



**Minutes of Guelph City Council
Held in the Council Chambers, Guelph City Hall on
Monday, May 12, 2014 at 5:30 p.m.**

Attendance

Council: Mayor Farbridge
Councillor B. Bell
Councillor L. Burcher
Councillor T. Dennis
Councillor I. Findlay
Councillor J. Furfaro
Councillor C. Guthrie
Councillor G. Kovach
Councillor M. Laidlaw
Councillor L. Piper
Councillor A. Van Hellemond
Councillor K. Wettstein

Absent: Councillor J. Hofland

Staff: Ms. A. Pappert, Chief Administrative Officer
Mr. M. Amorosi, Executive Director, Corporate & Human Resources
Mr. D. McCaughan, Executive Director, Operations, Transit & Emergency Services
Mr. D. Thomson, Executive Director, Community & Social Services
Mr. T. Salter, General Manager Planning Services
Ms. M. Aldunate, Manager of Policy Planning and Urban Design
Ms. S. Kirkwood, Manager of Development Planning
Ms. T. Agnello, Deputy Clerk
Ms. D. Black, Council Committee Coordinator

Call to Order (5:30 p.m.)

Mayor Farbridge called the meeting to order.

Authority to Resolve into a Closed Meeting of Council

1. Moved by Councillor Burcher
Seconded by Councillor Dennis

That the Council of the City of Guelph now hold a meeting that is closed to the public, pursuant to Section 239 (2) (a), (d) and (e) of the *Municipal Act* with respect to personal matters about an identifiable individual; labour relations or employee negotiations; and litigation or potential litigation.

CARRIED

Closed Meeting (5:31 p.m.)

Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest and General Nature Thereof

Councillor Piper declared a potential pecuniary interest with regard to Report C.2014.30 OPA 48 because she is employed by a competitor of one of the appellants, and vacated the room for this portion of the meeting.

The following matters were considered:

C.2014.28 Wilson Farmhouse – Submissions to the Request for Expression of Interest

C.2014.29 OPA 42 (Natural Heritage System) Appeals – Ontario Municipal Board

C.2014.30 OPA 48 (Official Plan Review) Appeals – Ontario Municipal Board

Rise from Closed Meeting (6:52 p.m.)

Council recessed.

Open Meeting (7:00 p.m.)

Mayor Farbridge called the meeting to order.

Silent Prayer

Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest and General Nature Thereof

There were no disclosures.

Council Consent Agenda

The following items were extracted:

CON-2014.30 Official Plan Amendment No. 54 Guelph Innovation District (GID) Secondary Plan

CON-2014.31 Wilson Farmhouse – Submissions to the Request for Expression of Interest

Balance of Council Consent Items

2. Moved by Councillor Kovach
Seconded by Councillor Dennis

That the balance of the May 12, 2014 Consent Agenda as identified below, be adopted:

CON-2014.26 Proposed Demolition of 1 Martin Avenue – Ward 5

1. That Report 14-32 regarding the proposed demolition of a detached dwelling at 1 Martin Avenue, legally described as Lot 29; Plan 37, City of Guelph, from Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment dated May 12, 2014, be received.
2. That the proposed demolition of the detached dwelling at 1 Martin Avenue be approved.
3. That the applicant be requested to erect protective fencing at one (1) metre from the dripline of any existing trees on the property or on adjacent properties which can be preserved prior to commencement of demolition and maintain fencing during demolition and construction of the new dwelling.
4. That the applicant be requested to contact the General Manager of Solid Waste Resources, within Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment regarding options for the salvage or recycling of all demolition materials.

CON-2014.27 Proposed Demolition of 11 Vardon Drive – Ward 5

1. That Report 14-33 regarding the proposed demolition of a detached dwelling at 11 Vardon Drive, legally described as Lot 21; Plan 420, City of Guelph, from Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment dated May 12, 2014, be received.
2. That the proposed demolition of the detached dwelling at 11 Vardon Drive be approved.
3. That the applicant be requested to erect protective fencing at one (1) metre from the dripline of any existing trees on the property or on adjacent properties which can be preserved prior to commencement of demolition and maintain fencing during demolition and construction of the new dwelling.
4. That the applicant be requested to contact the General Manager of Solid Waste Resources, within Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment regarding options for the salvage or recycling of all demolition materials.

