

# **York Road/Elizabeth Street Land Use Study**

## **What We Heard – Summary Report**



**Phase II – Feedback on the  
DRAFT York Road and  
Elizabeth Street  
Land Use Study  
March 25, 2021**



# **What We Heard – Summary Report**

Phase II – Feedback on Draft York Road and Elizabeth Street Land Use Study

March 25, 2021

# Community engagement summary report

The York Road/Elizabeth Street land use study area runs along York Road from Stevenson Street South (and captures part of Johnston Street), to Watson Parkway south, all bounded by the Metrolinx rail line (formerly CN rail line) to the north. The plan area also includes the south side of York Road between Stevenson Street and Victoria Road. While the IMICO lands (200 Beverley Street) are within the study area boundary, the [Council approved vision for the IMICO lands](#) will not be re-examined.

## Background

The first round of online community engagement through the City's online community engagement site, Have Your Say Guelph, was held between September 17, 2020 and October 9, 2020. Interested stakeholders were able to provide input into the York/Elizabeth Land Use Study through two different activities. The online engagement allowed the community to share knowledge about the study area and thoughts about its future. A total of 43 responses were received. Feedback was summarized thematically and the full data set is available on the [project webpage](#). The feedback received informed the development of the draft Land Use study.

## Feedback on draft York Road and Elizabeth Street land use study

A second round of online engagement took place from February 4 to February 25, 2021. Notice for the engagement was provided through City News and by mailing a notice to property owners, business owners and tenants in the study area. The online engagement allowed for the community to provide comments on the draft land use study. During this round of engagement the City was looking to hear from the community about

- reactions to the draft land use study;
- suggestions for changes to the draft land use study; and
- feedback on the properties proposed to be included on the heritage register.

162 people filled out the survey. The City also received letters providing additional feedback (see Appendix B). In addition, approximately 40 people attended a virtual public open house on February 18, 2021. Delegations

submitted for the March 8 Council meeting were also reviewed and considered. A virtual discussion for businesses was also offered however, there was not enough interest generated to hold the event. Staff met separately with all businesses that requested a meeting.

Based on the feedback received there was general support for the land use changes, as well as the conclusions and recommendation proposed in the draft Land Use Strategy.

Many of the comments received related to the recommended land use designation changes for specific properties or areas, including potential impact on adjacent uses. There was also some concern expressed regarding the direction to list cultural heritage resources. Other common topics that were raised included active transportation, road safety, parkland and thoughts on how to improve and/or create open spaces/public spaces in the study area. Collectively these topics made up the majority of the concerns. Please see Appendix A for a full summary the online engagement.

## **Summary of Results**

Based on the community engagement undertaken, some key ideas for the Y/E Land Use were identified. Key ideas were identified by clustering the 330 comments that were transcribed from the questions and by clustering of key phrases which were assigned to capture the intent of each comment.

Based on this analysis the key ideas heard are as follows:

1. General support for the proposed land use designation changes with some concerns related to specific properties or areas;
2. Desire to preserve, improve, create, and increase access to green spaces and parks in the study area;
3. Support for improving existing streetscapes and enhancing active transportation infrastructure to increase pedestrian and cycling throughout the study area and connections other areas of the City;
4. Support for the development of affordable housing;
5. Support for appropriately located intensification and a diversity of residential built forms and design;
6. Desire to preserve the existing neighbourhood character;
7. Desire to improve existing public transit routes, infrastructure and method of service provision;
8. Better connectivity around the Cityview Drive South area; and,
9. Concern regarding the direction to list cultural heritage resources on the heritage register.

# **Appendix A:**

## **Phase II: Draft York Road and Elizabeth Street Land Use Study**

**Date:** February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2021

**Surveys completed:** 162

**Comments:** 330

### **Note**

Comments are typed as written.

## **Sub Area 1 – West of Victoria Road**

### **Comment summary / general overview:**

- more green /natural open space i.e., parks, sports fields, skating rinks, community gardens, etc.
- reservation of natural and undeveloped land
- mixed-use Development
- concern about re-designation from low density residential to mixed office/commercial
- bike lanes and sidewalks. Prioritise active transportation
- inclusive space dedicated to Indigenous Peoples
- stricter pollution regulations for industrial sites
- trucking routes should be kept to perimeters
- adequate parking for restaurants / consideration to zoning bylaw parking requirements
- east end of Guelph has been so under serviced; need retail focus
- clean up the appearance and increase tourism
- IMICo lands

### **Make land uses changes:**

- 82 Agree
- 11 Disagree
- 18 No Opinion
- 14 Proposed Change
- **125 Total**

**Comments:**

- I have lots of questions ... the land use analysis is not totally accurate ...I have questions on "Heritage register" and property value, changes to existing frontages, outside storage space...
- Combine mixed business with mixed residential/commercial/business.
- There should be more green space and affordable housing.
- Do not add residential, its not appropriate for that area. You have enough development on Watson/Grange and north Watson
- I would recommend adding more parks and green space vs. Adding additional commercial spaces this will be beneficial to those who worked and live in the area.
- Residential
- York and Brockville Ave (Boxed Meat Revolution corner) could be appropriate for apartments with commercial on street level
- More natural open space. You have very few green space. More parks, sports fields, skating rinks, community gardens, more residential areas.
- I am concerned that the south portion of York Road between Hayes and Brockville will be re-designated from low density residential to mixed office/commercial. I own a single detached dwelling in this portion of sub-area 1 and am concerned that this will have negative consequences for my property. I propose that this portion of sub-area 1 remains low density residential.
- Who the [redacted] wants to live next to a quarry. either get the quarry out of town [redacted] or get the residential away from the quarry. Designating any house around this thing as a heritage site is the most ridiculous thing I have heard of . [redacted] .
- I want to see live/work units combining residential and business. We dont want strip malls or just offices. This is a family neighbourhood and should stay that way
- I would like to see a requirement for any new development to have community space available (eg. For neighbourhood group permanent space, like the TRNG)
- changes to land use must be respective of existing residential property
- The current Mixed Office/Commercial designation on the north side of York Road should be maintained. There should not be a maximum floor area introduced into the Mixed Business designation. Outdoor storage with screening should be permitted to continue.

**Improve active transportation:**

- 113 Agree
- 8 Disagree
- 3 No Opinion
- 4 Proposed Change
- **128 Total**

**Comments:**

- Walking and biking paths only. No vehicle transportation. Protect our Residential areas.
- Bike lanes!
- Sidewalks on both sides of streetscapes here are wasted given the types of potential uses for most.
- Existing smaller road allowances may only allow a sidewalk on one side of the road. Bike lanes should not be on road but should be provided as a safer multi-use trail.

**Protect cultural heritage resources:**

- 77 Agree
- 20 Disagree
- 28 No Opinion
- 2 Proposed Change
- **127 Total**

**Comments:**

- Cities all across Canada are building Urban Reserves for the Indigenous community. This is an area connected to the city and includes their cultural needs and traditions. Providing a safe and inclusive space dedicated to Indigenous Peoples. They can come into the Urban areas and have many needs met and still return to their home lands
- Disagree! Those houses you identified are not special, and this area needs to be revitalized by those who can freely construct updated homes. Heritage designation just creates roadblocks and reduces our neighbourhoods value.

**Add parkland:**

- 74 Agree
- 37 Disagree
- 9 No Opinion
- 7 Proposed Change
- **127 Total**

**Comments:**

- Absolutely need more parkland and as stated, sports fields, community gardens, multiuse parks and parking for families coming to parks for picnics, bbques, outdoor concerts.
- Given that the timing for the IMICO land redevelopment is unknown there should be alternate parkland opportunities in the interim.



- How the [redacted] can you say it is to contaminated to pour concrete on it but it is ok for dirt eating toddlers. [redacted] Now here is not a new thing but probably forgotten. That whole valley is contaminated!!!!
- 200 Beverley is in a perpetual planning stage. Must add parkland until 200 Beverly is fully developed.
- Provision for additional parkland should be made, as there are no guarantees on what will happen at 200 Beverley

### **Protect industrial land uses:**

- 67 Agree
- 33 Disagree
- 22No Opinion
- 6 Proposed Change
- **128 Total**

### **Comments:**

- Industrial use should be limited more.
- The industrial sites need stricter pollution regulations.
- I dont think industrial belongs here. Needs to be mixed residential and small business
- I agree with the idea of maintaining Employment Areas but perhaps restricting the types of uses. Right now businesses (with toxic emissions) are backing directly onto houses in the Stevenson Street area.
- The land use report refers to the existing road network being inadequate for truck traffic. Since the IMICO site will be redeveloped for residential according to the Council approved vision there should be consideration of this residential precinct being expanded onto properties surrounding the IMICO property located between Beverley Street and York Road,

### **Review existing trucking routes:**

- 93 Agree
- 9 Disagree
- 17No Opinion
- 7 Proposed Change
- **126 Total**

### **Comments:**

- Trucking routes should be kept to perimeters.
- Consider it now.
- Go drive a truck before making rules for or against them.!!!!

