sustainable community, we must look at land shrinkage. We must also look at joint development. Guelph and Puslinch should look at jointly developing lands south of the City boundary. There are environmental constraints to the south (Provincially significant wetlands), limiting development south of Guelph. Why are we considering extending the boundary of the City for more business?
 - *Response:* Agreed. We need more efficient land use and need to work together.

Financial Considerations Presentation

David Kennedy provided a brief overview of key financial considerations.

Participant Questions and Comments:

- *Question:* Is there any indication that Development Charges (DC) in Ontario will be changed so that 100% of the costs of growth will be attributable to new development?
 - *Response:* People are lobbying for it to include new/expansions to hospitals, waste management, etc.
- *Question:* What impact is there on the community respecting the rate of rising assessment values and how this is changing the amount of revenue available?

CAC Meeting #2 - May 24/06

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the Agenda and presentation material for the meeting.

- *Response:* Municipalities need a stable financial base to pay for maintenance and expansion of existing hard/soft infrastructure

Question: Money is extremely important. For example, how will we pay for required infrastructure (replacements and expansions for new growth)? We have a lot of interests here. Is there anything that looks at financial partnerships? If Places to Grow occurs, there will be massive infrastructure needed for regional water/wastewater treatment, transportation networks, etc.

- *Response:* When we look at Regional issues we will need to examine both costs and sources of dollars to pay for infrastructure. Development Charges (DC) review is coming in 2008.

Key Themes and Looking Ahead

Tying the 'threads' together

- Glenn Pothier asked Bob Lehman for his thoughts on the common threads.
- Bob Lehman commented as follows:
 - Places to Grow establishes a framework. We need to develop the Local Growth Management Strategy (LGMS) within this framework. At the same time, there is an opportunity to use our Local Growth Management Strategy (LGMS) to better define the implications of Places to Grow.
 - A key observation is that growth levels or rates of growth are much higher than previously planned. Growth is occurring much faster and sooner than we had planned, and this has implications for infrastructure.
 - Currently the City limits could accommodate a population of about 155,000, with an additional 16,000 more units being built within the existing area of the City. Higher growth rates will reach these limits earlier.
 - A variety of new measures would be required to ensure that City water supplies would be sufficient to meet the growth targets outlined in Places to Grow.
 - The capacity of the City's Sewage Treatment Plant is a key factor affecting the amount of growth the municipality can accommodate. The assimilative capacity of the Speed River (i.e., how much treated sewage effluent the stream can absorb without substantially changing its natural characteristics) and the Wastewater Treatment Master Plan will indicate whether Places to Grow projections can in fact be met.
 - The Local Growth Management Strategy will need to articulate the substantial growth costs associated with the Places to Grow plan. Opportunities for partnerships/cost sharing arrangements in a regional context will need to be examined.

CAC Meeting #2 - May 24/06

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the Agenda and presentation material for the meeting.

- Energy consumption needs to be a consideration in evaluating different growth form options. Opportunities for intensification and local energy production facilities need to be considered as a result of rising energy costs.
 - As we contend with the infrastructure required to address growth, there will also be a need to repair/rebuild existing infrastructure. Furthermore, infrastructure improvements will be required to bring capacities on stream and address expectations of accommodating higher levels of intensification.
 - Even with significant effort to alter transportation modal splits away from the automobile, a number of City road improvements are required to address transportation growth rates. In addition, Provincial road/rail infrastructure improvements are required by the Ontario government which, if not undertaken, will exacerbate local transportation network problems.
 - The Places to Grow plan also contemplates long-term sustained employment growth. There is a need to ensure adequate development opportunities and land supplies are available to meet anticipated long-term employment requirements. Current initiatives will address short-term needs.
 - A key outcome of the LGMS is a long-term financial strategy to outline capital infrastructure costs and consider operating expenditures.
 - Municipality jurisdictions are becoming less relevant to managing the impacts of growth. There are Provincially prescribed requirements dealing with matters such as waste management, transportation for goods movement, water, interregional transit, wastewater treatment, etc.
- Bob Lehman summarized the discussions of the evening into four key themes:
 - There needs to be sustainability in the use of existing systems. We need to maximize existing infrastructure and minimize demands.
 - There will be significant impacts of growth and intensification, and there are significant constraints to both.
 - Municipalities will need to work together to solve problems that cross traditional boundaries.
 - Costs are very significant, whether it's maintaining infrastructure, or building new things.

Bob briefly highlighted the next steps in the Local Growth Management Strategy (LGMS), including conducting focus group discussion, community leader interviews, and preparation of a background information report.

CAC Meeting #2 - May 24/06

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the Agenda and presentation material for the meeting.

Participant Comments:

A number of comments were made by members of the public in attendance:

- *Comment:* It is important that taxes that leave the community return to the community in some form or another. Property taxes are an archaic system (i.e., an elderly couple on a fixed income with their only money invested in their home are charged very high property taxes, when they don't have the money to afford it). It should be based on income.
 - *Response:* There is a meeting about Municipal imbalance coming up.
- *Comment:* City Staff should have a meeting to watch 'End of Suburbia'.
- *Comment:* It is important to remember that the biggest industry in the world is tourism, and we need to consider tourism and culture in our economic development.
- *Question:* Can everyone have access to the minutes from the previous meeting?
 - *Response:* Yes; information will be posted on the City's website: www.guelph.ca/localgrowth.
- *Question:* Can we be informed of the next meeting?
 - *Response:* Yes; information will be posted on the City's website: www.guelph.ca/localgrowth.

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

- Glenn Pothier thanked the group and staff for their attendance and presentations.
- The meeting was formally adjourned at 9:25 pm.

CAC Meeting #2 - May 24/06

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the Agenda and presentation material for the meeting.

Attendees:

City Staff Presenters:

Cameron Walsh
Martin Lavictoire
Rajan Philips
Dean Wyman
Don Kudo
Paul Kraehling
Craig Manley
Peter Cartwright
Dave Belanger
David Kennedy

Consultant Team:

Bob Lehman
Dana Anderson
Glenn Pothier

Senior Management Team:

David Kennedy
David Hosker
Larry Kotseff
Janet Laird
Lois Payne
Jim Riddell

Advisory Committee:

Bill Mungall
Lloyd Grinham
David Douglas
Astrid Clos
Jan Craig
Fred Natolochny
Gary Cousins
Dick Visser (Twp of Puslinch)
Chris White
Dan Schnurr
Laura Baily
Kate Quarrie
Ian Smith
Chuck Cunningham
Jim Riddell

Council Members:

Lise Burcher

CAC Meeting #2 - May 24/06

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the Agenda and presentation material for the meeting.

Maggie Laidlaw
David Birtwhistle
Dan Schnurr
Laura Baily
Dan Moziar
Ray Ferraro

City Staff:

Rick Tolkunow
Mat Vaughan
Geoffrey Keyworth
Katie Nasswetter
Christina Metherall

Members of the Public/Observers:

Chantelle Leidl
Norah Chaloner
Richard Chaloner

CAC Meeting #2 - May 24/06

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the Agenda and presentation material for the meeting.

Third Meeting of the Community Advisory Committee *In support of Guelph's Growth Management Strategy*

Agenda

Opening Remarks

- Welcome and session overview
- Introductions
- Three minute recap

Update on the Province's Growth Plan

- Status report from the Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal
- Questions

Local Growth Management Strategy Background Report

- Overview of the purpose and function of the Report
- Community survey
- Discussion of the draft Background Report:
 - What are the key messages being conveyed?
 - What, if anything, is of concern?
 - Anything unclear?
 - What's missing?
 - Is the level of detail right?
 - How else can the draft be improved?
- Questions

Review of the Draft Consultation Plan

- Overview of project phases and potential approaches
- Questions and feedback — ideas for refinements/enhancements

Looking Ahead and Open Forum

- The next meeting: September 14th
- Additional participant input: comments, ideas, issues

Public Comment

- Opportunity for 'observer' questions/comments

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

Meeting notes from:

Third Meeting of the
Guelph Growth Management Strategy
Community Advisory Committee

Meeting Date/Location:

August 30, 2006/Guelph City Hall

Facilitator: Glenn Pothier, President, GLP*i*



Meeting Purpose

The third meeting of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) was held August 30, 2006.

The meeting was held in order to:

1. Update the CAC on the status and direction of the Provincial Places to Grow initiative;
2. Review and obtain feedback from the CAC with respect to a draft background contextual report;
3. Review and obtain feedback from the CAC with respect to preliminary community consultation approaches;
4. Report on in summary from the feedback obtained from initial 'key informant' focus groups - July and August '06;
5. Provide an opportunity for observers to provide comments regarding the discussions during the meeting

Opening Remarks

Glenn Pothier, the independent meeting facilitator, called the group to order.

Glenn Pothier, welcomed all participants and observers, and thanked them for their Attendance and participation;

CAC members, Staff, the consultant team, and the audience introduced themselves;

Glenn Pothier provided an overview of the project and the group that was present;

Glenn Pothier provided a recap of the last CAC meeting; and

Glenn Pothier provided an overview of the purpose of the meeting and what it was hoped would be achieved.

Update on Provincial Growth Plan

Lisa Orchard from the Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal (MPIR) provided an update on the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GPGGH) and answered questions on the Growth Plan and the Places to Grow legislation:

- She presented the legal framework, timeline, and background of the Places to Grow legislation and the GPGGH
- Themes of the GPGGH include:

- Complete communities
 - Infill and redevelopment
 - Places to work and mixed use communities
 - Co-ordination of planning and infrastructure development
 - Making urban areas more livable
 - Protection of natural areas
- Implementation of the GPGGH:
 - Province is currently determining the best way to implement the delineation of the built boundary
 - Province to determine the size and location of the urban growth centres
 - Province to determine of the need for greenfield lands
 - Sub-area assessments of transportation systems, water/wastewater, agriculture, aggregates, natural systems, regional/provincially significant employment areas, and possibly others have not been defined as of yet.
- The population targets and projections will be used until a 5 year review and possible revision of the population targets and projections. The Province will work with the City and County to distribute the population targets in Schedule 3 for 2021 and 2031.
- MPIR will work with municipalities to outline ways to solve current issues and problems with GPGGH implementation
- MPIR and Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) will work together to provide one-stop service to municipalities
- Plan applies to matters commenced on or after June 16, 2006
- Public engagement will be used by the Province to inform and educate the public on planning and the reasons behind the Growth Plan

Participant Questions and Comments:

- Question: How do differences in policy be treated with respect to aggregates between MNR and MPIR?
 - Comment: No answer.
- Question: When sub-area analysis is completed and infrastructure is taken into account, might there be flexibility on population/employment growth targets? How can the municipality decide to go its own way?
 - Comment: Targets are fixed but can be reviewed after 5 years. Population targets are set to 2011 currently. Population past 2011 will be discussed later. Not sure how provincial population targets will be enforced.

- Question: Who does the sub-area analysis?
 - Comment: Province will complete with municipalities.
- Question: We don't know all the rules, so it is difficult for municipalities to come up with solutions to meet the requirements of the GPGGH. When will they be complete?
 - Comment: Built boundary definitions/rules should be out this year. MPIR is moving as fast as possible.
- Question: Can a commitment be made to the timeline?
 - Comment: No.
- Question: In terms of Guelph meeting growth targets, how do we meet the targets without facilities and infrastructure?
 - Comment: Municipality can discuss this with the Province.
- Question: What is the timing on the sub-area growth assessments?
 - Comment: No answer.
- Question: It would be useful for municipalities if they had a timeframe from the Province of work to be completed by the Province.
 - Comment: Ok.
- Question: How will forecasts be dealt with if Guelph does not achieve them?
 - Comment: That issue will be dealt with at the 10 year review of the GPGGH.
- Question: Sub-area analysis will change the context of the LGMS. When will they be completed?
 - Comment: Not sure. Information will be brought back from MPIR.

Local Growth Management Study (LGMS) Context Report

Bob Lehman from Meridian Planning Consultants provided an overview of the intent and purpose of the LGMS Context report:

- Meant to have wide public understanding
- Will inform the future of the LGMS study
- Provides a foundation of the current understanding of growth expectations and initiatives.

Glenn Pothier asked if there were any observations or comments on the LGMS Context Report from the CAC and Staff.