CON-2014.28 Proposed Demolition of 154 Ontario Street – Ward 1

1. That Report 14-35 regarding the proposed demolition of a detached dwelling at 154 Ontario Street, legally described as Lot 13, Registered Plan 120; City of Guelph, from Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment dated May 12, 2014, be received.
2. That the proposed demolition of the detached dwelling at 154 Ontario Street be approved.
3. That the applicant be requested to erect protective fencing at one (1) metre from the dripline of any existing trees on the property or on adjacent properties which can be preserved prior to commencement of demolition and maintain fencing during demolition and construction of the new dwelling.
4. That the applicant be requested to consult with Heritage Guelph to consider the design of the proposed new dwellings prior to the issuance of a building permit.
5. That the applicant be requested to contact the General Manager of Solid Waste Resources, within Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment regarding options for the salvage or recycling of all demolition materials.

CON-2014.29 Wellington Street Reconstruction (Gordon Street to McCrae Boulevard) Contract No. 2-1414

1. That the tender of Drexler Construction Ltd., be accepted and that the Mayor and Clerk be authorized to sign the agreement for Contract 2-1414 for the Wellington Street Reconstruction (Gordon Street to McCrae Boulevard) project for a total tendered price of \$3,571,482.12 with actual payment to be made in accordance with the terms of the contract.

VOTING IN FAVOUR: Mayor Farbridge, Councillors Bell, Burcher, Dennis, Findlay, Furfaro, Guthrie, Kovach, Laidlaw, Piper, Van Hellemond and Wettstein (12)

VOTING AGAINST: (0)

CARRIED

3. Moved by Councillor Laidlaw
Seconded by Councillor Burcher

That the Wilson Farmhouse – Submissions to the Request for Expression of Interest be considered at this reconvened meeting of Council to be held on May 21, 2014 at 6:00 p.m.

VOTING IN FAVOUR: Mayor Farbridge, Councillors Burcher, Furfaro, Guthrie, Laidlaw, Van Hellemond and Wettstein (7)

VOTING AGAINST: Councillors Bell, Dennis, Findlay, Kovach, Piper, (5)

CARRIED

Planning Public Meeting

Mayor Farbridge announced that in accordance with The Planning Act, Council is now in a public meeting for the purpose of informing the public of various planning matters. The Mayor asked if there were any delegations in attendance with respect to the planning matters listed on the agenda.

44, 56 & 76 Arkell Road – Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment (File: ZC1314) – Ward 6

Ms. Katie Nasswetter, Senior Development Planner provided an overview of the application. She advised the applicant is requesting to rezone the subject lands to a specialized R.3A (Cluster Townhouse) Zone to permit 40 stacked townhouse units and 176 multiple attached dwelling units. She highlighted the specialized regulations that are being requested as listed on page three of the report.

Discussion ensued regarding off-site parking, truck routes, pedestrian connectivity, private and public amenity spaces and waste collection.

Ms. Astrid Clos, on behalf of the applicant noted that over 80 per cent of the property will remain Greenland or wetland space. She clarified that the stormwater management will be outside of the wetlands and the dripline and that the common amenity areas will be connected by trails and sidewalks. She addressed the traffic concerns at Malvern Crescent and advised they anticipate the speed limit on Arkell Road will be reduced to 40km, a flashing red light over the intersection will be installed and sidewalks will be required. She explained that the requested zoning regulation exemptions are because the proposed forms of the multi-residential units they propose do not fit into current zoning categories.

Questions arose regarding fencing of the stacked townhouses, waste collection, parking and traffic.

Mr. Brian Watson, Arkell Road resident expressed concerns regarding the building heights and elevation, their property line proximity and the density of the development. He supports two storey units and townhouses with more open spaces. He also was concerned about the potential negative impact to the value of his property, stormwater management, student busing and the lack of open space. He believes the development will result in more deer on the residential properties, a loss of privacy, unsafe driveway access and egress, pedestrian endangerment and too much shading.