- Trucking route should be along Elizabeth. They should not be going along York. Too dangerous as this area has a lot of residential buildings and they take the corner into Wyndham way too quickly.
- Not clear what this means. I would agree with diverting trucking off of Stevenson.
- Through traffic should be discouraged

**Additional comments:**

- More parkland and residential areas
- Preservation of natural and undeveloped land is the most important factor, as well as cleaning up and returning to a natural, preserved state former industrial sites and brownsites.
- Its very sad and disturbing to see guelph continue to expand and grow on stolen indigenous lands. Bringing more people to guelph before we have cared for the communities that have lived here for the last 40,000 years is cruel beyond words. A continued horrific crime of canada that guelph continues to participate in the genocide of Indigenous Peoples. You have placed a large cart before the horse.
- Current zoning bylaw parking requirements for restaurants in this area are restrictive and potentially limiting to new entrepreneurial business activities. Most of the Mixed or Commercial units are old and were not constructed with adequate parking to meet zoning requirements for restaurants. This area would benefit greatly from better access to restaurants/food in the neighbourhood post-COVID but the existing per square metre parking space requirements are a major roadblock requiring a committee of adjustments for any possible plans. I'm not sure where the City is at with modernizing the zoning bylaws but I see this as being an important component of the future success of this area.
- Increase possibility for small neighbourhood scale businesses including retail, dining,
- The truck route is a huge issue. Also the Stevenson/York intersection is often an accident site. Needs to be better marked or lights synchronized separately to avoid issues.
- I'd like to see commercial areas reduced for more mixed residential. The proximity to downtown works best with small business and residential mixed together.
- high density residential
- The more parkland in this area the better. Nice to encourage some cafe's and small restaurants in this area.
- Are you kidding? The east end of Guelph has been so under serviced for so many years we need retail focus more than anything else!
- One recommendation is to make the area feel more walkable, easier for individuals who walk and bike. Making the space feel connected.
- Need more housing less industry in the area.

**Additional comments (continued):**

- Consider making the rail crossings on Victoria under or overpasses.
- Keeping natural green space and planting more trees
- Get the transport trucks off York rd
- Make owner of boxed meat revolution clean up their property, it's current state is a disgrace. Garbage everywhere, broken windows, animals living in building, etc. It has become a dump site.
- Cannot ever have enough green space.
- Whatever zoning is required to have a grocery store!!!!
- Please we need grocery store
- There is considerable heavy truck traffic along York Road. This is a problem, especially at night and in the early morning. I live along York Road and heavy trucks drive through this area at considerable speeds. At night when there is no other traffic they drive so fast that it rattles our hose. We beg staff to consider re-directing heavy truck traffic away from York Rd. I'm sure there are alternatives to create a truck by-pass route so that the heavy vehicles don't travel along York and through the downtown area. Obviously, trucks accessing businesses in this zone would be exempted.
- The city should also consider putting up camera speed traps to slow down the traffic that is coming through.
- I agree with the recommendations for mixed office/commercial south of York Rd where there are existing commercial uses. However, there should be restrictions on height and massing to fit in with the character of the existing neighbourhood.
- This area has the potential to become a hub of small businesses. I would recommend expanding the area under consideration, and creating more flexible designations. Eg. moving more properties from residential to mixed use residential/office.
- There is not enough green space in this city. developers can pay a small amount of money and buy their way out of providing Parkland which is invaluable. Building up should be prioritized over building out. There should be recommendations or restrictions placed on footprint that prioritize building up as opposed to paving over the land.
- Ensuring trucking routes are from the east (coming from Watson or farther east) and not going north on Victoria and turning left onto York. Trucks would likely be better routed from Watson and turning left onto York. However; I can see the likeliness of trucks going north on Victoria from Wellington straight to York. This should be avoided.
- I have no interest in becoming a Heritage home.
- I hope there are plans to do something with the former Boxed Meats store property - revitalize/renew it in some way? It is an eye sore in the area.

**Additional comments (continued):**

- Is there an option to widen the streets to allow better flow of traffic through these areas?
- When planning a city please plan the whole city not just the envelope carrying developers narrow view. Example property on corner of clair and gordon was in negotiations to sell to longos. The rich developer saw an opportunity to bully the owner into selling by pushing him into a corner therefore rendering his property worthless so it would have been wise to sell his property to the rich developer for half price. Which is exactly what happened. Working man lost his retirement funds so a [redacted] could buy a foreign look at me car. This could have been stopped if the city said it is our job to plan all of the city so longos will have to give right away to working mans property so he could sell it to someone else for a reasonable price. Another [redacted] planning went into solstice property corner of arkel rd and Gordon street. There the wet lands were deemed not wet lands so it was ok to build but when it came time to build the builder found he was building on wet lands . He then drilled deep into the aquifer with large diameter pipe drill then filled the thousands of hole with gravel. Then dug and put foundation on. All water from gordon st north and south as well as arkel rd now flood into this property going into the aquifer and then to our taps. 2nd brain wonder was not securing access to lights at gordon to facilitate future development south of arkel on gordon. lol later at planning meeting was told only high density would be allowed on southern properties. I put my hand up and asked why they didn,t plan ahead for this in regards to traffic lights at arkel rd. She looked at her shoes and said Other people want to ask questions. lol and no body did. Lol
- It would be good if the proposed trails and active transportation links are shown on maps when asking for public input.
- Why is my residual address both listed as changing to heritage and commercial 493 York?
- Creating a pathway along york to meet up with the two rivers trail
- This is not an attractive area in our city. But it is close to important wetlands and natural areas. Needs to be made more appealing with continuity of these natural areas. Industry should be relocated to present industrial parks. This would reduce need for transport/trucking routes. This is too close to the heart of Guelph to now be considered industrial. This has the potential to be a beautiful liveable area, close to city centre, for low rise development and parkland. Office space and commercial in terms of low rise, would be acceptable.
- What about the current zoning? Would they need to now conform to the new zoning amendments or are they exempt.
- So far I like the plan.

**Additional comments (continued):**

- Everything seems addressed. Would like to emphasize the importance of sidewalks on both sides of the street, especially in the mixed business areas. Would also like to see new developments not be too high. Love the idea of more biking paths from/to downtown, and a new truck bypass.
- If it is possible, making requirements or guidelines for industrial and commercial land uses to include greenery along sidewalk and streetscapes would really help improve the look and feel of this area.
- I would not recommend any changes to transportation that increase the traffic along Alice St. The sidewalks are directly next to the road (no grass buffer) and the roads are very narrow to being with.
- bike park!!!!
- It would be nice to have green walking spaces around the industrial spaces if possible as well as the IMCO green space.
- Finish Imico. With out significant movement on that project its difficult to get a sense of what this area needs.
- Incubator employment uses are not the highest and best use for this area which is transitioning. Aging industrial buildings with low rent uses are not sustainable in the long run. The City should take a longer view for this area transitioning to residential in support of the downtown.