Comments:

- More reference needed to Guelph within Wellington County
- Where are immigrants to Guelph coming from? What services, infrastructure, and programs are needed?
- Demographics need to be looked at and reviewed
- Changes in the live/work status of residents should be highlighted
- What effect will demographic changes have on land use
- Is the Context Report a static document or will the content evolve?
 - Answer from Bob Lehman: No, Context Report is a picture of Guelph in time.
 - Answer from Craig Manley: The intent is to get everyone on the same page initially.
- Need to highlight the intent and purpose of the document at the beginning
- Make clear the Provincial role in the process
- Document could have smoother flow
- Why are conditions on the second page
- Front 'conditions' historical piece provides good perspective
- Not much on employment lands. What happens with residential lands intensify and employment lands run out?
- Document from 1945 at the beginning is good
- St Patrick's Ward is a good example of intensification and mixed use to use
- Purpose of LGMS should be on the front page
- Need to expand section on
 - cultural heritage
 - urban design, the maintenance of unique character
 - intensification
- People need to see a visual representation of intensification and density, numbers don't mean much
 - Comment from Craig Manley: GuelphQuest is a software communications tool that is intended to provide information on the tradeoffs of intensification and density - it is more macro level than to show 'looks' of different densities
 - Comment from Craig Manley: There will be extensive visual displays of intensification and density using other media
- Will people be educated on intensification?
 - Comment: Yes they will have the opportunity to learn about positives, negatives and implications of density/intensification

Overview of Preliminary Public Consultation

Bob Lehman outlined public consultation findings to date regarding the community survey and the initial focus groups:

- The results of the focus group discussions and community survey will be posted on the web site and will form part of the background information concerning the LGMS.
- The focus groups held in July-August 2006 were meant to assist the consultants in developing the LGMS process
- High level themes included:
 - Ensure everyone is reached
 - Specifically reach out to immigrants, bring new immigrants into process
 - Have a focused process with less committees, but fewer more focused committees

Draft Consultation Plan

Glenn Pothier presented the Draft Consultation Plan for the LGMS and invited questions and comments from the CAC and Staff:

- Question: Will the plan be presented as a done deal?
 - Comment: LGMS is going to look at Places to Grow and see what the City wants to do with it. Consultation will determine the LGMS response to the Places to Grow
- Question: What is the timeframe for the phases of the LGMS process and its associated consultation?
 - Comment: Phase I, Jan/Feb 07; Phase II, May 07; Phase III, Dec 07; Phase IV, May 08.
- Comment: The City can use the Guelph Youth Council as a resource.
- Question/comment: How do we reconcile how people want the city to grow and what the province wants? Without looking at the implications of the GPGGH, Guelph has little ground to stand on. We must look at implications of growth, not just why or why not.
- Comment: Connect with AMO and other cities to discuss with the province. Reach out to others in similar situations, band together and use weight of numbers to hold sway with the province.
- Comment: Concern of sub-area assessments. How do we integrate work that the ministry is doing on sub-area assessments with work that municipalities are going to have to start?

Bob Lehman provided an overview of proposed web-based resources that are available and can be modified to use for the LGMS consultation.

- Proposed library of resources and issues
- Bulletin board for questions and answers from public to consultant team

- Would be available to anyone
- Will be one more method for building the consultation process

Glenn Pothier asked if there were any final thoughts on the Draft Consultation Plan. There were none.

Glenn Pothier asked if there was any more business. There was none.

Open Forum

Glenn Pothier opened the floor to any questions and/or comments from the public.

- Comment: Public input is good. What is the overall cost of the process?
- Comment: I feel that the mindset of the professional planner is far too bound to the Planning Act. It is very important for planners to look beyond the Planning Act rules. Look at the GreenPlan page 80-81. What is necessary to long term planning is natural system sustainability. We are still learning the lessons from the 1970s. We are doing much of what was done before. We are following in past mistakes. We are neglecting much of what planning should be. Constraints should come from natural systems.
- When is the Open Forum?
 - Comment: This is the open forum for tonight's meeting. Just a preliminary open forum, not the full consultation process. Community consultation to occur in spring '07.
- Comment: The biggest constraint for Guelph is water and wastewater. Will Guelph be able to choose its own natural system limits? Or will the Province force Guelph to do what is required to be able to meet the GPGGH population and employment targets?
- Comment: Let the public know what is happening with the City and the Province. People think the City is thumbing its nose at the Province.
- Comment: Need more public consultation. There are many people in Guelph who are smart and have lots of input.
- Comment: If we are strong environmental stewards the rest of the planning should follow along the way.
- Comment: City should tap into university assets, use students to do focus groups.

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

Glenn Pothier thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

The meeting was formally adjourned at 9:35.

Attendees:

Consultant:

Glen Pothier
Jeff Neilson
Bob Lehman

Advisory Committee:

Laura Baily
Jan Craig
Lloyd Grinham
Fred Natolochny
Jim Riddell
Dan Schnurr
Ian Smith
Anne Waller
Brad Whitcombe
Chris White

City Staff:

Craig Manley
Paul Kraehling
Larry Kotseff
Mat Vaughan
Katie Nasswetter

Members of the Public/Observers:

Jane and Stephen Rodd
Mark Muller
Stephanie MacLellan
Mark Juhasz
Tyler Demers
Susan Ratcliffe
David Sills
Arthur Churchyard
Jane Heuman
Jane Hall
Lisa Orchard

September 14th, 2006
7:00 – 8:30 PM
City Hall: Council Chambers

Fourth Meeting of the Community Advisory Committee *In support of Guelph's Growth Management Strategy*

Agenda

Opening Remarks – City Planning Staff

- Welcome and session overview

GuelphQuest Presentation – Mike Walsh, President of Envision Sustainability Tools Inc.

- Overview of MetroQuest (background info at www.questforthefuture.com)
- Introduction to Draft GuelphQuest Software – Work Completed to Date
- Draft GuelphQuest Software Preview – Scenarios and Options
- Discussion and Questions

GuelphQuest Next Steps – City Staff

Public Comment

- Opportunity for 'observer' questions/comments

Meeting notes from:

Fourth Meeting of the
Guelph Growth Management Strategy
Community Advisory Committee

Meeting Date/Location:

September 14, 2006/City Hall, Council Chambers

Presenter: Mike Walsh, Envision Sustainability Tools Inc.
President, Co-Founder

Meeting Purpose

The fourth meeting of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) was designed to:

- Provide an introduction of the Draft GuelphQuest Software;
- Provide an overview of the key functions of the software;
- Provide an opportunity for members and observers to ask questions and give feedback regarding the Draft GuelphQuest Software;
- Explore the next steps to take and how the Draft GuelphQuest Software will be continually developed over the fall.

Summary of Meeting Highlights

Opening Remarks

- City staff member Paul Kraehling called the group to order and welcomed all participants and observers, and thanked them for their attendance and participation;
- Paul Kraehling provided an overview of the purpose of the meeting and what it was hoped would be achieved;
- Paul Kraehling gave a brief description of the Draft GuelphQuest Software and its use as a communicative tool. He emphasized it is not a drafting or planning tool. He advised that the City received funding from FCM to help acquire this software
- Mike Walsh, president and co-founder of Envision Sustainability Tools provided an introduction to the Draft GuelphQuest Software and then gave a brief presentation for its utility as a communicative tool.
- Mike Walsh and City staff answered questions regarding the Draft GuelphQuest Software during and preceding the presentation.

Participant Questions and Comments:

- Question: I am seeing charts and graphs for the year 2041, but what numbers are these projections based on? How analytical is this tool supposed to be?
 - *Response: This software uses a combination of historical data to be able to make projections like this about the future. This data comes from places like Statistics Canada and from data provided by the City.*
- Question: Is this system based on current trends?
 - *Response: Yes. However have been consulting with the city to ensure these trends are correct.*
- Question: Will there be somewhere in the manuals or within the software where the statistics used will be referenced? Are we talking about only one set of numbers that will pre-determine the outcomes?
 - *Response: This program has the ability to change the rate of growth you are dealing with. There will be four options to choose from.*

- Question: People need to know where these statistics are being drawn from
 - *Response: Yes, I agree. We have tried very hard to be clear about where these numbers are coming from.*
- Question: We are talking about projections, but is there a scenario where we can put a specific cap on the population regardless of what the province wants us to do?
 - *Response: This software is based on four growth options. These options will be under review for the next couple months.*
- Question: Can you use different levels of growth?
 - *Response: Yes. There are four levels to choose from.*
- Question: I don't see a category for 'walkable communities' why is that?
 - *Response: The indicators you are seeing now are what are referred to as macro indicators. There are hundreds of micro indicators that you are not seeing. These indicators will be under review for the next couple months.*
- Question: Depending on what the user chooses, I don't see the level of details this software is providing to be correct.
 - *Response: This software is not to be used for giving the user a fine amount of detail. Its main purpose is to show the relationships between key indicators within the city and how they can affect each other. The outcomes of this software are based on assumptions. We will be working with the City of make sure these assumptions are correct.*
- Question: Will there be details on the micro level? The average person will not understand this.
 - *Response: This is more of a Regional tool and gives more of an over-view than a detailed look at each specific aspect of a city. This tool is very easy to understand if you have a good presenter explaining it to the audience.*
- Question: Will the CAC have a part in completing this tool?
 - *Response: We are intending to use the CAC as guinea pigs to receive feedback about the software.*
- Question: I wish the macro indicators would communicate better. The terms it is using are for professionals.
 - *Response: The wording used as the macro indicators will be reviewed and revised to ensure they are the best options.*
- Question: It would be nice to have pictures of what each outcome could look like.
 - *Response: We need to approach the growth of this city in stages. This tool allows us to get through stage one. It allows us to recognize the relationships that exist in the city. The next step will be to use a different tool to narrow down the detail we need to ensure the results are correct.*
- Question: I am still worried about the assumptions this software is making. I think there is a need to quantify the assumptions.

- *Response: We are still working through understanding the relationships in this tool. We need to be very clear about our assumptions. This tool is helping us to stimulate dialog about the possibilities in the city.*
- *We are not saying the outcomes of this software will be perfect. But it will give us a relative idea about the changes that could take place. There are no evaluations of the results. The 'wheel' is just a demonstration of the relationships. This tool will not give us the answer of what this city will become. And I do not think any software would be able to accurately give you that answer.*
- Question: During sub-sequent presentations of this software, I think it would be beneficial to show the whole package (including other tools), that will be able to compliment this tool. Otherwise we are giving the false message that the results produced by this software may be the only correct answer.
 - *Response: Yes, I agree.*
- Question: Can we change the categories around the 'wheel'
 - *Response: Yes, but it must be done at the macro level. Staff will forward the descriptions of the indicators to the Committee.*
- Question: Where in the process will the CAC be engaged in the development of this software?
 - *Response: Before we go out to the community we will have a workshop with this group to fine tune this software. In the next few weeks staff will be learning it. We need to figure out how to structure this workshop in order to make it effective. We would like to get this software out by the end of the year.*
- Question: It would be helpful to see hardcopies of the flow chart of this system.
 - *Response: Yes, we will send out the lists to you so that we can receive your feedback. However, it would be more beneficial to receive lists of what you'd like to see go on the list as opposed to what is missing from the list.*
- Question: How many communities have you worked with?
 - *Response: Six*
- Question: Are we the smallest?
 - *Response: No, we have worked with smaller*
- Question: Is Canada the only place you have looked at?
 - *Response: We have worked with examples from all over the world*
- Question: Is ten 'spokes' the max?
 - *Response: Yes. This is based on our experience. In this case, less is more because it is easier to understand. Otherwise this would also be a very costly thing to change.*

Observer Comments

Question: Can site specific environmental constraints be built into this model?

- *Response: Yes, they were part of the original design of the software. We will be working through making sure these items are avoided for the final product.*

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

- Mike Walsh thanked the group and staff for their attendance.
- The meeting was formally adjourned at 9:02 pm.

Attendees:

Consultant:

Mike Walsh

Advisory Committee:

Bill Mungall
Lloyd Grinham
David Douglas
Astrid Clos
Jan Craig
Fred Natolochny
Gary Cousins
Chris White
Dan Schnurr
Laura Baily
Chuck Cunningham
Jim Riddell
Anne Waller

Council Members:

Maggie Laidlaw
David Birtwistle
Dan Moziar
Ray Ferraro

City Staff:

Craig Manley
Paul Krehling
Larry Kotseff
Mat Vaughan
Katie Nasswetter

Members of the Public/Observers:

R.Stephen Rodd
Glenn Pothier

Meeting notes from:

Guelph Growth Management Strategy
GuelphQuest Trial Workshop
Community Advisory Committee

Meeting Date/Location:

November 8th, 2006 7 pm/City Hall, Council Chambers

Facilitator: Glenn Pothier, President, GLP/

Meeting Purpose

The trial workshop for the GuelphQuest software with the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) was designed to:

- Provide a general presentation of the questions, options and current trend scenario
- Provide an opportunity for a breakout session on option preferences and preferred option discussion
- Allow for a review of GuelphQuest scenarios derived from breakout session
- Provide an opportunity for members and observers to ask questions and give feedback regarding the GuelphQuest workshop format and the GuelphQuest software;
- Provide an opportunity for 'observer' questions/comments

Summary of Trial Workshop Highlights

Opening Remarks

- Facilitator Glenn Pothier called the group to order and welcomed all participants and observers, and thanked them for their attendance and participation;
- Glenn provided an overview of the purpose of the meeting and trial workshop and what it was hoped would be achieved;
- City Staff member Paul Kraehling gave a brief description of the Draft GuelphQuest Software and its use as a communicative tool and how it could be used in a workshop format;
- Paul reviewed the Questions and Options with the group and gave some detail regarding the options meanings and how the workshop would proceed.

