

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
1	Elizabeth Snell on behalf of Transition Guelph	March 26, 2012	Provided Transition Guelph's vision for Guelph to 2031. Indicated that the general direction of the Official Plan has similarities to the Transition Guelph vision.	Staff appreciate the input and acknowledge that the Official Plan contains a number of policies that address the vision of Transition Guelph. <u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to these comments.
2	John Ambrose	February 29, 2012	Suggested integrating community energy concepts with the Urban Forestry Plan. Suggested considering the trail system as a transportation corridor in addition to recreation function. Commented that the City needs to find ways to implement concepts of permeable paving, grey water, etc. Stressed importance of preserving green space, green corridors and trees.	Staff appreciate the comments. <u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to these comments.
3	Robert Mason Nosam Properties Ltd and NASA Holdings Inc. 363-369 Gordon Street and 1 College Avenue	2012	Request that the consolidation of their properties be designated "Neighbourhood Commercial Centre".	Staff confirm that the response to this request as outlined in the January 30, 2012 report to Council still stands. The response stated: "The properties are designated "General Residential" in the current Official Plan. Staff propose to designate the existing commercial property located at 363-369 Gordon Street as "Neighbourhood Commercial Centre". Commercial designations are not recommended to be applied to the existing adjacent residential property at 1 College Avenue West." <u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to this comment.

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
4	Kate MacDonald on behalf of the Mayfield Park Community Assoc.	April 2, 2012	Advised that they are in strong support of the proposed "Low Density Residential" designation for the property located at 716 Gordon Street.	<u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to this comment.
5	Laura Murr on behalf of the Kortright Hills Community Association	April 2, 2012	<p>Expressed concerns about the designation of lands on Niska Road as "Medium Density Residential" including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - negative impacts on residents - traffic problems - economic impacts of growth and increased taxes <p>Questioned why "medium density residential" is proposed for the greenfield area.</p> <p>Questioned how many units would be permitted by the designation on the site.</p> <p>Requested a traffic management plan and environmental assessment prior to any changes in density.</p> <p>Commented that "medium density" does not contribute to a walkable, compact community because it is a fringe site.</p> <p>Concern that higher density will impact the ecological integrity of the Speed River PSW.</p> <p>Asked for assurance that the OP update does not alter or negatively impact the OPA for the Hanlon Creek Business Park as approved by the Ontario Municipal Board.</p>	<p>Increased densities are supported in the greenfield areas of the City to support compact development which contributes toward the achievement of the density targets for the greenfield area. Medium density development in the greenfield area is an efficient use of land and services. Niska Road is a collector road and medium density housing forms are permitted and supported to locate on collector roads. Concerns about traffic and environmental impact would be dealt with through a site specific development application. The Medium Density Residential designation permits a maximum density of 100 units per ha; the number of units permitted would depend on the site area proposed for future development. The actual number of units permitted would be assessed at the time of an application.</p> <p>There have been no changes to the policies for the Hanlon Creek Business Park that would negatively impact the Ontario Municipal Board approval.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to these comments.</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
6	Judy Martin on behalf of the Sierra Club Canada	April 2, 2012	Commented that the draft Official Plan document should include strike-outs of text from the current plan that is to be deleted and indicate by some method the proposed changes. Asked for document explaining the intent behind major changes.	<p>Staff note that the January 30, 2012 draft Official Plan contains comment boxes which indicate whether the policy is existing, revised or reworded. If a policy is not listed in a comment box it has not been carried forward. Staff have outlined the rationale for changes to the Official Plan through reports to Council. These reports are available on the City website at guelph.ca/envisionguelph.</p> <p>Staff also note that a version of the existing Official Plan has been prepared to document which policies have been deleted and which have been carried forward into the OP Update. This is also posted on the City website.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to this comment.</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
7	Hugh Whiteley	April 2, 2012	<p>Requested that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the central focus on Guelph's rivers and river valleys in relation to the linked open space lands and component of Guelph's image be retained in the Official Plan. - the River System Management Plan be retained as a guide for the preparation of plans within river and tributary corridors. - the specific quantified protection for the comprehensively defined open space and environmental corridors along the rivers and tributaries be restored in the Official Plan. - ravines be included in the Official plan listing of valued features to be safeguarded. - the Vision Statement for the Official Plan be rewritten as a guide to the long-term aims of the City. - the background statement of the Official Plan be rewritten to name the demographic and economic challenges to be overcome by the City. 	<p>Policies related to the rivers, river valleys and environmental corridors are incorporated into the Natural Heritage System section of the Official Plan which was approved through OPA 42 and is currently under appeal.</p> <p>The recommendations of the 1993 River Systems Management Plan were incorporated into the Official Plan and Zoning By-law in 1995. The River Systems Management Plan has been superseded by recent planning studies and approvals including OPA 42 and the Trail Master Plan.</p> <p>The Vision Statement has been prepared based on the goals and visions of a number of Council approved directions including the Local Growth Management Strategy, the Community Energy Plan and the Strategic Plan. Staff do not agree with the assertion that the Vision Statement as written does not guide the City over the long-term. Staff do not support the inclusion of background information into the Official Plan. This information has been well documented in reports to Council for the Local Growth Management Strategy.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Addition of wording in the Parks and Trails section related to linkages with Natural Heritage System where appropriate.</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