**Other comments on the draft Land Use Study:**

- LINKS FOR QUESTION 5 DON'T WORK
- I have lots of questions ... the land use analysis is not totally accurate ...I have questions on "Heritage register" and property value, changes to existing frontages, outside storage space...
- Adding office or commercial or anything for the neighborhood is good.
- I appreciate more business/commercial areas as well as increase in high density housing in all subsections in this study
- Preservation of natural and undeveloped land is the most important factor.
- Consult Indigenous leaders and communities. Not band councils (federal interference is illegal)
- Capitalism or patriarchal societies like ours are parasites and only surviving by growth, spread and the exploitation of people (women, immigrants, black lives and indigenous people) a system that only works for rich white men. One that Guelph leans on and profits at the expense of many. So the answer to sustainability and health is not a mass doubling of guelphs population. We have so much to fix first
- high density residential

### **Other comments on the draft Land Use Study (continued):**

- Recently I and some co-workers reported a blatant violation of Guelph's zoning bylaw and instead of enforcing the bylaw, we were told that "this is only Fred being Fred, don't worry about it." I escalated the complaint to a higher level at the city and I was referred to the Ministry of Environment to have them enforce the provincial legislation. This experience makes me wonder why we even have zoning bylaws in this city!
- Bike lanes should be included along York Road throughout the study area
- Please do something about the abandoned M&M Meat Shop on York Rd. It is an eye-sore.
- People drive into Guelph and it's not a pleasant view. Incorporating local business would be great for our city, but also clean up the appearance and increase tourism
- Protect the land!!! Prioritize building up over out you can provide a much more livable city for everybody by doing this. There is the tiniest portion allocated to significant natural lands. This is not true - it's all significant land and can be protected if you try.
- None
- Prioritize Active Transportation, please! (New paths to get kids walking/cycling to the schools in the area?!)
- The whole valley is contaminated face it .
- Why is my residence being change to commercial? How does that effect the sale-ability of my house?
- Please give us a safe cycling route
- The general consensus amongst the citizens of Guelph is that City staff ask our opinion but never hear us. You are representing us. Please listen and act upon what the residents want.
- A) If you pull up any commercial realty listing websites, you can see there is now an over supply of mixed use business rental space to the area. This is the current trends where businesses are moving away from the existing norms and seeking more flexible space. A mixture of warehouse and commerce. This is a result of online trading. Unfortunately these trends make business office parks obsolete and the city should take this into consideration when they propose the land uses. A solution should allow the existing land uses to be incorporated into the mixed business zones and should allow for future trends.  
B) According to your background study, The properties East of Stevenson Street and North of the rail line are zoned industrial. D4. When you jump to your report, you show these same properties are currently designated as mixed business and not Industrial as currently zoned. Is this not incorrect.

**Other comments on the draft Land Use Study:**

- Perhaps building a pedestrian/cyclist covered bridge from the Clearview residential areas to the Reformatory Lands to facilitate safe movement if a park is ever built or just for future access.
- Additional tree plantings if no plans for parkland. Would like to see traffic calming design considerations on Elizabeth - motorists treat this section like an autobahn as there is no enforcement of speed on this stretch. Improving streetscape and traffic calming would really help this part of Guelph
- 1. I am concerned about the amount of commercial and mixed business proposals that will directly surround my neighbourhood. I am on Walter Street. Will this lower my property value.  
2. What do you mean by entrepreneurial and incubator businesses. Are you proposing niche businesses, or are you talking 7-Eleven's, etc. 3. My house is not showing in the Couling inventory, although I am on the the city's proposed heritage listing. 20 Walter Street. Does this mean that I am still protected, and do you have any information on my house.
- This Land Use Study is an excellent opportunity to also study the IMICO lands and redesignate them from the current Special Policy Area to the City's ultimate residential land use designation.
- extremely pleased to see Active Transportation adjacent to GJR rail from Downtown to Victoria rd being considered. This would connect to the proposed MUP along York road
- The proposal in some areas to delete the Mixed Use/Commercial designation and change it to Mixed Business would add restrictions to these areas.
- If the IMICO lands are located in the study area as they are and should be, then this area should not be excluded from the study. It is a large part of the study area and should be considered as part of the study.
- Given that the IMICo lands are part of this planning area and, in fact represent such a large portion of the planning area, they should be included in the proposed land use plan, particularly given that the IMICo MOU has expired. It also seems unfair to limit and otherwise restrict the future land uses of this planning area, while increasing the land uses of the IMICo lands which is in the same planning area. This would appear to be a serious conflict of interest.

## **Survey Area 2 – Development along Victoria Road**

### **Summary / General Overview:**

- More green space and residential.
- Preservation of natural and undeveloped land
- Mixed-use development
- Grocery
- Trucking routes should, like industrial use, be away from dense residential and mixed business.
- Improve walkability and streetscape
- Consider making rail crossings on Victoria under or over passes
- Bike lanes
- Relocate Industries
- Encouraging small/medium business
- Environmental impact on neighbouring wetlands
- Cleaning up of the Ontario Reformatory property and restoring it to the beautiful parkland

### **Make land uses changes:**

- 72 Agree
- 3 Disagree
- 9 No Opinion
- 5 Proposed Change
- **89 Total**

### **Comments:**

- Reduce amount of industrial/service commercial in favour of mixed business/commercial mixed use
- Less industrial. More residential
- Again no attempt for more residential or green space.
- How the [redacted] can any city plan residential next to a gravel pit. By designating the houses on Simcoe street as heritage you are creating a slum and restricting further development of commercial. Try to have a commercial truck parked anywhere. The hippy laws come along and say you should collect welfare like everyone else so sell the business. Plan a city with the assumption that roofs, furnaces, windows, floors, locks all need to be fixed or replaced.
- These lands should be encouraging small/medium business BUT more importantly they MUST allow for and encourage large anchor businesses to help sustain the smaller businesses otherwise many of these small businesses will fail in this type of location.



**Improve active transportation:**

- 79 Agree
- 5 Disagree
- 1 No Opinion
- 3 Proposed Change
- **88 Total**

**Comments:**

- I don't believe sidewalks should be an obstacle imposed for redevelopment here.
- The high frequency of trains blocking Victoria in the past 2 yrs or so during high traffic times such as rush hour has been very problematic, and led to increasing traffic jams during those times. I don't see the point of trying to add another connection here without addressing this first with the railway.
- Any active transportation link would need to consider residents in this study area. If the linkage is on the tracks on the north side then we (the 550 residents living here) would not have access to this linkage as metrolinx has fenced off any access of rail crossing. Please consider revising this recommendation to state "We propose creating an active transportation link between downtown and Victoria Road along the Guelph Junction Railway on both the north and south sides of the tracks" Or consider a pedestrian crossing - an overpass or underpass for residents in this area to access any proposed trail connections (a pedestrian underpass at Cityview would be ideal)

**Protect cultural heritage resources:**

- 60 Agree
- 12 Disagree
- 14 No Opinion
- 2 Proposed Change
- **88 Total**

**Comments:**

- Fix up for housing
- Unbelievable that this idea can even be tested. Start thinking logic over fluffy thoughts.

**Manage land use transition:**

- 73 Agree
- 6 Disagree
- 7 No Opinion
- 2 Proposed Change

- **88 Total**

**Comments:**

- East Guelph does not need any more residential land until there are services to support residents (grocery)
- Environmental impact on neighbouring wetlands should be directly and specifically addressed in this process.

**Protect industrial land uses:**

- 53 Agree
- 18 Disagree
- 12 No Opinion
- 4 Proposed Change
- **87 Total**

**Comments:**

- Industrial use should be away from residential and mixed business use, not mixed in.
- Additional language needs to be added around industrial uses to promote industry more compatible with residential than what is typically permitted by and industrial designation.
- relocate industrial service area
- The industrial lands should be relocated out of this area otherwise any hopeful redevelopment on the commercial/mixed business end for successful longevity will not happen.

**Review existing trucking routes:**

- 62 Agree
- 11 Disagree
- 11 No Opinion
- 4 Proposed Change
- **88 Total**

**Comments:**

- Trucking routes should, like industrial use, be away from dense residential and mixed business.
- go drive a truck before becoming an expert on this subject.
- Please close York west of Victoria to large trucking traffic

**Additional recommendations:**

- Preservation of natural and undeveloped land is the most important factor, and industrial (and former industrial) use land should be cleaned

up and returned to natural, protected land that is safe for wildlife and kept free from development into parks.