Breakout Exercise

- City Staff members Paul Kraehling and Craig Manley facilitated two separate breakout workshop groups who explored 10 questions related to growth within Guelph based on the GuelphQuest software. This exercise allowed participants to choose their own scenario for Guelph's future.
- Each participant filled out a short handout identifying their preferred option for each question - What would you choose for Guelph in 2041?
- Each participant also filled out a detailed response to one of the ten questions.
- There was a discussion regarding the preferred option chosen by each participant in each of the breakout groups. Each participant explained their choice for their question and the reasoning behind their decision.
- The group then discussed if they agreed with a preferred choice for their group or if they would choose an alternative option. (Potential impacts/tradeoffs of choices were highlighted).
- With the available time (30 minutes), 3 questions/options were explained by each workshop group.

- City Staff members Katie Nasswetter and Mat Vaughan recorded the discussions within the breakout group sessions.
- Results were tallied and a majority answer for each group was input as a scenario option into the GuelphQuest software.

Group A Summary

Group A briefly discussed Questions 4, 7, and 9.

Question 4 - Transit and Transit-Oriented Development: The preferred option for this question was Planned Improvements. This option was chosen to avoid traffic congestion and plan future land uses around good municipal transit. Another participant considered the Expanded Inter-Regional Transit option, with the argument that "If you have a car, you'll use it, so our goal should be to not need a car".

Question 7 - Energy and Air Quality: The option chosen by a group member in this scenario was to Improve Programs. It was chosen because the participant felt that energy costs will continue to rise faster than inflation and air quality will continue to decrease. Possible impacts of this decision include a reduced need for additional energy supply, better air quality which would reduce the number of health problems. In addition, the reduced energy use could also make us more economically competitive.

Question 9 - Water and Wastewater Capacity: The option chosen was to Maximize Technology, in order to be self sufficient. Impacts of this decision would be the costs involved and proving the efficacy of the new technologies used. There may also be a greater sense of stewardship developed in the community. There was some uncertainty as to what was meant by the use of the term 'grey water'.

Group B Summary

Group B briefly discussed Questions 2, 3, and 9.

Question 2 - Job Location: The job option chosen by a group member in this scenario was to encourage City-wide development. It was chosen because the participant felt that jobs should be placed where people live, and because people live all over the city, jobs should also have an even distribution around the city as well. This will have a positive affect on other aspects of the city such as the transportation network by decreasing commute times. It was noted that the private sector needs to help to place these jobs. In general the group agreed to this. They agreed that minimizing commuting time will help save people money and it should also increase the quality of life.

Question 3 - Housing Development Density: The option chosen by a group member in this scenario was to encourage more compact growth. It was chosen because the participant felt that the aging population was going to change the demands of the housing market to want smaller more dense development then in the past. They felt that there were not enough apartments going up in the city. The group agreed this was the way the city should be developed but pointed out that single detached housing development should not be forgotten, but just made denser. In general this type of development was thought to lessen the required

infrastructure, better community living, address the changing demographics, avoid urban sprawl and create more walkable communities.

Question 9 - Water and Wastewater Capacity: The option chosen by a group member in this scenario was to maximize the use of technology. It was chosen because the participant felt that the technology will get better over time and this will be able to compensate for the growing population. They also mentioned that it would be in the best interest to choose option three now, and if in the future technology improvements and demand reduction are not sufficient, we could then switch options. The group agreed this was a good course of action to take. It was agreed that we have reduced our water usage, but we could still do better. We need tighter conservation management.

Workshop Results

- City staff member Geoffrey Keyworth input the data collected during the breakout session into the GuelphQuest software and showed how the two groups differed in their majority opinion. This showed the similarities and differences between the two groups. This comparison was based on land-use, transportation and energy components. The majority selections from the two groups generated almost identical scenarios. An additional scenario (a current trend approach) was created highlighting the different outcomes for different options to better demonstrate the capabilities of the software.
- City staff members Katie Nasswetter and Mat Vaughan provided commentary on the breakout session discussions (what was debated/accepted).
- Some questions and comments were asked at this point:

Question: Do the indicators relate to the questions - what do fiscal health and household affordability relate to?

A: Some indicators relate directly to the questions. For example, total water supply relates directly to the choice of conservation or Great Lakes supply. On the other hand, other indicators are related to multiple indicators, such as fiscal health and household affordability.

Question: Why does growth go where it does?

A: The software allows us to determine which areas growth is to be encouraged, discouraged (such as stable residential areas) or prohibited entirely (such as Provincially Significant Wetlands). The software will then determine where growth will occur based on the choices for density and population/employment growth. Growth is also more likely at certain attractors, such as along arterial roads or near transit terminals.

Question: Is this program for the average 'Joe Citizen' to develop a better understanding of these factors and relationships?

A: Yes, to better understand the tradeoffs inherent in planning choices and to understand how the choices can affect different quality of life indicators.

Question: Regarding transportation and current predictions, what if we run out of oil within the 40 year time frame?

A: This is difficult to predict because there are no trends on which to base a prediction. Also, since global energy prices are not within Guelph's control, there is no option within the software we can use to model that. The best approach from within the GuelphQuest software is to use transit and road infrastructure and transportation policy choices to prepare for such a future if we believe that it is plausible.

Summary of Workshop

- City staff member Craig Manley summarized the findings and discussed how information could be used in a real Local Growth Management Strategy GuelphQuest workshop.
- Things to consider in the future included participant selection of options for various stakeholder groups, packaging of information and commentary on values being discussed by participants.
- Participants then were given a short evaluation form to fill out regarding the workshop experience.

Workshop Feedback

- Facilitator Glenn Pothier encouraged discussion with the group regarding the workshop regarding its format, content, etc.

Participant Questions and Comments:

Comment: I would keep in mind the targets of Places to Grow. The City wants to decide its own growth, but PTG targets are there, and people will want to know if we are meeting those targets. Does the software tool show what these targets will look like?

Glenn: There was similar discussion in Group A for question 10 dealing with different population and job projections. Whether we are talking about assumptions or desirability, and that growth rate has implications for the answers to other questions.

Comment: I would put Question 10 as Question 1. In the introductory remarks there needs to be more engagement.

Craig: Given that questions are related, maybe the suggestion would be for people to read through them all together, and then answer them individually. Also, what this means for people needs to be made clear, what do these factors do to people... Its too abstract, what does it mean on a personal level.

Glenn: Real people examples, i.e. more stewardship, conservation - people behaviour would need to change, how would we be willing to change.

Comment: Social, cultural, new Canadians, whole situations of factors we're note dealing with - this is very economic, infrastructure driven approach to growth. We need to address social-cultural equity issues. In the introduction, if participants are told that preferences are

not a done deal, that this is a citizen engagement process - make sure it is clear what this tool is for.

Comment: In preparation for the audience - need to make it clear in advance what the project is for - maybe in a communications piece from the City like Insight Guelph - that homework needs to be done beforehand. Also, a lot of info in the introduction needs to be made; maybe make a video or powerpoint that is more interesting.

Question: When this process is complete, how is it implemented? Council?

A: Yes

Comment: I think vocabulary is important - how easy is the document to read: Grade 5 level. Need to simplify, make it more comprehensible, so everyone understands what we are talking about.

Craig: Maybe we should explain the choices individually and as we go have people choose them.

Comment: Need to make everyone aware how complex this subject matter is; will take 2 to 3 hours - longer than an average City meeting. Maybe there are two classes of people - ones that just want to go and cast votes for an hour or so and ones that want to go deeper and look at the connections involved.

Comment: I think you should go to senior levels of schools with this - like grade 11 and 12s, science, environmental and civics classes.

Comment: I've been preoccupied with the illustration that in any of these scenarios, impacts of solid waste with population/employment growth doesn't move. How can this be?

Glenn: So we need to explain why some things move and others don't - facilitators need to be able to explain this.

Question: The model made vast changes but no fiscal changes: Why?

A: Assumptions are made in the software that costs are off-set by revenues.

Comment: To show what the model does, I'm thinking of a Results Chain Model, might be useful: If we increase density by 30% for example, what does it show, i.e. key results, bubbles shoot up. The idea is to show how things are connected before people make decisions.

Question: Also, are there ways to break down the results more?

A: The model can show results in 10 year increments.

Glenn: We need to hold up some as examples, show some key changes and implications.

Question: Can you go backwards on the diagram to maximize solid waste and find out what we need to do to accomplish this?

A: You can choose various options to the questions, and examine the resulting impacts on the summary scenario diagram; an iterative process.

Question: Can we see how much a particular option costs?

A: No, there are too many assumptions, and uncertain of all of the trade offs. The purpose is to engage workshop participants in discussion, figure out what we trying to get to; there's no need for numbers until we have a direction. Information is directional only.

Comment: The colours are difficult to differentiate: orange is confusing.

Observer Comments

Colours don't show up well enough, and answers need to be shown clearly, ie. what answers are whose? In terms of results: people can see them; it has merit, but need to show the implications clearly.

Can you add a map legend? When developing scenarios - getting a majority may be skewed - and if you're not in the majority, where are the individual results, i.e. where did this information come from?

Next Steps

Over the course of the next month City staff will be reviewing the process used during this trial workshop, and using the notes and experience gained here to refine the workshop for future dates.

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

- Glenn Pothier thanked the group and staff for their attendance.
- The meeting was formally adjourned at 10:00 pm

Attendees:

Consultant:

Glenn Pothier

Advisory Committee:

Lloyd Grinham

David Douglas

Astrid Clos

Jan Craig

Chris White

Chuck Cunningham

Jim Riddell

Anne Waller

Ian Smith

Bill Mungall

City Staff:

Craig Manley

Paul Krehling

Larry Kotseff

Mat Vaughan

Katie Nasswetter

Geoffrey Keyworth

Members of the Public/Observers:

Christina Thomas

Dwayne Evans

Vicki Beard

Bryn Hobbs

Dave Marriott

Maggie Laidlaw

Sixth Meeting of the Community Advisory Committee *In support of Guelph's Growth Management Strategy*

Agenda

Opening Remarks

- Welcome and introductions

Committee Background Update

- Where we've been; where are we going
- Review Committee Terms of Reference

GuelphQuest Public Consultation Results

- Presentation of Results of Spring Public Consultation Process
- Discussion and Questions

Other Initiatives Underway and Co-ordination Efforts

Next Steps

- Public Open House on Results: June 21st, 2007
- Summer Scenario Development
- Fall 2007 Public Consultation

Facilitated Discussion

- Translation of GuelphQuest Results to Potential Growth Scenarios

Public Comment

- Opportunity for public questions/comments

Meeting notes from:

Sixth Meeting of the
Guelph Growth Management Strategy
Community Advisory Committee

Meeting Date/Location:

June 14, 2007/Council Chambers - City Hall

Facilitator: Janette Loveys Smith

Meeting Purpose

The sixth meeting of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) was to focus on the results from the GuelphQuest workshops and to develop next steps for the Fall 2007 public consultation regarding preferred growth options for the community, (see June 14, 2007 Agenda and handout documents).

Opening Remarks:

Paul Kraehling outlined the agenda for the evening. He reviewed current planning thresholds for the community to 2021, and the rationale for undertaking the present planning growth management process to 2031.

He briefly highlighted the objectives of the Places to Growth growth plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and the implications to the City of Guelph.

Paul outlined the 4 phase growth planning process for the Local Growth Management Strategy. We are currently midway through Phase 2 - the selection of a Preferred Growth Strategy for the community. He outlined how the results of the GuelphQuest workshop series held in the spring of 2007 was going to serve as the basis for future growth scenario planning.

GuelphQuest Public Consultation Results

Katie Nasswetter presented the committee with results from the GuelphQuest workshops. The committee then provided feedback to the presentation and comments regarding the results.

Discussion and Questions:

C = comment, Q = Question, A = Answer

- Q - I'm surprised looking at the preference/current trend summary scenario charts that the fiscal health doesn't change in 2041 when other indicators improve. So our fiscal health is not getting worse with growth?
- A- What the preference scenario indicates is that as we make investments in certain aspects of our community - related to urban form, transportation improvements, environmental considerations - we find there are additional returns/cost savings that in the end balance out the fiscal health of the community so that it does not worsen.
- Q - In terms of the results and the sample size of the participants involved in the GuelphQuest workshops, is this credible data that we should be confident in? How many people participated?