8	Mark Cowie on behalf of Industrial Equities Guelph Corporation	February 29, 2012	<p>Concern that the Southgate Business Park will never achieve the employment density of 36 jobs per hectare because it primarily attracts distribution warehouse facilities. Suggests that the Official Plan should encourage warehouse uses.</p> <p>Requests that any job specific targets are removed from the Official Plan and that the OP rely on the combined persons and jobs density from Places to Grow.</p> <p>Expressed concern about policies discouraging high water users from locating in the City as this is a constraint to food industries and manufacturers looking to locate in Guelph.</p>	<p>Refer to detailed response in the staff report related to density targets and high water users. Revisions have been made to the policies for greenfield area density targets to provide clarity that it is a long-term target and not a required density for each site.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Policy revisions.</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
9	Marc Kemerer Blaney McMurtry Barristers & Solicitors on behalf of Cooper Construction Limited	March 8, 2012 and April 11, 2012	<p>Concerned with the policy that directs warehouse uses to locate within the built-up area (9.5.2.3). Requests that warehouse uses be directed to greenfield areas.</p> <p>Concerned that greenfield area density targets for employment lands are arbitrary and unrealistic. Request that all policies related to density targets for employment lands be deleted.</p> <p>Concerned that district energy system policies would be a disadvantage for Cooper Construction.</p> <p>Concerned that policies will restrict users that require water from locating in the City.</p> <p>State that parking policies related to minimizing surface parking are not appropriate for greenfield areas.</p> <p>Requests that policies requiring sidewalks in employment areas be deleted.</p> <p>Suggests that height related policies be set out in metres.</p> <p>☐</p>	<p>Refer to detailed response in the staff report related to density targets and high water users. Revisions have been made to the policies for greenfield area density targets to provide clarity that it is a long-term target and not a required density for each site. The density targets are recommendations from the Employment Lands Strategy Phase 2.</p> <p>The district energy system policies are support and encourage policies and clearly state that the feasibility of a system would have to be demonstrated in conjunction with partners.</p> <p>Parking policies have been modified and moved to the Urban Design section.</p> <p>Sidewalks are required in all areas to support walkability, transit use and integrated development.</p> <p>Building height policies have been revised to remove minimum height as a requirement and moved to the Urban Design section.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Policy revisions.</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
10	Chris Pidgeon GSP Group Inc on behalf of Abode Varsity Living	March 5, 2012	Opposed to the change in designation from "General Residential" to "Low Density Residential". State that it represents a down-designation of the property that directly conflicts with the existing policies that encourage intensification on their property at 716 Gordon Street.	<p>The "General Residential" designation has been modified from the current Official Plan and split into two designations: Low Density Residential and Low Density Greenfield Residential. The maximum densities for these designations has been reduced from the current Official Plan to reflect a gradient in residential densities from low to high based on the designation. The designation of the subject property in the 2012 Official Plan is the residential designation that corresponds with the property's existing designation and its location within the built-up area of the City. The property is the subject of an Ontario Municipal Board hearing. OMB decision will determine future land use permissions.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u>: No changes in response to this comment.</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
11	Blake Mills	March 23, 2012	<p>Suggests that the following areas of the Official Plan be modified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - water usage as an obstacle to attracting industry; - references to pattern and design of streets, facilitating bike lanes and trails, and requirement for sidewalks; - height of building policy of 2 storeys is not appropriate for industrial buildings; - allowing warehousing in Greenfield areas; - wording related to reuse of residual heat energy or water should be qualified to be done if it is cost-effective to the business. 	<p>Refer to staff report for the response to the high water usage comment.</p> <p>The policy for design of streets including trails and sidewalks continues to be supported by staff. This policy supports walkable, transit supportive and integrated development.</p> <p>The building height policy has been deleted from the land use designation. Policies related to building heights have been added to the Urban Design chapter and encourage a minimum height in particular locations.</p> <p>Warehousing is a permitted use in the Industrial designation throughout the City.</p> <p>The policy related to reuse of residual heat and water is an encourage policy not a requirement.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Minor policy revisions.</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
