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1. INTRODUCTION

IBI Group was retained by Mr. Robert Saroli of Debrob Investments Limited to prepare this Report in support of two planning applications – an application to amend the City of Guelph Zoning By-Law, and an application for the approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision. These applications are intended to facilitate a municipally serviced subdivision containing 261-336 residential units in the form of single detached, semi-detached, street townhouse, and multiple dwellings.

These applications involve two separate properties under the ownership of Debrob Investments Limited being 55 Cityview Drive and 75 Cityview Drive within the City of Guelph.

55 Cityview Drive has been subject to two previous submission processes:


75 Cityview Drive has been subject to one planning application/approvals process, undertaken by the previous owner:

1. Application for Permission to Change or Extend Legal non-Conforming Use (Committee of Adjustment) – File A-115/09

Since the initial Draft Plan submission for 55 Cityview Drive in 2007, a number of events and municipal policy changes related to the subject lands and proposed development have occurred:

- The property was acquired by a new owner, Debrob Investments Limited;
- 75 Cityview Drive, adjacent to 55 Cityview Drive, was acquired by the current owner;
- An Environmental Impact Statement has been completed to characterize the existing natural features on the subject lands, determine the impacts on those features as a result of the proposed development, and provide recommendations with regard to the protection of features in the context of detailed design and construction;
- The Draft Plan has been revised to increase unit and people/jobs density to compensate for an undevelopable portion of the property as a result of an existing Provincially Significant Wetland, thereby maintaining conformity to municipal and provincial policies related to minimum densities for greenfield developments;
- The adoption of Official Plan Amendment 39 (Growth Plan Conformity) by Guelph City Council in June, 2009 and subsequent approval by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing in November, 2009; and
- The adoption of Official Plan Amendment 42 (Natural Heritage) by Council in July, 2010, subsequently approved by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing with modifications on February 22, 2011 and currently under appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board.
This report has been written with the intent of being read as a stand-alone document, with the purpose of providing the required planning justification in support of the proposed applications. Relevant information from previous planning reports has been included within this Report where applicable.

Furthermore, it is requested that the previous municipal application/file for 55 Cityview Drive be closed by staff and the enclosed Zoning By-Law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications be accepted as the formal submission in support of the proposed residential subdivision for 55 and 75 Cityview Drive.

The Zoning By-Law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision Applications are submitted concurrently with this Report, and are to be reviewed and processed simultaneously so that any issues or concerns may be addressed and reflected in both applications. It is intended that this Report provide a description of the subject lands, a detailed description of the proposed residential subdivision, an overview of the applicable Provincial and municipal planning controls, justification as to how the applications conform to these planning controls, and a summary of recommendations from the supporting technical studies, submitted concurrently with this report.

2. DESCRIPTION OF LANDS

The following section provides a detailed description of the local context of the subject lands, their historic use, existing conditions and constraints, and surrounding land uses and features.

2.1 Local Context

The subject lands are located on the east side of Cityview Drive, north of the Canadian Pacific Railway and across from Cedarvale Avenue within the City of Guelph as illustrated in Figure 1. The Tivoli (UP0601) subdivision is located to the north, the proposed Cityview & Watson subdivision to the south, and the Valleyhaven subdivision and existing residential development is located to the east. The legal descriptions of the two properties are as follows:

- **55 Cityview Drive**: 14.977 ha in size, is legally described as Part of Lots 25, 31, and 32, Registered Plan 53 and Part of Lot 4, Concession 3, ‘Division C’ City of Guelph, Former Township of Guelph; and
- **75 Cityview Drive**: 0.233 ha in size, is legally described as Part of Lots 25, 31, and 32, Registered Plan 53, and Part of Lot 4, Concession 3, Division C, City of Guelph, Former Township of Guelph

The total property area owned by Debrob Investments Limited, and therefore the Draft Plan of Subdivision, consists of 15.217 hectares. The two properties are herein referred to as the ‘subject lands’ unless otherwise identified throughout the Report.
2.2 Existing Conditions

2.2.1 55 CITYVIEW DRIVE

55 Cityview Drive has been vacant for some time, with two-thirds of the property mainly comprised of fallow agricultural fields. As such, no buildings or structures exist on the property. The lands were formerly used for agricultural purposes but have been left fallow for some time. As a result, the property is scattered with trees and weed growth, with approximately 10% of the lands being topographically lower than the remainder and heavily treed. Existing site grades are relatively level in the southern half of the lands, sloping gently in a northerly direction to a treed area at the northern limit of the site.

With regard to natural features, two small unevaluated wetland features are present along the southeastern and southwestern property boundary. The northern portion of the property contains cultural woodland that varies from densely vegetated to open areas, thicket, savannah, plantation, and a swamp which is part of the Clythe Creek Provincially Significant Wetland Complex. A tributary of Clythe Creek historically transacted the northeast corner of the subject property, however this tributary no longer exists.

2.2.2 75 CITYVIEW DRIVE

75 Cityview is currently a residential property with an existing single detached dwelling. The dwelling is listed as a Non-Designated Property on the City of Guelph’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Properties. It is described as a single family residential, neo-classic vernacular 1.5 storey dwelling with heritage features including the gable roof, centre gable, and stone gateposts at the driveway. It is noted in the Heritage Register that the dwelling is estimated to be c. 1870. A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) was undertaken to determine the significance of the heritage resource, and it was determined that although the house appears to be in the style of that period, there is no evidence of a building being on the property in either the 1877 or 1906 Historical Atlases. Furthermore, the turnover of the property in the latter part of the 19th century makes it questionable if buildings existed at that time, and the construction details and materials of the house are not of the 1870’s, but of a significantly later date. Through the HIA it was determined that the previous owner demolished much of the interior of the house.

The existing driveshed to the rear of the property is in poor condition. An additional shed also exists on the subject property in proximity to the existing driveway/parking area.
Trees on the property are either over mature, in poor condition, invasive species, or susceptible to fatal disease or pests, except for one Sugar Maple. The stone gateposts located on either side of the driveway were determined to have design and physical value through the Heritage Impact Assessment as they are a representative example of a style, construction method and material of an era and are in good condition with the exception of a defaced date stone. Further discussion with respect to 75 Cityview Drive and identified significant heritage features and recommended conservation measures are discussed in Sections 5.2.1.5 and 6.7 of this Report.

2.2.3 CITY OF GUELPH OFFICIAL PLAN

The subject lands are currently designated General Residential, Mixed Use Node and Open Space in the City of Guelph Official Plan as illustrated in Figure 2. As such, it is the intent that these lands accommodate a portion of the City’s existing and future population and employment growth through new development, while recognizing development constraints associated with existing natural features.

2.2.4 EASTVIEW SECONDARY PLAN

The subject lands are also located within the Eastview Secondary Plan. The policies of the Secondary Plan as they relate to the subject lands speak to the phasing of development within this Secondary Plan area. These policies, with regard to the proposed subdivision, are further discussed in Section 5.2.1.7 of this Report and within the Functional Servicing Report, which is summarized in Section 6.6 of this Report and submitted concurrently with this application.

2.2.5 CITY OF GUELPH ZONING BY-LAW

The subject lands are currently zoned Urban Reserve (UR) as shown in Figure 3. The intent of the Urban Reserve Zone is to provide for comprehensive redevelopment through development application(s) that are consistent with legislation and planning policies in place at the time the application is submitted and/or approved.

2.3 Surrounding Neighbourhood

The subject lands form part of the Eastview Community within the City of Guelph. The area surrounding the subject lands consist primarily of existing and proposed residential development, as illustrated in Figure 4. The lands to the northwest consist of existing residential development, with existing and proposed residential development located in proximity to the southwestern boundary of the subject lands. Lands designated for Mixed Use Node and Industrial purposes are located to the north and northeast, while lands to the southeast are currently occupied by a single detached dwelling but are to be developed as a residential Plan of Subdivision.

The CP Rail line runs approximately 265 metres southeast of the subject lands.
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3. PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

As stated in Section 1 of this Report, two development applications were submitted on behalf of the former applicant and owner of 55 Cityview Drive, Jannett Developments Inc. (Fierro). An application to the Committee of Adjustment was also submitted by the former owner of 75 Cityview Drive, Mr. Dean Goods. These previously submitted development applications are reviewed in the following sections for information purposes.

3.1 55 Cityview Drive

3.1.1 AMENDMENTS TO THE CITY OF GUELPH OFFICIAL PLAN AND ZONING BY-LAW

Applications to amend the City of Guelph Official Plan and Zoning By-Law were submitted to the City of Guelph on September 21, 2006 to re-designate 55 Cityview Drive from General Residential, Open Space, and Industrial to General Residential and Open Space to provide the policy framework to implement a future Draft Plan of Subdivision and Draft Plan of Condominium.

The conceptual Draft Plan at that time proposed a subdivision consisting of a mix of single-detached, semi-detached and on-street townhouse lots and cluster townhouse block for a total of 257 units as well as parks, open space and future development areas. The conceptual Draft Plan had an overall net residential density of 28 units per hectare.

3.1.2 WITHDRAWN OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT, REVISED ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT AND APPLICATION FOR DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION (55 CITYVIEW DRIVE)

In the time after the submission of the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law amendments, the City of Guelph adopted Official Plan Amendment (OPA) 29 to update the commercial policy framework of the Official Plan as a result of a comprehensive commercial policy review process. OPA 29 incorporated a revised commercial framework that included the establishment of Mixed Use Nodes in three areas of the City. With regard to the subject lands, the portion of the 55 Cityview Drive property designated for Industrial use was ultimately redesignated to Mixed Use Node as a result of OPA 29.

As a result of this City-Initiated redesignation, an application was submitted April 4, 2007 on behalf of Jannett Developments Inc. for Draft Plan Approval. Concurrent with that submission, the proposed Official Plan Amendment was withdrawn and the proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment was revised to reflect policy changes resulting from OPA 29. The proposed Draft Plan provided for a mix of single detached, semi-detached and on-street townhouse lots for a total of 239 lots as well as parks, open space and future development areas. A large future development site at the rear of the property was intended to accommodate a mixed-use development, consistent with the Mixed-Use Node land use policy framework. The proposed Draft Plan had an overall net residential density of 24 units per hectare.
3.2 75 Cityview Drive

3.2.1 APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION TO CHANGE OR EXTEND THE LEGAL NON-CONFORMING USE

The former owner of 75 Cityview Drive filed an application to renovate a portion of the second storey of the existing dwelling and construct an L-shaped two-storey addition. The proposed addition required the demolition of the existing rear addition of the dwelling and relief from the By-Law with regard to setbacks of accessory dwellings from the left side lot line. Planning staff had concerns with the proposal given that:

- The intent of the UR Zone is for comprehensive redevelopment to occur through a development application under the Planning Act; and
- The property is within the City's Designated Greenfield Area, and associated density targets under the Growth Plan need to be achieved through redevelopment.

As such, Planning Staff recommended that the application be refused.

Heritage Planning Staff also had concerns with the proposal given that the property, while not designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, was listed in the Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Properties, and the proposed demolition would remove almost all of the heritage characteristics or attributes of the heritage resource identified in the Heritage Register.

At the Committee of Adjustment meeting of December 15, 2009, the applicant expressed concern about comments from staff and requested to meet with them to clarify their concerns. As such, the application was deferred by the Committee, with the application considered withdrawn if not dealt with within 12 months of the deferral.

The lands were subsequently acquired by Debrob Investments Limited in July, 2010.
4. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

There are two development applications to be considered pertaining to the proposed residential development of the subject lands. These applications are outlined below.

4.1 Zoning By-Law Amendment

The first application is to amend the City of Guelph Zoning By-Law to rezone the subject lands to implement the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision. Figure 5 shows the proposed zoning of the subject lands to implement the proposed draft plan of subdivision.

The lands are currently zoned Urban Reserve. The proposed amendment to implement the draft plan of subdivision as proposed is as follows:

- **Lots 1 to 25, 40 to 47, 62 to 71, 86 to 108** will be zoned Residential Single Detached (R.1D) Zone to permit single detached dwellings with a minimum lot area of 275 square metres, a minimum lot frontage of 9 metres and minimum corner lot frontage of 12 metres.

- **Lots 109 to 145** will be zoned Residential Single Detached (R.1C) Zone to permit single detached dwellings with a minimum lot area of 370 square metres, a minimum lot frontage of 12 metres and minimum corner lot frontage of 12 metres.

- **Lots 26 to 39 and 48 to 61** will be zoned Residential Semi-Detached/Duplex (R.2) Zone to permit semi-detached dwellings with a minimum lot area of 230 square metres per unit and minimum lot frontage of 7.5 metres for each unit.

- **Lots 72 to 85** will be zoned Residential On-Street Townhouse (R3.B) Zone to permit street townhouses with a minimum lot area of 180 square metres and minimum lot frontage of 6 metres.

- **Blocks 146 and 148** will be zoned Residential Townhouse (R.3A) Zone to permit cluster townhouses and stacked townhouses on part of Street B and part of Street A in the Draft Plan of Subdivision, through the Site Plan Approvals process.