Mr. Jim Rife, a neighbourhood resident, expressed concern about demolishing the four detached homes to build taller buildings. He supports the original plan of 78 units and requested this proposal be refused. He would like a tree replacement plan for the 79 mature trees scheduled for removal. He believes the development is unsuited for small children due to traffic issues and lack of amenity space. He requested a right turn only onto Arkell Road be instituted. He believes the roof amenity spaces will be misused for parties and the units filled by students. He advised public notification of the development was only provided to some of the residents on Malvern Crescent and all should be given notice despite being outside the prescribed circulation area. He is concerned that the neighbourhood will change from one of single detached homes to a majority of multi-residential units.

Ms. Mary Rife, an Arkell Road resident raised concerns about excess water runoff, protection of the municipal well, and traffic flow. She believes the traffic impact study does not adequately reflect the traffic volume increase and safety issues. She is concerned about parking overflow and issues at the intersection of Malvern Crescent and Arkell Road. She believes the smaller, close units with small yards, the unsafe walking area, and lack of amenity space for children will be detrimental. She requested building heights not exceed two storeys, a lower density, a mix of semidetached buildings, more amenity areas, the installation of sidewalks, larger setbacks, a better tree replacement plan and a left hand turn lane be added onto Arkell Road.

Mr. Bob Norrish, a neighbourhood resident, requested a lower density development on the property because of potential damage of runoff to the wetlands, and the noise and light pollution that will result. He is also concerned about the lack of sidewalks, emergency vehicular access, bus mobility and the increased onstreet parking on Malvern and Ridgeway. He noted traffic concerns crossing Arkell Road and people using Ridgeway Drive for access and create more issues. .

Mr. Marko Thom, a nearby resident, moved into the area aware there would be development, but it was proposed as two storeys and lower density. He advised his sightlines will be severely impacted and is concerned about the devaluation of surrounding properties and impact on lifestyle due to loss of privacy. He does not believe the development is good planning and is not sustainable. He is concerned about the proposed height, the increased traffic, the increased risk to the wetlands and runoff issues. He noted that the density increase is extreme and the concept does not suit the neighbourhood due to the lack of amenity areas and common space. He requests the proposal be denied.

Ms. Deidre Dunn, a neighbourhood resident, believes the development will negatively impact their homes due to loss of privacy and shading. She noted the four storeys proposed is too high for the predominately one storey neighbourhood. She raised the issue of the runoff effects on the well, safety issues of a higher density with no fencing, light pollution, sight lines reduction, wildlife impacts, loss of privacy, and safety crossing the road. She believes this development will start a trend where houses will become an anomaly. She requested the development be refused.

Mr. David Raymond, a neighbourhood resident, does not believe the proposal complies with the Official Plan. He raised concern about the density, the stormwater management, preservation of the wetlands and traffic flow. He believes the development is incompatible with its surroundings and noted that shorter buildings, greater setbacks and increased amenities would be more suitable. He noted the proposal would result in four times as many residents as the rest of the neighbourhood combined. He believes that assumptions are being made on single detached dwellings usage rather than multi-residential units and thus inaccurate data is being

used to determine stormwater and traffic needs. He requested buffer zones be extended, sidewalks built and more action to address the traffic safety issues at Malvern and Arkell.

Discussion ensued regarding the need for a cumulative traffic analysis inclusive of all the area development; addressing overflow parking on neighbourhood streets; the intersection at Malvern and Arkell; the timing of the proposed road widening; the issue of the blind hill and blind spot on Arkell; compatibility of the proposal; increasing the circulation of further notices to include all of Malvern; acquiring a legal opinion of the City regarding well water protection; provision of a shade study; stormwater drainage information; a cumulative impact summary if all the zoning exemptions were granted; an analysis of the amenity spaces; and, a review of waste collection options and a tree replacement plan.

3. Moved by Councillor Laidlaw
Seconded by Councillor Burcher

1. That Report 14-28 regarding a Zoning By-law Amendment application by Astrid J. Clos Planning Consultants to permit the development of 40 stacked cluster townhouses and 176 multiple attached dwelling units for the properties municipally known as 44, 56, 66 and 76 Arkell Road, and legally described as Part of Lot 6, Concession 8 (formerly Township of Puslinch) City of Guelph and Lots 3, 4, 5 and 6, Registered Plan 514 City of Guelph, from Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment dated May 12, 2014, be received.