12	Astrid Clos on behalf of Springfield Golf and Country Club	March 27, 2012	<p>Request that the golf course be removed from the area identified as having archaeological potential on basis that it has been entirely disturbed during grading for the golf course.</p> <p>Request for a site-specific policy stating that the golf course use is an interim use and that the conversion of the property to a residential use is anticipated.</p> <p>Request that the property be designated as "Low Density Greenfield Residential".</p> <p>Request that the Clair-Maltby lands be included in Stage 3 of the Staging of Development Schedule.</p> <p>Commented that the Clair-Maltby lands should be a priority for the City to expedite development.</p> <p>Request that identified trail location on the Trail Network schedule be moved to the east to follow natural heritage features on the property.</p>	<p>The "Areas of Potential Archaeological Resources" Schedule has been removed from the Official Plan. However, in accordance with Official Plan policies and Provincial regulations, an archaeological assessment may be required at the time of a development application.</p> <p>It is premature to determine future land uses for this property through site-specific policies in the Official Plan. The secondary plan for the Clair-Maltby area will comprehensively review land use designations.</p> <p>The Clair-Maltby lands do not fit within Stage 3 of the Staging of Development Schedule because Stage 3 and Stage 4 are geographic stages and Stage 3 is specific to the Guelph Innovation District. Description of Stage 4 has been modified to indicate that it is area based.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the Secondary Plan is an upcoming work plan priority, the specific timing for undertaking the secondary plan is determined through the Capital Budget process.</p> <p>The trail locations on Schedule 8 may be modified without amendment to the Schedule provided connectivity of the trail network is maintained. The actual final location of the trail would be determined through the Secondary Plan or future development applications.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to these comments.</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
13	Hugh Handy GSP Group Inc. On behalf of Estate of Valeriotte 1968 Trust 1968-1992 Gordon Street	March 30, 2012	<p>Concern that the lands were designated "General Residential" and "Core Greenlands" in the current Official Plan and are now proposed to have only a few pockets of land designated "Low Density Residential" with the remainder designated as "Significant Natural Area".</p> <p>Concern that the requirement for a Secondary Plan for the Clair-Maltby area is a significant policy shift that impacts on the policy permissions currently provided to the site.</p> <p>Suggest that the "Medium Density Residential" designation may be more appropriate for the developable portions of the property given the density permissions provided under the existing "General Residential" designation.</p> <p>Request flexibility with alignment of a future trail through future planning approvals because the identified location on the Trail Network Schedule directly impacts the developable areas of the site.</p>	<p>This property is subject to the Ontario Municipal Board hearing for OPA 42 in terms of the Significant Natural Area designation.</p> <p>Future land use designations, other than the Significant Natural Areas designation, will be determined through the Secondary Planning Process.</p> <p>Staff note that one of the reasons for the Secondary Plan is the need to comprehensively review and plan for servicing south of Clair Road. The provision of servicing is a precursor to development and thus the study requirements are not considered to be a significant policy shift.</p> <p>Staff note that the trail network on Schedule 8 may be modified without amendment to the Schedule provided that connectivity in the trail network is maintained. The final location of a trail would be determined through the Secondary Plan or a development application.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to this comment.</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
14	Hugh Handy GSP Group Inc. On behalf of 2274237 Ontario Inc. 1291 Gordon Street	March 30, 2012	Notes that the site has site-specific zoning which permits a height of 7 storeys. Question about Schedule 2 which shows a small triangle of land designated "Low Density Residential" at Arkell Road and Gordon; is this an error?	The existing land use permissions provided by the approved zoning for this property are not affected by the proposed Official Plan designation and associated policies. Staff confirm that there is a mapping error at Arkell and Gordon Street related to a small triangular shaped parcel. The parcel was erroneously designated "Low Density Residential". The designation of the parcel has been modified to place it within the adjacent land use designations ("Neighbourhood Commercial" and "Medium Density Residential") as appropriate. <u>Recommendation:</u> Revision to mapping.
15	Hugh Handy GSP Group Inc. On behalf of 2274237 Ontario Inc. Properties south of Arkell Road, west side of Gordon Street	March 30, 2012	Question about how the commercial floor area permissions for the Neighbourhood Commercial Centre would be distributed amongst the properties. Question about permissions for residential densities in the Neighbourhood Commercial Centre designations. Question about what the maximum permitted gross floor area applies to. Question about maximum permitted height of 6 storeys when adjacent property has site specific zoning that permits 7 storeys.	Intent is that the properties in question would be consolidated and developed as one commercial development. The gross floor area applies to commercial uses and it applies to all of the properties that are contiguous within the designation. Residential is permitted in a mixed-use building, not as a free-standing building so there are no density requirements in the Official Plan. The maximum permitted height is a new policy to the Official Plan. Sites that have existing zoning with different height permissions may proceed under their approved zoning regulations. However, development that requires a zoning amendment would have to comply with the Official Plan. <u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to these comments.