- Increased flexibility for the lots at the corners of York and Victoria
- Improve walkability and streetscape.
- Consider making rail crossings on Victoria under or over passes.
- Protect natural areas and green space including planting more trees
- Please we need grocery store
- Would this proposal include cleaning up of the Ontario Reformatory property and restoring it to the beautiful parkland it used to be?
- Protect the land!!! Prioritize building up over out you can provide a much more livable city for everybody by doing this. There is the tiniest portion allocated to significant natural lands. This is not true - it's all significant land and can be protected if you try.
- Same comment as other parcels - Ensuring trucking routes are from the east (coming from Watson or farther east) and not going north on Victoria and turning left onto York. Trucks would likely be better routed from Watson and turning left onto York from Watson. However; I can see the likeliness of trucks going north on Victoria from Wellington Rd. 34 straight to York. This should be avoided.
- Thank you for the proposal. It is a hard No. I do not want to be classified as a Heritage home.
- Plan the whole city. That means if some one doesn't want to sell (he has that right) don't land lock that property. This isn't a hard concept. Maybe a lawsuit with regards to this will shame the planning department into opening there eyes. Can you imagine nationally televised lawsuit against a city planning department for not seeing the obvious. Only in Guelph would this happen. Lol
- This is too important an area and too near the heart of the city to be used for industrial. Low residential, extension of existing parkland, low rise office and commercial. Remove industry to existing industrial parks. In doing this, you will no longer require proposed trucking routes into the heart of our city.
- Focus here appears to be on businesses that will likely not thrive without removal of industrial lands and also without the neccessity of large scale business/retail commercial as anchors.
- I'm curious at how little is being said about PDI, and not considering them directly while changing nearby land use. PDI isn't just chemical storage, they are also actively blending and packaging.  
<https://pdibulk.com/services/packaging-blending/> There is a tremendous amount of chemicals on site (360,000 lb just on the blender capacity alone) and a lot of resulting safety/fire/chemical issues around this which I'm not seeing discussed. Right now they are in an industrially zoned area, but if the city wants to start putting mixed use and residential nearby, this needs to be directly examined from a safety perspective.

- protected bike lanes/multi use path on Victoria Road
- multi use path along York Road
- trucks should use existing 4 lane roads only

**Other comments on the draft Land Use Study:**

- Preservation of natural and undeveloped land is the most important factor, and industrial (and former industrial) use land should be cleaned up and returned to natural, protected land that is safe for wildlife and kept free from development into parks.
- Bike lanes should be included along York Rd throughout the study area
- Industrial businesses beside residential homes is unhealthy and unsafe. Having these units as you enter the city is an eye sore. We need to keep them, but maybe clean things up or relocate.
- None
- Yes. Please hear the citizens of Guelph.
- Additional tree plantings if no plans for parkland. Would like to see traffic calming design considerations on Elizabeth - motorists treat this section like an autobahn as there is no enforcement of speed on this stretch. Improving street scaping and traffic calming would really help this part of Guelph

## **Survey Area 3 – East of Victoria Road**

### **Summary / General Overview:**

- Regulate noise level
- More green /natural open space i.e., parks, sports fields, skating rinks, community gardens, etc.
- Naturalization and restoration
- Add amenities for east end residents.
- Grocery Store
- Improve walkability, sidewalks and streetscape
- Bike Lanes
- Widen York road to include a turning lane
- Recommend daylighting creeks throughout study area, there is currently a creek that enters a ditch at Suburban Dr that could be day lighted and re-naturalized between there and York Rd
- Ensuring trucking routes are from the east (coming from Watson or farther east) and not going north on Victoria and turning right onto York.
- Concern about included into Heritage list.

### **No land use changes:**

- 51 Agree
- 18 Disagree
- 16 No Opinion
- 5 Proposed Change
- **90 Total**

### **Comments:**

- Industrial use land needs to be replaced with cleaned-up natural area land that is protected from development and safe for wildlife.
- Explore possibilities of other business/commercial land use in this area, potential green space.
- If this area remains industrial, there should be decibel rating regulations that would regulate noise levels to a rating that is compatible with the adjacent residential areas. Especially between the hours of 7 am to 9 am. And 5 pm to 7 pm. The noise level from Ben-Met continues to increase and is audible even at Starwood and Grange.
- Quit forgetting about us East Enders and add amenities for this area...It's always the south end...We pay taxes too!
- Industrial lands need to be removed entirely from this area.

### **Implement potential Hadati Creek improvements:**

- 73 Agree

- 4 Disagree
- 10 No Opinion
- 4 Proposed Change
- **91 Total**

**Comments:**

- I would like to see more naturalization and restoration. in these areas.
- Creek should be naturalized / daylighted through study area as much as possible.
- How about a grocery store!
- I see no information on Hadati Creek so cannot comment.

**Protect cultural heritage resources:**

- 58 Agree
- 14 Disagree
- 18 No Opinion
- 0 Proposed Change
- **90 Total**

**Comments:**

- None.

**Protect industrial land uses:**

- 52 Agree
- 18 Disagree
- 15No Opinion
- 2 Proposed Change
- **87 Total**

**Comments:**

- relocate industrial service area
- Yes please read the above recommendation in #3.

**Review existing trucking routes:**

- 63 Agree
- 10 Disagree
- 15 No Opinion
- 1 Proposed Change
- **89 Total**

**Comments:**

- not clear what this means.

**Improve active transportation:**

- 80 Agree
- 4 Disagree
- 3 No Opinion
- 4 Proposed Change
- **91 Total**

**Comments:**

- Sidewalks on one side would be sufficient.
- I agree with the sidewalk proposal. Ensure that bike lanes are not at the expense of car lanes and are separated from car lanes.
- Again, see no need for sidewalks on both sides of roads implementation as requirement.
- I don't think just new development needs sidewalks - the whole area does. I live on Wells and it is very hard to get out of the street on foot. Exiting at the Elizabeth end involves cutting through scrub and a car lot. Exiting onto York is hazardous - there's a dirt path on the north side that between Wells and the retail plaza at Victoria/York. Trucks fly past, when it's wet you get sprayed, and my dogs are scared. I'm unable to walk my dogs from my house with ease - I usually put them in the car and drive to the parking by the river and walk them there. We need sidewalks connecting the streets between Elizabeth and Victoria on the north side of York Road - it's unsafe.

**Additional recommendations:**

- Widen York road to include a turning lane.
- Industrial use land needs to be replaced with cleaned-up natural area land that is protected from development and safe for wildlife.
- Improve walkability and streetscape.
- Consider adding a grocery store to this stretch of Elizabeth St.
- Protect natural areas and green space including planting more trees
- More residential use and again MORE GREEN spaces, parks, sports fields, community gardens, multiuse green space for outdoor concerts, picnics, build in bbq pits, like you see in green spaces in Toronto, bike paths, walking trails.
- Once again clean up of OR property
- Recommend daylighting creeks throughout study area, there is currently a creek that enters a ditch at Suburban Dr that could be daylighted and renaturalized between there and York Rd.
- Where are the parks? How are you protecting the land?! By minimizing pavement over natural land you improve and mitigate flooding disasters and help the environment. Where are the parks?!? There is enough significant scientific research to show how natural land improves quality

of life. You have to stop allowing developers to pay pennies to escape building Parkland which is invaluable.

- Same comment as other parcels - Ensuring trucking routes are from the east (coming from Watson or farther east) and not going north on Victoria and turning right onto York. Trucks would likely be better routed from Watson and turning right onto Elizabeth from York. However; I can see the likeliness of trucks going north on Victoria from Wellington Rd. 34 straight to York. This should be avoided.
- I do not want to be a Heritage home.
- Enough with putting everything in the south end! It's time to develop the east end! I've lived here since 2007 and it's disappointing! More residences but little else...
- Side walk and bike path along York from victoria to Watson
- This is a terrible plan. Make this a liveable area. Relocate industry to industrial parks already in existence. Expand, not destroy natural areas. The natural areas are very significant in this area.
- I don't think just new development needs sidewalks - the whole area does. I live on Wells and it is very hard to get out of the street on foot. Exiting at the Elizabeth end involves cutting through scrub and a car lot. Exiting onto York is hazardous - there's a dirt path on the north side that between Wells and the retail plaza at Victoria/York. Trucks fly past, when it's wet you get sprayed, and my dogs are scared. I'm unable to walk my dogs from my house with ease - I usually put them in the car and drive to the parking by the river and walk them there. We need sidewalks connecting the streets between Elizabeth and Victoria on the north side of York Road - it's unsafe.
- trucks should use existing 4 lane roads only

#### **Other comments on the draft Land Use Study:**

- Industrial use land needs to be replaced with cleaned-up natural area land that is protected from development and safe for wildlife.
- Bike lanes should be included along York Road throughout the study area
- We need to follow through with the proposed park for Sloan Ave. We have many children in the neighbourhood that have no place to play
- Protect the land!!! Prioritize building up over out you can provide a much more livable city for everybody by doing this. There is the tiniest portion allocated to significant natural lands. This is not true - it's all significant land and can be protected if you try.
- None
- Additional tree plantings. Would like to see traffic calming design considerations on Elizabeth - motorists treat this section like an autobahn as there is no enforcement of speed on this stretch. Improving streetscape on Elizabeth and traffic calming would really help this part of Guelph. Would like to see bike lanes on Elizabeth