- A - These types of studies are difficult to conduct as it is based on a voluntary contribution. We find that people interested in the topic will be the ones to participate. We did go out and make sure we included different sectors in the community. We captured businesses, social, environmental, student groups, etc. This all adds to the credibility of the process. Over 250 people participating in the workshops.
- Q - I'm curious about the urban containment indicator; under the worse case 'current' scenario I noticed that there is a fair bit of spillage. Is that the worse case future scenario?
- A - These scenarios are based on what we 'could expect' to happen in the event of the spill-over into the surrounding lands, i.e. one scenario only. It is based on past trends and in consideration of market forces.
- C- I guess the argument for significant spillage into Puslinch is not there because of the presence of wetlands to the south of Guelph.
- Q - Puslinch Township is already getting very small; why take us over when there are lots of other areas to move into?
- A - This is just a scenario and is not what will for sure happen.
- Q - In the current trend scenario, why is there so much growth projected out in the west? Why move towards the Region of Waterloo?
- A - This is one example of what could happen with growth in a City-fringe location. The specific location of growth is not the focus of GuelphQuest; it is the policy choices that are being made to result in a particular scenario.
- Q - Would it be fair to say that that the land use growth scenario illustrated on the left side of the screen is 'intensification' and the right illustrated on the right side is 'sprawl'?
- A - Yes
- C - I think it is really important to state the validity of the various scenario options and the statistical reliability of the workshop inputs to the process.

Next Steps:

Craig Manley gave a description of the next phases of public consultation would entail and discussed the timing of this.

Facilitated Discussion:

Janette Loveys Smith facilitated a discussion regarding the GuelphQuest results and potential growth scenarios:

1. How do we translate the GQ results into more tangible growth scenarios?

- C - Our planning now may be speculative because there may be a new 400 series highway in the northeast part of the city. We should be working with the province so that our growth plan is in line with how we chose to grow.
- C - We need to start making decisions now because things are happening already.
- C - If we are going to use the rail lines to move freight/people, we first need to have all levels of government involved first.

- Q - Are the background documents to the preparation of our preferred growth plan - the GuelphQuest Workshops results and the Major City Initiatives Underway now going to be online?
- A - Yes

- Q - How did you do the high school workshops? Their scenario results don't seem to be inline with any of the other records. What high schools were they?
- A - We used the same workshop format as we did with the other groups. The differences came with different grades/ages of the student participants. We went to St. James and GCVI. There was significant interest in the topic by the high school groups.

- C - Given the overall community preference answers to Question 2 - where people should live in nodes, corridors and downtown; Question 4 - alternatives should be supported to the automobile; and Question 7 - there is a need for best practices for energy conservation and air quality improvements, how can our recent commercial policy review be possibly blended in with Guelph Quest? They don't seem to fit.

- Q - How does the Provinces' Places to Grow 'built boundary' definition fit with how we want to define our growth pattern? From my understanding there is a huge discrepancy with the province. How much leeway do we have with them to define it?
- A - We do not have too much say in the definition. They set the methodology and we need to follow it. There are some grey areas where we can negotiate, e.g. rural estate lot subdivisions.
- A continued - The provincial methodology sets out different targets for different areas of the City. In new Greenfield areas there is an overall target of increasing densities for residential and employment activity to 50 persons and jobs per hectare. This is significantly higher than current suburban development. Garrison Woods is a subdivision area in Calgary (for those who were at the recent FCM conference) where densities are significantly higher than typical suburban growth today. There is also an expectation that higher densities will occur in the downtown area and in

nodes and corridors. There may be an upper growth threshold that we can indicate to the Province is applicable based on our water supply (as outlined in our Water Supply Master Plan).

- Q - Within the last couple of months it is evident that several other municipalities in the GGH are seeming to be getting some leeway on their growth requirements; why don't we?
- A - I don't think they are getting any more leeway than we are.

- Q - I think the greenfield density targets are hard to visualize. There are issues there. I don't understand why we can't apply more densities there than we have done in the past. Is there more room there for us to play around with the densities?
- A - There is some room to alter our densities; however for employment lands our analysis indicates that we are not achieving provincial employment land density targets. Our employment base has significant amounts of warehousing and lower density industrial employment activity.

- Q - There is some discussion around water capacities - are we going to be looking through the lenses of water resources for growth?
- A - Yes, we have meetings set up with engineering to discuss infrastructure capacity considerations.

- C - These target numbers from the provincial growth plan seem like averages; I think we could seem some deviation on either side of them to recognize particular circumstances of an area.

- C - I think its great that we engage high school students, maybe we should be including more university students
- C - In terms of engagement, this paints an excellent picture to keep going forward with this and keep trying to get more responses out of the community

- C - In terms of engaging residents, we could be approaching more neighbourhoods and groups. This will affect them directly and we could show them how this will directly affect their neighbourhood.

What are some issues to consider while designing the process?

- C - We need to have a number. The province has to stop playing around and we need a number to do this properly. Until we get that number this will be too difficult

- C - Maybe we should be the one to give them the number.

- C - We have gone through the process and they will see how we did it and they will be happy with what we came up with
- C - Even though we identified the numbers, we need to be able to say what this means for individual neighbourhoods. People need to understand they have a choice as to where this will happen. The choice is critical.
- Q - What is the overall City population growth range again for 2031?
- A - 175,000 - 195,000
- Q - Could the province make the number higher than our top range?
- A - Through the discussions we have had with them I don't think they will. They understand there are some constraints here to growth.
- C - The county needs to make their plan at the same time. We need to stick together in this. If we can get the county mayors together on this we would be better off. Other jurisdictions are being shut down when they come back with different numbers than what the province wants.
- C - On the overall City growth process, I think it would be useful to get the population on the border of the city involved in this because they will be affected by this a lot. We need to give people the opportunity to do this.
- C - Some of Guelph's employment is in the county - do you see this changing at all?
- C - I live in Puslinch and there are a lot of people who are commuting from Toronto to live in Guelph and there are a lot more people using the roads now than before.
- A - There is commuting in and out of Guelph. Cannot control this. We can make opportunities available for people to live and work in Guelph but cannot force it through planning.
- C - We need to assist people in understanding the need to manage change. People don't know what to expect, and there is a natural resistance to change things from what we have. We need to see some great success stories for how this has worked for other neighbourhoods. We need to see what new development at higher densities could look like.
- A - Visualization examples of high quality urban locations will be a component of the next stage of public consultation, i.e. where and what will future growth look like in nodes, corridors and the downtown.

- C - In terms of engaging stakeholders, have you ever thought about putting this on TV for people to be able to watch it? You may get more word out about the process.
- Q - What is the scheduled date for consultation in the fall?
- A- We will be reengaging the public in September - November so that we can approach Council in December with a preferred approach.
- C - We really could get some of the expertise from the university to get involved in this. We could do charrettes with them and have a great discussion about it. In this case we will need to get in line with the school year. You'd have to liaise with the faculties to coordinate activity.

2. What indicators should we consider to evaluate the options?

- C - From a public side, you are ultimately going to do something that has already been started. You need to be upfront about how other studies are being intergraded into this. You need to let people know how they are affecting the direction of this process.
- C - I am thrilled with this. This is exactly what people want.
- C - I am a very visual person, so it will be great to see this on paper.

Final Thoughts:

- C - I would like to see how we are fitting into this process.
- C - The public meeting next week - Will it be what we saw tonight?
- A - Yes.
- C - I would like to see consistency with who is participating. Some GuelphQuest sessions were very spotty in attendance (3 participants), and there were some participants that came out many times (3 times).

Comments from public:

None.

Adjournment: 8:50pm

Attendees:

CAC Members:

Lise Burcher
Astrid Clos
Jan Craig
Chuck Cunningham
Lloyd Grinham
Maggie Laidlaw
Don McKay (on behalf of Brad Whitcombe)
Fred Natolochny
Ian Smith
Dick Visser (on behalf of Brad Whitcombe)
Anne Waller
Chris White

City Staff:

Craig Manley
Paul Kraehling
Katie Nasswetter
Mat Vaughan
Janette Loveys Smith

Consulting Staff:

Bob Lehman, Meridian Planning Consultants

Attachments:

Please find the following attachments:

Detailed GuelphQuest Results chart
Status and Relationship of Major City Initiatives

STATUS AND RELATIONSHIP OF MAJOR CITY INITIATIVES

June 2007

Category	Initiative	Relevance	Status / Timing	Lead Service Area	Key Contacts
Strategic Initiatives: Provide an overall framework to align City initiatives and services, to inform decisions and to manage growth to achieve community building objectives.	Strategic Plan:	Provides a unifying big picture overview of the key themes / directions of the City. Other strategic and operational plans should aligned with it. It should be consistently used to help inform decision-making and resource allocation.	To be completed July 2007	CAO's Office	Brenda Boisvert
	Local Growth Management Strategy	It will provide the framework for the management of long term growth of the City in keeping with Places to Grow legislation. The LGMS addresses both urban form as well as the geographic distribution of growth.	Council decision on 'Preferred Scenario' December 2007 Detailed Strategy 2008	Community Design and Development Services (Policy Planning and Urban Design)	Craig Manley Paul Kraehling (Project Manager) Ian Panabaker (Urban Design Strategy)
	Community Energy Plan	Provides a vision, series of principles and ideas to minimize the need for additional energy sources for the City. The CEP will inform the LGMS particularly as it relates to energy efficient urban form and standards.	Vision, goals and directions adopted as the basis of energy planning – April 2007 Implementation through 'scale projects' 2007/8	Environmental Services	Janet Laird
	Employment Lands Strategy	Identifies the long term need for employment land by type, location as well as a strategy in terms of the phasing of land and the City's role in the employment land development process.	Phase 1 – Need and Demand Analysis – July 2007 Phase 2 – Strategy – Fall 2007	Community Design and Development Services (Economic Development)	Peter Cartwright Jim Mairs (Project Manager)
Infrastructure Master Plans: Provide the long term structure for adding new growth related infrastructure or for replacing current infrastructure and are required for subsequent approval processes	Water Supply Master Plan Ground water Protection	Identifies potential means and high level structure to augment current water supplies to address growth pressures. To respond to requirements of Provincial Source Water Protection Legislation.	Water Supply Master Plan approved in 2006.	Environmental Services	Janet Laird Peter Busatto Dave Bellanger
	Wastewater Treatment Master Plan	Identifies potential means and high level structure to augment current wastewater treatment capacity to address growth pressures.		Environmental Services	Janet Laird Cameron Walsh
	Solid Waste Management Strategic Plan	Identifies a long term waste management system, technologies and phasing to maximize waste diversion	January 2008	Environmental Services	Janet Laird Dean Wyman
	Master Servicing & System Optimization Studies	This work will provide detailed water/wastewater distribution and conveyance system improvements necessary to support long term growth and	Phase I – System Optimization - complete Fall 2007 Phase II – Master Servicing - complete	Community Design and Development Services (Engineering)	Don Kudo

Category	Initiative	Relevance	Status / Timing	Lead Service Area	Key Contacts
		intensification. It will be used to identify prioritized rehabilitation / replacement work. It will inform the LGMS particularly as it relates to infrastructure capacity to support long term growth and intensification .	end 2007 Phase III – Asset Management – complete end 2007		
	Transportation Master Plan	The Plan identifies all road and transit infrastructure requirements in Guelph and surrounding Wellington County areas. The Plan is based on a balance between transportation supply management approaches and demand management initiatives to encourage more non-automobile transportation including public transit. It details planned municipal transportation infrastructure improvements to 2021 and identifies desirable Provincial infrastructure improvements.	Transportation Master Plan approved in 2005 and covers the period from 2001 to 2021. Future updates will be undertaken based on future growth projections and updated information from 2006 Census and Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS) data.	Community Design and Development Services (Engineering)	Rajan Philips
Financial Strategy Provides the mechanism to understand the cumulative fiscal implications of growth and associated infrastructure and allows for long term financial planning.	Long Term Fiscal Impact Study / Model	This will allow an assessment of the implications of growth and infrastructure renewal programs on the capital and operating requirements of the City. It will allow for a long term financial strategy to be put in place to respond to future economic pressures and to develop policies related to a sustainable economic pace of growth.	Fall 2007	Finance	David Kennedy
Implementation Measures Provides the vehicle to implement the strategic and master plan objectives	Policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Official Plan • Downtown Community Improvement Plan • Tax Policy 			
	Regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By-laws • Operating procedures 			
	Departmental Business Plans				
	Fiscal tools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Charge policy • Incentives • Spending Priorities 			
	Environmental Assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation, Infrastructure, Waste Resources 			