- **Block 147** will be zoned Residential General Apartment (R.4A) Zone with a special provisions (R.4A - #) to permit low rise apartment and/or cluster and stacked townhouse units along Street B through the Site Plan Approval Process.

- **Blocks 149 and 150** will be zoned Neighbourhood Park (P.2) Zone to establish neighbourhood parks within the proposed subdivision and to permit the extension of Grangehill Park into the neighbourhood;

- **Block 151 and 152** will be zoned Conservation Land (P.1) Zone to recognize the existing Provincially Significant Wetland, associated buffer and existing topography within this block.

- **Blocks 153** will be zoned Residential Single Detached (R1.C) Zone with a special provision (R1.C-5) to permit single-detached dwellings with the same lot area and setback requirements as existing dwellings along Starwood Drive to ensure compatibility in streetscape and built form along Starwood Drive, and to recognize the zoning of adjacent lands that are to be incorporated into this future development block.
• **Blocks 154 to 156** will be zoned Residential Detached/Duplex (R.2) Zone with a special provision (R.2-6) to permit semi-detached dwellings with the same lot area and setback requirements as existing dwellings along Silurian Drive to ensure compatibility and consistency in built form upon the extension of Silurian Drive into the subject lands and subsequent construction of dwellings.

• **Blocks 157** will be zoned Urban Reserve (UR) Zone to provide for the comprehensive development of this block in conjunction with neighbouring properties, intended for a higher density, at a future date.

### 4.2 Draft Plan of Subdivision

The Draft Plan of Subdivision has been revised to ensure existing natural features are protected from development to the greatest extent possible while providing for a greater housing mix in the Eastview Community in an effort to meet required density targets and accommodating planned road connections. As such, the Draft Plan of Subdivision is reflective of the cumulative planning, engineering, and environmental work completed for this property as well as adjoining existing and proposed subdivisions. It is our opinion that the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision provides a balance of all interests.

The Draft Plan of Subdivision together with the implementing Zoning By-Law Amendment proposes a new residential subdivision that strives to protect and maintain significant natural features existing on the subject lands while providing for a planned street connection between Starwood Drive and Cityview Drive, through Keating Street. The Draft Plan also provides for a housing mix compatible with existing and proposed residential developments. The Draft Plan (refer to Figure 6) is 15.217 hectares in size and contains 145 lots and 11 blocks – accommodating a total of 261-336 units. Based on unit yield calculations and estimations, provided in greater detail in Table 1 below, the proposed subdivision has a net residential density of between 32.5 to 41.9 units per hectare and 56.6 to 69.2 persons and jobs per hectare. Multiple Blocks 146, 147, and 148 will be developed as condo apartment and/or cluster/stacked townhouse units but the ultimate dwelling type intended is cluster and stacked townhouse units. Multiple Blocks 146, 147, and 148 will be subject to Site Plan Control. Future Development Blocks 153 to 157 are intended to be redeveloped with neighbouring properties once additional lands can be assembled, and will likely become single detached lots in part being determined by the size and orientation of the assembled parcels.

The subdivision provides for the extension of Keating Street to future residential lands to the southeast, providing connectivity between existing and future developments on the east side of Cityview Drive. Silurian Drive will also be extended into the subdivision to provide connectivity to the existing neighbourhood to the north, providing for the completion of the neighbourhood to the northwest.

A range of housing types are proposed to contribute to a greater range of housing choice in the Eastview neighbourhood and to meet a variety of housing needs of existing and new residents to the community and City. Higher-density housing in the form of stacked townhouses in conjunction with cluster townhouses are proposed in the front portion of the site. Lower-density housing forms are located to the rear of the subject lands, also providing for a slight transition in density from the front to the rear of the development, providing an opportunity to maintain views from and to existing and proposed open space areas.

Grangehill Park has been extended into the subdivision through Block 149. A second park area has been provided in Block 150. There may be an opportunity to extend a trail system from Street...
A to the lands adjacent to the southeast behind Lots 13 to 25 and Lot 150 to accommodate a naturalized pedestrian connection. The extension of Grangefield Park into the subdivision will extend active recreation opportunities to new residents of the proposed development. Block 151 and 152 have been established to recognize and protect the Open Space and Provincially Significant Wetland and associated buffer area from development.

Both sanitary and water services for this development would be provided through the extension of and utilization of existing municipal services. Stormwater from the site will be directed to existing stormwater management facilities to the southeast and southwest of the proposed subdivision, each of which have been sized to provide quality and quantity control of stormwater runoff generated by the proposed subdivision. Various utilities all have existing facilities adjacent to the proposed subdivision. Servicing of the development by the various utilities is anticipated to occur through the extension of these facilities in accordance with the policies and procedures of the service provider and would be addressed through the review and approval of the Draft Plan.

4.2.1 LAND USES AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCKS

Table 1 provides a summary of the lands uses based on a proportion or percentage of the total subdivision area (15.217 hectares) and areas of the blocks within the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lots/Blocks</th>
<th>Proposed Land Use</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>As a % of Total Subdivision Area (15.217 hectares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-25, 40-47, 62-71, 86-145</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwellings</td>
<td>4.222</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-39, 48-61, 72-85</td>
<td>Semi-Detached Dwellings</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146-148</td>
<td>Street Townhouse Dwellings</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149-150</td>
<td>Multiple Dwellings – Stacked Townhouse</td>
<td>2.473</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-152</td>
<td>Parkland</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153-157</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>4.233</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.217 ha</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 provides a breakdown of the residential component of the proposed subdivision. This table demonstrates that single detached dwellings make up the largest residential land component of the subdivision at 53%, however multiple dwellings make up the highest proportion of the total residential units at between 40 to 50 percent. The overall result is a balanced subdivision of a variety of housing types at a range of densities and scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Type</th>
<th>BY LAND AREA</th>
<th>BY UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Area (ha)</td>
<td>As a % of Total Residential Area (8.028 ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Detached</td>
<td>4.222</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Detached</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Townhouse</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Development & Multiples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Development</th>
<th>0.330</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>3% - 4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiples</td>
<td>2.473</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>105 - 180</td>
<td>40% - 54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.054 ha</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>261 - 336</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.2 DENSITY CALCULATIONS

According to the calculations below in Table 3, the proposed subdivision has an overall net residential density of between 32.5 and 41.9 units per hectare, which is in conformity with the maximum net residential density of 100 for the General Residential designation as described in Policy 7.2.32 of the City of Guelph Official Plan.

**Table 3: Gross and Net Residential Density (Units Per Hectare) of Proposed Subdivision**

| Single Detached Units | 103 |
| Semi-Detached Units   | 28  |
| Street Townhouse Units| 14  |
| Multiple Units         | 105 - 180 |
| Future Residential Units| 11 |
| **Total Residential Units** | 261 - 336 |
| **Net Residential Area of Proposed Subdivision** | 8.028 ha |
| **Net Residential Density** | 32.5 - 41.9 units/ha |
| **Maximum Density Permitted** | 100 |

In Table 4, the People per Unit (PPU) values used in the calculations below were taken from the City of Guelph’s Development Charges Background Report, 2009. It assumes these values are an accurate estimate for new development to 2020. According to the calculations below, the proposed subdivision has a density of between 56.6 and 69.2 residents and jobs per hectare, when excluding the land area occupied by significant natural features (in Block 152) – exceeding the Growth Plan density target for greenfields of 50 persons and jobs/hectare.

**Table 4: Residents and Jobs of Proposed Subdivision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Persons Per Unit Type</th>
<th>Total Persons</th>
<th>Total Jobs</th>
<th>Total Land Area (ha)</th>
<th>Total Persons and Jobs Per Hectare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Detached Units</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12,938 ha</td>
<td>56.6 - 69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Detached Units</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Townhouse Units</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Units - apart.</td>
<td>45 - 77</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>77 - 132</td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Units - towns</td>
<td>60 - 103</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>146 - 251</td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Development</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>261 - 336</td>
<td>718 - 877</td>
<td>16 - 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Area excludes portions of the subdivision intended for conveyance to the City of Guelph or other agency, including Park and Open Space Blocks and Road Right of Ways.
2. PPU values were taken from the City of Guelph Development Charges Background Study, 2009.
3. Jobs are calculated as a rate of 2% of the total persons.
4. Less area of Provincially Significant Wetland and associated buffer area (2.279 ha).
The detailed calculations with respect to the proposed subdivision by land use type, lot and block is contained within Appendix A of this Report.

4.3 Future Site Plan Approval

Applications for Site Plan Approval will be required to undertake the development of Blocks 146, 147, and 148 of the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision, as condominium developments. Being blocks within a Plan of Subdivision, an application for Condominium Exemption will also be submitted to legally establish those parts of the condominium which are privately owned, exclusive use areas (patios, balconies and private amenity space) and common element areas, which are collectively owned by all residential of the condominium, such as the roads, parking areas, and common amenity space.

4.3.1 MULTIPLE BLOCK CONCEPTS

In support of the proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision, Conceptual Site Plans have been prepared for all Multiple Blocks to demonstrate that their size and configuration are appropriate for future development through Site Plan Approval. Block 146 fronts Street B on two sides (due to a road bend), Block 147 has frontage on Street B, and Block 148 is located at the entrance of the subdivision and as such has frontage on Cityview Drive as well as Street A and Street B. All conceptual site plans have been designed to conform to the proposed zoning category for each Block as noted in Section 4.1 and illustrated Figure 5 of this report.

The Conceptual Site Plan for Blocks 146, 147, and 147 are provided in Figures 7, 8, and 9 respectively. A detailed description of the concept for each block is provided below.

4.3.1.1 Block 146

This Block is 0.908 hectares in size and fronts onto Street B on two sides. The Block for the most part is located internally to the neighbourhood block bounded by Keating Street, Street A and Street B and is therefore screened from lower density forms of housing on adjacent streets. The Block is of a sufficient size to accommodate between 30 and 54 units of condominium cluster and stacked townhouses, as well as common and private amenity areas and visitor parking area consistent with the requirements of the R.3A Zone. The images below provide a conceptual rendering of three storey stacked and cluster townhouses that might be built based on the footprint used to create the conceptual site plan.

[Image: Architectural rendering of three storey cluster townhouses]
Architectural rendering of three storey stacked townhouses

It should be noted that the above renderings are for information purposes only and may not reflect the exact look of the building when it is constructed.

The conceptual site plan conforms to the zoning regulations as illustrated in Figure 7.

4.3.1.2 Block 147

This Block is 0.777 hectares in size and is bound by Street B to the northeast, Block 148 to the southeast, a residential subdivision to the northwest, and existing single family properties to the southwest. The proposed zoning for Block 147 is R.4A with special provision to permit apartment and/or cluster/stacked townhouse dwelling units as the best design for the land is to be determined.

The Block could accommodate condominium cluster/stacked townhouse and/or apartment units between 45 and 77 in number. Sufficient parking is provided on site with driveway entrances to Street B. Common amenity areas can be easily screened from Street B through landscape treatments and fencing. The future Site Plan Approval process will involve a detailed review of the proposed apartment building at the time of application, and will be further refined through the future approvals process.

4.3.1.3 Block 148

This Block is 0.820 hectares in size and is bound by Cityview Drive, Street A, Street B and Block 147.

This Block has the capacity to accommodate between 30 and 49 condominium cluster and stacked townhouse units. The site is designed with an internal condo road with vehicle access only onto Street B for the purpose of traffic calming. Common parking and amenity areas for all units are provided within the interior of the site; however each unit will also have a private amenity area. Given that the Block has frontage on three streets, the units have been conceptually designed to front as much as possible on to Cityview Drive and Street A to ensure the maintenance of the neighbourhood streetscape. Consistent with the recommendations of the Heritage Impact Assessment, which is discussed in this Report in Section 5.2.1.5 and summarized in Section 6.7 and submitted concurrently with these applications, the existing stone gateposts have been incorporated into the conceptual development as framing the main pedestrian entrance to this Block.
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from Cityview Drive. Treating the gateposts in this manner will ensure their perpetual care and maintenance through the development of Block 148 as a Condominium.

The proposed cluster townhouse units are compatible with existing and planned residential dwellings along the Cityview Drive corridor, and parking has been located to the interior of the Block to minimize negative impacts on the neighbourhood streetscape. The conceptual site plan conforms to the zoning regulations in the R.3A Zone as illustrated in Figure 8.
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5. REVIEW OF PLANNING FRAMEWORK

The following section demonstrates that the proposed Plan of Subdivision and implementing Zoning By-Law Amendment are consistent with and conform to the applicable Provincial and Municipal Planning regulatory framework.

5.1 Provincial

5.1.1 PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT (PPS), 2005

Effective March 1, 2005, the Province of Ontario issued, in accordance with Section 3 of the Planning Act, a new Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) that is to be considered in all planning decisions. One of the key considerations of the Provincial Policy Statement is that planning decisions must be “consistent with” the Policy Statement. It should be noted that the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe prevails where there is a conflict between it and the PPS, the exception being where there is a conflict between policies relating to the natural environment or human health. In these instances, the direction that provides more protection to the environment and human health shall prevail.