## **Survey Area 4 – York Road frontage east of Victoria Road**

### **Summary / General Overview:**

- Mixed-use development and medium-density residential
- Grocery
- Walkable amenities in most of East Guelph
- Concerned about the medium density residential included within the natural heritage underlay at the east end of the study area. The natural heritage underlay areas need to be studied further before this area should be redesignated.
- No Parks. Concertation to convert the area of Sloan and Beaumont into a parkland area.
- Sidewalks and road safety infrastructure/measure because increasing housing would increase the traffic to this area and also increase a safety concern for the children in this area.
- Pedestrian access bridge should be built across the railway line to allow safe access to businesses and school
- Add parkland to existing commercial use land.
- Street furniture (not the ad-covered plastic monstrosities on Stone)
- Possible connection between cityview drive south and cityview drive north
- East end transit hub maybe in the ontario reformatory lands
- Don't touch any building on the OR lands unless to renovate keeping the heritage properties
- Preserve the reformatory buildings and grounds as a green oasis in the city and an environmental research hub for the area
- Concern about being on Heritage List.
- Gate way to the city. This is where many people enter our city, and it's such a poor representation of it.
- Before the train tracks on York Rd add an entrance to the 210 Victoria Rd South Tim Hortons to avert the dangers of the left turn off of Victoria who are headed south bound on Victoria. This is a serious hazard and bottleneck as people try to squeeze around the left turners. It's also a terrible left to get out of that gei to get back into Victoria Rd South.

### **Make land uses changes:**

- 82 Agree
- 4 Disagree
- 9 No Opinion
- 11 Proposed Change
- **106 Total**

**Comments:**

- Allow for mixed residential/commercial/business use of land, providing opportunity for second floor residential.
- Commercial area for grocery store.
- As long as mixed business designation includes the ability to have a grocery store, I am in favour.
- Way to much industrial and mixed building. More residential.
- I am concerned about the medium density residential included within the natural heritage underlay at the east end of the study area. The natural heritage underlay areas need to be studied further before this area should be redesignated.
- Clean up the area, remove industrial. Clean up derelict buildings, add bus route but you need to reduce truck traffic
- Please make the area of Sloan and Beaumont a parkland area. We have plenty of kids in the area and we have no park
- A maximum building height of 3 storeys, or low-rise apartments in the area to be re-designated as medium-density residential would better fit in with the current residential area and surrounding environment.
- Many people in this area are here because of the lower volume of traffic on our streets increasing housing would increase the traffic to this area and also increase a safety concern for the children in this area. Due to the fact there are no sidewalks or parks the children play on the roads.
- Mixed business should focus on anchor larger commercial retail businesses with availability for small/medium mixed in. With only smaller businesses this area will never thrive and always struggle.
- Do not agree to redesignation of lands to medium density between all areas of Beaumont Cr and York. Agree with the other points. Not enough space for park for our neighbourhood youth, there are many families living here with new ones moving into new condos. We do not have a park here, but everyone currently uses it as a park.

**Improve active transportation:**

- 90 Agree
- 4 Disagree
- 1 No Opinion
- 9 Proposed Change
- **104 Total**

**Comments:**

- A pedestrian access bridge should be built across the railway line to allow safe access to businesses for the people living north of the tracks and allow people south of tracks to walk to Winegard school.
- Sidewalks should be added to the residential area already present, not just to the new development.

- Again opening up this area to higher traffic flow is a concern. However side walks are a necessity. I think a crosswalk would be an excellent addition to allow safety for people crossing York Rd for buses and or walking trails.
- I highly discourage you to widen the south side of the street by building a sidewalk there. The Clythe Creek would be severely impacted, which goes against Guelph's (and my personal) commitment to environmental conservation and stewardship. Especially amid the current Climate Emergency, of which biodiversity loss (and loss of habitat) is a critical component, the City must do everything in their power to protect the natural spaces we are collectively responsible for.
- Instead, I propose that any development should take place on the north side of York Road. On the north side, I would love to see both a sidewalk and bike path along York Road, as well as a crossing at the entrance to the main gate of the Yorklands Green Hub.
- I think the sidewalks should only be on the North side of York road, as any modifications to widen the road on the South side would affect the creek.
- No need for sidewalks on both sides always.
- I like this but I am concerned about the creek that runs along the prison lands.
- I am also concerned where ppl will park that want to enjoy the prison lands. I now it is technically a no park zone but ppl have used it for years to access the prison lands. If it is a sidewalk or bike trail which is excellent ppl will not be able to park to access the prison lands. Will there be an alternative?
- To save the destruction of pertinent cultural and natural features along Clythe Creek, either do not construct sidewalks on the south side of York Rd or make them so that there is no requirement to move the Creek. Expand the road on the other side. It is not a particularly busy road, I travel it every day to work.
- As previously indicated sidewalks need to be improved in this whole area not just for NEW developments.

#### **Assess the cultural woodland overlay:**

- 97 Agree
- 4 Disagree
- 6 No Opinion
- 1 Proposed Change
- **108 Total**

#### **Comments:**

- keep all woodland as woodland do not consider any uses that removes trees.

**Protect cultural heritage resources:**

- 80 Agree
- 14 Disagree
- 13 No Opinion
- 0 Proposed Change
- **107 Total**

**Comments:**

- None.

**Manage land use transition:**

- 86 Agree
- 10 Disagree
- 9 No Opinion
- 2 Proposed Change
- **107 Total**

**Comments:**

- Not necessary just build more homes for people.
- do not add any more residential designations in East Guelph until there is infrastructure to support existing. (e.g. grocery, transit service)

**Add parkland:**

- 91 Agree
- 5 Disagree
- 5 No Opinion
- 6 Proposed Change
- **107 Total**

**Comments:**

- Add parkland to existing commercial use land, NOT by developing designated natural land.
- don't just "consider" a park. commit to more parks
- This is a token gesture. This whole area is a significant in terms of potential restoration of parkland and natural area.
- 'I urge you to consider your commitment to sustainability as you create plans for the park. I recommend that:
  - no trees be harmed or removed
  - no wildlife habitats would be harmed or removed
  - any materials used to build the park be sourced ethically and sustainably, without the use of plastics; a net-zero park would be an incredible statement for Guelph to make!

- A fully-fenced dog park would be an amenity. I've lived in Guelph for 12 years and have to travel to Kitchener-Waterloo in order to visit a fenced dog park. Please consider!
- Consider the opportunity for a neighbourhood park on the City-owned lands at 106 Beaumont Crescent and add community improvements such as tree plantings, seating areas and sidewalks. This is a dropoff location for several school buses and we want our children to not only have a community park - but have a safe, welcoming and attractive neighbourhood

### **Review Cityview and York Road connection:**

- 82 Agree
- 8 Disagree
- 15 No Opinion
- 1 Proposed Change
- **106 Total**

### **Comments:**

- Do not put another set of lights in that stretch. It's bad enough that there are no walkable amenities in most of East Guelph, don't make it even harder.

### **Improve the design of York Road:**

- 93 Agree
- 6 Disagree
- 1 No Opinion
- 7 Proposed Change
- **107 Total**

### **Comments:**

- Yes Street scape but derelict buildings need to be sorted out. Clean up of garbag
- I agree, and I hope this includes sidewalks.
- agree as long as the street furniture is tasteful not the ad-covered plastic monstrosities on Stone.
- No benches it wouldn't be safe
- I recommend that you plant \*native\* trees, shrubs, and wildflowers (perhaps in collaboration with Yorklands Green Hub, as they would have much wisdom to share)

I also recommend that you reframe your intentions here: the primary goal being to support biodiversity (i.e. environmental stewardship), with

the bi-product, or secondary goal, being to "improve the design" (i.e. aesthetics).

- Improve the design of York Road and Elizabeth Road. There are new businesses opening on Elizabeth - a vegan cheese business just open up on Elizabeth. Would be nice to see active transportation improvements on both roads
- in addition to the street furniture and trees consideration for a pedestrian overpass over York to the reformatory lands
- This would act like a gateway to the City if properly designed

#### **Review existing trucking routes:**

- 76 Agree
- 16 Disagree
- 12 No Opinion
- 3 Proposed Change
- **107 Total**

#### **Comments:**

- Please consider the impact on air quality for the plants and animals living in reciprocity with the land around Yorklands Green Hub and elsewhere along this route.