Detailed GuelphQuest Results chart

GuelphQuest Workshop Results	Ward Reps	Environmental Groups	Developers and Real Estate Agents	Social/Health, Community Orgs	Business Owners	Recreation, Culture, Heritage	Neighbourhood Groups	Highschool Students	Public	Total
1. How compact will new housing development be?										
Favour Houses with Yards	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	10	1	13
Maintain Current Mix	0	0	5	1	2	0	2	36	6	52
More Compact Growth	9	6	7	13	11	6	7	11	83	153
Mostly Compact Growth	0	0	1	4	2	1	0	4	15	27
2. Where will people be encouraged to live?										
Edges of the City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	3	20
Focus on Nodes and Corridors	0	0	5	5	2	0	1	14	16	43
Nodes, Corridors, Downtown	9	5	10	12	12	4	8	23	75	158
Emphasize Downtown	0	1	0	1	1	3	0	5	7	18
3. Where will jobs be encouraged to locate?										
City Edges, Low Density	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	5	1	9
City-Wide Medium Density	9	5	13	18	10	4	6	48	90	203
City Core, High Density	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	8	21
4. How much will alternative transportation be encouraged?										
Favour Drivers	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	5
Support Alternatives	0	1	10	4	14	0	7	35	41	112
Strongly Favour Alternatives	9	5	5	11	1	7	2	22	64	126
5. How will the City focus investment in new transit infrastructure and transit-oriented development?										
Existing Transit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	5
Planned Improvements	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	10	16	30
New Inter-Regional Transit	9	6	14	18	13	6	9	47	89	211
6. How will the City focus investment in new road infrastructure?										
Existing Road Network	2	2	5	2	1	6	3	8	35	64
Planned Improvements	4	2	5	10	2	1	4	42	46	116
Inter-Regional Additions	0	2	4	5	12	0	2	11	16	52
7. To what extent will energy conservation and air quality management programs be implemented?										
Remove Programs	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Maintain Programs	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Improve Programs	0	0	9	1	8	0	3	32	11	64
Achieve Best Practices	9	6	5	17	5	7	6	27	93	175
8. To what extent will water conservation and solid waste reduction programs be implemented?										
Remove Programs	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Maintain Programs	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	6
Improve Programs	0	0	7	10	4	1	4	40	20	86
Achieve Best Practices	9	6	8	7	10	5	5	14	85	149
9. How will the City manage its water and wastewater capacity concerns										
Great Lake Supply	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	6
Expand Local Supply	0	2	8	4	5	0	4	30	18	71
Maximize Technology Use	9				5	7	5	30	82	159

September 5th, 2007
6:30 – 9:30 PM
St. Stan's School: Meeting Room
(Beside the Church of Our Lady)

**Seventh Meeting of the Community Advisory
Committee**
In support of Guelph's Growth Management Strategy

Agenda

Opening Remarks

- Welcome and session overview

Review of Draft “Shaping Our Choices” Report

- Presentation of Key Information in Report
- Discussion and Questions

Trial “Building Guelph’s Future” Workshop

- Participation in a trial version of the Fall Public Workshop
- Feedback and Discussion

Next Steps

- Public Info Night on Report and Upcoming Workshops: September 19th at the River Run Centre
- Fall Public Workshops: Late September, Early October
- Workshop Report Back

Public Comment

- Opportunity for public questions/comments

Meeting notes from:

Seventh Meeting of the
Guelph Growth Management Strategy
Community Advisory Committee

Meeting Date/Location:

September 5th, 2007/ St. Stanislaus School: Community
Services Meeting Room

Facilitator: Glenn Pothier, President, GLP*i*

Meeting Purpose

The seventh meeting of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) will focus on the review the 'Shaping Our Choices' Local Growth Management Strategy Report II. The Committee will also participate in a trial of the "Building Guelph's Future" Workshop to determine if any changes should be made to the workshops' format (see September 5, 2007 Agenda and handout documents). The Mayor and Councilors will also be invited to participate in the discussions for the evening.

Opening Remarks:

Glenn Pothier opened the discussion by having everyone in the room introduce themselves. He then outlined the agenda for the evening. The minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

Review of Draft "Shaping Our Choices" Report

Paul Kraehling gave a brief background on the past several months of work. (eg. land capacity analysis, residential intensification opportunities analysis, and preliminary infrastructure assessment). He described the process and methodology that was used to develop the report.

Bob Lehman, of Meridian Planning Consultants, described the report and presented background information on growth in Guelph. Bob explained the requirements we need to meet in order to be in line with Places to Grow. He gave a description of greenfield, built boundary, and urban growth centre density expectations. He highlighted the key findings of the report and discussed what initiatives have been occurring since the release of the first 'context report.'

Discussion and Questions:

C = comment, Q = Question, A = Answer

- C- Could I ask that in the future the presentation overview handout photocopies are clearer? Thank you.
- Q- In terms of intensifying the city, do we have to meet the intensification targets with all residential and employment development? What if we were to 'just' intensify the residential part of the equation?
- A - You could do that but it would be an uneven mix.
- Q- Isn't there a minimum requirement for employment development?
- A - Yes the Places to Grow plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe area outlines minimum employment thresholds.
- Q - Can we do both intensify the existing fabric and increase new densities in the greenfields?
- A - Yes

- Q - When you are talking about census information, are you talking about 2006 census or 2001 statistics?
- A - 2006, however we do not have a complete set of employment information for the City from the census for 2006 so we have compiled it from other sources (vernons directory, Economic Development directory)
- Q - In terms of the employment lands forecasting I'm curious to know whether we are forecasting place of work jobs or place of resident jobs?
- A - We are referring to jobs in Guelph as distinct from the labour force that resides in Guelph.
- Q - You mentioned that the City of Guelph has lands available for intensification; are the lands currently zoned for future development?
- A - No, some lands may require re-zoning.
- Q - Are there enough lands available for us to grow as the status quo? Ie. Single detached homes as the predominant form of development
- No, there are insufficient lands available for growth as status quo
- A - You definitively can't build those densities any longer
- C - Can't we just ban single detached homes?
- Q - Are these calculations based on only residential zoned lands?
- A - No, all lands in the City were included (including reserve lands), however, we left future employment lands for future employment use.
- C - We understand the province is pushing for intensification and that is our stand as well (county rep)
- Q - Can we just say we can't accommodate much growth?
- A - In reality, we are being charged with getting ready for the populations and we are suggesting that we should acknowledge a range of population increase. We are bound by our resources (water and waste water)
- C - I think we need to think about what would happen if we didn't have these discussions. We are being proactively planning by doing this.
- C - We should be considering our tax income.
- Q - I'm not clear if the City/County overall population target figures have been finalized. How open are these figures?
- A - We have had discussions with the County and PIR staff. We are assuming that the population would be divided up as it has historically.
- C - I think it is very interesting language that is being used in places to grow as it is using words that seem prescriptive. I think at the end of the day we need to recognize that we are going to grow as a country and it is forcing us to plan our City with the urban design characteristics we want. I think places to grow is more or less just reiterating what we as a city already want to do.
- C - From the county perspective, at the end of the day there has to be a political component to this.
- C - When we talk about 60% of future jobs being found in the health and education sectors it scares me because those jobs are paid with general tax dollars in the county.

- C - I think this is an exercise we need to go through and its about time we do it.
- C - I thought the report was very easy to read.

Was there anything in the report that was a hot button?

- Q - What can we put into place to manage our growth and monitor it? There are lots of numbers
- Q - I was reading about the vacant lands and it said that there are sites for apartment buildings and yet they are not being built. So who is going to build them?
- A - It is a supply side argument. Whether the market is there, is a different subject.
- Q - If you don't do what the province says, will you get infrastructure funds? Where is the province in this?
- A - Funding for all this will be fundamental.
- A - We have a fiscal impact assessment underway for all of this. This will include infrastructure upgrades.
- C - The energy section 5.5 should be reviewed. I'm not sure it captures integrated energy planning. We need to include how the energy is produced and distributed at this level.
- C - I fear that because of the land value for Guelph land relative to the Greater Golden Horseshoe area, we may get less intensive employment activities and with fewer jobs overall (i.e trucking yards)

Trial "Building Guelph's Future" Workshop

Katie Nasswetter introduced and gave an overview of the "Building Guelph's future" workshop. The group then divided into two groups and conducted two exercises: Exercise 1: Building Guelph Future in a targeted area of the city; Exercise 2: City of Guelph Population location for 2031.

Discussion and Questions:

C = comment, Q = Question, A = Answer

- Q - For the Gordon Street corridor 'before' and 'after' visualization illustrations, what does the "after" picture reflect in the visualization material of an intensified node/corridor?
- A - The illustration of the Guelph corridor would be reflective of a moderate form of intensification
- Q - What does moderate intensification mean?
- A - Moderate would be indicative of a medium form of development; 5-8 stories in height with an overall density of 180 persons and jobs per hectare.

- C - I think it is important to show that so that people can translate targets into a visual example. I would like to know more about how the game board can be translated into visualizations of intensification.
- C - Land-uses need to be represented on the game board better - areas to develop and areas not to develop
- C - Right from the beginning of the exercise I did not really understand what was going on. This exercise is too abstract and difficult to understand
- C - As the exercise unfolds, there needs to be a better way of counting unit numbers to avoid confusion or duplication.
- C - During the facilitation rather than asking for consensus, ask for comments on what things people don't like.
- C - There should be more thought about what exercise should come first.
- C - The chips were too thin and you don't really see a relative difference between what you have done in the two exercises.
- C - I think it would help if each table had a board and some principles of development that the public has pointed out in the last 6 months. That way we have criteria for the distribution to follow.
- C - When it comes to absolute numbers, I don't think the distribution of numbers on a horizontal surface is a good representation. The exercise is a good one, and it is good for comparing distributions, but we should not speak in terms of absolutes - only special distributions
- C - No group should be allowed to go over their allocation limit in exercise 1 because it distorts the next exercise.
- C - I think in order to increase population in any neighbourhood, you have to really know that place. And there are a lot of areas people won't know
- C - There has to be some limitations to make the discussions work
- C - It would be interesting to see how people would develop their own neighbourhood versus people who don't live there.
- C - Just on the dynamics of the exercise, it seems that people were working independently on the area right in front of them. This is a good exercise for sharing reason and it didn't really happen this time around.
- C - We should encourage more rationale than just the outcome.
- C - The order of the exercise was alright. I think people can be more objective going in the sequence we did. If we did exercise 2 first, I think we would have been less creative and understanding of the implications of the choices being made.

What did you like about the exercise?

- C - I like the first exercise most because it gave me an idea of the challenge of fitting all those people into an area. It is good for creating perspective.
- C - I think people were learning by seeing it done (a visually effective exercise).

Next Steps:

- Public Info Night on Report and Upcoming Workshops: September 19th at the River Run Centre
- Fall Public Workshops: Late September, Early October
- Workshop Report Back

Comments from public:

- C - I think that the process is going on and that is a positive thing. I think it is important that we find different and creative ways to address the energy demand concerns that are on the horizon.
- C - I liked the game idea because it simplified a very difficult and complex process.

Adjournment: 9:15pm

Attendees:

CAC Members:

Astrid Clos
Anne Waller
Chris White
Chuck Cunningham
David Douglas
Gary Cousins
Ian Smith
Jim Riddell
Maggie Laidlaw

Mayor and City Councillors:

Karen Farbridge
Bob Bell
June Hofland
Karl Wettstein
Kathleen Farrelly
Mike Salisbury
Vicki Beard

City Staff:

Paul Kraehling
Katie Nasswetter
Mat Vaughan
Janette Loveys Smith

Kelly Guthrey
Kelly Rutherford
Ian Panabaker
Katie Nasswetter

Consulting Staff:

Bob Lehman, Meridian Planning Consultants
Glenn Pothier, President, GLP*i*

Member of Public:

Mark Muller

Attachments:

Please find the following attachments:

1. Community Advisory Committee Agenda September 5th 2007
2. Local Growth Management Strategy September 5th 2007 Presentation
3. "Shaping Our Choices" - LGMS Report II

Eighth Meeting of the Community Advisory Committee *In support of Guelph's Growth Management Strategy*

Agenda

Opening Remarks

- Welcome and session overview [Glenn]

The Big Picture

- Overview of key findings [Paul]

Report on Public Consultation

- Highlights from the Fall activities and Nov. 28th public meeting [Katie]
- Feedback and Discussion [Glenn]

Strategic Directions Report

- Overview of the 12 key directions [Paul]
- Feedback and Discussion [Glenn]

Next Steps

- Work plan: [Paul]
 - Upcoming Council workshop – December 11th
 - Recommendations report
 - Alignment with other initiatives
- Ongoing role of the CAC [Paul and Glenn]

Open Forum

- Additional Committee member comments, ideas and issues [Glenn]

Public Comment

- Opportunity for public questions/comments [Glenn]

Closing Remarks [Glenn]



G. L. Pothier Enterprises Inc.
2197 Galloway Drive
Oakville, Ontario, Canada L6H 5M1

tel: (905) 844-5174
fax: (905) 844-7368
em: glenn@gipi.com

Meeting notes from:

The Eighth Meeting of the
Guelph Growth Management Strategy
Community Advisory Committee

Meeting Date/Location:

December 4, 2007/Guelph City Hall: Council Chambers

Facilitator: Glenn Pothier, President, GLPi

Meeting Purpose

This meeting of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) had four key objectives:

- Update members on Study progress including an overview of findings from the public workshops undertaken in the Fall;
- Provide an overview of and get member feedback on the Strategic Directions report prepared by Meridian Planning Consultants;
- Provide an overview of next steps and how the Study will proceed in the future; and
- Provide an opportunity for members and observers to ask questions/offer comments on issues of their choosing

Summary of Meeting Highlights

Opening Remarks

- Glenn Pothier (the independent meeting facilitator) called the group to order, welcomed all participants and observers, and thanked them for their attendance/participation.
- CAC members and City staff/project team representatives introduced themselves.
- Glenn Pothier provided an overview of the session objectives and agenda — followed by an invitation for comments and questions, prior to confirming the agenda items.
- Glenn Pothier noted that the minutes from the previous CAC meeting (Sept. 5/07) were available and that members should alert City staff to any notable errors or omissions within the next week or two.