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
16	Hugh Handy GSP Group Inc. On behalf of Acorn Developments 331 Clair Road	March 30, 2012	<p>Concern about the property being included in the secondary planning area south of Clair Road.</p> <p>Questions the need to differentiate density requirements between the Low Density Residential and Low Density Greenfield Residential designations.</p> <p>Request that policies similar to the existing OP policies which provide consideration for an OPA for properties such as 331 Clair Road be included in the Draft OP. Alternatively, request that the site be designated "Medium Density Residential" through OPA 48.</p>	<p>The property is included in the Secondary Planning Area because its designation is Reserve Lands which does not permit development without a study to determine its future land use.</p> <p>The low density residential designation is split into two designations to distinguish between the built-up and greenfield areas of the city. The minimum density target applies to the greenfield area therefore the density permissions within the Low Density Greenfield Residential designation are different, in part, to support achievement of this target.</p> <p>Staff do not support including policies allowing development to proceed ahead of the Secondary Plan process if certain conditions are met.</p> <p>Site specific land use designation changes are not supported in the OP Update and are to be dealt with through site specific Official Plan Amendments to allow for a full public process.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to these comments.</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
17	<p>Hugh Handy GSP Group Inc. On behalf of 6&7 Developments Ltd. 11 Woodlawn Road W.</p>	<p>March 30, 2012</p>	<p>Questioning the definition of "urban village". Asking for confirmation that any "concept plan" for the site would reflect the site layout of the approved site plan. Concern that the proposed wording related to residential uses in the Community Mixed-use Centres is prescriptive in requiring residential uses. Asking for confirmation about the intention of "main street" type development for their site. Question about the intention and purpose of including urban squares and open space as uses within the Community Mixed-use Centre designation. Concern about the meaning of the minimum height of 2 storeys. Suggest that the policy should be revised to state "appearance of 2 storeys."</p>	<p>A description of urban village is contained within the Community Mixed-use Node policies in Chapter 3. The policies for concept plans are included in Ch. 3 and indicate that the concept plans are for new major development proposals and should address linkages and transition to surrounding properties (i.e., identified through approved site plans or existing development). Wording related to residential permissions has been revised to clarify that it is not a required use. Main Street type development would be determined through concept plans for new major development within the Community Mixed-use Node and therefore is not required on each individual site within the Node. Urban Squares are a permitted use within the Community Mixed-use Centre designation; in private developments they could include restaurant patio areas, transit stop areas, open space between buildings, etc. The policy for minimum heights has been revised, it has been removed from the land use designation and placed in the Urban Design Policies as an encourage policy.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Revisions to policies.</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
18	Hugh Handy GSP Group Inc. 9 Valley Road 1242 and 1250 Gordon Street	March 30, 2012	<p>Question the height and density limitations of the "High Density Residential" designation. Suggest that additional height and density (than what is permitted within the High Density Residential designation) is warranted for the site given that it is within the Intensification Corridor on Gordon Street.</p> <p>Concern about the built form policies for high rise buildings that suggest limitation of floor plate sizes above 5 floors and that parking would be located primarily underground.</p> <p>Asking for confirmation of the land use designation for 9 Valley Road.</p>	<p>Additional height and density is permitted through a bonusing by-law.</p> <p>Built-form policies for high-rise buildings are encourage policies; details would be determined through site plan approval and based on circumstances of the property and proposed development.</p> <p>In terms of the land use designation for 9 Valley Road; generally, the High Density Residential designation applies to properties with frontage onto Gordon Street in this area. 9 Valley Road is within the Low Density Residential designation.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u>: No changes in response to this comment.</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
19	Steven Zakem Aird & Berlis LLP on behalf of Silvercreek Guelph Developments Limited	March 28, 2012	<p>Policies 3.16 and 4: suggest that OPA 48 ought to reflect the ultimate disposition of the appeals with respect to OPA 42.</p> <p>Suggest that the policies related to the encouragement of structured and underground parking should be balanced with economic considerations.</p> <p>Policies for Community Mixed-use Centres should permit rather than require residential uses.</p> <p>Request that townhouses be set out as a permitted use in the Community Mixed-use Centre designation.</p> <p>Concerns with Policy 9.4.2.6 for Community Mixed-use Centres; indicates that the proposed main street development policies are not attainable or feasible and that the requirement of these types of features reduces the value of the land.</p> <p>Questions why the gross floor area maximum for the Community Mixed-use Centres at Woodlawn/Woolwich and Paisley/Imperial have increased substantially from the current Official Plan.</p> <p>Suggests that the maximum net density in policy 9.4.2.19 is inconsistent with permitting townhouse units in Community Mixed-use Centres.</p> <p>States that minimizing the amount of surface parking in CMUC's may not be realistic or achievable.</p> <p>Requests that OPA 48 be revised to reflect their current application for an OP Amendment for their site.</p>	<p>Staff note that the outcome of the appeals to OPA 42 will be incorporated into the Official Plan.</p> <p>Staff note that the parking policies are encouragement policies not a requirement.</p> <p>The policies for Community Mixed-use Centres have been revised to be clear that residential is a permitted not a required use.</p> <p>Townhouses are inconsistent with the policy direction for CMUCs; the primary function is commercial with permissions for residential in high density forms or mixed-use buildings. References to medium density within the CMUC designation have been deleted.</p> <p>The policies for main street type development are for the overall Community Mixed-use Node and appropriate locations are to be identified through concept plans for the Nodes. Staff are supportive of main street development as part of creating walkable, mixed-use areas in a compact form.</p> <p>The gross floor area maximums for the CMUCs have been modified from the current OP in terms of description only. The current OP refers to "new" retail which did not include existing buildings. OPA 48 changes the language to "total" and is consistent with the maximum floor area permissions approved through the Commercial Policy Review.</p> <p>(continued on next page)</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