#### **Additional recommendations:**

- Possible connection between cityview drive south and cityview drive north.
- 106 Beaumont is far too busy of an area for a park.
- The safety of the parkland users would be at risk.
- Industrial use land needs to be replaced with cleaned-up natural area land that is protected from development and safe for wildlife.
- Preserve the natural heritage around the reformatory ponds and stream. Maintain and restore the landscaping around the stream to return it to its former glory. The city is responsible for the demolition by neglect of this historic feature
- Support the existing businesses that are already there! Integrate them into the plan.
- Commercial space for grocery store.
- More business catering to local residents, and less used car dealers
- We need a grocery store in the East end.
- I cant stress enough the cleanup of the OR beautiful parkland. Why build more when we have such natural beauty at our fingertips As you enter our city from the east it was such a beautiful welcoming site.
- Remove industrial. Remove derelict buildings. Offer home owners tax incentives to improve properties
- A east end transit hub maybe in the ontario reformatory lands.

- Adding a Tim Hortons or an ice-cream shop along York to increase use of future parklands at the corrections facility. Wider lanes for cycling and/or multi use trails. Creating green space for arboretum additions from u of g. Use of turf grass institute studies from u of g for the implementation of turf for the park space. Use Of u of g students and alumni feedback and layouts of park space/turf.
- We need sidewalks on Cityview
- A park on the city owned property is a great idea
- One park is not enough.
- Same comment as other parcels - Ensuring trucking routes are from the east (coming from Watson or farther east) and not going north on Victoria and turning right onto York. Trucks would likely be better routed from Watson and turning left onto York from Watson and/or right onto Elizabeth from York. However; I can see the likeliness of trucks going north on Victoria from Wellington Rd. 34 straight to York or Elizabeth. This should be avoided.
- Crosswalks over York road to OR from residential areas on the north side of York
- Currently, many people park along York Road to access the O.R. lands. With the road's redevelopment, parking for the O.R. needs to be planned - perhaps reinstating the parking lot on York Road that is presently blocked off, or allowing access into the entrance driveway and building a lot there.
- I will not classify my home as Heritage. I have and will continue with my strong requests. Remove me from your list. Thank you for your consideration and your time.
- Crosswalk on York Rd near Beaumont for bus route. Sidewalks on York Beaumont Sloan Cityview and White st and continue sidewalks on Elizabeth St.
- Don't touch any building on the OR lands unless to renovate keeping the heritage properties.
- Add a bike path and sidewalks along York from victoria to Watson
- I have said it all in surveys 1+2+3
- York Road should not be widened, especially on the south side as it would impact the Clyde Creek. There should be a sidewalk and grade separated protected bike path along York Road, and a crossing at the entrance to the main gate of the Yorklands Green Hub.
- I believe this shines through in my comments, though I urge you to make environmental stewardship & sustainability the #1 priority in each decision that you make. This is integral to achieving the goals outlined in the IPCC report and Paris Agreement.
- Would like to see more residential/retail space and public parking in this area. Definitely too busy of a corridor to just be the place where scrapyards are kept.

- This study is very confusing and you need to make these types of surveys much easier for community members to understand.
- Recommendation 1 - Stormwater drainage: assess water flow / drainage along Cityview from train tracks to York Road and look for stormwater design improvements. There is a large drainage area that flows from the top of Cityview southward and terminates at York Rd / Cityview. This drainage area frequently floods - every spring and fall. A stormwater recommendation to study stormwater flow and examine design solutions could be added. Ideally there will be a combined sidewalk / drainage ditch improvement to improve active transportation and improve onsite water management
- Recommendation 2 - Connection with provincial lands: consider opportunities to provide business growth across from former reformatory lands. There is a need for more diversity of business to address community residential needs. There is opportunity for retail, grocery and other small businesses and the connection to the provincial lands provides opportunity for economic growth
- York Road absolutely needs improving - it's a major artery into Guelph and it's a disgrace.
- bike lanes!
  - \* A north - south active transportation connection, metrolinx has fenced this connection completely so we might need an underpass at Cityview or another location
  - \* Improved bike lanes and traffic calming on Elizabeth St
  - \* A pedestrian actuated traffic signal located at Cityview (close to social housing and entrance to reformatory lands)
  - \* The MUP along York –
- trucks should use existing 4 lane roads only

#### **Other comments on the draft Land Use Study:**

- I appreciate more business/commercial areas as well as increase in high density housing in all subsections in this study. I also like the idea of improving York road and creating an easier trail to the woodlands in subsection 4. I'm excited to see how it transforms
- Industrial use land needs to be replaced with cleaned-up natural area land that is protected from development and safe for wildlife.
- Lots of discussion of active transport along the railway which is great. Cross streets should also be factored in. This section of Victoria Rd specifically connects Ward One to other important community resources (Rec centre, commercial centre at top of grange, schools) but pedestrian and other active transport is not encouraging at the moment.
- Preserve the reformatory buildings and grounds as a green oasis in the city and an environmental research hub for the area.



- You have a lot of industrial land use in the south and west end of the city. Let the north and east end remain more family friendly and scenic.
- Bike lanes should be provided along York Road throughout the study area.
- I do not think any residential housing should be included in the land use east of Victoria Road
- This is where many people enter our city, and it's such a poor representation of it. Would love to see it landscaped, booming with business, while maintaining our natural space. Let's show off the beauty of Guelph and encourage tourism for our small businesses
- More housing in this area is NOT the answer
- Protect the land!!! Prioritize building up over out you can provide a much more livable city for everybody by doing this. There is the tiniest portion allocated to significant natural lands. This is not true - it's all significant land and can be protected if you try.
- None
- Thank you for taking into account the residents' responses to the earlier survey used to produce this study.
- More greenspace, tree cover, and parks. More services for existing residents, no additional residential
- Sidewalks and a park needed should be #1 priority.
- Before the train tracks on York Rd add an entrance to the 210 Victoria Rd South Tim Hortons to avert the dangers of the left turn off of Victoria who are headed south bound on Victoria. This is a serious hazard and bottleneck as people try to squeeze around the left turners. It's also a terrible left to get out of that get to get back into Victoria Rd South.
- Please keep the current footprint of the greenspace along Sloan / Beaumont Cr / White and dedicate all to a neighbourhood park. The full footprint is needed to provide a municipal park site for a land use area of 500+ residents. There are no municipal parks in this study area! The Royal City Jaycees Park referenced in the report is no longer a City maintained park and is not located on municipal lands - so the park area counted
- Strongly agree with any efforts to improve streetscape in this area.
- how can mixed business occur in residential areas; do you plan to push current residents off their land?

## Appendix B – Letters and Emails

### Email from Gregory Irons

**From:** gregory irons [redacted]

**Date:** Thursday, Feb 18, 2021, 8:17 PM

**To:** Stacey Laughlin <[Stacey.Laughlin@quelp.ca](mailto:Stacey.Laughlin@quelp.ca)>

**Subject:** Re: York Road/Elizabeth Street land use study and urban design concept plan

Good evening Stacey

Firstly I would like to thank you for a wonderful presentation this evening.

I am not sure if we have connected directly but I recently purchased 110 Stevenson Street South. This property falls in your Mixed business designation. I have been engaging with the planning department in the hopes to erect a 90,000Sqft Flexi storage unit on the 1.6acres of land that we own. Your current recommendation is to limit the size of units to 950m2.

You mentioned in your presentation that this was to aid employment and encourage incubation in the area. The product that we intend to develop at 110 Stevenson Street would be such a compliment to this endeavour.

If it is at all possible, I would like to call you tomorrow to explain to you what our product is and what we envision for 110 Stevenson Street. It would be interesting to hear your thoughts on the project and see how we can fit into your mould.

Regards



**Gregory Irons Company Director**

**Canprop Inc**

145 Hillview Road Aurora Ontario L4G 2M6

+1 647 295 0529

[greg@canprop.ca](mailto:greg@canprop.ca)

## **Email from Sean Kenny**

**From:** Sean Kenny [redacted]

**Sent:** February-25-21 6:03 PM

**To:** Stacey Laughlin <[Stacey.Laughlin@guelph.ca](mailto:Stacey.Laughlin@guelph.ca)>

**Subject:** [redacted] York Road

Hello Stacey,

I would like to request that our property be removed from consideration to the heritage register.