Overview of Local Growth Management Strategy (LGMS) Study Findings

- Paul Kraehling (City planning staff) presented key findings from the LGMS process to date. Broadly stated, the presentation provided an overview of:
 - The City's current planning context including the implications of the Province's Places to Grow initiative;
 - The LGMS background, purpose and phases completed;
 - Key findings from various consultation exercises;
 - LGMS (and related) findings and their implications — including population and growth form options; and
 - Next steps.
- Regarding next steps, Jim Riddell (City planning staff) clarified that the Recommendations Report will likely go to Council in February 2008 and not January as thought previously.

- There were a number of questions and comments during and following Mr. Kraehling’s presentation:
 - *Question:* What is the link between the LGMS and the Water Supply Master Plan (WSMP) — what are the implications of water/wastewater for population thresholds?
 - *Response:* Each study informs the other. Staff involved with the WSMP are more cautious now than when the Plan was first released — they say that we can reach a population threshold of 175,000 people if everything works – conservation, new wells and new technology. This is down from a previous estimate of 195,000 people.
 - *Comment:* Some of the directions in the Strategic Directions report are confusing and appear to be contradictory. There are various stated population thresholds based on different capacities — water, wastewater, etc. — from 165,000, to 175,000, to 195,000 people. It looks as though water capacity would limit growth to 175,000 and wastewater capacity would limit growth to 165,000. These numbers and the significance of them need to be made clear.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]
 - *Question:* Did the WSMP say that a potential population threshold is 195,000?
 - *Response:* Yes. However, as noted earlier, staff are now less confident about this estimate — a more cautious projection is 175,000.
 - *Question:* At the planned Council workshop on December 11th, will there be public delegations?
 - *Response:* Though the session will be open to public observers, there will be no delegations. The workshop will be an overview of key directions and financial implications.
 - *Question:* It was mentioned previously that PIR might rethink its underlying assumptions regarding natural carrying capacities — is there any update on this?
 - *Response:* We met last week with the County and PIR, and there was no mention of any revisiting or clarifying of these

assumptions. While the City recognizes that water/wastewater capacities are a real issue, it appears that the Province is looking to us to prove that we cannot reach the population target of 195,000 or some other number that may still be beyond what our capacity limits allow.

- *Comment:* There are articles in the media today that say that water and other natural capacities should be legitimate limits to growth.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]

Report on Public Consultation

- Katie Nasswetter (City planning staff) presented an overview of the findings from the Building Guelph's Future workshop series, including:
 - A description of the workshops' goal and context;
 - A description of the number/location of the workshops and the exercises conducted;
 - An overview of key findings from the exercises (i.e. participant preferences and underlying rationales for choices); and
 - A debrief on the November 28th Open House at which the workshop and public consultation summaries were shared.
- The presentation was followed by a number of questions and comments:
 - *Question:* Given that there were only 100 or so participants at the workshops, are the findings defensible...can they be considered representative of the feelings of 'Guelphites'?
 - *Response:* The workshops provide results that are indicative and directional rather than statistically reliable. However, they closely reflect information from other parts of the public input process such as the community survey, which is statistically valid. Confidence in the results is high given the homogeneity of responses from throughout the workshop series and the consultation process generally.
 - *Comment/Question:* Focusing population growth in the City's nodes, corridors and downtown seems logical and there are certainly opportunities to do so. However, infill applications are being brought before Guelph Council for development outside the nodes, corridors and downtown. What input did you get in the workshops about this type of infill, including applications that can be very contentious?

- *Response:* Workshop participants focused the new growth in the City's nodes, corridors and downtown area. They recognize that infill developments raise issues concerning community character and compatibility, particularly within stable residential areas — and feel that development needs to be appropriate given the context within those areas. Participants tended to avoid altering established neighbourhoods featuring single-detached homes given the high potential for conflict.
 - *Comment:* As a workshop participant, I felt that the exercises did not really deal explicitly with specific neighbourhood impacts. These are difficult issues to grapple with. From what I saw, participants took a broader view and did not get into a micro-level impact analysis. Though participants seemed to be saying that some intensification is okay, they tended to go for the easiest opportunities and avoided established neighbourhoods.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]

Strategic Directions Report

- Glenn Pothier noted that Paul Kraehling would be providing an overview of the Strategic Directions Report on behalf of the Report's author, Bob Lehman from Meridian Planning Consultants (who was unavailable to attend the meeting).
- Paul Kraehling's presentation focused on the 12 directions from the Strategic Directions Report (including a table summary of scenarios for both residential population and employment growth).
- There were a number of questions and comments during and following the presentation:

[Relating to Direction 1 and the table summary of growth scenarios]

- *Question:* Why are the growth targets listed as both 175,000 and 195,000 — what is the actual Places to Grow population target? Does 195,000 meet the Places to Grow requirement? This is not clear in the Report.
 - *Response:* The population figures of 175,000 and 195,000 are being used to assist with the LGMS options and implications analysis. In fact, both figures fall slightly short of the provincial target. The City and County have been given a total target of 321,000 — as things currently stand, the City's portion of that would be somewhat in excess of 195,000.

- *Question/Comment:* Why not place greater emphasis on intensification and higher densities in yet to be developed greenfield lands? This seems easier and could be beneficial.
 - *Response:* This is something we have been and are currently considering — we could go higher in greenfields. However, we also have to consider broader questions regarding what constitutes a reasonable housing mix and what is viable from a market perspective. We only create planning permissions; we cannot prescribe activity.
- *Comment:* We need to look further at higher density in nodes. We're looking at 60% infill and 40% greenfield and the implications for jobs and people per hectare. We need sufficient density in greenfields to take advantage of CEP opportunities.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]
- *Comment/Question:* We need to consider lands covered in the Commercial Policy Review — there is about 2 million square feet of retail that's eligible to be brought into the mix. Can they be intensified with higher densities and mixed use?
 - *Response:* Yes, we want to add residential to these areas and maximize the opportunities. It is unclear as to how successful we might be, though there is a 30-year timeframe to work with.
- *Comment/Question:* I agree with the opportunities for greenfields — let's look seriously at what's possible. Are there certain assumptions about how the population growth would be split between the City and the County? Does the table that's been presented have different assumptions for the City/County split?
 - *Response:* The table doesn't focus on the County. The County is looking at population growth to 115-125,000. The County has not finalized its numbers, but does not want to go higher than this range.
- *Question:* So, the total for the City and County does not add-up to the 321,000 target?
 - *Response:* That's correct. We have told the Province that the combined City and County totals do not meet the Places to Grow target. There is really no room to shift population growth between the City and the County. We cannot expect either party to make-up what the Province may view as a shortfall.

- *Comment:* We have to remember that we're talking about a potential shortfall in 'hypothetical people.' The real growth over the next 30 years could be less than projected. Things could change significantly.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]
- *Comment:* The City's Official Plan talks about a 1.5% rate of growth – these new projections are for 1.7% — only a 0.2% difference on an annual basis. The differences aren't that substantial.
 - *Response:* In fact, the actual rate of growth has been 1.8%.
- *Comment/Question:* If Guelph grows to 175,000 people, we can assume there will be an effluent problem. If Rockwood grows by 5,000 people and Guelph processes their sewage, is that counted towards Guelph's Places to Grow target? Where does it count?
 - *Response:* The simple answer is that Rockwood gets credit for the population increase, but Guelph gets stuck 'holding the pipe' so to speak. However, you raise some interesting points concerning cross-boundary issues, all of which need to be considered.
- *Question:* In the earlier conversation about greater intensification in our greenfields someone said 'they' could decide to go elsewhere. Who is 'they' and don't other communities in the Greater Golden Horseshoe have similar requirements?
 - *Response:* 'They' refers to builders and developers. Though we write policies, they have the option of going elsewhere. Not every municipality faces the same population requirements as does Guelph or has the limitations that we must deal with. For example, the Kitchener-Waterloo area has more land available; Brantford only wants single unit housing; Halton can accommodate virtually all growth in greenfields. Many other communities have more space and servicing capacity. We are wrestling with questions about what is an acceptable magnitude of growth and intensification given our unique circumstances.
- *Comment:* There's a need to confront the fact that there are limits to growth capacity in Guelph. The Province needs to grapple with this and it will become an issue. Guelph could be a case study. Are we developing a 'build-out' plan for Guelph or a Places to Grow plan — these are different things and they raise different questions.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]

- *Comment:* A key question is what are people going to want to buy given how and where they want to live. Developers will only build what they can sell.
 - *Response:* That is a challenge. If we have restrictive policies, people may choose to build/live elsewhere. It would be ironic if Places to Grow created a situation where larger numbers of people choose to live in Kitchener-Waterloo so they can get a single detached home and commute to Guelph. This would run counter to the Province's goals.

- *Comment:* There's a need to view things holistically and to think regionally — to look at 5-6 different major urban areas to determine the community pattern repercussions. You cannot look at Guelph in isolation of the surrounding area. We also need to consider and reflect changing demographics — and explore the implications of an increasing median population age and the willingness of older adults to consider housing that is consistent with intensification. We have to be careful about our assumptions. For example, we can't assume that immigrants will continue to be younger people or that other patterns will reflect current trends. The structure of the population is important and will affect densities and housing types.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]

[Relating to Direction Two]

- *Comment:* I assume that the reference is to greenfield annexation and not employment lands. Taking employment and industrial areas from surrounding municipalities would be a major issue with significant implications for the tax base and economic development.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]

- *Comment:* In considering employment lands, there's a need to look beyond hectares and the amount of land, and also to take into account location. Factors such as transportation and access should be key considerations.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]

- *Comment/Question:* There should be discussion and debate about both the proposed number of jobs per hectare and the types of employment. There's a need to look at the overall economic development strategy — are we assuming manufacturing jobs or service jobs? Ninety percent of

new jobs are in the service sector. Intensifying nodes and reducing commute times should also be considered and questioned.

- *Response:* We are not looking exclusively at manufacturing. For example, the GTA west area is targeted for lower density jobs such as trucking and warehouse operations.
- *Comment:* Perhaps we should have policies that discourage this focus on warehousing and distribution.
 - *Response:* Again, we need to consider various types of employment. PIR often references securing corporate head offices as a means to increase employment density. This is not always realistic — not every town or city can land enough corporate head offices. From a servicing and capacity perspective, a good thing about warehousing is that it's a low water usage industry.
- *Comment:* Puslinch and Guelph-Eramosa have employment lands that could be expanded and considered.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]

[Relating to Direction Three]

- *Comment:* To improve clarity at your upcoming workshop with Council, your slides should reference page numbers in the report.
 - *Response:* Thank you for the suggestion.
- *Question:* Are environmental features 'netted-out' of the numbers included at the bottom of page 19 of the Report — specifically the 276 hectares for lands without development applications?
 - *Response:* Yes. Of the 276 total, there are 232 hectares of residential lands and 44 hectares of mixed-use lands.
- *Comment:* A number of the 'directions' are not really directive or action-oriented. Some are more like cautions, considerations or questions. I'm looking for directions and not always seeing them.
 - *Response:* I understand the comment. What is being called direction three is really a preamble to numbers four and five.

[Relating to Directions Four and Five]

- *Comment:* Again, some of these are not directives or actions, but rather cautions and statements.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]
- *Comment:* The word ‘balance’ is used in the context of employment and residential housing. Given that ‘balance’ is a value-laden word, maybe the term should be changed to ‘employment mix’ or ‘housing mix.’
 - *Response:* Thank you for the suggestion.

[Relating to Directions Six, Seven and Eight]

- *Comment:* I agree with the comments of earlier — are these directions, conclusions, statements, recommendations or something else? The actual directions are not clear.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]
- *Comment:* On page 22 of the Directions Report in the passage about housing preferences, Hemson says apartments do not become the primary preference until people are in their late 80s.
 - *Response:* Different studies have come to varying conclusions about this. The study you referenced that was conducted for Halton Region says this. However, a study conducted for the Region of Waterloo says interest in apartments occurs at a much earlier age.