The principle thrust of the PPS is to define the Provincial interest, to provide the policy framework and structure to integrate the principles of strong communities and to ensure a comprehensive approach to proposed changes to land use policy, a clean and healthy environment and economic growth for the long term. To provide for the building of strong communities, the Policy Statement requires the management and direction of land uses to achieve efficient development and land use patterns. The subject lands are considered to be within a designated growth area, as defined by the PPS. This section demonstrates how the proposed development is consistent with the applicable policies of the PPS.

5.1.1.1 Achieving Efficient Development and Land Use Patterns

The proposed subdivision is consistent with Policy 1.1.1 regarding sustaining healthy, liveable and safe communities as it:

- Provides for an appropriate range and mix of residential and open space uses, contributing to efficient development patterns while ensuring natural heritage features are protected;
- Minimizes land consumption and servicing costs through the extension and utilization of existing infrastructure within an area intended to accommodate future residential growth; and
- Ensures development is avoided as much as feasible in the steep slope areas characteristic of the subject lands.

5.1.1.2 Designated Growth Areas

Policy 1.1.3.7 of the PPS requires that new development within designated growth areas “should occur adjacent to the existing built-up area and shall have a compact form, mix of uses and densities that allow for the efficient use of land, infrastructure and public service facilities.” The development of the subject lands represents another stage in the build out of the Eastview Community, and is adjacent to existing and proposed residential subdivisions. The development of these lands will facilitate connections between existing and proposed subdivisions. The proposed subdivision provides for a full range of dwelling types, ultimately providing for a more efficient use of
greenfield land while protecting significant natural features, maintaining existing open space areas and creating new parkland. The proposed residential uses will also support the viability and functioning of the Mixed Use Node at Starwood Drive and Frasson Road adjacent to the rear of the subject lands by increasing the number of people living within walking distance of this area.

5.1.1.3 Housing
Section 1.4 of the PPS pertains to Housing, and states that a range of housing types and densities should be provided and that development of new housing should be encouraged in locations where there are appropriate levels of infrastructure and public service facilities. New housing should also be promoted at a density that efficiently uses land, resources, infrastructure, supports transit use and alternative transportation modes.

The Functional Servicing Report, summarized in Section 7.3 of this Report and submitted concurrently with the application, demonstrates that there is adequate capacity to service the proposed subdivision given existing stormwater management ponds to the southeast and southwest have been sized to accommodate the proposed development, watermains exist at the edges of the subject lands and services can be extended into the proposed subdivision. The proposed subdivision provides for a wide range of housing types at a density that facilitates a more efficient use of land and resources while protecting significant natural features as much as is feasible while implementing the City of Guelph’s intentions for a road connection between Starwood Drive and Cityview Drive through the subject lands.

5.1.1.4 Public Spaces, Parks and Open Spaces
Policy 1.5.1 promotes planning spaces to meet the needs of pedestrians to facilitate non-motorized movement. This includes “providing for a full range… of publicly accessible built and natural settings for recreation, including… parklands and open space”. Block 149 provides for the extension of Grangehill Park into the proposed subdivision and a second park has been provided in Block 150 facilitating pedestrian connections between Keating Street and Street A. Walkway accesses have been provided to Block 151. As discussed in Section 5.2.1.4 of this Report, a trail is proposed through Block 151, providing a pedestrian connection from Street D.

5.1.1.5 Significant Wetlands
Policy 2.1.3 prohibits development and site alteration within significant wetlands. Block 152 contains a portion of the Clythe Creek Provincially Significant Wetland Complex and as such no development is proposed within this block, which is intended to be zoned for Conservation Land (open space) purposes. There is also no development being proposed within the 30 metre established wetland buffer.

Given that the proposed subdivision is consistent with Provincial policy with respect to efficient development and land use patterns, providing a range of housing types, efficiently using existing municipal services and will not result in any direct impacts to significant natural features, it is our opinion that the proposed residential development is consistent with the policies of the Provincial Policy Statement.

5.1.2 GROWTH PLAN FOR THE GREATER GOLDEN HORSESHOE, 2006
Effective June 16, 2006, the Province of Ontario approved the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. The Growth Plan provides a broad range of policy directions and is based on the principle of requiring growth at a minimum density of persons and jobs per hectare, providing for development that results in improved utilization of existing infrastructure and land use designations while providing for development that is more transit-oriented.
5.1.2.1 Designated Greenfield Area

The subject lands are located within a Designated Greenfield Area as identified in the Growth Plan. Policy 2.2.7.1 states that new development in these areas must contribute to complete communities, support walking and cycling, and create high-quality public spaces.

The proposed subdivision will accommodate a greater number of persons living within walking distance to the adjacent Mixed-Use Node at Starwood Drive and Frasson Road, contributing to the future viability of this node and the development of a ‘complete community’ in the Eastview neighbourhood.

Grangehill Park is extended into the proposed subdivision through Block 149, a new park is being proposed in Block 150, and walking trails are provided in Block 151 to connect smaller neighbourhoods within the subdivision. Accommodating medium-density development along Street B provides for a greater number of people living within a five- to ten-minute walking distance of existing transit stops on Grange Road and Starwood Drive, and therefore potentially increases the number of transit users for existing transit infrastructure in the neighbourhood.

Policy 2.2.7.2 requires that a minimum density of 50 persons and jobs per hectare is achieved over the entire Designated Greenfield Area within a municipality. Based on the calculations in Table 4, the proposed subdivision will generate between 56.6 and 69.2 persons and jobs combined per hectare – exceeding the provincial target while feasibly maintaining the protection of natural heritage features.

5.1.2.2 Moving People

Policy 3.2.3.3 of the Growth Plan requires that pedestrian and bicycle networks are integrated within new development and linkages are provided between adjacent neighbourhoods to accommodate the safe travel of pedestrians and cyclists. Connections provided include:

- Keating Street and Silurian Drive have been extended into the proposed subdivision and will provide connections between existing and future residential development surrounding the subject lands; and

- A trail is proposed within Block 151, which could potentially be constructed as a multi-use trail, to connect smaller neighbourhoods within the proposed subdivision.

Given that the proposed development meets and exceeds minimum Greenfield density target requirements, provides for a range of housing types within walking distance of a mixed-use node, and accommodates linkages within and between adjacent neighbourhoods and makes use of existing and the planned extension of municipal infrastructure, it is our opinion that the proposed development is consistent with the applicable policies of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

5.1.3 PLANNING ACT (SECTION 51 (24))

The Planning Act, as amended, identifies the matters that are to be considered by the Approval Authority in evaluating recommendations of Draft Plan Approval for Draft Plans of Subdivision. Section 51(24) of the Planning Act is outlined in italics and our comments are provided in regular text:
“In considering a draft plan of subdivision, regard shall be had, among other matters, to health, safety, convenience and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the municipality and to,

(a) the effect of the development of the proposed subdivision on matters of provincial interest as referred to in section 2;

As discussed within this Report, the proposed subdivision has regard to all matters of provincial interest – particularly protection of natural areas and features, provision of adequate services and a range of housing, creation of a safe community supportive of healthy lifestyles as well as direct and indirect economic stimulation, appropriate location of growth, and a layout that supports future public transit and is pedestrian oriented.

(b) whether the proposed subdivision is premature or in the public interest;

The subject lands are identified within the Eastview Community Plan, which provides policies and guidelines to facilitate the phasing of development within the Community Plan Area. The policies for Phase I and Phase IIa, within which the subject lands are located, require that municipal sanitary trunk sewers and watermains must be extended into the area and appropriate stormwater management and hydrogeological studies must be approved prior to development occurring. As discussed in the Functional Servicing Report and Section 6.6 of this report, the proposed plan of subdivision will provide for the extension of existing services from the immediate vicinity and utilize existing stormwater management ponds that have been sized to accommodate the proposed subdivision. Furthermore, these lands have been designated within the City’s Greenfield Area through Official Plan Amendment 39 and as such are intended to accommodate a portion of growth in the municipality over the next 20 years. Lastly, these lands have been identified in the 2012 Development Priorities Plan as lands to be registered for development in 2013, and are also noted to require the planned extension of services along Cityview Drive prior to development occurring. In our opinion, this development is not premature and is in the public interest.

(c) whether the plan conforms to the official plan and adjacent plans of subdivision, if any;

The proposed development conforms to the City of Guelph Official Plan (refer to Section 5.2.1 of this Report for a detailed justification) and is compatible with the low rise housing forms, densities and road networks in adjacent existing and proposed residential subdivisions.

(d) the suitability of the land for the purposes for which it is to be subdivided;

The subject lands are predominantly surrounded by existing and proposed residential subdivisions with a mixed use node designated adjacent to the northern boundary of the property and has been designated in the City of Guelph Official Plan for General Residential, Mixed Use Node and Open Space uses. The proposed subdivision represents the efficient development of a Designated Greenfield Area, which is intended to accommodate growth in the City of Guelph, while providing for the protection and maintenance of significant natural features. In our opinion, the land is suitable for the purposes for which it is to be subdivided.

(e) the number, width, location and proposed grades and elevations of highways, and the adequacy of them, and the highways linking the highways in the proposed subdivision with the established highway system in the vicinity and the adequacy of them;

A Traffic Impact Study was completed by Paradigm Transportation Solutions Limited based on the proposed location of the municipal roads on the subject lands and the existing municipal roads on
neighbouring properties. The study looked at traffic flows at existing major intersections and determined that the additional traffic estimated to be generated from the proposed subdivision will not be significant enough to warrant major changes to the current road network. Grange Road and Starwood Drive are both planned to be four-lane roads, within the City Official Plan, and providing left turn lanes at some side street connecting intersections should be sufficient to keep up with the increased traffic.

In our opinion, the proposed internal road network and the surrounding roads are adequate to provide for the proposed development.

(f) the dimensions and shape of the proposed lots;

In our opinion, the dimensions and the shape of the proposed lots and blocks are compatible with the lots in adjacent subdivisions while ensuring provincial and local residential density targets are met. Dwellings providing for higher residential densities have been located internally within the subdivision to ensure that the edges of the proposed development are consistent and compatible in form and dwelling type with that of surrounding existing and proposed development. The lots and blocks make efficient use of land given constraints associated with identified natural features and effectively facilitate circulation within the subdivision and between neighbourhoods while conforming to the regulations of the applicable proposed zoning categories.

(g) the restrictions or proposed restrictions, if any, on the land to be subdivided or the buildings and structures proposed to be erected on it and the restrictions, if any, on adjoining land;

In our opinion, appropriate restrictions can be required as identified through the planning review process and can be implemented through the conditions of approval and the Subdivision Agreement process as provided by the Planning Act, as amended [Section 51(25) and Section 51(26)].

(h) conservation of natural resources and flood control;

In our opinion, the Draft Plan provides for the conservation of natural resources as it has been designed to protect existing significant features, such as the existing Provincially Significant Wetland, to the greatest extent possible. An Environmental Impact Study was conducted and determined that the proposed development, taking into consideration the design of the Draft Plan in conjunction with the application of proposed stormwater management techniques outlined elsewhere in this Report, would not negatively impact the PSW or associated water balance within the study area. Other natural features that will be impacted as a result of the subdivision, have been deemed non-significant as a result of past development activities in the surrounding neighbourhood.

(i) the adequacy of utilities and municipal services;

In our opinion, the utilities and municipal services are adequate to provide for the Draft Plan, as indicated in the Functional Servicing Report, which is summarized in Section 6.6 of this Report and submitted concurrently in support of the proposed applications.

(j) adequacy of school sites;

A new school site has been identified to the northwest of the subject lands with access from either Lee Street or the proposed Stockford Road. It is anticipated that upon the construction of the new
school, adequate access to such facilities will be provided to residents of the proposed subdivision. Both School Boards will have an opportunity to provide comment on this development proposal and advise of the adequacy of existing and future schools in the surrounding neighbourhood/community.

(k) the area of land, if any, within the proposed subdivision, that, exclusive of highways, is to be conveyed or dedicated for public purposes; and

In our opinion, the appropriate areas of the Draft Plan are identified as park blocks to be dedicated or conveyed for public purposes. A total of 0.325 hectares of land or 2.9% of the total area of the Draft Plan is to be conveyed to the City of Guelph for parkland purposes, through the extension of Grangehill Park through Block 149 and the establishment of Block 150. The balance of the 5% park dedication will be provided as cash in lieu.

(l) the physical layout of the plan having regard to energy conservation.

In our opinion, the layout of the Plan has regard to energy conservation, as a minimum of 45% and maximum of 58% of the total units proposed are multiple and/or townhouse units which tend to be easier to heat than the typical single detached dwelling. The modified grid street layout and proposed density minimizes fossil fuel use as far as is practicable by increasing transportation connections between existing and proposed neighbourhoods, reducing local vehicle travel distances, maximizing public transit effectiveness as much as feasible, and encouraging walking and cycling.

Therefore, it is our opinion that the Draft Plan together with the appropriate Draft Plan conditions of draft approval appropriately addresses Section 51(24) of the Planning Act, as amended.