Thanks,  
Sean Kenny  
[redacted] York Road

## **Email from Myra Buzbuzian and Rick Rozyle**

From: Rozyle <[redacted] >  
Sent: February-25-21 10:43 PM  
To: Stacey Laughlin <[Stacey.Laughlin@guelph.ca](mailto:Stacey.Laughlin@guelph.ca)>  
Subject: 264 & 266 Elizabeth Street Guelph

Not in favor of the heritage register, ( status ) to many restrictions in case of future development. I would like to have these properties removed from the heritage register.

Thank you.

Myra Buzbuzian & Rick Rozyle

Sent from my iPhone

## **Email from Betty Lester**

From: Betty Lester

Sent: Friday, February 26, 2021 11:01 AM

To: Stephen Robinson

Subject: municipal register of cultural heritage properties

I received a letter saying you want to put my house at [redacted] St. Guelph on this register. I do not want it added to the register.

Elizabeth (Betty) Lester

[redacted]

Guelph, Ont.

N1E 2X7

[redacted]

## Email from Leah Stumpf

Dear Stacey, Krista and David,

I hope everyone is healthy and well.

As a homeowner located on White Street, I have some questions, concerns and feedback for the future development and current issues to bring forward. Please see below, including the same information attached in a PDF format.

Thank you in advance for reviewing my document and I look forward to hearing from you. Have a nice weekend.

Feb 26, 2020

Re: Beaumont Cres Guelph Vacant Green Space

Dear Stacey and Krista,

Apologies for missing the York Road and area survey, I was only made aware of this today.

As a resident in the area and homeowner on White Street with four school aged children, I do have some points and concerns I would like to address with the City of Guelph staff who oversee development, zoning, and safety within our communities.

1. Why was the holding zone removed from your City of Guelph property on Beaumont Cres without going through the legislative process? I have documentation of the holding zone on record since my home also has it as well?
2. There is a steadily increasing population within our area and over 70 children in a 10–15-minute walking radius. Why don't they have access to a safe park with play structures/sport equipment? The City View train crossing is a hazard with no safe crossing for anyone. York Road is a high traffic area and is not safe for children to cross, the old reformatory has no play structure and it is private property. Do you plan on putting a cross walk on York Road and stopping 4 lanes of traffic in the future?
3. Local amenities are lacking and non-existent within the area, the green space on Beaumont Cres acts as our safe meeting place, green space for children and adults to play sports and go sledding. With proposed houses next to a park how can you keep balls from going in their yards when the children are trying to play, including the concerns of a parking lot so close and children running through it. We have 8+ people with disabilities in the area. There should not be blind spots with housing blocking views and increased traffic so close to a park.
4. After reviewing the park plans the park is hidden which raises safety concerns. There is a hill beside the proposed park which creates a runoff and wetland within that area.

What are the setbacks and policies around having a park so close to a hill with in-proper draining/flood zone?

5. There are many families who are low income in the area and have no place to grow food. A community garden and park combined would be a better idea for the area. Everyone should have access to physical resources and good food.

6. There is 20+ children who take multiple buses on Beaumont Cres to school, there are no sidewalks, improper drainage, city trucks that have been stuck on the Sloan and City View hills multiple times. Why isn't the city concerned about providing safety for our 20+ children? This should be a priority. The children walk these hills each day and their bus stops are in front of the proposed housing? It is not safe for the buses to come up the hill so where are they supposed to go where they can still be in sight and safe?

7. Studies show there has been an increase of mental health diagnosis in both adults and children. Our community lacks the resources to bring people together. Seclusion, segregation, and lack of resources contributes to mental health decline. Children and adults should have a safe place to come together to form relationships, feel accepted and embrace community inclusion. The City of Guelph Should be promoting an inclusive community and providing the resources such as a park.

8. Is part of the land considered conservation?

Under the Children's Charter of Rights for WDG it states all children should have a safe place to play and access to a park within a certain radius. Has the City of Guelph met this legislation, if not, why? It has been a topic of our community for a while now.

As a taxpayer and someone who advocates for the safety of our community and children why isn't more being done? These are all valid points and questions. Please consider all the points above when making decisions and timelines for our area. I think my points speak that this space should be a priority for our area to meet legislative policies and standards.

I look forward to hearing from you and being involved in the future development of our community.

Sincerely,

Leah Stumpf

White Street, Guelph homeowner.

## Email from Bob Mason

**From:** Robert Mason <[rmason@masonrealestate.ca](mailto:rmason@masonrealestate.ca)>

**Sent:** February-26-21 2:23 PM

**To:** Stacey Laughlin <[Stacey.Laughlin@guelph.ca](mailto:Stacey.Laughlin@guelph.ca)>

**Subject:** York Road / Elizabeth Street Land Use Study

Dear Stacey,

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss this plan this week. I am submitting our comments on the study to be on record.

Most of our comments pertain to Sub-area 4 along York Road east of Victoria Road.

We are generally in favour of the addition of more uses and flexibility of non-residential uses to this intensification corridor. For years we have had interest from many businesses wanting to locate along this section of York Road, but the restrictive and irrational site specific zoning (ie. SC.2-10, which is the predominant zone in the corridor) has not permitted those businesses to locate here. Furthermore, the uncertainty about the road reconstruction has been a major concern in attracting redevelopment and new businesses. It is good that the road design and improvements seem to be back on track. We are also very encouraged that the zoning bylaw review currently underway is intending to simplify the Service Commercial zones and hopefully eliminate the redundant site specific zones that do not align with the Official Plan.

This land use study states that "York Road will evolve from a service commercial auto dominated streetscape to a mix of business and some residential uses". It appears that the proposed Mixed Business designation will eliminate much of the newly anticipated and gained flexibility and uses for service commercial being proposed in the current zoning bylaw review, and the loss of service commercial lands will be detrimental. The auto dominated uses in this area play an important part in servicing the City. Those businesses located here because: (a) York Road is a visible arterial road supportive of current SC OP policies, (b) there is very little service commercial land elsewhere in the city, let alone east Guelph, and (c) the market supports it – many Guelphites relies on these businesses for their transportation supply and service. We would encourage the City to consider retaining some service commercial vehicle uses in the Mixed Business designation at least in the remainder of the areas shown designated as Mixed Business. There is very little service commercial land in east Guelph,



and if lost, the City must address this loss of service commercial land that support these essential businesses.

More understanding on how some of the uses in the Industrial and Corporate Business Park designation would fit with the intended function of this corridor would be beneficial. The 950 m<sup>2</sup> maximum building size limit would preclude some uses that would seem inappropriate such as manufacturing and warehousing. Interestingly, some of the unworkable uses in the current SC.2-10 zone which dominates this corridor are being proposed in the Mixed Business designation – hotel, commercial entertainment, and recreation centre; however, with the exception of the land parcel zoned SC.2-11 sandwiched between Beaumont and York, the remainder of the land parcels on the north side of York Road are very small, from 0.14 acres to 0.6 acres and to support some of the proposed uses in these designations, land assembly would be required should there be demand for these types of use at some point in the future.

We are supportive of a wide variety of convenience commercial uses and retail commercial uses in the Mixed Business designation in this underserviced area of Guelph.

We are supportive with the medium density residential designation east of Clearview along York and north of York and if the floodplain and flood fringe areas could be reduced with the redesign of culverts as suggested in the study, it would to permit broader residential redevelopment.

Thank you for your consideration.

**Bob Mason**

Mason Real Estate Limited, Brokerage  
32 Douglas Street  
Guelph, ON N1H 2S9

519-824-1811 phone  
519-824-1160 fax  
[rmason@masonrealestate.ca](mailto:rmason@masonrealestate.ca)

## Email from Mike Darmon

On Thursday, March 4, 2021, 12:03 PM, Mike Darmon  
<[mike\\_darmon@gcat.ca](mailto:mike_darmon@gcat.ca)> wrote:

Hi Benita ,Jennifer and Tracey  
The York / Elizabeth Land use study is coming to Council this Monday.  
With regards to ACtive Transportation GCAT has much interest in vital connections

I have read some of the Report and noted in particular a reference on p38 - Active Transportation- to one of our proposed priorities projects - a South extension of the TCT from Downtown to Victoria Road.

It seems like this may a possibility and will be important as a connector to downtown from residents of the N and S of the Metrolinx rail line with the proposed MUPs for York road.