VOTING IN FAVOUR: Mayor Farbridge, Councillors Bell, Burcher, Dennis, Findlay, Furfaro, Guthrie, Kovach, Laidlaw, Piper, Van Hellemond and Wettstein (12)
VOTING AGAINST: (0)

CARRIED

First Amendment

4. Moved by Councillor Dennis
Seconded by Councillor Wettstein

That any subsequent correspondence and notification regarding the proposed zoning by-law amendment for 44, 56, 66 and 76 Arkell Road be broadened to include Malvern Crescent and Ridgeway Road.

VOTING IN FAVOUR: Mayor Farbridge, Councillors Bell, Burcher, Dennis, Findlay, Furfaro, Guthrie, Kovach, Laidlaw, Piper, Van Hellemond and Wettstein (12)
VOTING AGAINST: (0)

CARRIED

Main Motion as Amended

5. Moved by Councillor Laidlaw
Seconded by Councillor Burcher

1. That Report 14-28 regarding a Zoning By-law Amendment application by Astrid J. Clos Planning Consultants to permit the development of 40 stacked cluster townhouses and 176 multiple attached dwelling units for the properties municipally known as 44, 56, 66 and 76 Arkell Road, and legally described as Part of Lot 6, Concession 8 (formerly

Township of Puslinch) City of Guelph and Lots 3, 4, 5 and 6, Registered Plan 514 City of Guelph, from Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment dated May 12, 2014, be received.

2. **That any subsequent correspondence and notification regarding the proposed zoning by-law amendment for 44, 56, 66 and 76 Arkell Road be broadened to include Malvern Crescent and Ridgeway Road.**

VOTING IN FAVOUR: Mayor Farbridge, Councillors Bell, Burcher, Dennis, Findlay, Furfaro, Guthrie, Kovach, Laidlaw, Piper, Van Hellemond and Wettstein (12)

VOTING AGAINST: (0)

CARRIED

816 Woolwich Street – Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment (File: ZC1402) – Ward 3

Mr. Al Hearne, Senior Development Planner provided an overview of the application. He advised the purpose of the application is to permit a multi building mixed use phased development with 31 three storey townhouses in 3 buildings and a commercial component within 4 buildings in addition to the existing curling club.

Discussion ensued regarding transit services, the township's level of input, the zoning of the surrounding properties in the township and on the east side of highway 6, the level of permeability between the sites and pedestrian connectivity.

Ms. Nancy Shoemaker, on behalf of the applicant, provided information regarding the buffer zones and setbacks and advised the township is amenable to the proposed development. She noted that there will be substantial plantings and segregated parking areas to make the development less obtrusive. She advised they are reviewing transit options which includes extending the bus route to the property and out through SmartCentres. She also explained that if the Curling Club relocates, that building will be required to meet the zoning uses set out for the proposed development.

Discussion ensued regarding the location and number of amenity areas to be provided.

6. Moved by Councillor Wettstein
Seconded by Councillor Burcher

1. That Report 14-26 regarding a Zoning By-law Amendment application by Black, Shoemaker, Robinson & Donaldson Limited on behalf of The Guelph Curling Club Limited, to rezone lands legally described as Part of Lots 6 and 7, Registered Plan 169, municipally known as 816 Woolwich Street, City of Guelph (Guelph Curling Club lands), from the existing Specialized SC.2-3 (Highway Service Commercial) Zone, to a new Specialized CC (Community Shopping Centre) Zone, to permit the development of the site for a phased multi-building mixed use commercial/residential development, from Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment dated May 12, 2014, be received.

VOTING IN FAVOUR: Mayor Farbridge, Councillors Bell, Burcher, Dennis, Findlay, Furfaro, Guthrie, Kovach, Laidlaw, Piper, Van Hellemond and Wettstein (12)

VOTING AGAINST: (0)

CARRIED

The meeting recessed. (9:25 p.m.)

The meeting reconvened. (9:35 p.m.)

Consent Agenda

CON-2014.30 Official Plan Amendment No. 54 Guelph Innovation District (GID) Secondary Plan

Ms. Joan Jylanne, Senior Policy Planner provided a review of the process and development of the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan (GID) to date.

Mr. Peter Cartwright, General Manager, Economic Development, explained how the secondary plan aligns with numerous other City plans and strategies and how it provides a framework to implement the plans.