[Relating to Direction Nine]

- *Question:* To what does the phrase ‘medium term’ refer?
 - *Response:* It means prior to 2021. Long term would be after 2021.
- *Question:* What is the difference between directions two, three and nine?
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]
- *Question:* Regarding the ‘balance’ aspect and our current mix – what are you referring to?
 - *Response:* Basically this means that our jobs grow in proportion to the overall population growth — that we keep our current jobs to residents mix, and that the tax base is in reasonable balance.

[Relating to Direction Ten]

- *Question/Comment:* There are three different population targets — 165,000, 175,000 and 195,000 — that are referenced. The 175,000 target is recommended, but servicing is only available to 165,000 — and neither of these meets PIR’s target — so why pick 175,000? There’s a need to layout the premise for the different numerical targets early in the document.
 - *Response:* We are trying to work within the parameters of the Places to Grow Plan recognizing the Province’s focus on population targets. However, we are looking at a variety of population thresholds as part of the analysis to determine what’s possible and reasonable. There’s a major challenge in assessing how all of the factors and decisions nest together.

- *Question:* It sounds as though 165,000 is the population threshold based on the servicing limit and that neither 175,000 or 195,000 meet the Places to Grow target — what is the PIR target?
 - *Response:* It’s about 200,000 for Guelph. We need to take into account the Water/Wastewater Master Plan — capacities here may limit growth to 165,000 though its possible to achieve higher numbers through improvements.

- *Comment:* Given that population growth to 195-200,000 does not appear to be realistic, maybe you should just go with your servicing limit.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]

- *Comment:* I agree — pick something Guelph can handle like 165,000 and justify it to the Province. The City’s growth limit should be based on our natural resource capacity and only what we can justify given this limit.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]

- *Comment:* I also agree. Guelph should choose one number and be firm on it — don’t allow for ‘wiggle room’ with the Province. Base the number on what you can accommodate today.
 - *Response:* The Province and engineers may say that you can do anything with enough money and technology — that there aren’t really any finite natural capacity limits.

- *Comment:* The LGMS public consultation process has been progressive and included significant outreach and public involvement in determining by how much and where Guelph should grow. We need to share this

information with the Province and demonstrate that our case is both valid and strong.

- *Response:* PIR is impressed with what we have done to date and I think the consultation findings will have some weight.
- *Comment:* I like the idea of growth targets being based on Guelph's ecological limits. This approach is difficult to challenge. We can't plan on the assumption of future techno-fixes. The community has set the bar high — people have said that they expect a healthy community with parks, greenspaces, good design and so forth.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]
- *Comment/Question:* I agree that we should look at a target of 165,000. Does the base City population of 115,000 account for the 20,000 or so students?
 - *Response:* Yes, they are accounted for in both current population estimates and future growth planning.
- *Question/Comment:* What happens if the provincial targets aren't met? There will be financial carrots in terms of funding for communities that comply. Strategically, Guelph needs to ensure that it does not miss out on potential funds. There is no guarantee of funding, but this is something that needs to be considered. Don't use the LGMS simply as a means of proving why the provincial targets are unreasonable.
 - *Response:* That's never been our intention. We have gone through this process to determine what the right population number should be — not to disprove the Places to Grow target.
- *Comment:* The Galt-Paris Moraine could be a further constraint to population growth. The 165,000 target gives the City some flexibility in planning.
 - *Response:* [Comment Noted.]
- *Question:* Places to Grow is supposed to have sub-area studies that could be important to us and that may help put this work in a broader regional context. These need to be completed for relevant local planning. What's the status of these?
 - *Response:* Unclear. I believe there were five planned studies, but we have not seen or heard much about them. I'm not sure how the Province's plans have evolved — it could be that the emphasis on

the sub-area studies has been reduced. [Note: Paul Kraehling then read aloud the Province's proposed sub-area planning topics.] We have not seen any results to date.

- *Comment:* Some GTA areas did review Natural Heritage and Employment lands.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]
- *Comment:* If you take a bigger population number to the Province you will get new highways and other infrastructure. You many lose out on provincial funding if you don't. There's a need to make decisions that are consistent with delivering the kind of City you want — that may not be the Province's population target.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]
- *Comment:* Again, we need to consider whether we will get money if the City does not reach the provincial target.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]
- *Comment:* The real focus is on the greenbelt.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]

[Relating to Directions Eleven and Twelve]

- *Comment:* Guelph should not plan based on whether the public will object to development applications. People can and do object to most any kinds of development including that planned for nodes and corridors.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]
- *Comment:* Though the level of planning is at a high-level, these last two directions are important given that they deal with issues of access, social justice, diversity, and so on. It is very important to consider these quality of life factors for all residents — we really haven't addressed them in detail as part of the Study.
 - *Response:* This is something that will be addressed during next steps in the process.
- *Comment:* The implications of the varying population targets — from 165,000 versus 195,000 certainly speaks to and has implications for quality of life.

- *Response:* [Comment noted.]
- *Comment:* Many options reference the need to expand Guelph's boundaries, yet Places to Grow is about living within boundaries and an area's means, and better controlling growth. This seems contradictory. The boundary expansion options seem at odds with the Province's goals.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]
- *Comment:* We need to look seriously at options that allow us to stay within natural resource limits and our current boundaries. A scenario showing what is feasible within our limits needs to be presented to Council and further analyzed.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]
- *Comment:* Please expand the table to consider the 165,000 population option.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]
- *Question:* Does the 165,000 include Rockwood's sewage needs?
 - *Response:* No, just the City of Guelph.
- *Question/Comment:* What if the Wastewater Master Plan was to say that Guelph could grow to 185,000? It may not be necessary to focus on 165,000 — this number may not be the limit.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]
- *Comment:* We also want to consider growth in the context of no boundary expansion.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]
- *Comment:* We also need to consider the Galt-Paris Moraine and implications for growth targets.
 - *Response:* [Comment noted.]
- *Comment:* There may be an opportunity to create a type of decision-making tree showing things like the physical limits, natural ecological limits, etc.

- *Response:* [Comment noted.]
- *Question:* Is the financial analysis currently available?
 - *Response:* This analysis is currently only at a very high-level stage. More work and refinement are required. It will be made available at some point when there is more detail.

Next Steps and Open Forum

- Glenn Pothier noted that there seems to be a shared sense that the input of the CAC has been of significant value and that meetings have been both informative and substantive. He then asked for and secured the agreement of members to continue on in their advisory capacity — in support of upcoming LGMS phases.
- Glenn Pothier noted that the next meeting of the CAC likely would not be held until sometime after the Council workshop and the Recommendations Report has been generated.
- Paul Kraehling noted that he had nothing more to add to the ‘next steps’ outlined in his earlier presentation.
- Glenn Pothier asked whether CAC members or the project team had any further business to add to the meeting agenda. No items were identified.

Public Comment

- Glenn Pothier reminded the group that in the interest of openness, transparency and accountability, any member of the public can attend a CAC meeting as an observer. He then noted that no observers were present at this time and, therefore, no questions/comments would be forthcoming.

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

- Glenn Pothier wrapped-up the evening and thanked the group for their attendance and participation.
- The meeting was formally adjourned (having run from approximately 7:05 to 9:35 P.M.).

Attendance (names listed in alphabetical order)

CAC Members:

Lise Burcher
Astrid Clos
Gary Cousins
Jan Craig
Chuck Cunningham
David Douglas
Susan Fielding
Maggie Laidlaw
Bill Mungall
Fred Natolochny
Jim Riddell
Ian Smith
Dick Visser
Chris White

Observers/Public:

Eleanor [Katie to add]

Project Staff (City of Guelph):

Paul Kraehling
Katie Nasswetter

Facilitator:

Glenn Pothier, GLPi

Ninth Meeting of the Community Advisory Committee *In support of Guelph's Growth Management Strategy*

Agenda

Opening Remarks

- Welcome and session overview [G. Pothier]

Update and Status Report

- Key activities since the last meeting — and what's upcoming [M. Plaunt]
- Overview of key themes from recent consultations, including the 'How is Guelph Going to Grow?' sessions [M. Plaunt]
- Feedback and Discussion [G. Pothier]

The Local Growth Management Strategy Implications

- Overview presentation [P. Kraehling]
- Feedback and Discussion [G. Pothier]

A Look Ahead

- Next steps in the work plan [P. Kraehling]
- Ongoing role of the CAC [M. Plaunt/G. Pothier]

Open Forum

- Additional Committee member comments, ideas and issues [G. Pothier]

Public Comment

- Opportunity for observer questions/comments [G. Pothier]

Closing Remarks



G. L. Pothier Enterprises Inc.
2197 Galloway Drive
Oakville, Ontario, Canada L6H 5M1

tel: (905) 844-5174
fax: (905) 844-7368
em: glenn@gipi.com

Meeting notes from:

The Ninth Meeting of the
Guelph Growth Management Strategy
Community Advisory Committee

Meeting Date/Location:

April 1st, 2009/Guelph City Hall: Committee Room B

Facilitator: Glenn Pothier, President, GLPi

Meeting Purpose

This meeting of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) had five objectives:

- Update members on the progress of the growth management initiative, including an overview of activity over the past year and some consultation highlights;
- Provide an overview of and get member feedback on the implications of the Local Growth Management Strategy (LGMS);
- Provide an overview of next steps, including the Strategy's connection to the broader Official Plan update;
- Discuss the future of the CAC and its potential role in assisting with Official Plan-related issues; and
- Provide an opportunity for members to ask questions/offer comments on issues of their choosing.

Summary of Meeting Highlights

Opening Remarks

- Glenn Pothier (the independent meeting facilitator) called the group to order, welcomed all participants and observers, and thanked them for their attendance/participation.
- CAC members and City staff/project team representatives introduced themselves.
- Glenn Pothier provided an overview of the session objectives and agenda — followed by an invitation for comments and questions, prior to confirming the agenda items.
- Glenn Pothier provided a brief overview of the last CAC meeting highlights (Dec. 4/07) and noted that the minutes from that session had been distributed some time ago. He then called for the identification of any errors or omissions concerning these minutes. None were identified.

Update and Status Report

- Glenn Pothier introduced this agenda component before handing it to Marion Plaunt (City planning staff) who provided an overview presentation covering:
 - The Official Plan (OP) update and related initiatives, including various plans and studies that have or will be completed — [Ms. Plaunt selectively referred to various projects identified in a companion handout and slide:]
 - The Phase 1 Employment Lands Strategy;
 - Council approval of the Local Growth Strategy (in June 2008);
 - The Water Supply Master Plan;
 - The Brownfield Community Improvement Plan; and
 - The Development Charge By-law.

- The OP update phasing and timing, including an overview of Phases I and II — and important upcoming dates in the process.
- The Growth Plan conformity amendment — including selected components of the amendment and key dates/steps in the process.
- Selected initiatives currently underway as part of Phase II (including mention of recent and upcoming activities concerning each):
 - The Growth Strategy implications report;
 - The Natural Heritage Strategy;
 - The Urban Design Action Plan;
 - The Policy Paper on Affordable Housing; and
 - The Employment Lands Strategy (Phase 2).
- Initiatives to follow the OP update:
 - The Downtown Secondary Plan; and
 - The York Innovation District Secondary Plan.
- Highlights from the last community survey (which included interviews with a random sample of 500 City residents):
 - Support for Guelph’s Growth Management Strategy approach and the population increase to 169,000 (or 175,000 including the undercount) by 2031;
 - The need for a balance between green space and development (including a willingness to accept some higher density housing);
 - Support for protecting the environment;
 - Support for economic stability; and
 - Support for GO train service to/from downtown Guelph.

Ms. Plaunt noted that the full survey findings are available on the City’s website.

- There were a number of questions and comments during and following Ms. Plaunt’s presentation:
 - *Question:* I heard mention of a City of Guelph population of 169,000 — how is that number considered equivalent to the target of 175,000 identified in the Province’s Places to Grow Plan?

Response: The discrepancy is attributable to different calculation methods. The province includes the census undercount — that is, the estimated 6,000 people who are missed in the census — as part of its calculation.

- *Question:* What part of Guelph is being studied as part of the Provincial Greenbelt around the GTA?

Response: In the south end of Guelph, below Clair (Note: reference was made to the Natural Heritage Strategy map).

- *Comment/Question:* It would be presumptuous of Guelph to look at expanding the Greenbelt without consulting Puslinch and considering the collective impacts of doing so. Has there been consideration of the fact that much of Puslinch is in the Grand River Watershed?

Response: Guelph understands the importance of functional linkages. We are already looking at the Paris-Galt Moraine in conjunction with the Natural Heritage Strategy initiative. We are also looking at surface and groundwater resources.

- *Question:* Would Guelph be okay with losing land in the South to the Greenbelt — would you still have enough land to accommodate the targeted population growth to 2031? Have you looked at the implications of an expanded natural heritage system for growth plan conformity?

Response: The approach used in developing the Natural Heritage Strategy has taken issues concerning Places to Grow into account. There would still be sufficient area to accommodate the required population growth. The idea of growing the Greenbelt area stems from a desire to have a less fragmented natural heritage system.