5.2 City of Guelph

5.2.1 CITY OF GUELPH OFFICIAL PLAN

The subject lands are designated General Residential, Mixed Use Node and Open Space in the City of Guelph Official Plan.

The City of Guelph Official Plan provides a policy framework for land use decisions within the municipality concerning land use, servicing, heritage, transportation, and the natural environment. Given that the policy framework contained in the Official Plan will also assist Council and other public agencies in their consideration of proposed developments, the following section demonstrates how the proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision is consistent with the policies of the Official Plan.

The following section demonstrates how the proposed development is consistent with the current City of Guelph Official Plan, including Official Plan Amendment 39, approved by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing November, 2009.

5.2.1.1 Growth Management

Policies speaking to growth management within the City in order to conform to the Places to Growth: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe were established through Official Plan Amendment 39, which was approved by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing in November 2009 and subsequently modified by the Ontario Municipal Board in March 2010.
The subject lands are located within the Greenfield Area, with the rear portion of the lands also located within a Community Mixed Use Node, as illustrated in Figure 9.

Policy 2.4.10 requires Greenfield Areas to be developed in a compact manner at densities that support walkable communities, cycling and transit, as well as promoting live-work opportunities. The proposed subdivision is consistent with the criteria for the planning and designing of development within the Greenfield Area in that it:

- Is anticipated that a density target of between 55.6 and 69.2 people and jobs per hectare can be accommodated upon the build-out of the development;
- Promotes energy conservation through the inclusion of multiple-unit and attached low-rise housing forms that are increasingly efficient to heat, as well as locating a greater number of residents within proximity to existing transit routes and within walking distance to planned shopping and work opportunities (located within the adjacent Mixed-Use Node);
- Provides for a street pattern, pedestrian connections and urban form that enhances connectivity between planned and existing neighbourhoods, thereby supporting walking, cycling and potentially the integration of future transit services; and
- Provides for a diverse mix of residential dwelling types in close proximity to transit and commercial/employment uses.

Figure 9 Schedule 1B: Growth Plan Elements

Community Mixed Use Nodes are intended to accommodate higher density mixed uses, including residential, commercial, employment, entertainment and recreational commercial uses that serve...
the immediate and wider community, as outlined in Policy 2.4.9. As discussed in Section 5.2.2 of this Report, the portion of the subject lands included within the Mixed-Use Node identified in Schedule 1B of the Official Plan is designated Significant Natural Area in Official Plan Amendment 42 given the location of the existing Provincially Significant Wetland. As a result of this feature located within Block 152, together with open space Block 151, the lands will be subsequently zoned Open Space and therefore unable to contribute to the future development of the Mixed-Use Node.

5.2.1.2 General Residential

All forms of residential development are permitted in the General Residential designation including low rise housing forms as well as multiple unit residential buildings (cluster/stacked townhouses and/or apartments) at a maximum net residential density of 100 units per hectare. The proposed subdivision accommodates a range of housing including single detached, semi-detached, street townhouse lots, as well as cluster townhouses and stacked townhouses at a net residential density of between 32.5 and 41.9 units per hectare, consistent with Policy 7.2.31 and Policy 7.2.32 of the Official Plan. In order for multiple residential housing forms to be permitted without an amendment to the Official Plan, the following criteria, outlined in Policy 7.2.7, is used to evaluate new development proposals and rezoning applications to permit new multiple unit residential buildings:

*That the building form, massing, appearance and siting are compatible in design, character and orientation with buildings in the immediate vicinity.*

The existing neighbourhood to the north is characterized by single and semi-detached dwellings. The cluster townhouses and stacked townhouses within Multiple Blocks 146, 147, and 148 are restricted to three storeys in height in the proposed zoning category and will therefore be compatible in design and character with surrounding proposed and existing dwellings.

*That the proposal can be adequately served by local convenience and neighbourhood shopping facilities, schools, parks and recreation facilities and public transit.* The subject lands are adjacent to a Mixed Use Node that is intended to accommodate higher density mixed uses, including residential, commercial, employment, entertainment and recreational commercial uses that serve the immediate and wider community. It is anticipated that upon build out this node will contain amenities that will adequately serve the residents of the multiple dwellings as well as those of the remaining subdivision. The multiple blocks have been located in close proximity to the proposed extension of Grangehill Park and Cityview Drive, are within a 10 minute walk of an existing transit stop for Route 6 – Auden/Eastview, and walking trails have been proposed within Block 151. The local School Board has identified a new school to the northwest of the subject lands. Therefore, it is anticipated that the proposed multiples, as well as the remainder of the proposed subdivision, can be adequately served by existing and planned amenities and institutions.

*That the vehicular traffic generated from the proposal can be accommodated with minimal impact on local residential streets and intersections and, in addition, vehicular circulation, access and parking facilities can be adequately provided.* A Traffic Impact Study has been prepared in support of the proposed subdivision by Paradigm Transportation Solutions Limited based on the proposed location of the municipal roads on the subject lands and the existing municipal roads on neighbouring properties. The study looked at traffic flows on three existing major intersections and one future intersection, including Starwood Drive and Grange Road, Grange Road and Cityview Drive, Keating Street/Fleming Road and Starwood Drive, and Cityview Drive and the future Street A. From the completion of the study, it has been determined that the additional traffic estimated to be generated from the proposed subdivision will not be significant enough to warrant major changes to the current road network. The surrounding road network is capable of accommodating the future traffic without making changes to the type of intersections
however providing left turn lanes at some intersections are recommended. In our opinion, the proposed internal road network and the surrounding roads are adequate to provide for the proposed development.

*That adequate municipal infrastructure, services and amenity areas for the residents can be provided.* The proposed multiple units and remaining subdivision can be serviced through the planned extension of municipal services, which have been deemed adequate as discussed in Section 6.6 of this Report. Sufficient amenity areas for all proposed forms of multiple dwellings can be accommodated consistent with the regulations of the proposed zoning categories as discussed in Section 4.3.1 of this Report.

The physical character of the existing established low density residential neighbourhoods are also to be respected wherever possible. The proposed subdivision provides for detached and low-rise housing adjacent to existing lots of a similar dwelling type to the northwest, and proposed lots to the southwest and existing and proposed development to the southeast. Where multiples are located adjacent to existing low-rise dwellings a lower building height is contemplated. All proposed multiples have been located internally to the development or along roads where the impact on existing dwellings is minimized. While the proposed apartment blocks are located adjacent to existing dwellings along the east side of Cityview Drive, the land use policies governing these properties contemplate their ultimate redevelopment at a higher density given their location within the designated Greenfield Area.

Generally, the proposed plan of subdivision meets a number of the residential objectives established in Section 7.2 of the Official Plan, as it:

- Attempts to minimize potential conflicts between various housing forms by locating higher densities of low-rise housing internally to the development and along proposed streets, as well as providing for compatible housing forms adjacent to existing residential neighbourhoods;
- Provides for residential development on municipal services that are intended for extension into the subject lands and surrounding area;
- Establishes a proposed street network that connects the proposed subdivision to adjacent existing and planned neighbourhoods, providing access to shopping and recreation;
- Provides for a more compact urban form and increased variety of housing types within the Eastview Community.

As such, it is our opinion that the proposed subdivision meets the local policy framework with respect to General Residential uses.

### 5.2.1.3 Mixed Use Node

Section 7.4 of the Official Plan – Commercial and Mixed Use – provides the policy framework with respect to the function of Mixed Use Nodes. Mixed Use Nodes are intended to serve both the needs of residents living and working in nearby neighbourhoods and employment districts as well as the wider City as a whole, creating a well-defined focal point. Such Nodes are also intended to efficiently use the existing land base by grouping compatible uses together and providing for the concentration of shopping and service needs in a central location. To this end, Mixed Use Nodes are to provide for a wide range of retail, service, entertainment and recreational commercial uses as well as complementary uses including open space, institutional, cultural and educational uses,
hotels, and live-work studios. Medium and high density residential development and apartments are also permitted where appropriate.

The portion of the subject lands designated for Mixed Use purposes is located in the vicinity of the existing Provincially Significant Wetland as shown in Figure 2, and therefore rendered undevelopable due to existing natural features and associated buffers. Furthermore, this portion of the property has been designated as within the Natural Heritage System through Official Plan Amendment 42, which is currently under appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board. As such, a development consistent with the policies of the Mixed Use Node designation has not been included in the proposed draft plan of subdivision. Conformity of the proposed subdivision to the applicable policies of Official Plan Amendment 42 is discussed in Section 5.2.2 of this Report.

5.2.1.4 Open Space

The lands in the vicinity of Block 151 and 152 are designated Open Space in the Official Plan as illustrated in Figure 2. The intent of the Open Space designation is to provide for a balanced distribution of open space and recreation facilities connected through a continuous linear open space system. Permitted uses in the Open Space designation include public and private recreational uses and facilities, parks and conservation lands, among other similar-type uses. Lands designated for Open Space uses are also identified as part of the Linked Open Space Concept within the City, as noted in Schedule 7 of the Official Plan and shown in Figure 10.

![Figure 10 Schedule 7 - Linked Open Space Concept](image)

The Linked Open Space Concept outlines the potential for a city-wide open space system with connections to surrounding municipalities. Policy 7.12.8 directs the City to develop linkages between different open space areas in a variety of ways. Walkways, whether or not incorporated into an existing park space and routes that make use of a street system are considered appropriate linkages between open spaces. Figure 11 illustrates the proposed approach to linking existing open spaces to the north and south of the subject lands identified in Schedule 7 of the Official Plan.

From the north, it is proposed that Grangehill Park be extended into the proposed development to Street B. In order to connect to existing open space to the east, Block 151 features a walkway connection at the intersection of Street D and Keating Street.
It is proposed that a walkway system be established within Block 151 where feasible, providing enhanced pedestrian connections throughout the subdivision. To facilitate a connection to the future development lands to the southeast, a park is being provided in Block 150 which provides a connection to those lands.

Based on existing and proposed grades, the proposed trail network may have to be considered further through the application review and approvals process.

5.2.1.5 Cultural Heritage Resources

Section 3.5 of the Official Plan provides the policy framework related to the protection, maintenance and restoration of the City's Cultural Heritage Resources.

75 Cityview Drive is currently listed on the Municipal Heritage Register of Non-Designated Properties. A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) was undertaken by the LandPlan Collaborative Ltd., consistent with the requirements of Policy 3.5.12, to determine whether the property is of heritage significance and worthy of designation under the Ontario Heritage Act. It was concluded through the HIA that the existing dwelling is not a significant heritage resource. However, it was determined that the stone gateposts located at the Cityview Drive entrance possess design and physical value under the meaning of the Ontario Heritage Act as they are a representative example of a style, construction method and material of an era and in good condition with the exception of the defaced date stone.

An application was made to Heritage Guelph in April, 2011 requesting a correction to the Municipal Heritage Register as it related to 75 Cityview Drive based on the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the HIA. The requested correction involved the removal of all listed significant features from the Municipal Register of Non-Designated Properties related to the existing dwelling. It was further requested that the listing of the existing fieldstone gateposts as the only significant feature of the property be retained on the Register. It was also noted in the application that the owner had no objection to the designation of the fieldstone gateposts under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act if desired by Heritage Guelph.

The application was heard by Heritage Guelph on June 14, 2011. At that meeting, Heritage Guelph carried the following resolution:

- THAT Heritage Guelph has no objection to the removal of all references to the house at 75 Cityview Drive from the Heritage Register;
- THAT the stone wall be retained in situ and maintained in the Heritage Register; and
- THAT Heritage Guelph does not object to any future proposal to demolish the house at 75 Cityview Drive.

Members also felt that the gates would be best protected through a Heritage Conservation Easement.

Based on the recommendations of the HIA and the resolution passed by Heritage Guelph, the stone gateposts have been incorporated into the conceptual site plan for Block 148, with the site being designed so that the posts frame the main pedestrian entrance to the development from Cityview Drive. The conceptual site plan for Block 148 is shown in Figure 8. The incorporation of the gateposts in this manner is also consistent with Policy 3.5.3 of the Official Plan with respect to incorporating built heritage resources into new development proposals.

It is the intent of the owner to demolish the existing dwelling given its current poor condition.
The Request for Correction to Municipal Heritage Register application and Heritage Guelph Meeting Minutes of June 14, 2011 are enclosed as Appendix B. The HIA has been submitted concurrently with the development applications and is summarized in Section 6.7 of this Report.

5.2.1.6 Natural Environment

While not illustrated on Schedule 2 – Development Constraints of the current Official Plan, a Provincially Significant Wetland at the rear of the subject lands has been identified by the Ministry of Natural Resources, located in Block 152 of the proposed draft plan. Section 6.4 of the Official Plan provides the policy framework with respect to Provincially Significant Wetlands in the context of protection, enhancement and adjacent development proposals. Policies of Section 6.4 state that the City encourages the retention of all wetlands, with development being prohibited within Provincially Significant Wetlands. Development proposals shall also be designed to minimize impacts on wetlands and their ecological functions. For proposals that involve development on lands adjacent to a Provincially Significant Wetland, an Environmental Impact Study is required to determine the impact, if any, of the proposed development on the PSW and its ecological function. To this end, Policy 6.4.3 states that the Environmental Impact Study shall indicate that the proposed development will not:

- Result in the loss of the wetland’s ecological function;
- Create subsequent demand for future development which will negatively impact on the wetland’s ecological function;
- Conflict with existing site-specific wetland management practices; and
- Result in loss of contiguous wetland.