	Steven Zakem Aird & Berlis LLP on behalf of Silvercreek Guelph Developments Limited (continued)			<p>New parking policies have been added related to considering reducing required parking in the Zoning By-law.</p> <p>Site specific amendments are outside of the scope of OPA 48. The application submitted by Silvercreek Guelph Developments will be assessed through the public process under the Planning Act.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Policy revisions for Community Mixed-use Nodes and Community Mixed-use Centres.</p>
20	Tom Krizsan Thomasfield Homes Limited 99 Maltby Road	March 28, 2012	<p>Comment that the Clair-Maltby lands should be a priority for the City to expedite for development. Request that the Clair-Maltby lands be included in Stage 3 on Schedule 6 and that the City make the Secondary Plan for this area a priority.</p> <p>Concerned that the Staging of Development policies proposes a dramatic change for the Clair-Maltby lands.</p> <p>Suggests that there is a shortfall in available greenfield lands to meet the Places to Grow density target and that the "Reserve Lands" are required to meet the target by 2031.</p>	<p>Staff acknowledge that the secondary plan is a work plan priority and that the specific timing is determined through the Capital Budget process.</p> <p>Stage 3 and Stage 4 of the Staging of Development policies are geographic in nature; the Maltby Road lands do not fall within the boundaries of the Stage 3 Secondary Planning area. The Stage 4 policies have been modified to indicate the geographic area that Stage 4 applies to.</p> <p>The Local Growth Management Strategy and the approval of OPA 39 confirmed that there is sufficient land available within the City's boundary to meet the population and employment projections to 2031. Refer to Staff Report for more information about this topic.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Revision to policy for Staging of Development.</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
21	Jonathon Rodger Zelinka Priamo Ltd on behalf of Loblaw Properties Limited	March 29, 2012	<p>Request for wording related to flexibility or recognition that the policies will be implemented and transitioned over the long term. Request for wording related to existing approved developments being deemed to conform to the Official Plan. Concern that wording for the Community Mixed-use Centres requires commercial retail uses to be accommodated only within mixed-use buildings.</p> <p>Concern over the requirement for Concept Plans for Mixed-use Nodes and how they will be implemented.</p> <p>State the wording for "Main Street" development is unclear because there is no definition for Main Street.</p> <p>Request for a definition of "municipal services".</p> <p>Suggest that policy 8.2.10 be revised to state "new development is encouraged to be designed...".</p> <p>Concerned with wording of policy 8.3.6 and its flexibility.</p> <p>Concerned that design policies for drive-throughs and service stations are not flexible.</p> <p>Expressed concerns with the Community Mixed-use Centre policies and flexibility afforded by the policies.</p> <p>Expressed concern with policy for a minimum height of 2 storeys for buildings fronting onto arterial and collector roads in commercial designations.</p> <p>Asked a number of questions about how the policies may be implemented for various sites.</p>	<p>There are policies within the Community Mixed-use Node section of Chapter 3 that address the long-term nature of the development of the Nodes.</p> <p>The policies encourage and allow for mixed-use buildings within the CMUCs but do not require them. Concept plans are for new major development within the Nodes and are intended to guide development application approvals.</p> <p>The Main Street concept is generally described in the policies; it will have differences in meaning depending on its location and context.</p> <p>A definition of municipal services is not required. Policy 6.1.3 describes what it means.</p> <p>Staff do not propose any modifications to Policy 8.2.10 because the policy provides examples of strategies to achieve pedestrian-oriented streetscapes.</p> <p>Policy 8.3.6 has been modified and is focused on maintaining public vistas which is a defined term.</p> <p>The design policies for drive-throughs and service stations are intended to provide guidance to the review of development applications and to zoning regulations.</p> <p>(continued on the next page)</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
	Jonathon Rodger Zelinka Priamo Ltd on behalf of Loblaw Properties Limited (continued)			<p>Generally, the Community Mixed-use Centre policies provide permissions, the policies related to height, building placements and parking have been modified to address the concern about flexibility.</p> <p>Many of the concerns are related to implementation of the policies through site plan applications. Staff cannot address potential development scenarios given that a number of the policies in question are encouragement rather than prescriptive and each application will have unique characteristics that affect how the policies would be applied.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Policy revisions to address comments.</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
22	Larry Kotseff Fusion Homes	March 30, 2012	<p>Expressed concerns with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ability of urban boundary to accommodate population and employment targets - affordable housing target directed to new developments - urban design policies that limit ability to brand new communities - approval of secondary plans could raise conformity issues with the Official Plan - density provisions limiting the consideration of development in secondary plan areas - proposed Chapter 4 policies seem overly onerous to an applicant when provincial and conservation authority regulations prevail - underground parking policies for high rise buildings need to be practical in terms of cost - policies that discourage private roads considering they are needed for condominium developments - parkland dedication requirements should include open space area, linkage and urban squares - lands at the southeast corner of Stone Rd E and Victoria Rd S should be designated as "Mixed Use". <p>Suggest that prescriptive policies should be left to zoning and site plan stages.