1-Can you confirm MUPs on York?

2-Of course an underpass or overpass of the Metrolinx corridor is vital.  
Can you confirm if this is included in this study or any other communication with Metrolinx etc

3-Another big concern for residents is a pedestrian crossing in the vicinity of the Reformatory grounds as it is used for recreational purposes. However it is also a safety concern with a 4 lane highway and with residents needing to cross to the bus stop.

Can you confirm if this is seriously being considered?

4-Speed limits are also an issue here and I hope this is considered.?

I will be delegating on Monday and this information will be helpful.

Thanks

Mike Darmon

VP GCAT

[redacted]





## Letter from Astrid Clos



March 4, 2021

Project No. 2105

Guelph City Hall  
1 Carden Street  
Guelph, Ontario  
N1H 3A1

Attention: Mayor Guthrie and Members of Council

Re: March 8, 2021 Council Meeting (Agenda Item 5.1)  
Draft York Road/Elizabeth Street Land Use Study (February 8, 2021)

I am the planning consultant retained by 642762 Ontario Inc., the owner of 10 Kingsmill Avenue, a property with an approximate area of 1.75 hectares which is located with frontage on York Road, Kingsmill Avenue and Beverley Street. The current Guelph Official Plan, Schedule 2 – Land Use Plan, designates the majority of the subject property as Mixed Business, with the York Road frontage designated as Mixed Office/Commercial. The current Mixed Office/Commercial designation permits residential uses including detached, semi-detached, townhouses and apartments. The 10 Kingsmill Avenue property is currently within the Industrial B.4 Zone. The existing B.4 Zone does not include a maximum floor area regulation for permitted uses. The B.4 Zone currently permits outdoor storage on the property.

Draft York Road Elizabeth Street Land Use Study (February 8, 2021)

10 Kingsmill Avenue, the subject property, is located within Sub-Area 1 as identified by the Draft York Road Elizabeth Street Land Use Study. Figures 6 and 9, the Proposed Land Use Maps, indicate that the City proposes to delete the current Mixed Office/Commercial designation located along York Road from the subject property and designate the entire property as Mixed Business. This is not acceptable to the owners of this property.

## **Letter from Astrid Clos (continued)**

The Draft Land Use Study states that;

“While the IMICO lands (200 Beverley Street) are within the study area boundary, the [Council approved vision for the IMICO lands](#) will not be re-examined. Rather the ongoing [Memorandum of Understanding](#) process will continue to provide direction for that site and this study will have regard for the vision and that process.”

The City released a media statement on January 13, 2021 confirming that;

“A memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the City of Guelph, ARQi R&D Inc. and Habitat for Humanity Wellington, Dufferin, Guelph to create a mixed-use development at [200 Beverley Street](#) expired [December 31, 2020](#).

-2-

The City and ARQi R&D Inc. were unable to reach an agreement on the terms and conditions for an agreement of purchase and sale.

The City is working on next steps and plans to bring recommendations for moving ahead with site redevelopment to Council later this year.

The City continues to work with the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks to file the Record of Site Condition by the end of 2021.”

On this basis, the Land Use Study should not characterize the Memorandum of Understanding process for the 200 Beverley (the “IMICO lands”) as “ongoing” when the City has confirmed that it has expired. There is also no rationale for the IMICO lands to be excluded from this Land Use Study. Given that the IMICO lands are designated a Special Policy Area and will require an amendment to the Official Plan in order to implement the vision for the IMICO lands as approved by Council on August 25, 2014, it seems logical to include the IMICO lands within this Land Use Study to allow the proposed Official Plan Amendment to come forward for this area in a comprehensive manner. The proposed land uses for the IMICO lands will inform the appropriate land uses abutting 200 Beverley Street, in particular the future land uses for the area located between York Road, Stevenson Street South and the IMICO lands, including 10 Kingsmill Avenue.

## **Letter from Astrid Clos (continued)**

There should be consideration of expanding the contemplated residential permissions (currently anticipated for the IMICO lands) onto abutting lands, to create a larger residential precinct in this area. Residential development on both sides of Beverley Street would create land use compatibility. Expansion of the Urban Village concept, including affordable housing, commercial, and community gardens would benefit this district. Expanding the Mixed Office/Commercial designation to replace the Mixed Business designation will ensure compatible development within the area located between York Road, Stevenson Road South and the railway.

Within this quadrant of Sub-area 1, located between York Road and Stevenson Road, south and the railway, there are three existing homes with potential cultural heritage interest located along Beverley Street. Retaining these existing homes in a residential setting should not be overlooked and would be positive for this area.

The Mixed Office/Commercial designation is proposed to be removed from 10 Kingsmill Avenue and should not be. The current Mixed Office/Commercial designation located on the subject property permits townhouse and apartment development. This designation should remain on the subject property to provide potential residential intensification along York Road.

On page 17 of the Draft Land Use Report, it states that uses within Sub Area 1 should "continue to support the existing employment uses" with the land uses revised "to provide greater flexibility" and provide a "broader mix of uses." In fact, the Draft Land Use Study reduces the mix of uses by taking away the ability to develop residential land uses with the exception of the City owned IMICO lands.

-3-

The City's proposal also does not support the existing employment uses. On page 18, the Draft Land Use Study introduces a new restriction to a maximum of 950 square metres and prohibits outdoor storage, which is currently permitted.

The Draft Land Use Study refers to this area remaining as an employment area, but is imposing new size and outdoor storage restrictions that do not support this objective. The City is encouraging small to medium incubator and entrepreneurial uses. Undervalued industrial buildings tend to attract

## **Letter from Astrid Clos (continued)**

incubator uses. Has the future demand for these incubator uses been deemed to be positive by the City? Do these incubator uses pay the building owners a sustainable rent or will these proposed uses cause this district to potentially decline? Page 19 of the Draft Land Use Study refers to the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) with respect to "maintaining a range and choice of suitable economic activities" and "taking into account the needs of existing and future businesses." The proposed policies are not consistent with the PPS in that they reduce choice by restricting the size (GFA) and prohibit outdoor storage, which does not take into account the needs of business [nor the current size and use of 10 Kingsmill Avenue.

On page 20, the Draft Land Use Study states that, "Small to medium sized businesses are desirable in this Mixed Business designation because they are less likely to rely on trucks and much of the existing road network is not suitable for large truck movement. Additionally, there is employment land in other areas of the city that will accommodate larger employment uses." If the long-term vision of this area is that it transition away from the scale of employment uses that are viable and rely on trucks, perhaps there should be a different land use vision considered for this area. A vision that contributes to providing housing intensification within the City in proximity to the downtown is appropriate for this area, particularly in the quadrant of Sub-area 1, located between York Road and Stevenson Road, south and the railway.

There is no reason to plan 10 Kingsmill Avenue differently than the IMICO lands. The quadrant of Sub-area 1, located between York Road and Stevenson Road, south and the railway, is geographically the closest area to the downtown and, together with the IMICO lands, is physically separated from the other lands in the area by the railway line. For these reasons, they should be dealt with in the same manner in any new land use plan. To change the designation of the IMICO lands to permit residential while removing residential from 10 Kingsmill Avenue is not consistent with the concept of creating compatible land uses. Furthermore, to change the use of the IMICO lands to a sensitive use, while restricting the uses of 10 Kingsmill Avenue to support the more sensitive uses on the IMICO lands, is an unfair imposition to place on the owners of 10 Kingsmill Avenue.

## **Letter from Astrid Clos (continued)**

We are respectfully requesting that the Draft York Road Elizabeth Street Land Use Study (February 8, 2021) be revised as follows:

- That the entirety of the 10 Kingsmill Avenue property be designated Mixed Office/Commercial or alternatively,
- That the Mixed Office/Commercial designation currently located on the 10 Kingsmill Avenue property along York Road be retained.

-4-

- That the Mixed Business designation policies not add a restriction to the maximum size (GFA) of the permitted uses.
- That outdoor storage continue to be permitted within the Mixed Business designation.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments related to the Draft Land Use Study. We look forward to our comments being incorporated into the Final Land Use Study when it is presented to Council for approval and these comments being incorporated in the future Official Plan Amendment.

Please add me to the circulation list to receive notification of any future, meetings, workshops, public meetings or reports etc. related to this area.

Yours truly,

Astrid Clos, MCIP, RPP

cc: Stacey Laughlin, Senior Policy Planner