A scoped Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was conducted by Natural Resource Solutions Inc., and was EIS was completed in July 2013. The EIS determined that with the implementation of proper stormwater controls to meet the water balance requirements, no cumulative impacts are anticipated to the surface water and groundwater as a result of the development. This approach would result in the maintenance of the PSW’s ecological function through the completion of the proposed development. With respect to creating a demand for future development, the subject lands are within the Eastview Community, where additional lands to the east and north are designated for development; however the proposed subdivision will not alone create a demand for additional development given planning permissions for such activities currently exist. It was noted in the EIS that other developments east of the subject lands must consider potential future impacts on the PSW and woodlands given that these features are contiguous and the development lands share linkages. Shared impact linkages focus on cases where more than one development that may not actually overlap in time or space, affects the same component of the ecosystem.

Given that the lands are currently vacant, the proposed development was not seen to conflict with an existing site-specific wetland management practices. Furthermore, given developable features (such as roads, lots, infrastructure, etc.) are located outside of the wetland boundary and any impacts can be mitigated through innovative stormwater management practices, no contiguous wetland is lost as a result of the proposed development.

5.2.1.7 Municipal Servicing

As noted in Section 2.2.2 of this Report, the subject lands are located within the Eastview Secondary Plan Area with respect to the staging of municipal services. The lands are located within Phase I and II as shown in Figure 12. With respect to Phase I, the extension of municipal sanitary trunk sewers and watermains must be extended into the area, as well as the development of appropriate stormwater management approaches consistent with the applicable policies of the
Official Plan as well as the Clythe Creek Subwatershed Overview and the Eastview Secondary Plan Master Drainage Report (Hadati Creek Section) prior to development occurring in this Phase.

With respect to Phase IIa, stormwater management and hydrogeological studies must be approved by the City, sanitary trunk, watermain services and stormwater management must be extended into the area, and required Environmental Impact Studies must be completed prior to development occurring on lands within this phase.

The preliminary Stormwater Management Report is based on information contained in stormwater management reports completed for adjacent existing and proposed subdivisions as well as the Final Stormwater Management Design Report for the Southern Hadati Creek Watershed, Upstream of the C.N Railway Tracks. The preliminary Report concluded that both water quantity and quality of runoff will be accommodated in existing off-site stormwater management facilities that have been sized to accommodate runoff from the proposed development.

A hydrogeological study of the subject lands was completed in July, 2013 by Anderson GeoLogic Limited. The study concluded that:

- the existing PSW is fed directly from surface runoff and interflow;
- the other two wetlands features are moreover “wet areas” as a result of topography and geology; and
- with respect to development, it is recommended that the appropriate water quantity be directed to the PSW through three surface discharge outlets designed to mimic the shallow lateral groundwater and interflow character of the existing hydrogeological setting, including oil-grit separators.

The Functional Servicing Report completed in support of the proposed subdivision concluded that the existing sanitary sewer location on Starwood Drive will provide a sanitary sewer connection for the eastern portion of the subdivision, while the extension of the existing sanitary sewer up Cityview Drive is required to accommodate the western portion of the subdivision. With regard to water services, existing watermains are located adjacent to the proposed subdivision and will provide the domestic water and firefighting requirements for the subdivision.

An EIS has been completed to analyze the impacts on existing natural features of the subject lands as a result of the proposed development. The EIS determined that the two existing unevaluated wetlands do not meet the criteria to be considered significant natural features; there are no significant upland woodland features on the site; direct impacts to the PSW have been avoided where at all possible; and with the incorporation of surface discharge outlets along Street ‘A’ to maintain the PSW water balance post-construction, the proposed development will not result in any direct impacts to PSW features.

The abovementioned reports have been submitted concurrently with the Development Applications and are summarized in Section 6 of this Report. As such, all study requirements of the Eastview Secondary Plan with respect to Phase I and IIa have been met, subject to review and approval by the City of Guelph and Grand River Conservation Authority where applicable, consistent with the phasing policies of the Eastview Secondary Plan as they apply to the subject lands.
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5.2.1.8 Transportation

Policy 8.2.12 of the Official Plan states that the main elements of the road network are set out in Schedule 9B – Recommended Road Plan for Further Study and Environmental Assessment, which illustrates the functional hierarchy of roads and their location and excludes the local road network. With respect to the subject lands, a "New/Altered 2 Lane Road" is considered crossing through the subject lands as illustrated in Figure 13. A new road connection through the subject lands is also shown in the Eastview Secondary Plan, enclosed in this report as Figure 12, and a future road connection shown in Schedule 1B of the Official Plan, enclosed as Figure 9. While Schedule 9B illustrates the connection extending from Keating Street, other above-noted Schedules illustrate a connection originating from the intersection at Starwood Drive and Frasson Road. From these Schedules of the Official Plan, it appears that it is the intent of the City to have a collector road connection from Cityview Drive to Starwood Drive. Policy 8.2.28 of the Official Plan states that collector roads in the southeast quadrant of Eastview Road and Starwood Drive will require needs assessment studies based on localized and regional development patterns, with the final needs assessment for these roads occurring at the subdivision approval stage.

Street A was originally designed as a connection from Cityview Drive to the Starwood Drive/Frasson Road intersection however due to encroachment on the wetland 30 metre buffer the plan was revised. The new plan still conforms to the transportation policies of the City Official Plan by creating a road connection resembling Schedule 9B (Figure 13). Keating Street is being extended south into the subject lands and intersects with Street B on the north end of the subject property and Street A on the south end of the subject property, which will provide the desired road connection.

A Traffic Impact Study was completed by Paradigm Transportation Solutions Limited based on the proposed location of the municipal roads on the subject lands, including the Keating Street extension and Street A, and the existing municipal roads on neighbouring properties. Based on the study it was determined that proposed development and the associated traffic would be adequately supported on the existing road network in conjunction with the additional roads planned on the subject lands. A few minor upgrades regarding left turn lanes at some surrounding intersections as well as future traffic monitoring however, specifically at the Grange Road and Cityview Drive intersection and Keating/Fleming Road and Starwood Drive intersection, are recommended.
Recommendations also propose that Keating Street and Street A have the right of way through the subdivision and that sidewalks be provided on both sides of all roadways internal to the subject lands.

Given that the subdivision design accommodates a road connection between Starwood Drive and Cityview Drive, through the Keating Street and Street A intersection, and that the road network is able to accommodate the future traffic it is our opinion that the proposed subdivision is consistent with the applicable transportation policies of the Official Plan.

5.2.2 NATURAL HERITAGE SYSTEM – OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT 42

Although Official Plan Amendment (OPA) 42 is currently under appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board, it is important to demonstrate the conformity of the proposed development to these policies given they have been approved by both City of Guelph Council and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. These approvals indicate the Natural Heritage System policy framework is consistent with the direction of both the City and Province with respect to the maintenance, protection and enhancement of such features and therefore the policies of OPA 42, in our opinion, are valid to the review of the proposed subdivision.

Through OPA 42, the rear portion of the subject lands currently designated Mixed Use Node are redesignated Significant Natural Area and Natural Areas (Overlay) in Schedule 2 – Land Use of the Official Plan as illustrated in Figure 14.

The purpose of the Natural Heritage System is to “protect natural heritage features and areas for the long term, and maintain, restore and where possible, improve the biodiversity and connectivity of natural heritage features and ecological function of the Natural Heritage System in the long term, while recognizing and maintaining linkages between and among natural heritage features and area sand surface water and groundwater features.” This approach is consistent with the Natural
Heritage Policies of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2005. The City's Natural Heritage System policies also “...aim to strike a balance between protection of the Natural Heritage System while providing for limited compatible development.” It has been the intent through the design of the proposed subdivision to provide for the protection of existing natural features while still achieving objectives related to providing for planned road connections and ensuring density targets are met through the future development of the lands. With regard to the components of the Natural Heritage System, Significant Natural Areas and Natural Areas are identified in the rear of the subject lands in Schedule 10: Natural Heritage System as shown in Figure 15.

Policy 6.1.3.1 of OPA 42 states that the Natural Heritage System and its associated ecological and hydrological functions are to be protected for the long term. With regard to Significant Natural Areas, development and site alteration is not permitted within these features or their minimum buffers, while such activities may be permitted in lands adjacent to these features provided it has been demonstrated through an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) that there will be no negative impacts on the protected natural heritage features or their associated ecological functions. Exceptions are permitted and are identified within the policy framework of OPA 42. These exceptions are further discussed in this section. Development or site alteration may be permitted within all or parts of identified Natural Areas, provided it has been demonstrated through an EIS that all or parts of such areas do not meet the prescribed criteria that require their protection. Development and site alteration is also permitted in lands adjacent to Natural Features based on the conclusions of an EIS.

The boundary of the Provincially Significant Wetland in Block 152 was delineated in the field by Natural Resource Solutions Inc. and the GRCA and subsequently surveyed and included on the proposed draft plan. The general location of this feature is also illustrated in Schedule 10A: ANSI and Wetlands of OPA 42 as shown in Figure 16. According to Table 6.1 of OPA 42, the minimum buffer requirement for a PSW is 30 metres, while adjacent lands are considered within 120 metres of such features. All of the lands within the 30 metre buffer are proposed to remain as open space, or undeveloped. Within adjacent lands to the PSW and outside of the 30 metre minimum buffer, a range of housing types are proposed as well as park/open space and roads.
Section 6.1.5 of OPA 42 outlines the specific objectives, criteria for designation and policies for Significant Natural Areas and their buffers, with Section 6.1.5.3 providing the policy framework specific to Provincially Significant Wetlands. Policy 6.1.5.3.1 states that development and site alteration is not permitted within Significant Wetlands or established buffers with the exception of those uses identified as General Permitted Uses in Section 6. No site alteration/development is proposed within the 30 metre minimum buffer of the PSW and Block 152, which includes the designated PSW, will remain as protected open space.

Cultural Woodlands are also identified at the rear portion of the subject lands in Schedule 10C: Significant Woodlands of OPA 42 and as illustrated in Figure 17. In Policy 6.1.6.2 Cultural Woodlands are generally considered as areas of less ecological value than those categorized as Significant Woodlands, however their environmental benefits and services that are provided are recognized within the policy framework of OPA 42.
As noted by Policy 6.1.6.2.3.1, development and site alteration may be permitted in accordance with the underlying land use designation within all or part of Cultural Woodlands where it has been demonstrated through an EIS or EA, to the satisfaction of the City that the cultural woodland or part thereof does not meet the criteria for one or more Significant Natural Areas and is dominated by non-indigenous species (i.e. 60% or more). A portion of the identified Cultural Woodland is located in Block 152 associated with the PSW and is therefore not subject to any proposed development or site alteration. The remainder of the identified Cultural Woodland area identified in OPA 42 is proposed to be developed as lots, roads and open space. With regards to the character of the identified Cultural Woodlands on the subject lands and in the context of the proposed development, the EIS concluded that these woodlands have a high proportion of non-native, invasive species dominating the canopy, subcanopy and understorey. As such, the EIS recommended that this woodland be considered non-significant.

Consistent with Policy 6.1.6.2.3.2, a Tree Inventory and Tree Protection Plan has been completed as part of the EIS for those portions of the Cultural Woodland that are proposed for development. The Tree Protection Plan concluded that 375 trees would have to be compensated for through replanting.

Lastly, a small portion of the subject lands are identified as Other Valleylands in Schedule 10D: Significant Valleylands and Significant Landform as illustrated in Figure 18. The policy framework contained in Section 6.1.5.6.3 speaks to development and site alteration within Significant Valleylands and limits such activities to the General Permitted Uses of Section 6, as well as “essential transportation infrastructure including roads and sidewalks and their normal maintenance.” With respect to development and site alteration in this feature, the EIS concluded that the proposed development has been designed to minimize impacts to natural features and as a result the proposed subdivision will not result in any direct impacts to existing features.

Given that the proposed development will not result in any direct impacts to the PSW feature, the two non-significant wetland features do not meet the criteria to prohibit development in their vicinity,
there are no upland woodland features on the site that are significant, there are no significant species on the subject lands, and improvements to existing vegetative buffers are recommended adjacent to the existing PSW and proposed open spaces, it is our opinion that the proposed subdivision is consistent with the policies of OPA 42.

The Environmental Impact Study prepared by Natural Resource Solutions Inc. is summarized in Section 6.4 of this report and submitted concurrently with the development applications.