</p>	<p>The accommodation of population and employment projections within the Urban Boundary was determined through the approval of OPA 39.</p> <p>Affordable housing policies are directed at new development because the City has no control over the existing housing stock.</p> <p>The urban design policies are not intended to limit the ability to brand new communities, rather they provide examples of preferred methods for establishing gateways to new communities.</p> <p>Staff generally try to ensure that there are no fundamental conflicts between city-wide policies and secondary plan policies, however in case of policy differences, the area specific policies prevail. For example, density provisions in a Secondary Plan prevail over density provisions in the Official Plan.</p> <p>Chapter 4 policies are for the most part under appeal through OPA 42. The policies related to flood plains and hazard lands are required in the Official Plan to address land use permissions in this regard and to be consistent with the PPS and provincial regulations and guidelines including conservation authority regulations and guidelines. (continued on next page)</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
	Larry Kotseff Fusion Homes (continued)			<p>Underground parking policies in the Official Plan are supported to reduce dependency on surface parking. Policies are not intended to discourage private roads for cluster townhouse developments.</p> <p>Parkland dedication requirements address the features in question but the determination of what would be agreed upon as parkland dedication is determined through development applications.</p> <p>Requests for site-specific land use designation changes are beyond the scope of the Official Plan Update. The subject lands are included within a secondary plan area which will determine their appropriate future land use.</p> <p>A number of prescriptive policies have been modified however, staff continue to support the retention of some prescriptive policies that support achievement of the objectives of the Official Plan and provide direction to zoning and site plan approvals.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to these comments.</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
23	Glenn Anderson Guelph & District Homebuilders Association	March 30, 2012	<p>Suggest removal of the policy (4.7.4.1) related to achievement of an improvement of 1.5% over the Building Code energy efficiency requirements because it cannot be regulated or implemented by the Building Department.</p> <p>Questions how a private road would be designed for public access (policy 5.6.3).</p> <p>Suggests amendment to policy 6.6.3 which states that gravity fed sanitary sewers are required. Suggests that the words "where possible" be added.</p> <p>Suggests removal of the affordable housing target for 3% rental units because the City cannot control or regulate the tenure of housing.</p> <p>Asks for revision to the Official Plan to make the Clair-Maltby Secondary Plan a high priority for the City.</p>	<p>Policy related to the Building Code and energy efficiency is included as support to the achievement of the Community Energy Plan.</p> <p>Private roads which allow unrestricted access (i.e., no physical barriers) would be considered to allow public access.</p> <p>Staff are supportive of the policy related to gravity fed sanitary sewers and do not propose any changes.</p> <p>The breakdown of the affordable housing target into rental and owner is intended to reflect the need for these types of housing. It is acknowledged that the City cannot regulate tenure. The policy will be used to encourage the development of rental units.</p> <p>The Secondary Plan for Clair-Maltby is an upcoming work plan priority and the specific timing is determined by the Capital Budget process.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to these comments.</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
24	Alfred Artinger Guelph and Wellington Development Association	March 30, 2012	<p>Expressed concerns with population projections.</p> <p>Requested that the secondary plan for the Clair-Maltby area be made a priority.</p> <p>Stated that the affordable housing target should be removed from Official Plan until the Housing Strategy is complete.</p> <p>Urban design policies should be re-evaluated based on timing of implementation.</p> <p>Asked for revisions to mixed-use policies to support transit and walkability.</p> <p>Suggested inclusion of a definition of "steep slope" and questions what makes a slope significant.</p> <p>Asking for clarification as to why land uses would be restricted on or adjacent to land fill constraint areas.</p> <p>Concerned with policies that direct the City to establish policies.</p> <p>Questions about heritage trees.</p> <p>Requested new OP policy about traffic signals and speed limits.</p> <p>Question about the addition of policies for vibration studies.</p>	<p>Population projections and associated policies were approved through OPA 39.</p> <p>The Secondary Plan for Clair-Maltby is an upcoming work plan priority and the specific timing is determined by the Capital Budget process.</p> <p>The inclusion of an affordable housing target is a requirement of the Province for the Official Plan update and the specific target is based on the City's 2009 Affordable Housing Discussion Paper.</p> <p>Timing of consideration of urban design in the application process is based on the need for sufficient information to assess the merits of an application.</p> <p>The intent of the mixed-use policies is to support transit and walkability.</p> <p>Steep slope would be determined through individual development applications.</p> <p>Land uses are restricted on or adjacent to land fills due to contamination risks.</p> <p>Heritage tree policies are in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act.</p> <p>The OP does not contain policies related to operational functions such as traffic lights and speed limits.</p> <p>(continued on next page)</p>

Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