They highlighted the principles of the GID, how best practices were determined, and explained the governance modules. They outlined the next steps and advised adopting OPA 54 is the first step to moving the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan forward. They will be implementing a block planning approach and there will be a need for public-private partnerships and partnerships with the other levels of government to implement the strategy successfully.

Discussion ensued regarding the timing of urban development planning, the level of owner interest in moving the block planning forward, and the status of provincial action.

Ms. Lin Grist, Yorklands Green Hub, advised they are interested in the portion of the correctional centre property that is designated as heritage to develop an education, demonstration, and research program for the adults to become engaged in sustainable use of water, energy and food. She requested the City support their submission to Infrastructure Ontario to designate approximately 36 acres and the superintendent's house for the sole use of Yorklands Green Hub; and shared use of the administrative building with the government and other partners as the Ontario's 21st Century sustainable environmental exhibition centre. She also requested that City staff be directed to ensure that Yorklands Green Hub is an integral part of the planning of the new phase of the GID.

Dr. Hugh Whiteley would like the river corridor to be protected in perpetuity. He requested the City restore a provision from OPA 42 that states new development or redevelopment will be subject to the provisions of the plan or add a provision to OPA 54 to include that the City will require development to be set back the greater of a) 30 metres from the Eramosa River edge; or b) where there is a steep slope adjacent to the river, 15 metres from the top of the slope.

Mr. David Aston, HMBC planning, representing the owner of 728 Victoria Road South, supports the increase to the maximum residential height in the area and design plan for the mixed use corridor and the adjustment to the minimum setbacks and advised they would like to see minimum and maximum height included in section 11.26.2.2 to provide more flexibility and allow design consideration to occur. He stated that although provincial involvement is important, private investment may attract other investments and priority in the area and they support the Secondary Plan.

Discussion ensued regarding the impact of including river setbacks as proposed by Dr, Whiteley. Staff advised that the setbacks are part of a matter before the Ontario Municipal Board and addressed through OPA 42, and therefore not appropriate to be included in OPA 54.

Staff addressed the correspondence regarding the timing of the implementation of the plan and explained the timing of the staged policies.

7. Moved by Councillor Kovach
Seconded by Councillor Piper

1. That Report 14-24 regarding Official Plan Amendment No. 54 for the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan from Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment dated May 12, 2014 be received.
2. That Official Plan Amendment No. 54, initiated by the City of Guelph be adopted in accordance with Attachment 2 – Official Plan Amendment No. 54, **as amended to include the following new clause:**

11.2.6.3.6 Glenholme Estate Residential

7. Notwithstanding the policies of this plan pertaining to woodlands, for the properties at 745 Stone Road East and 58 Glenholme Drive, where a woodland has been identified through an EIS, the assessment of the potential to allow development shall be undertaken in accordance with policies of Section 6.8, including any associated definitions, of the 2001 City of Guelph Official Plan, in effect as of May 12, 2014.

3. That the General Manager of Economic Development be directed to explore with the Province of Ontario the creation of an updated Memorandum of Understanding to address an implementation strategy framework regarding the development of a Research and Development cluster and the redevelopment of the former Guelph Correctional Facility for the purposes described in Report 14–24.
4. That the General Manager of Economic Development report back to Guelph City Council by no later than August 25, 2014 on the status of an updated Memorandum of Understanding.

VOTING IN FAVOUR: Mayor Farbridge, Councillors Bell, Burcher, Dennis, Findlay, Furfaro, Guthrie, Kovach, Laidlaw, Piper, Van Hellemond and Wettstein (12)

VOTING AGAINST: (0)

CARRIED

First Amendment

8. Moved by Councillor Laidlaw
Seconded by Councillor Burcher

1. **That Council express support in principle, Yorklands Green Hub’s vision for the use of a small portion of the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to showcase environmental education and green technology demonstration.**
2. **That staff continue to discuss Yorklands Green Hub’s submission with the group.**

VOTING IN FAVOUR: Mayor Farbridge, Councillors Bell, Burcher, Dennis, Findlay, Furfaro, Guthrie, Kovach, Laidlaw, Piper, Van Hellemond and Wettstein (12)

VOTING AGAINST: (0)