5.2.3 CITY OF GUELPH ZONING BY-LAW

As described in Section 2.2.3 of this Report, the subject lands are currently zoned Urban Reserve (UR) Zone and Floodplain (FL) Zone in the City of Guelph Zoning By-Law. The requested Zoning By-Law Amendment is intended to implement the proposed municipally serviced residential subdivision while recognizing existing significant natural features. The subject lands are to be rezoned to a variety of existing residential and open space zoning categories as outlined in Section 4.1 of this Report and illustrated in Figure 6. All proposed lots and multiple blocks conform to the applicable zoning regulations of each proposed zoning category as discussed and illustrated in this report. As such, no special regulations or provisions are required to provide for the proposed lots and multiple blocks of the draft plan of subdivision.

Given that all proposed residential zoning categories are consistent with the policies of the General Residential Designation, and the zoning of Block 152 for Open Space purposes provides for the perpetual protection and maintenance of the existing Provincially Significant Wetland, we are of the opinion that the proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment is consistent with the intent of the City of Guelph Zoning By-Law.
6. SUMMARY OF SUPPORTING TECHNICAL STUDIES

The following sections provide a summary of all supporting technical studies completed in support of the proposed Zone Change and Draft Plan of Subdivision. All technical studies listed and summarized below have been submitted concurrently with this report and required development applications.

6.1 Geotechnical Report

Chung & Vander Doelen Engineering Ltd. was retained to undertake a geotechnical investigation of 55 Cityview Drive in July 2006, in support of the previously proposed subdivision. Ten (10) boreholes were drilled and sampled in mid-July 2006. Through the investigation, the following was determined with respect to the existing conditions of the site:

- The site is covered by a relatively thin topsoil veneer which is underlain by a silt till deposit, with silt to sandy silt found at the lower northern limit of the site;
- Surficial topsoil has a measured thickness varying between 300 mm and 900 mm at borehole locations, however the thickness of the topsoil layer could vary drastically across the site from those reported at borehole locations;
- Topsoil was underlain by a major deposit of glacial sandy silt till which extended to the maximum depths of borehole exploration, with some boreholes exhibiting silt till underlain by grey, saturated silt or sandy silt;
- The sandy silt till contains a trace of embedded gravel and a trace of clay;
- Within the sandy silt till, natural moisture contents were measured at a range of 5% to 18%, indicative of typically damp to moist condition; and
- Boreholes located in the higher areas of the site remained dry and open throughout the sampling operation, and groundwater was observed at depths between 2.1 and 4.5 m below existing grades in boreholes located at the edge of the heavily treed northern limit of the site.

With respect to site grading, the report recommended that site grading should be undertaken during the drier summer months as sandy silt soils will be difficult to handle when they are wet, and fill materials should be suitably compacted in order to support future roadways, buildings and houses.

With respect to underground services, it was anticipated that the trench excavation will intersect native and/or re-compacted sandy silt till throughout the site, and west soils and groundwater conditions would be encountered in the lower northern limit of the site unless grades are raised. As a result of the field work the following was recommended with respect to installing underground services:

- Trenching can be carried out using conventional open cut procedures;
- Minor groundwater seepage should be adequately controlled during excavation and backfilling – although no major problems due to groundwater were expected within the excavations;
Generally, no bearing problems are anticipated for flexible and rigid pipes;

It is expected that some loss of moisture take place during the process of excavation and backfilling, facilitating backfilling and compaction – with overly wet materials being mixed with drier materials excavated from the upper portion of the trenches to achieve a more compactable soil mixture; and

Backfilling operations should follow closely after excavation so only a minimum length of trench slope is exposed at any one time to minimize potential problems.

With respect to building foundations, the investigation concluded that the sandy silt till is competent to support building foundations which can be founded on these soils or well-compacted engineered fill. Footing subgrade inspections were recommended to verify the bearing capacity of the soil prior to placement of the forms and concrete for the building foundations.

The full report is submitted concurrently with this Report and proposed Development Applications.

### 6.2 Slope Stability Assessment

Chung & Vander Doelen Engineering Ltd. was retained to review the condition of the site specifically related to the relatively steep slope comprising the north half of the property in 2007. Based on the Assessment and the anticipation that the site grades would be moderated by the use of cut and fill, careful planning in carrying out the site grading was advised as the native sand silt till soil is susceptible to erosion caused by surface runoff during rainfall events. It was recommended that the on-site sandy silt till cut from the higher part of the site could be used to construct engineered fill over the existing slope compacted to at least 95% along the future roadway and 98% under future houses, with all reconstructed slope surfaces topsoiled and seeded/sodded to prevent surface erosion.

The full report is submitted concurrently with this Report and proposed Development Applications.

### 6.3 Hydrogeological Investigation

Anderson GeoLogic Limited was retained in April 2011 to undertake a hydrogeological assessment required as part of the Environmental Impact Study exercise. The specific objectives of the assessment were as follows:

1. To summarize the hydrogeological setting, with particular emphasis on the shallow groundwater flow system;

2. To calculate the pre-development water balance components;

3. To evaluate the role or function that groundwater and surface water have in respect to the wetland features of the property; and

4. To identify post-development engineering stormwater management methods for maintaining groundwater recharge and/or surface water flows, where necessary, in relation to wetland features.

It was concluded through the assessment that the existing Provincialy Significant Wetland is fed primarily from surface water runoff (including interflow, which is the transient near-surface flow that
originates from recent runoff events and which moves short lateral distances through surficial soil layers) and to a lesser degree by lateral shallow groundwater flow. No apparent upwelling or discharge of groundwater to the PSW was evident, although shallow groundwater was considered to pass beneath the wetland.

With regard to the two small wetland features, each were found to be situated in a topographic dip where surface water drainage is poor. This condition, coupled with the characteristics of the underlying soils, was found to allow surface water runoff to accumulate in the lows. The available data was determined to indicate that these two features are wholly supported by surface water runoff and there is no groundwater function.

To ensure the runoff and groundwater components that currently provide a function to the PSW are maintained post-development, a standard water balance assessment was undertaken as part of the investigation. Block 152, including the wetland itself, is not expected to be affected with respect to water balance components because the vegetation and grading will not be altered. Nevertheless, the overall drainage area contributing to the wetland will be reduced, necessitating the direction of runoff from other areas in order to maintain the PSW in post-development.

Based on the water balance calculation, it was estimated that the total quantity of runoff and lateral groundwater flow from lands adjacent to the wetland (i.e., not including the 1.3 ha wetland itself) that provide a function to the PSW is approximately 22,099 m$^3$/year. To match this target quantity in post-development, approximately 6,529 m$^3$/year water balance will be maintained in the Block 152 open space, approximately 5,895 m$^3$/year will be directed toward Block 152 from the pervious portions and house rooftops of lots 120-145, and approximately 9,675 m$^3$/year will be directed from the east storm sewer toward a spreader located upgradient from the PSW buffer area.

The recommended “Post-Development Strategy for Wetland Maintenance” includes the maintenance of the water balance quantity that currently provides a function to the PSW. The assessment noted that is not “strictly critical” that the water reach the wetland purely in the calculated proportions as direct runoff and lateral groundwater infiltration, since the wetland does not receive any significant direct groundwater discharge. The spreader should be shallow in design to mimic the runoff and interflow character of the existing hydrogeological setting and include an oil-grit separator. Surplus stormwater runoff quantities from the development (i.e. the amounts in excess of the pre-development target quantity), will be directed to the off-site storm water facility, ensuring that the wetland is not inundated with excess runoff.

The full report is submitted concurrently with this Report and proposed Development Applications.

### 6.4 Environmental Impact Study & Tree Protection Plan

Natural Resource Solutions Inc. (NRSI) was retained to complete a Scoped Environmental Impact Study (EIS) to analyze the impacts of the proposed subdivision on existing natural features within the subject lands. The analysis and conclusions contained in the Hydrogeological Study, Preliminary Stormwater Management Report and Functional Servicing Report were used in the preparation of the EIS. A Tree Protection Plan was also prepared as part of the EIS exercise to create a tree inventory, analyze the existing biological health of existing trees, establish protection measures for retained trees and recommend mitigation/protection for retained trees and compensation measures for removed trees. With regard to existing natural features on the subject lands, the EIS determined:

- There are no federally or provincially significant plant species on the subject lands,
NRSI observed 3 regionally significant plant species during floral inventories; rough-leaved goldenrod (*Solidago patula*), heart-leaved aster (*Symphyotrichum cordifolium*) and soft willow-herb (*Epilobium strictum*),

NRSI observed 2 provincially and/or federally significant bird species during surveys; bank swallow (*Riparia riparia*) and barn swallow (*Hirundo rustica*) and 3 regionally significant species; Baltimore oriole (*Icterus galbula*), American redstart (*Setophaga ruticilla*) and sharp-shinned hawk (*Accipiter striatus*),

No significant herpetofauna (reptiles and amphibians) were observed within the property during focused surveys or incidentally,

There are 2 federally and provincially significant mammal species known to occur within the area based on background review; Northern myotis bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) and little brown myotis bat (*Myotis lucifugus*). In addition, northern myotis and southern flying squirrel (*Glaucomys volans*) are regionally significant. None of these species were observed during field surveys and suitable breeding habitat is not present within the property,

NRSI observed monarch (*Danaus plexippus*), a butterfly Species of Conservation Concern within the property. No migratory stopover habitat for this species is present within the property,

1 regionally significant dragonfly species was observed; Halloween pennant (*Celithemis eponina*). Suitable breeding habitat for this species is not present within the property,

Suitable breeding habitat for American redstart and Baltimore oriole is present within the thicket features on-site, while foraging habitat may be present for sharp-shinned hawk and Halloween pennant within the open areas of the shrub thicket or along the ephemeral watercourse,

There are no permanent aquatic features on site that provide fish habitat; however, an ephemeral head water swale feature, which conveys surface runoff flows from a small area south of Starwood Drive towards the Clythe Creek PSW,

The existing Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) is predominantly fed directly by surface water and interflow, while the two non-PSW features existing on the subject lands are not hydraulically connected to the PSW and as such are most likely present as a result of existing topography and past development activity on adjacent lands;

The meadow marsh located along the southern property boundary is considered a non-significant wetland given it does not meet GRCA criteria and as such the GRCA may permit development in this area under Ontario Regulation 150/06;

The wetland located in the southwest parcel (deciduous thicket swamp) appears to have formed by the alteration of the landscape due to surrounding urban development. This wetland does not meet GRCA criteria and as such the GRCA may permit development in this anthropogenic feature under Ontario Regulation 150/06,

The two non-significant wetland features do not meet the criteria outlined in OPA 42 and as such development and site alteration may be permitted in these areas,
The shrub thickets on the subject lands identified in OPA 42 have a high proportion of non-native, invasive species dominating the canopy, subcanopy and understorey. These areas do not meet the OPA 42 criteria for Significant Woodlands as they are comprised of a high proportion of non-native/invasive species and deciduous tree cover is <60%. Portions of the shrub thicket are being retained within the 30m PSW buffer and Open Space Block 151,

A screening exercise was undertaken, in addition to field survey findings to determine that there are no Significant Wildlife Habitats present within the property,

A Stewardship Plan is recommended to enhance and restore the natural area buffers and provide compensation for tree removal throughout the property as a result of grading requirements. The plan also recommends removal of the non-native/invasive shrub species, common buckthorn (*Rhamnus cathartica*) where feasible,

The delineation of significant natural features included the PSW boundary which is the basis for the design of the Draft Plan of Subdivision. The PSW is buffered with a minimum 30m setback,

Direct impacts from the development include tree and vegetation removal and non-PSW wetland removal,

Sediment and erosion control measures, along with tree protection fencing is recommended to ensure that development will not result in any direct impacts to PSW feature,

A water balance analysis was undertaken by Anderson GeoLogic Limited (2013) to determine the quantity of surface and groundwater required to maintain the PSW post-development.

