

Council Committee Room B  
November 5, 2007 6:40 p.m.

**A meeting of Guelph City Council.**

Present: Mayor Farbridge, Councillors Beard, Bell, Billings, Burcher, Farrelly, Findlay, Hofland, Kovach, Laidlaw, Piper, Salisbury and Wettstein

Staff Present: Ms. T. Agnello, Deputy City Clerk; and Ms. D. Black, Assistant Council Committee Co-ordinator

- 1. Moved by Councillor Laidlaw  
Seconded by Councillor Beard

THAT the Council of the City of Guelph now hold a meeting that is closed to the public, pursuant to Section 239 (2) (b) of the Municipal Act, with respect to:

- personal matters about an identifiable individual

Carried

The meeting adjourned at 6:41 o'clock p.m.

.....  
Mayor

.....  
Deputy Clerk

Council Committee Room B  
November 5, 2007 6:42 p.m.

**A meeting of Guelph City Council meeting in Committee of the Whole.**

Present: Mayor Farbridge, Councillors Beard, Bell, Billings, Burcher, Farrelly, Findlay, Hofland, Kovach, Laidlaw, Piper, Salisbury and Wettstein

Staff Present: Ms. T. Agnello, Deputy City Clerk; and Ms. D. Black, Assistant Council Committee Co-ordinator

**DECLARATIONS UNDER MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT**

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest.

Councillor Kovach provided information with respect to personal matters about an identifiable individual.

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 o'clock p.m.

.....  
Mayor

.....  
Deputy Clerk

Council Chambers  
November 5, 2007

**Council reconvened in formal session at 7:00 p.m.**

Present: Mayor Farbridge, Councillors Beard, Bell, Billings, Burcher, Farrelly, Findlay, Hofland, Kovach, Laidlaw, Piper, Salisbury and Wettstein

Staff Present: Mr. H. Loewig, City Administrator; Ms. Tricia Sinclair, Assistant City Solicitor; Mr. J. Riddell, Director of Community Design & Development Services; Mr. S. Hannah, Manager of Development & Parks Planning; Mr. A. Hearne, Senior Development Planner; Ms. M. Castellan, Senior Development Planner; Ms. T. Agnello, Deputy City Clerk; and Ms. D. Black, Assistant Council Committee Co-ordinator

**DECLARATIONS UNDER MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT**

There was no declaration of pecuniary interest.

**PLANNING PUBLIC MEETING**

Mayor Farbridge announced that in accordance with The Planning Act, Council was now in a public meeting for the purpose of informing the public of various planning matters. She also advised everyone of the current process.

The Manager of Development & Parks Planning advised those present to sign the sign in sheet if they wish to receive further notification of meetings and/or decisions.

### **264, 348, 408, 452 Crawley Road and 385 Maltby Road West**

Mr. A. Hearne, Senior Development Planner provided background information on this application. He stated that the lands are currently designated “Industrial”, “Core Greenlands”, and “Non-Core Greenlands Overlay” and there are “Provincially Significant Wetlands” and “Other Natural Heritage Features” that apply to the site. He also advised the subject lands are presently in the “Urban Reserve” zone, “Conservation Land” zone, “Wetland” zone, and “Specialized Industrial B.2 Holding Zone. He stated that overlays applying to the subject property include the “Lands Adjacent to Provincially Significant Wetlands” overlay and the “Lands with one of the following: Locally Significant Wetlands, Significant Woodlots, Natural Corridor, or Linkage” overlay.

The proposed plan of subdivision will create three large blocks for industrial development, four blocks for the protection of environmental features, one storm water management block, one sanitary pumping station block, roads and two road widening blocks along Crawley Road. The Zoning By-law amendment proposes to include two new Specialized Industrial B.3 Zones on Blocks 1 and 2 permitting mainly manufacturing and warehouse uses and on Block 3 includes a list of uses that are intended to assist in the reuse of the stone heritage house located at 264 Crawley Road. He also advised specialized parking provisions applying to manufacturing and malls are also proposed and the zoning also requests changes to the existing Conservation Land P.1 Zone and Wetland WL Zone boundaries. The proponent has submitted a revised application addressing many of the concerns received on the original application but there are still outstanding issues. He advised that the correspondence attached to the report was in response to the original application.