CARRIED

Main Motion as Amended

9. Moved by Councillor Kovach
Seconded by Councillor Piper

1. That Report 14-24 regarding Official Plan Amendment No. 54 for the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan from Planning, Building, Engineering and Environment dated May 12, 2014 be received.
2. That Official Plan Amendment No. 54, initiated by the City of Guelph be adopted in accordance with Attachment 2 – Official Plan Amendment No. 54, **as amended to include the following new clause:**

11.2.6.3.6 Glenholme Estate Residential

- 7. Notwithstanding the policies of this plan pertaining to woodlands, for the properties at 745 Stone Road East and 58 Glenholme Drive, where a woodland has been identified through an EIS, the assessment of the potential to allow development shall be undertaken in accordance with policies of Section 6.8, including any associated definitions, of the 2001 City of Guelph Official Plan, in effect as of May 12, 2014.**
3. That the General Manager of Economic Development be directed to explore with the Province of Ontario the creation of an updated Memorandum of Understanding to address an implementation strategy framework regarding the development of a Research and Development cluster and the redevelopment of the former Guelph Correctional Facility for the purposes described in Report 14-24.
4. That the General Manager of Economic Development report back to Guelph City Council by no later than August 25, 2014 on the status of an updated Memorandum of Understanding.
- 5. That Council express support in principle, the Yorklands Green Hub's vision for the use of a small portion of the Guelph Innovation District Secondary Plan to showcase environmental education and green technology demonstration.**
- 6. That staff continue to discuss the Yorklands Green Hub's submission with the group.**

VOTING IN FAVOUR: Mayor Farbridge, Councillors Bell, Burcher, Dennis, Findlay, Furfaro, Guthrie, Kovach, Laidlaw, Piper, Van Hellemond and Wettstein (12)

VOTING AGAINST: (0)

CARRIED

By-laws

10. Moved by Councillor Burcher
Seconded by Councillor Bell

That By-laws numbered (2014)-19745 to (2014)-19752, inclusive, are hereby passed.

VOTING IN FAVOUR: Mayor Farbridge, Councillors Bell, Burcher, Dennis, Findlay, Furfaro, Guthrie, Kovach, Laidlaw, Piper, Van Hellemond and Wettstein (12)

VOTING AGAINST: (0)

CARRIED

Recess (10:55 p.m.)

11. Moved by Councillor Burcher
Seconded by Councillor Guthrie

That the meeting be recessed and reconvene on May 21, 2014 at 6:00 p.m.

CARRIED

The meeting reconvened at 6:00 p.m. on May 21, 2014.

Attendance

Council: Mayor Farbridge
Councillor B. Bell
Councillor I. Findlay
Councillor J. Furfaro
Councillor C. Guthrie
Councillor J. Hofland
Councillor G. Kovach
Councillor M. Laidlaw (*arrived at 7:17 p.m.*)
Councillor L. Piper
Councillor A. Van Hellemond
Councillor K. Wettstein

Absent: Councillor L. Burcher
Councillor T. Dennis

Staff: Ms. A. Pappert, Chief Administrative Officer
Mr. D. Thomson, Executive Director, Community & Social Services
Mr. T. Salter, General Manager Planning Services
Ms. M. Aldunate, Manager of Policy Planning and Urban Design
Ms. S. Kirkwood, Manager of Development Planning
Mr. G. Bernardi, Realty & Planning Specialist
Mr. B. Stewart, Purchasing and Risk Management
Mr. B. Labelle, City Clerk
Ms. D. Black, Council Committee Coordinator

The Mayor advised this is a reconvening of the meeting of May 12th and addressed the Conflict of Interest Act for clarification to Council.

Councillor Findlay spoke to the issue of declaring a pecuniary interest and advised that he will not be making a declaration.

CON-2014.31

**WILSON FARMHOUSE – SUBMISSIONS TO THE REQUEST FOR
EXPRESSION OF INTEREST**

The Mayor provided a history of the matter and advised the staff report addresses what was requested by Council and outlined the options.

Ms. Daphne Wainman-Wood, Heritage Guelph, expressed concern that Heritage Guelph did not have opportunity to provide input to this application. She noted that heritage is no longer a constraint on the property so it should not be a factor for consideration of the submissions. She requested that an ad hoc subcommittee be formed to give further consideration to the Expressions of Interest.

Discussion ensued regarding the involvement of Heritage Guelph and the former Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee as well as the heritage and monetary value of the building.

Mr. Stephen Hagen was not present.