A preliminary stormwater management plan was designed by IBI Group to ensure proper stormwater quantity control to meet the water balance requirements. To achieve stormwater quality, on-site treatment of stormwater directed to the PSW will provide for an Enhanced Protected Level for long-term sediment removal,

Development is proposed to the east and south of the Cityview Drive property, Starwood and Cityview Ridge. The PSW and associated natural features will be encircled by the 3 separate development plans, therefore, spatial crowding may occur over-time,

No additional cumulative impacts are anticipated as a result of the development,

The potential for temporal crowding is not seen as significant for the proposed development,

Maintenance of on-site surface flow infiltration through treated stormwater is important to control off-site impacts and address any spatial lag impacts,

No cumulative impacts from temporal lags are anticipated to result from this development, and

With regard to shared impact linkages, although no significant impacts to the PSW are anticipated, other developments east of the subject property must consider such impacts since the PSW area and shrub thickets/adjacent woodlands are contiguous.
As a result of the analysis of the proposed development in the context of existing natural features, the following recommendations were included in the EIS:

- Directional lighting for all areas of road and developments that are within 30m of natural features will be required to eliminate lightwash,
- An environmental monitoring program is recommended to ensure that the sediment and erosion control measures are installed, maintained and functioning as intended,
- Common buckthorn and other non-native species should be removed from the buffers and other lands to be retained,
- Enhancement plantings are recommended within the park blocks, along the backs of residential properties and along Open Space Block 152 to act as a vegetative buffer to the wetland and provide a number of other benefits,
- Sediment and erosion control measures must be installed prior to, and maintained during construction,
- Existing areas of natural vegetation, including trees to be retained, that will be retained should be clearly delineated in the field prior to any construction activities commencing,
- Any limbs or roots to be retained which are damaged during construction should be pruned using appropriate agricultural techniques,
- Maintenance of machinery during construction should occur at a designated location away from the natural areas on-site,
- Any areas of bare soil that are left idle until development, should be re-vegetated within 30 days to prevent erosion of soils and eliminate dust issues,
- No vegetation removal should occur during the breeding bird season (May 31 – July 31) in order to protect breeding bird populations,
- Native restoration plantings should be considered to maximize protection of the PSW and associated natural area from erosion, wind throw, as well as unauthorized entry,
- Planting of native tree, shrub and herbaceous species on currently un-vegetated portions of the site is recommended to enhance site conditions,
- No storage of equipment, materials or fill is to occur within the natural area,
- During the installation of construction limit fencing, any hazard trees should be identified by a Certified Arborist or tree professional and removed as warranted,
- Pre, during and post construction monitoring is recommended,
- Prior to construction, on-site impacts of sediment and erosion control measures and tree protection measures are required;
- Prior to construction, sediment and erosion control measures and tree/natural area protection fencing to be inspected by environmental inspector or qualified biologist,
During construction, the following should be undertaken:

- On-site inspections of sediment and erosion control measures and tree/natural area protection fencing to ensure maintenance and effectiveness,
- Pruning of any limbs or roots (of trees to be retained) disrupted during constructions,
- Maintenance of vegetated setbacks from wetlands,
- Fuelling of machinery to be done at designed location away from the wetland and ephemeral drainage features (minimum 30m),
- Storage of machinery and material, fill, etc. to be done in designated areas away from the PSW and buffer area,
- Equipment movement through natural areas and associated buffers to be controlled,
- Qualified biologist or Ontario Landscape Architect to inspect naturalization and tree compensation plant material prior to being planted throughout site,
- Implement During Construction Sighting Protocols for all on-site crew members to address possibility of encountering a species at risk,
- Qualified biologists to inspect vegetated areas for wildlife just prior to removal as per Migratory Birds Convention Act.

Post-construction monitoring within the PSW is required and is to include measurements of water inputs on a quarterly basis with water quality being tested annually to assess the presence of any contamination – if monitoring results indicate there is the potential for adverse effects due to development activities, immediate action should be taken to further protect where possible, with mitigation depending on the particular circumstances of the disturbance; and

Annual health inspections and a two-year warranty is recommended for all proposed planting material throughout the study area within Restoration Areas.

With regard to the Tree Protection Plan, 705 trees, consisting of 28 species, were inventoried and assessed within the subject property, including hedgerows, isolated trees, residential property and open space blocks. Of the surveyed trees, 350 (49.6%) are native species and 355 (50.4%) are non-native. The wooded portion of the property is dominated by tree-sized common buckthorn, an exotic and highly invasive shrub species. As a result of the inventory and overall canopy cover of this community (<60%), it was not recommended that the woodlot be considered significant.

Of the 705 trees inventoried, 494 are anticipated to be removed, of which 250 are native and 244 are non-native species. This includes 98 trees that have been identified as being in poor or very poor condition, and/or have a high risk of structural failure, and/or have been identified as snags. An additional 34 trees under these conditions are located greater than 10m from the development limit line, and therefore will be retained. Recommendations contained within the Plan will be addressed during the application review process.
6.5 Preliminary Stormwater Management Report

IBI Group was retained to prepare a Preliminary Stormwater Management Report in support of the proposed subdivision. Based on information prepared for adjacent subdivisions, the proposed subdivision and the City of Guelph with respect to the Hadati Creek Watershed, the purpose of this report is to establish the preliminary design for stormwater management, and to satisfy the criteria set out by the City of Guelph, the Grand River Conservation Authority and the Ontario Ministry of the Environment Stormwater Planning and Design Manual (MOE 2003). Based on the existing and proposed conditions as a result of the proposed subdivision, the report concluded the following:

- It has been confirmed that both water quantity and quality control will be provided in existing off-site SWM facilities for both the east and west draining portions of the proposed development;
- Runoff from the east-draining portion of the development will be routed to the existing storm sewer system on Starwood Drive;
- Runoff from the west-draining portion of the development will be routed to an upgraded storm drainage system on Cityview Drive, and they to the Valleyhaven Subdivision SWM pond from an easement (or block) adjacent to the Railway lands;
- Water balance calculations for existing and proposed conditions have been prepared for the wetland area;
- Treated road runoff and yard drainage will continue to provide the required annual volume of surface flow to the existing Provincially Significant Wetland;
- Based on information provided by the GRCA, the Clythe Creek floodline does not encroach on the subject lands; and
- Preliminary erosion and sediment control features have been identified and will be finalized at the detailed design stage.

The full report is submitted concurrently with this Report and proposed Development Applications.

6.6 Functional Servicing Report

IBI Group was retained to prepare a Functional Servicing Report in support of the proposed development applications. The objective of the report is to determine a functional servicing design for the proposed subdivision. The recommended servicing approach outlined in the report will provide the basis for the detailed engineering design of the proposed subdivision. Based on the analysis contained in the report, the following conclusions and recommendations were made with respect to the servicing of the proposed subdivision:

- That an area grading operation should be completed prior to servicing construction since a significant amount of cut and fill is required;
- That a sufficient amount of stripped topsoil be stockpiled on site for landscaping purposes on the residential lots/blocks, in the park and on the roadway boulevards;

- That a cut and fill analysis be completed as part of the detailed grading design with the goal of achieving a cut and fill balance for the site;

- An existing 200 millimetre sanitary sewer stub located at the CPR tracks will be extended along Cityview Drive to service the western portion of the subdivision; this sanitary sewer was intended to service the subject lands so it is designed to have sufficient capacity;

- An existing sanitary sewer located on Starwood Drive will provide a sanitary sewer outlet for the eastern portion of the subdivision; this sanitary sewer was intended to service the subject lands so it is assumed to have sufficient capacity;

- Existing watermains are located in the existing subdivisions adjacent to the proposed subdivision and also watermains will be installed in a new adjacent subdivision and a watermain will be extended along Cityview Drive; these existing and proposed watermains will be connected to and will provide the domestic water and firefighting requirements for the subdivision;

- Existing stormwater management facilities to the southeast and southwest of the proposed subdivision have been designed and built to provide both quantity and quality control for the stormwater runoff generated by the proposed subdivision, and internal and external storm systems will be constructed to convey the stormwater to these existing facilities; and

- In order to maintain the water balance of the wetland feature, runoff from lots adjacent to the wetland will be directed to it where possible, and also the storm sewer system will be designed to divert the required amount of storm flow to the wetland so the overall quantity of runoff to the wetland is maintained to existing conditions as much as possible.

The full report is submitted concurrently with this Report and proposed Development Applications.

6.7 Heritage Impact Assessment

The Landplan Collaborative Ltd. was retained to prepare a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) to determine whether the property at 75 Cityview Drive is of heritage significance and worthy of designation under the Ontario Heritage Act and determine what, if any impact, the proposed subdivision has on any identified cultural heritage resource.

The HIA identified the existing house, driveshed and landscape (specifically the fieldstone gateposts) as potentially significant heritage resources on the property. The HIA concluded the following regarding the potential significance of each of these elements:

**Existing House**

- The house is not a significant heritage resource, and the condition of the house as a result of partial interior demolition, considered vandalism by the previous owner, is not considered to have had an impact on the potential significance of the house;

- The house does not meet the design or physical value criteria of the City’s Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment Guidelines as it is not a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method, nor does it display a
high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit or demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement;

- The house does not meet the historical or associative value criteria of the City's Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment Guidelines as no direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to the community were determined through the HIA, nor does it yield, or have the likely potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of the community or culture, demonstrate or reflect the work or ideas of an architect, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to the community; and

- The house does not have contextual value because it is not important in defining, maintaining, or support the character of the area; it is not physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings; and it is not a landmark.

**Driveshed**

- The driveshed was not listed on the City’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Properties, and is not a significant heritage resource as it does not meet any of the applicable criteria.

**Landscape**

- Landscape plantings were documented to the north and east of the house and a row of White Cedar flanks the north side of the driveshed, while mature Silver Maple, Sugar Maple, and White Ash with an understory of Buckthorn and native herbaceous material were identified flanking the gateposts. With the exception of one Sugar Maple, all trees were found to be over mature, in poor condition, invasive species, or susceptible to fatal disease or pests;

- The fieldstone gateposts, which are listed in the City’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Properties, are determined to have design and physical value as they are a representative example of a style, material and construction method of an era. They are noted as being well-executed examples of a type that was once fairly common in rural Wellington County, but becoming scarcer, and in good condition with the exception of the defaced date stone.

As such, the HIA determined that the fieldstone gateposts are a significant cultural heritage resource.

With respect to the proposed subdivision and conceptual site plan for Block 148, within which the gateposts are located, the HIA documents the rationale for the purchase of 75 Cityview Drive and inclusion in the Draft Plan – to ensure that the gateposts were conserved on one property. Before the purchase by Debrob Investments (now Can Art Aluminum Extrusion Inc.), these gateposts straddled the property boundary between 55 and 75 Cityview Drive.

The conceptual site plan for Block 148, enclosed as Figure 8 in this Report, incorporated the gateposts as the main pedestrian entrance feature to the conceptual cluster townhouse development. The approach in which the gateposts were incorporated into the conceptual development was considered to be an adaptive re-use that “adds to the ambience of the new development while conserving the heritage resource.”
A complicating factor regarding the conservation of the gateposts was noted in the Assessment – the location of a portion of the posts within the right-of-way for Cityview Drive, and had always been there. It was recommended that, if they are to be conserved, the City should acknowledge this arrangement as a matter of record with no further action being required.

No negative impacts to the gateposts were determined as a result of the development – moreover it was concluded that the gateposts were “given a prominent position and important function in the new landscape.”

The recommended conservation option was determined to be avoidance mitigation with ‘preservation/conservation’ and ‘adaptive re-use’ mitigation strategies. With respect to ‘conservation/preservation’, it was recommended that all mortar joints should be checked for voids and loose mortar and re-pointed where/if necessary, especially the separated joint between the southerly and westerly post. With respect to ‘adaptive re-use’, it was proposed that the gateposts function as the main pedestrian entrance of the development, ensuring their long-term conservation.

The full report is submitted concurrently with this Report and proposed Development Applications.
7. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is our opinion, as outlined in this Report together with the supporting technical reports that have been submitted concurrently with the development applications, that the proposed application for Draft Plan Approval of the Draft Plan of Subdivision, and the implementing amendment to Zoning By-Law be recommended by staff and approved by Council as the proposed residential development has been shown to:

- Be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, and in conformity with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe;
- Appropriately address Section 51(24) of the Planning Act as amended;
- Conform to the approved planning policies of the City of Guelph Official Plan and OPA 42, while approved by the City and Province, has been subsequently appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board;
- Provide for a balance between the protection and maintenance of significant natural features and their ecological functions while accommodating envisioned road connections in the Eastview Community;
- Achieve appropriate site grading and municipal servicing provisions;
- Reflect the recommendations of the enclosed technical studies; and
- Represent good planning.

For these reasons, we recommend that Staff support the following:

1. The Application for the Draft Plan of Subdivision to create Lots 1 to 25, 82 to 71, and 86 to 145 for single detached dwellings, Lots 26 to 39 and 48 to 61 for semi-detached dwellings, Lots 72 to 85 for street townhouse dwellings, Blocks 146 and 148 for cluster /stacked townhouse dwellings, Block 147 for apartment and/or cluster/stacked townhouse dwellings, Blocks 149 and 151 for parkland dedication, trail connections and mid-block walkways, Block 151 and 152 for open space purposes and the perpetual maintenance of the existing Provincially Significant Wetlands, and Blocks 153 to 157 for future development in the form of single and semi-detached dwellings. The Draft Plan contributes to the completion of the Eastview Community and facilitates the extension of services in this area.

2. The Application for an Amendment to the City of Guelph Zoning By-Law to rezone the subject lands that are currently zoned Urban Reserve (UR) Zone and Floodplain (FL) Zone to Residential Single Detached (R.1D) Zone and Residential Single Detached (R.1C) Zone to permit varied single detached lot sizes; Residential Semi-Detached/Duplex (R.2) Zone to permit semi-detached dwellings; Residential Cluster Townhouse (R.3A) Zone to permit cluster and stacked townhouse dwellings; Residential On-Street Townhouse (R.3B) Zone to permit street townhouse dwellings; Residential General Apartment (R.4A - #) Zone with special provision to permit apartment dwellings as well as cluster and stacked townhouse dwellings; Residential Single Detached (R1.C-5) Zone with a special provision to permit single-detached dwellings with the same lot area and setback requirements as existing dwellings along Starwood Drive; Residential Semi-Detached/Duplex Zone with a special provision (R.2-6) to provide for single and semi-detached dwellings in a manner similar to what has been established along Silurian Drive; Neighbourhood Park (P.2) Zone to define the lands to be used as parklands, community trail and trail access; Conservation Land...
(P.1) Zone to recognize existing significant natural features; and Urban Reserve (UR) Zone to provide for future development in conjunction with neighbouring properties along Cityview Drive.