- *Comment/Question:* The world has changed significantly in the past 14 months — there have been a lot of significant economic and other events. Given this, have any of the City's core assumptions changed that would cause you to re-visit your numbers or analysis?

Response: The Province has not changed its direction or adjusted their numbers due to the recession. Recessions generally come and go. The Growth Plan is looking at a longer-term time horizon. Guelph's calculations — average annual growth of 1.5% — are conservative enough that we feel comfortable that they will be reasonably accurate over the long-term.

- *Comment:* Places to Grow is a long-term plan and I understand from the province that the targets and plan will be reviewed every five years to assess growth against the targets.

Response: Things will likely even-out over the long-term.

- *Comment:* It's possible that Guelph may not achieve its anticipated population growth.

Response: [Comment noted.]

- *Comment:* The City has to plan for the population of 169,000 even though that number may not be realized.

Response: That's correct.

- *Question:* Given the assumption of no annexation, how much land is available/required for development and what are the proposed densities?

Response: This will be covered in the next presentation on the implications of the Growth Management Strategy.

The Local Growth Management Strategy (LGMS) Implications

- Paul Kraehling (City planning staff) presented key findings from the LGMS implications report. Broadly stated, the presentation provided an overview of:
 - The four phases of the LGMS — and key activities undertaken within each;
 - The Places to Grow initiative — its highlights and the conformity requirements for Guelph;
 - Selected key Guelph plans, strategies, policies and other initiatives;
 - The public engagement process and selected consultation highlights;
 - Higher-level growth implications, in particular:
 - The need to accommodate 54,000 additional people within the corporate limits of the City by 2031 — this translates into about 26,600 new households (37% high density; 33% medium density; 30% low density);
 - That the population growth is planned at a steady average compounded rate of 1.5% per year; and
 - The City's population will be aging and become more multi-culturally diverse.
 - The general form of development and intensification opportunity areas (noting that higher density housing forms will be found in all areas of the City);

- Opportunities for Community Energy Plan implementation;
 - The anticipated shift in the City’s housing inventory — including a proportional increase in the amount of medium and high density housing;
 - The location of new housing — including a focus on 40% of the City’s annual housing development occurring within the ‘built-up’ areas beginning in 2015;
 - The form of housing in the new Greenfield area;
 - The anticipated employment growth — an increase of 32,400 jobs from approximately 65,000 in 2006 to over 97,000 by 2031 — and plans for accommodating it;
 - Plans for the City’ urban growth centre (which Mr. Kraehling emphasized refers to the Downtown area and not the City as a whole) — including the target of achieving an overall persons and job density of 150 per hectare for this area by 2031;
 - Other implications of growth for such things as: hard infrastructure (water/wastewater; transportation; etc.), soft infrastructure (education, social, health care, etc.), natural and cultural heritage, affordable housing, and so forth;
 - The City’s notable successes in the area of accessory apartments; and
 - Next steps, including a fiscal impact assessment currently underway.
- There were a number of questions and comments during and following Mr. Kraehling’s presentation:
 - *Question:* Will higher density urban villages only be created in the York Innovation District?

Response: No. Urban villages is a design concept that will be applied to various areas within the greenfield area, i.e. undeveloped South Guelph.

- *Question:* For the 40% of the growth to occur within the built boundary, what will be the density of that development — how many units does that represent?

Response: I don't have the numbers available this evening, but these calculations have been done and the numbers are identified in the Intensification Analysis Report. The study identified where the intensification opportunities exist and explored the potential for different sites. A total of 18,500 potential new units was identified.

- *Comment/Question:* You seem to believe that the 40% will be achieved somewhere within the identified areas, yet some of the sites identified are not even currently available for redevelopment — there are existing commercial and other uses in some of the locations. How do we know we'll get the 40%?

Response: There's no guarantee of achieving the target number. The Intensification Report includes a map covering 'Potential Residential Intensification' that shows the areas where staff feel there is the greatest potential to intensify based on the criteria used. Essentially, the potential is gauged by the current density and what the current by-law allows. For the purpose of this exercise we are identifying the potential options. The next step is to answer the question of how to encourage landowners and developers to embrace the 'intensification plans.' The province has asked for a plan and the city is responding to that request by identifying where intensification could take place in the City. We cannot force people to live in certain areas. We need to keep reviewing the plan — every five years — to gauge progress and identify new or relevant contextual considerations.

- *Comment:* The Province's legislation has noble goals, but implementation may be difficult. All a municipality can do is follow the rules and create a framework for realizing intensification and other kinds of possibilities.

Response: [Comment noted.]

- *Comment:* There are a lot of potential barriers to intensification — water/wastewater infrastructure capacity, landowner/resident opposition and so on.

Response: There are barriers. Part of our role as planners is to help overcome them and create the conditions and broader environment in which desired change can take place.

- *Question:* Given that achieving 40% of development in the built-up area is probably not realistic, due to servicing issues and other considerations, why is the City looking at 50%?

Response: The Province has set the 40% target and we must abide by it. The City will be going with that target in terms of our growth plan conformity. Though the 40% will be challenging enough, it may be possible to achieve a somewhat higher number. The 40-50% referenced in the presentation is a range. We simply do not know at this point what exact percentage will be realized.

- *Question:* As a means of achieving the higher densities in the employment lands, will you allow major office buildings to be placed in industrial areas?

Response: We have made some allocation for corporate offices in our Hanlon Business Park. We allow for buildings of up to six storeys. To a large degree, it's a question of market interest; market conditions must be right to allow this to happen.

- *Question:* Given that major office buildings can be used to enhance or redevelop a downtown area, will allowing them in the Business Park — essentially in the suburbs — undermine your goal of strengthening the Guelph Downtown and attracting this kind of investment to that area?

Response: It's possible. There needs to be a balance. One of our goals is to strengthen Downtown Guelph and we would encourage major office initiatives in that area. The downtown secondary plan will include strategies to stimulate growth and the local economy.

- *Question:* What are the density targets for the low, medium and high density types of housing?

Response: We are looking at: 40-50 units per net hectare for low density housing; 75 units per net hectare for urban villages; and 100-150 units per net hectare for medium to high density housing.

- *Comment:* I understand that Watson & Associates is looking at the costs associated with the growth — for infrastructure and so forth. This work should be advanced — it's important to understand the financial implications now, not after the fact.

Response: That's a good point. We recognize the need to fully understand the costs and financial implications — that's why we're looking at this now as a component of a detailed fiscal impact assessment by Watson.

- *Question:* Regarding grey water re-use — is what is being proposed ‘proven-technology’? Will the degree of success in this area assist in the City’s ability to reach the 169,000 population target? If the grey water system works as well or better than anticipated, can the City grow beyond the 169,000 target?

Response: When one is looking at a 50-year growth timeframe, as has been done in the recent Water Supply and Wastewater Management Master Plans, a lot can happen and be accomplished in terms of technological advances. The full potential of the grey water re-use is not known today. There will be pilot programs and the master plans will be re-visited every five years or so to gauge success. However, it’s important to note that the growth target of 169,000 is not directly linked to grey water re-use and there is no intent to increase the population target should the grey water system prove more successful than anticipated.

Following Mr. Kraehling’s presentation and the ensuing questions/answers, CAC members were invited to complete a growth implications ranking exercise. More specifically, the group was asked to assign an ‘importance priority rank’ to eleven growth related dimensions/considerations (plus an ‘other’ category in which additional dimensions could be identified as per the individual’s inclination). The Table below shows the mean score rankings (i.e. the averages based on the number of responses per category) for each of the dimensions/considerations. The exercise is intended to produce results that are directional only.

Table: Growth Implication Priorities	
The Growth-Related Dimension/Consideration	Rank (Mean Score)
Provision and sustainable management of basic infrastructure	3.9
Protection of natural heritage system and groundwater resources	4.9
Planning for an integrated City transportation system	5.0
Soft service infrastructure	5.4
Protection of community character	5.5
Implementation of community energy plan	5.5
High quality urban design	5.8
Planning for an aging population	6.3
Expansion of health care services	7.3
Planning for additional affordable housing opportunities	7.4
Additional facilities and services for an increasingly more ethnically diverse population	9.8

Note: The mean score is the average ranking based on 1 being the most important and 12 being the least important.

Of the few respondents who identified considerations under the ‘other’ category, the need to plan for diverse employment was most often mentioned.

Following the ranking exercise, CAC members shared a number of comments and questions:

- *Comment:* Soft services will become even more critical with increased intensification in the City.

Response: [Comment noted.]

- *Question:* The implementation of the Community Energy Plan will be important.

Response: [Comment noted.]

- *Question:* What is meant by ‘health care services’ — are we talking about hospitals — and how much control or influence does the City have here?

Response: It includes hospitals — which we understand are a provincial responsibility — but also things such as attracting physicians, making provision for medical centres and so forth. The City can generally be planning for the kinds of facilities and services required to meet projected needs.

- *Comment:* The nature of health care is changing. It’s not just about acute care. In the future, community-based and ambulatory care will be even more important.

Response: [Comment noted.]

- *Question:* Was the ‘priorities ranking’ exercise conducted with the public as well?

Response: It was intended for use with the public, but the number of attendees at the growth plan consultation sessions was very limited. However, we know from the statistically reliable community survey that the public ranked the environment as their primary concern; cultural heritage second; the balance of development and green space third; and transportation fourth.

- *Question:* Who and how many were surveyed?

Response: It was a representative telephone survey of a random sample of 500 Guelph residents 18 years of age and over. The results

are considered accurate to within +/- 4.4%, 19 times out of 20. The survey was completed earlier in the growth planning exercise.

- *Question:* Was City staff surprised by any of the survey findings?

Response: Not really. In fact, we were quite encouraged by most of the findings. We were a little disappointed in the awareness levels of Places to Grow and, more specifically, the Guelph Local Growth Management Study — only 29% said they were ‘very’ or ‘moderately familiar’ with the latter — despite a lot of community engagement. The City is looking at means of increasing outreach and communication during the OP update phase.

A Look Ahead

- Paul Kraehling noted that he had nothing more to add to the ‘next steps’ outlined in his earlier presentation.
- Glenn Pothier noted that there seems to be a shared sense that the input of the CAC has been of significant value and that meetings have been both informative and substantive. He then said that the City is interested in having the CAC continue to serve as a sounding board and advisor as the growth management strategy and other initiatives get integrated into the updated Official Plan — and as the OP gets rolled-out over time. Marion Plaunt then identified various facets of the OP and specific initiatives (such as the Urban Design Action Plan) as those that could benefit from the ongoing perspective of the group.
- The vast majority of CAC members agreed to continue on in their advisory capacity to the preparation of the City’s updated Official Plan. However, some officials from neighbouring municipalities — though very appreciative of the opportunity to have served on the Committee and to have been part of the valued forum — said that the OP and more specific implementation issues should be left to Guelph (without the appearance of any undue influence from surrounding communities). These officials suggested that the City consider inviting them to a different forum to discuss any further issues with implications for Guelph’s neighbours.
- In response to a question about expanding the representation on the CAC, members shared the following suggested additions:
 - Members of the development community (who can provide a practical perspective on key issues and suggestions for achieving OP implementation);
 - Youth members;
 - Seniors; and
 - Representatives of more culturally diverse groups.

- As an action item in support of augmenting the group, members were encouraged to send the names of potential new Official Plan update CAC members to Paul Kraehling.

Open Forum

- Glenn Pothier noted that the next meeting date for the CAC concerning the Official Plan update has not yet been determined.
- Glenn Pothier asked whether the project team had any further business to add to the meeting agenda. No items were identified.
- Glenn Pothier asked whether CAC members had any further business to add to the meeting agenda. A number of members commented on the value of the CAC meetings and their appreciation for the City involving them in the overall exercise. Some officials from neighbouring municipalities noted that these kinds of meetings/approaches help encourage constructive dialogue and build important partnerships.

Public Comment

- Glenn Pothier reminded the group that in the interest of openness, transparency and accountability, any member of the public can attend a CAC meeting as an observer. He then noted that no observers were present at this time and, therefore, no questions/comments would be forthcoming.

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

- Glenn Pothier wrapped-up the evening and thanked the group for their attendance and participation. On behalf of the City, Paul Kraehling and Marion Plaunt also thanked the group and encouraged everyone to frequently consult the City's website to review the latest reports and initiatives.
- The meeting was formally adjourned (having run from approximately 7:05 to 8:45 P.M.).

Attendance (names listed in alphabetical order)

CAC Members:

Astrid Clos
Gary Cousins
Chuck Cunningham
Susan Fielding
Lloyd Grinham
Don McKay
Bill Mungall
Fred Natolochny
Jim Riddell
Dick Visser
Ann Waller
Chris White

Observers/Public:

None in attendance

Project Staff (City of Guelph):

Jason Downham
Paul Kraehling
Lawrence Kuk
Marion Plaunt

Facilitator:

Glenn Pothier, GLPi