<p>Alfred Artinger Guelph and Wellington Development Association (continued)</p>		<p>Requested that linkages between parks be included in the parkland dedication requirements. Expressed concern that development projects are held up at the zoning stage by urban design details that should be dealt with at site plan. Requested that urban squares be included in parkland dedication. Requested recognition of noise wall requirements in policy 8.4.8. Concerned that policy restricting gated communities would also restrict condominium developments. Suggested that "live/work and residential" uses not be included as permitted uses in the Commercial and Mixed-use designations. Concerned about site-specific zoning being too restrictive. Expressed that the policies for "main street" type development should be removed from the Official Plan because they cannot be implemented and are therefore not good public policy.</p> <p>Requested removal of policy requiring minimum height of 2 storeys of usable space. Concerned about density requirements for residential within Community Mixed-use Centres and medium density as a permitted use. Concerned about policies that encourage underground and structured parking because this type of parking is expensive.</p>	<p>Vibration policies are not new to the Official Plan; they have been modified slightly from the current OP. Determination of what lands would be taken as part of parkland dedication would be determined through a development application. Requirements for information about urban design at the zoning stage is related to City operational procedures and Council direction. Urban squares could be considered as part of parkland dedication depending on ownership and context. Policy 8.4.8 has been revised to remove references to walls in response to these comments. A range of uses is permitted in the Commercial and Mixed-use designations including live/work and residential. Staff continue to support the mixed-use nature of these designations and residential uses are not required or mandatory. Site specific zoning is related to individual development applications. Need for regulations is determined through a development application.</p> <p>Staff are supportive of Main Street type development in terms of providing pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use, walkable communities. These policies may be implemented through site specific development approvals as guided by Concept Plans. Alternative forms of parking are encouraged to reduce the amount of land being consumed by surface parking. (Continued on next page)</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
	Alfred Artinger Guelph and Wellington Development Association (continued)		Suggested that warehousing should be directed to the greenfield area. Suggested that the proposed density target for industrial lands is not achievable and should be deleted. Requested change in designation for lands south of Clair Road from "Reserve Lands" to "Special Study Area".	Warehousing is a permitted use in the Industrial designation within the greenfield area. Refer to the staff report for the staff response to the greenfield density target concerns. A change in land use designation from Reserve Lands to Special Study Area would not alter the timing or requirement for a Secondary Plan. <u>Recommendation:</u> Policy revisions to address comments as appropriate.
25	Nikolas Papapetrou Kilmer Brownfield Management Limited	April 2, 2012	Provided suggestions for modifications to wording for Section 4.4.4 Potentially Contaminated Properties. Asks for clarification on Policy 4.4.4.7 as to the circumstances that would lead to City staff determining that a peer review of an Environmental Site Assessment would be required.	Appreciate the comments. Staff note that the policies in the Official Plan often refer to Provincial regulations in general terms rather than to specific regulations. Staff note that the need for a peer review would be dependent upon the issues and staff expertise related to those issues. <u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to these comments.

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
26	Keith MacKinnon KLM Planning Partners Inc. on behalf of Guelph Watson 5-3 Inc.	April 2, 2012	<p>Concerned that their site is proposed to have three designations.</p> <p>Concerned that the maximum retail floor space permitted for the Watson/Starwood Node cannot be achieved and are in conflict with the "High Density Residential" designation proposed for the area.</p> <p>State that "High Density Residential" is not appropriate for this site.</p> <p>Request that their lands be designated "Community Mixed-use Centre" and that the residential density for that designation be changed to a range of 50 units/ha to 150 units/ha.</p> <p>Request that height limitations be removed from the Official Plan.</p>	<p>A site specific application including an Official Plan Amendment has been submitted for the subject property. The ultimate land use designation for this property will be determined based on Council's decision on that application. Staff continue to support a range of uses for the property including a mix of commercial and residential.</p> <p>The gross floor area permissions for commercial uses within the Community Mixed-use Centre designation were determined through OPA 29 and were based on projected need to the year 2021.</p> <p>Staff do not support the proposed density range for residential uses because the primary use within this designation is commercial. References to medium density within the CMUCs has been deleted from the Plan. Staff continue to support height limitations for a variety of uses within the Official Plan. The minimum height requirement for commercial properties has been revised and is now an urban design policy.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Modifications to the land use designation for this property to be determined through current development application for this property.</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
27	Wendy Nott Walker, Nott, Dragicevic Associates Limited on behalf of Armel Corporation	April 2, 2012	<p>Suggest additional policies in Chapter 3 for the Mixed Use Nodes to clarify the policy intent of the nodes relative to the "Community Mixed-use Centre" designation. Suggest that there should be some flexibility to recognize the degree of build-out of the Mixed-use Nodes. Suggest that references to urban squares be moved to the Mixed-use Node.</p> <p>Suggest modifications to policies for the CMUC that are prescriptively regulatory to delete or modify them (e.g. height, parking, store front widths, building massing).</p> <p>Comments related to schedules include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Schedule 8: existing trail linkage should be shown from Silvercreek to Greengate - Schedule 2: Natural Heritage System at westerly edge of city south of Paisley Road should be clarified - alignment and closure of Whitelaw Road: suggest removal from schedules because no formal approval has occurred. 	<p>Staff agree that there is a lack of clarity between the Community Mixed-use Nodes and Community Mixed-use Centres. The policies have been modified to address this concern.</p> <p>Urban squares are a permitted use in the CMUCs therefore, they are referenced in both the Nodes and the Centres.</p> <p>Policies for the Community Mixed-use Centres related to minimum height and parking have been modified and moved to Chapter 8 Urban Design.</p> <p>Schedule 8 does not display the trail in question because the trail has not been built.</p> <p>Schedule 2 includes the Natural Heritage System for context only; the Natural Heritage System policies are currently under appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board. The potential alignment of Whitelaw Road has been removed from the Schedules because the need for a realignment has not been finalized.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Policy revisions to Chapter 3, 8 and 9 in response to these comments. Schedules modified to remove realignment of Whitelaw Road.</p>