In summary, this Report should be utilized by the community in their review of the proposed development, by the development review agencies to advise of conformity and compliance with their policies and programs, by the City of Guelph municipal staff in formulating their recommendations and by City of Guelph Council in their approval. It is our opinion the proposed development together with appropriate conditions of draft approval represents good planning, is in conformity with Provincial, and Municipal policies and is in the public interest.

On behalf of Debrob Investments Limited, we request that this report and all supporting material related to these development applications be made available to planning review agencies, the Council and the community for their consideration. We will provide presentation of this information to the community at the statutory Public Meeting as required by the Planning Act. We would be pleased to respond to any questions related to the proposed development applications identified through the review and approval process.

Respectfully Submitted,

IBI GROUP

[Signature]

Odete Gomes, BES, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner

OG/LO/baw
Encl.
APPENDIX A

GROWTH & DENSITY CALCULATION SPREADSHEET, OCTOBER, 2011
**CITYVIEW SUBDIVISION - LOT & BLOCK SUMMARY & DENSITY CALCULATION**

**1 - SINGLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT #</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>TOTAL AREA (ha)</th>
<th>MIN. CORNER LOTS (15 m)</th>
<th>MIN. CORNER LOT WIDTH (m)</th>
<th>MAX. INTERIOR LOT WIDTH (m)</th>
<th>TOTAL # OF LOTS</th>
<th>PROPOSED ZONING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>R.1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-25</td>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>R.1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-47</td>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>R.1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-71</td>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>R.1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-69</td>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>R.1C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-108</td>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.97</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>R.1C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108-115</td>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>R.1C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116-123</td>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>R.1C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155-164</td>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>R.1C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.325</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2 - SEMIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT #</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>TOTAL AREA (ha)</th>
<th>MIN. CORNER LOTS (15 m)</th>
<th>MIN. CORNER LOT WIDTH (m)</th>
<th>MAX. INTERIOR LOT WIDTH (m)</th>
<th>TOTAL # OF LOTS</th>
<th>PROPOSED ZONING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48-57</td>
<td>SEMI-DETACHED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.94</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>R.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-67</td>
<td>SEMI-DETACHED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.94</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>R.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3 - STREET TOWNS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT #</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>TOTAL AREA (ha)</th>
<th>MIN. CORNER LOTS (15 m)</th>
<th>MIN. CORNER LOT WIDTH (m)</th>
<th>MAX. INTERIOR LOT WIDTH (m)</th>
<th>TOTAL # OF LOTS</th>
<th>PROPOSED ZONING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78-88</td>
<td>TOWNS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.38</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>R.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.625</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4 - MULTIPLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLOCK #</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>BLOCK AREA (ha)</th>
<th>MIN. TOTAL UNITS</th>
<th>MAX. TOTAL UNITS</th>
<th>PROPOSED ZONING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>TOWNHOUSE</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>R.1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>APARTMENT CLUSTER</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>R.4A GP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>TOWNHOUSE</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>R.1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.412</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>169</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5 - PARK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLOCK #</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>BLOCK AREA (ha)</th>
<th>PROPOSED ZONING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>R.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>R.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.208</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6 - OPEN SPACE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLOCK #</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>BLOCK AREA (ha)</th>
<th>PROPOSED ZONING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>OPEN SPACE</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>R.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>OPEN SPACE</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>R.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.203</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7 - FUTURE DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLOCK #</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>BLOCK AREA (ha)</th>
<th>MAX. INTERIOR LOT WIDTH (m)</th>
<th>ZONING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R.1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R.1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R.1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R.1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>SEMI-DETACHED</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R.1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.538</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8 - ROAD RIGHT OF WAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>AREA (ha)</th>
<th>PROPOSED ZONING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROADS</td>
<td>2.425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL OF SUBDIVISION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA (ha)</th>
<th>MIN. TOTAL UNITS</th>
<th>MAX. TOTAL UNITS</th>
<th>DENSITY UNITS/ha</th>
<th>DENSITY UNITS/ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.217</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MINIMUM TOTAL PERSONS AND JOBS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>TOTAL UNITS</th>
<th>PERSONS PER UNIT (PPU)*</th>
<th>TOTAL PERSONS</th>
<th>TOTAL JOBS**</th>
<th>TOTAL PERSONS AND JOBS</th>
<th>TOTAL AREA (ha)</th>
<th>PERSONS &amp; JOBS/HA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SINGLES</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SEMIS</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. STREET TOWNS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MULTIPLES - APARTMENT</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PARKS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. OPEN SPACE</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. FUTURE DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ROADS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>341</strong></td>
<td><strong>716</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>815</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.330</strong></td>
<td><strong>65.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAXIMUM TOTAL PERSONS AND JOBS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>TOTAL UNITS</th>
<th>PERSONS PER UNIT (PPU)*</th>
<th>TOTAL PERSONS</th>
<th>TOTAL JOBS**</th>
<th>TOTAL AREA (ha)</th>
<th>PERSONS &amp; JOBS/HA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SINGLES</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SEMIS</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. STREET TOWNS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MULTIPLES - APARTMENT</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PARKS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. OPEN SPACE</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. FUTURE DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ROADS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>341</strong></td>
<td><strong>777</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.330</strong></td>
<td><strong>65.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PPU = Person Pap in Unit
**Jobs are calculated at a rate of 25% of the total persons.
***Less area of Provincially Significant Wetland and associated Buffer (2.279 ha)
APPENDIX B

CORRECTION TO GUELPH MUNICIPAL HERITAGE REGISTER APPLICATION AND HERITAGE GUELPH MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 14, 2011
MEETING MINUTES

MEETING: Heritage Guelph
DATE: June 14, 2011
LOCATION: City Hall Committee Room ‘B’
TIME: 12:00 Noon

PRESENT: Paul Ross (Chair), Martin Bosch, Joel Bartlett, Susan Ratcliffe, Lorraine Pagnan, Doug Haines, Daphne Wainman-Wood, Tony Berto, Russell Ott, Stephen Robinson (Senior Heritage Planner).
REGrets: Christopher Campbell, Laura Waldie, Nate Valeriote

DISCUSSION ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Welcome and Opening Remarks</strong>&lt;br&gt;Paul Ross welcomed all to the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Approval of Agenda:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Moved by Russell Ott and seconded by Lorraine Pagnan,&lt;br&gt;“THAT the Agenda for the June 14, 2011 meeting of Heritage Guelph be approved as presented.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Declaration of Pecuniary Interest:</strong>&lt;br&gt;None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Approval of Meeting Minutes from the May 9, 2011</strong>&lt;br&gt;Moved by Lorraine Pagnan and seconded by Daphne Wainman-Wood,&lt;br&gt;“THAT the Minutes of the Heritage Guelph meeting of May 9, 2011 be adopted.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Matters Arising from Previous Minutes</strong>&lt;br&gt;None to report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Business Items</strong>&lt;br&gt;Item 6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Downtown Secondary Plan  
David DeGroot (City of Guelph Urban Designer) and Ian Panabaker (Corporate Manager, Downtown Renewal) attended this portion of the meeting to present the status of the Downtown Secondary Plan and the Protected View Areas on Gordon Street in relation to the Church of Our Lady.

Moved by Martin Bosch and seconded by Doug Haines,

“THAT, in principle, Heritage Guelph supports the proposed Downtown Secondary Plan as presented at their meeting of 14 June 2011.”  

CARRIED

Item 6.2  
3-7 Gordon Street  
John Farley of Creating Homes Guelph attended this portion of the meeting regarding a proposed encroachment into the current protected view sightline on Gordon Street. If a proposed amendment is approved, this encroachment would be eliminated. The view point that encroaches is currently hidden by mature trees.

Moved by Martin Bosch and seconded by Lorraine Pagnan,

“THAT the property owner’s 3-D renderings of the proposed building at 3-7 Gordon Street as seen from Gordon Street’s primary intersections be received; and

THAT Heritage Guelph supports the proponent’s opinion that in the renderings presented, the majority of the Church of Our Lady is visible from Gordon Street as far away as Wellington Street and that in these views the intent of the Protected View Corridor proposed in the Downtown Guelph Secondary Plan is maintained; and

THAT Heritage Guelph have no objection to a future Minor Variance Application that would allow the proponent to construct the proposed Market Commons building at 3-7 Gordon Street as shown in elevations presented at Heritage Guelph on 14 June 2011.”  

CARRIED

Item 6.3  
5 Arthur Street South  
Pamela Kraft (Kilmer Group) attended this portion of the meeting to update members on the results of the Heritage Impact Assessment. She noted that partial interior demolition will be required in order to access the sanitary sewers beneath Buildings 3 and 4.

Moved by Martin Bosch and seconded by Lorraine Pagnan,

“THAT the following information material regarding 5 Arthur Street South (Heritage Report: 5 Arthur Street South – Buildings 3 & 4 [ERA Architects Inc., June 6, 2011]; Letter re Impact on Heritage Buildings Due to Sewer Removal and Replacement [MTE Consultants Inc., May 2, 2011]; Letter re Impact of Existing Environmental Conditions [Arthur EMPC Four L.P., May 18, 2011]) submitted by the property owner be received; and
THAT, due to the results of additional environmental testing and the condition assessment of the sanitary sewers beneath the subject buildings, Heritage Guelph has no objection to the removal of the internal walls, floor slabs and roofs of Buildings 3 and 4 on the property at 5 Arthur Street South; and

THAT Heritage Guelph support the proposed retention of the exterior wall and the foundation wall along the river at 5 Arthur Street South.”

CARRIED

Item 6.4
75 Cityview Drive
Odette Gomes (IBI Group) and Owen Scott (LandPlan) attended this portion of the meeting representing the property owner to discuss the request for the removal of the existing house from the Heritage Register in order to allow its demolition. Ms. Gomes noted that no interior features were left intact by the former owner of the house. The existing stone gates, which span 3 properties (including the street right of way) will be incorporated into the new development as a pedestrian access feature. Members felt these gates would best be protected through a Heritage Conservation Easement.

Moved by Martin Bosch and seconded by Daphne Wainman-Wood,

“That Heritage Guelph has no objection to the removal of all references to the house at 75 Cityview Drive from the Heritage Register; and

THAT the stone wall be retained in situ and maintained in the Heritage Register, and

THAT Heritage Guelph does not object to any future proposal to demolish the house at 75 Cityview Drive.”

CARRIED

Item 6.5
139 Morris Street
Ray Ferraro attended this portion of the meeting representing the owner of the property. Mr. Ferraro advised the Committee of the owner’s attempt to retain some or all of the existing building, however, Mr. Ferraro reported that it is the opinion of the proponent that it was not viable to retain any of the existing building. Committee members were unconvinced that all or any of the original structure could not be rehabilitated within the redevelopment. Stephen Robinson suggested that a full Heritage Impact Assessment would normally include some examination of buildings on the property from a structural aspect. The proponent should look at the potential for retention to identify what, if anything, would impede this. Stephen agreed to forward his recommendations to Mr. Ferraro.

Item 6.6
108 Water Street
Stephen Robinson reported that the Engineering Dept requires comment on their proposal regarding reinforcement of the attic floor in the Coach House on the John McCree House site by replacement of the attic floor joists and the attic flooring. The Committee felt that the reinforcement should be accomplished by sistering modern materials to the existing members so that they could be removed for
conversion back to the original construction at a later date. Rather than using plywood as the attic flooring it would be preferred if plain tongue and groove boards be used for the floor so that the original look of the attic seen from the ground floor remains in keeping with the heritage character of the interior. Stephen was advised by the Committee that an alternate design proposal should be brought to Heritage Guelph prior to any decision by the Committee being made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>Subcommittee and Committee Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>Information Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>Next Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Committee Meeting – Monday, June, 27 2011 in City Hall Meeting Room “B”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular Meeting - Monday, July 11, 2011 in City Hall Meeting Room “B”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>Other Matters Introduced by the Chair or Heritage Guelph Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 10.1 Intention to Designate Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information from draft staff reports will be emailed to Heritage Guelph members and the June 27th subcommittee meeting will be used to review recommendations of intention to designate for the following properties: 340, 344, 348 Woolwich Street and 12 Mont Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18 Norwich Street East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Robinson reported that the interior stairway is now being considered for the secondary emergency exit rather than creating this on the exterior of the building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Conservation District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Robinson advised that there were six submissions made for the RFP for the Brooklyn and College Hill Heritage Conservation District Study and Plan. Stephen will be reviewing these with Ian Panabaker and Stacey Laughlin later this week.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin Bosch thanked staff for including staff recommendations on the HG Agenda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>