Ms. Susan Watson, Wilson Farmhouse Community Group, believes proposals for the Wilson Farmhouse represent civic engagement and synergies and the issues identified in the staff report could be resolved in a matter of weeks. She stated 90% of the work is completed and the next step is to negotiate the terms. She raised the issue that the City risks credibility and trust of the citizens if they do not accept a proposal because a majority of the neighbourhood is in favour of using the building for a community centre. She stated that connectivity would result and be a key component and there have been several other successful community buildings in the City resulting from citizen engagement.

Ms. Malkah McNeilly, a neighbourhood resident, noted she has 234 signatures on a petition to save the farmhouse and does not want the City to lose the history of the old building, nor the brick or old stone to be lost.

Mr. Dennis Waechter was not present.

Ms. Kristen Bustamante was not present.

Ms. Vera Ettema was not present.

Mr. Ben Barclay, Wilson Farmhouse Community Centre, advised the three options for the farmhouse are to save it, sell it or sink it. He noted it would be too costly to save it; that it is too late to sell it, and there is too much opposition to sink it. He suggested the building be used for social enterprise by a large employer and that the maintenance could be done by volunteers. He believes the farmhouse could be used as an example of citizen involvement similar to projects in Toronto and Waterloo and suggested a \$1 a year lease and a loan guarantee for construction. He believes they would then be able to raise the necessary money to complete the project because the City involvement would attract investors and stakeholders and the value of the finished house would make it easy to sell if necessary.

Ms. Catherine Kormendy, Trillium Waldorf School parent, sees the farmhouse as an opportunity for a community centre. She requested more time be taken to review the expressions of interest because requirements were not clearly communicated.

Mr. Pillalamarri Jagam submitted the Expression of Interest proposal number four and advised he has worked on a similar project that had no funding and the project was worth 250 million over 20 years after it was completed. He explained they can start with zero funding, zero

capital, zero budget and design a concept and proceed. He requested City involvement at no cost to the City because their preferred option is to maintain ownership.

Councillor Laidlaw arrived at the meeting. (7:17 p.m.)

Ms. Debra Briese was not present.

Mr. John Farley, Wilson Community Farmhouse Centre, stated that the public understanding of the request for Expression of Interests was based on the expectation that details would be clarified later in the process. He advised that they are recommending an option for a place where the community can gather and their work is 90% complete. He surmised that input from planning staff for each proposal would have been beneficial to clarify the required information. He believes the proposals were vetted on criteria not included within the request for expressions of interest and suggested Council develops a subcommittee to give further consideration of the submissions.

Ms. Marcia Santen, Friends of Wilson Farm Beautification, believes there is a need for a community centre and requested an ad hoc committee be formed to explore the possibility. She supports options of severing and selling or the City keeping the property. She does not see the loss of parkland or the need for parking as issues and believes it would be a good cycling destination since bike trails end there.

Mr. Matthew Vermeulen, Wilson Farmhouse Community Centre, advised he is a certified energy advisor and home consultant. He explained that retrofits made at a project he worked on in Kitchener have nearly eliminated operating costs and believes the same could be done with the Wilson Farmhouse. He teaches specialist high skills majors and sees the Wilson Farmhouse as an opportunity to build a community centre and useful teaching tool.

Mr. Frank Barber, on behalf of the Northern Heights Neighbourhood Group, stated that 98% of their survey respondents do not want to sever and sell the property; 60% are in favour of removing the farmhouse, and 18% are opposed. He requested Council refuse the options that would expect taxpayers to assume some or all of the financial risk for the project or plan, or would create the need to sever and sell. He believes that staff have given consideration to the financial and heritage issues and asked Council to approve the staff recommendations.

Ms. Julia Murray, resident across from Wilson Park, expressed concern about having the community centre in her neighbourhood. She believes the required zone change process will take too long and the neighbourhood would need to give approval. She questioned the issue of a conflict of one of the councillors and believes an unfair advantage would be gained due to his involvement. She expressed concern that the expressions of interest are all from people not from the neighbourhood and have no vested interest and are ignoring the desire of the neighbourhood to keep the park whole. She advised the process has taken enough time and the building is beyond salvaging and asked Council to approve the staff recommendations.