28	Shelley Kaufman Turkstra Mazza on behalf of Garibaldi Holdings Limited	April 2, 2012	Request change in designation for their entire property from "Significant Natural Area" and "Natural Area" to "Industrial".	<p>This request is outside of the scope of Phase 3 of the Official Plan update. The designation in question is the subject of an Ontario Municipal Board hearing (OMB 42).</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> No changes in response to this comment.</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
29	Dwayne Evans Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	March 21, 2012	<p>Comments from Ministry of Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - suggest that modes of transportation by identified that will serve as a linkage - suggestion to consider providing further direction with respect to development in the vicinity of existing transportation facilities - suggestion to include two parking policies related to shared parking arrangements and redevelopment/retrofitting of surface parking areas - add policy related to separate dedicated space for cyclists - modify definitions for affordable housing, built-up area and settlement area. 	<p>Generally, the transportation policies as a whole indicate support for multi-modal transportation systems throughout the city.</p> <p>Schedule 2 designates land within the vicinity of existing transportation facilities to appropriate land uses as per the Growth Plan.</p> <p>Parking policies have been added.</p> <p>Dedicated space for cyclists is included in policies in Section 5.4.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u>: Policies modified to incorporate comments from the Ministry of Infrastructure.</p>
29	Dwayne Evans Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	March 21, 2012	<p>Comments from Ministry of Transportation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - request that the interchange at the Laird Road intersection with Highway 6 be shown on all land use schedules. - Suggest revising Schedule 5 to show results of approved Environmental Assessment for Highway 6 as it affects lands adjacent to the highway and future interchanges. - suggest that the location of future interchanges on Highway 6 be included on all land use Schedules. <p>Recommendation for inclusion of a policy in Section 5 or Section 9 stating that "...all proposed development located adjacent to and in the vicinity of a provincial highway within MTO's permit control area under the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act (PTHIA) will also be subject to MTO approval. ..."</p> <p>Suggest that roads on Schedule 7 should be labelled and that the legend be modified to display Highway 6 as "Provincial Highway".</p>	<p><u>Recommendation</u>: Policies and schedules modified as appropriate to incorporate comments from the Ministry of Transportation.</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
29	Dwayne Evans Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	March 21, 2012	Comments from Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - suggests stronger language for some policies rather than using the word "encourage"; - suggests clarification for policies related to disposal or use of demolished cultural heritage resources; - recommends changing the word "prehistoric" in policy 4.8.6.1 to "precontact"; - recommends that 4.8.6.4 v. be deleted because it may conflict with archaeological licensing requirements; - suggests that the policies related to transportation, infrastructure and urban design address consistency with Section 2.6 of the Provincial Policy Statement or that a cross-reference to Cultural Heritage Policies be added to Sections 5, 6 and 7 of the Official Plan. 	<u>Recommendation</u> : Policies modified as appropriate to incorporate comments from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport.
29	Dwayne Evans Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	March 21, 2012	Comments from Ministry of the Environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - recommends a modification to policy 4.4.3.2 under Landfill Constraint Area; - Suggests inclusion of a reference to the regulatory requirements for public transit related projects be included in the Official Plan. 	<u>Recommendation</u> : Policies modified as appropriate to incorporate comments from the Ministry of the Environment.

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
29	Dwayne Evans Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	March 21, 2012	<p>Comments from Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - questions potential for appeals to the Ontario Municipal Board based on priority setting in the Development Priorities Plan. - Notes that the Clean Water Act does not identify the extraction of mineral aggregates in source water protection areas as a significant threat. - suggests deletion of the wording related to "handling" in policy 4.3.3.1 iv - Question about how the City would encourage the development of social housing since the County is the service manager - suggestion to include a policy related to editorial changes to the Official Plan being made without need for an Official Plan Amendment 	<p>Staff note that the Development Priorities Plan is developed in consultation with development proponents and there is flexibility in the Plan to allow projects to move forward.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Policies modified as appropriate to incorporate comments from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.</p>

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
30	Dwayne Evans Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing		<p>Comments from Ministry of Natural Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - recommends revisions to Mineral Aggregate Resource policies. - asking for clarification about source protection policies. - questioned what would constitute "potential" groundwater or drinking water source. 	<p>Staff note that the Source Protection Policies in OPA 48 are for the most part carried forward from the current Official Plan. The intent is that the policies would be updated through a subsequent amendment to the Official Plan following the completion and approval of the Source Protection Plan for the Lake Erie Region. Staff note that potential groundwater or drinking water sources would be determined through City study such as the Water Supply Master Plan.</p> <p>The policy related to the prohibition of asphalt and concrete plants in the City is an existing OP policy and staff do not intend to modify it. The policies related to permissions for these types of uses (i.e., portable asphalt and concrete) in the PPS have been included in the OP.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u>: Policies modified as appropriate to incorporate comments from the Ministry of Natural Resources.</p>