Mr. Mike Lackowicz believes the report from the 1990's was ignored at the time which resulted in the farmhouse settling into disrepair with the interior no longer holding heritage value. He questioned why Heritage Guelph did not get involved at that time and noted there was no involvement until complete demolition was recommended. He refuted the statement that Heritage Guelph was not given opportunity to provide input. He inquired whether parking on the street would occur or would a parking lot for a community centre be put on some of the

parkland. He believes misinformation regarding the heritage value and the condition of the building has been provided and has created confusion.

Ms. Michelle Sparkle, on behalf of her spouse and other neighbourhood residents, stated they are frustrated with the process. She advised that if a zone change is required, the process will be drawn out further, resulting in further deterioration. She raised concerns regarding noise, parking, privacy, increased traffic and safety issues that a recreation center or an outdoor café portion would create. They do not want taxpayers to be responsible for the financial risk if the project fails or required to pay for a loan for a private company. She questioned the survey process and reiterated that the neighbourhood will be impacted most and should have a say regarding the outcome, and their preference is to demolish the farmhouse.

Ms. Pat Prior, a licensed realtor, believes the house should be demolished. She noted that all proposals depend upon a zone change and that will extend the timeline to resolving the issue. She raised the issue of the lack of City finances available for maintenance, the potential of breaking a promise of no further delays, the perceived pecuniary interest, and parking concerns. She advised it has been over ten years of discussions, inspections and repairs and she requested the matter be resolved. She does not believe the property is suitable for a community center, it's not wanted by the neighbourhood and enough money has been spent.

Ms. Vera Ettema believes Council should make an effort to examine the expressions of interest because of the time people invested preparing them and she believes this is an opportunity to preserve the historic essence in a new, generic neighbourhood.

The meeting recessed (8:21 p.m.)

The meeting reconvened. (8:31 p.m.)

Discussion ensued regarding the merits of demolishing the building or engaging in a RFP process.

12. Moved by Councillor Piper
Seconded by Councillor Laidlaw

- 1. That pursuant to Sec. 21.3 of the City's Procedural By-law, an Ad Hoc Committee of Council be struck for the purpose of reviewing submissions 4 and 5, or a combination thereof, in relation to the Wilson Farmhouse and report back to Council with a proposed recommendation for evaluation criteria no later than July 28th to be used in an RFP process or to take no further action and proceed with staff's recommendation that the Wilson Farm House be demolished and its materials, where possible, be salvaged for reuse or recycling.**
- 2. That the Wilson Farmhouse Ad Hoc Committee be comprised of three members of Council.**
- 3. That the appropriate staff resources be provided to the Ad Hoc Committee as required in an advisory capacity.**

VOTING IN FAVOUR: Councillors Findlay, Laidlaw and Piper (3)

VOTING AGAINST: Councillors Bell, Furfaro, Guthrie, Hofland, Kovach, Van Hellemond, Wettstein, and Mayor Farbridge (8)

DEFEATED

13. Moved by Councillor Kovach
Seconded by Councillor Van Hellemond

1. That report CHR-2014-39 entitled "Wilson Farmhouse – Submissions to the Request for Expression of Interest" be received.
2. That Council withdraw the Notice of Intention to Designate the property known as 80 Simmonds Drive, in accordance with Section 29 (14) of the Ontario Heritage Act.
3. That once the Notice of Intention to Designate has been withdrawn, the farmhouse be demolished, while documenting and salvaging, where possible, significant architectural and heritage features to the satisfaction of the City's Senior Heritage Planner.
4. That the existing walnut trees be protected, prior to and during demolition, by fencing to define a Tree Protection Zone beyond the dripline of the trees.
5. That the land area surrounding the farmhouse be retained as parkland and that Park staff integrate the parcel into the Wilson Farm Park Master Plan.

VOTING IN FAVOUR: Councillors Bell, Findlay, Furfaro, Guthrie, Hofland, Kovach, Van Hellemond, Wettstein, and Mayor Farbridge (9)

VOTING AGAINST: Councillors Laidlaw and Piper (2)

CARRIED

Adjournment (9:05 p.m.)

14. Moved by Councillor Furfaro
Seconded by Councilor Guthrie

That the meeting be adjourned.

Minutes to be confirmed on July 28, 2014.

Mayor Farbridge

Deputy Clerk

City Clerk