Mr. Mark Cowie, on behalf of Industrial Equities Guelph Corporation advised they have been investors in Guelph for seven years. The process has gone on for over two years and involved assembling five different properties. The first phase of Southgate has been completed, and they plan environmental stewardship with the next phase and have the intention to develop lands with utmost respect to the City, the environment, neighbours and stakeholders. He believes they have assembled a first class team to deal with the issues and believes they can be dealt with in a sensible and sensitive manner.

Astrid Clos, was present on behalf of the applicant and advised that the consulting team was also present and available to answer questions. She stated that when the properties were annexed in

1993 from the Township of Puslinch, the City was proactive in preparing the lands for future development as employment lands. She outlined the various hydrological and Environmental Impact Studies done in the vicinity. The Township of Puslinch and County of Wellington are on record as supporting these lands as being employment lands and that this was the spirit of the annexation. She advised of various requirements the Ministry of Transportation have in place with respect to the Hanlon Expressway. The original application was filed in 2006, but a number of changes have been made since then to reflect concerns expressed about linkages and environmental issues. She advised that Maltby Road improvements to pave to two lanes will be tied into improvements on Gordon Street with development applications. A list of prohibitive uses will be reviewed and possibly included in the application; as well as addressing berm issues and environmental concerns. Ms. Clos stated that grading would have to be similar to that of industrial sites in the vicinity and the results would actually assist with runoff and more water would go into the ground post-development than pre-development. They recognize they must meet or exceed the current recharge targets. She said there will be three peer reviews completed.

Mr. Bruce McEachern, on behalf of some of the residents of the Township of Puslinch advised they want the development to be done with respect of the environment. He reviewed their concerns as listed in their letter of October 30, 2007. He advised that the groundwater directly affects their properties and they want to ensure the existing groundwater will be maintained. They would like independent reports to prove that results meet or exceed current levels and they wish to have linkages maintained and regenerated. He also requested a traffic study of all of Maltby Road and the Hanlon south of Clair Road. He believes a more thorough long term study is needed. He also raised concerns with respect to noise, light and odour pollution and general site appearance. He advised that the residents are concerned that contaminants from the road such as sand/salt will damage the wetlands along Maltby Road. He feels they have constructive suggestions but had only two weeks to provide them and they have had no time to meet with planning experts. They would like to see a rural/urban interface but want one to point to with pride. Residents want assurance that their concerns are being addressed.

Mr. Paul Rice, a resident of Puslinch was present to address some issues on this application. He advised he was involved during the discussions at the time of annexation. He would like a monitoring program both during and after construction to ensure what is promised actually occurs. The Southgate extension was not advertised in Puslinch and they feel they were given no opportunity for them to provide input. They are concerned that loss of linkage areas is being proposed.

Councillor Dick Visser, Township of Puslinch, representing the ratepayers of Maltby Road in the Township stated that their residents have met with Township Council but will not sign off on the application until the residents' concerns have been addressed. Puslinch wants efficiency but not at the expense of the environment. He also stated they want a good interface between the City and Township.

Charles Cecile on behalf of Guelph Field Naturalists was present to express concerns and does not want to see a private well put in place. He requested that studies be done on the Moraine to ensure development is not done in piecemeal. He would also like to see restrictions in place with respect to pesticides or "salting" of road that could cause contamination. He is concerned about wildlife in woodlot that contains provincially significant species and locally significant species. He advised that although the Environmental Assessment study indicates woodland is now not worthy of protection, it failed to address natural regeneration of trees or seeding, as well as seeing the woodlot as a community of species of ground shrubs and flora as well. He believes the regenerative capacity is high and provides significant ecological function and feels it should be protected and maintained in any future development. He also raised concerns with respect to the Environmental Assessments failing to address the significance of the loss of all the small parcels of wetland combined. He expressed the need for conformity to the Hanlon Creek Watershed Plan and the Official Plan. He also stated that the tree bylaw should be updated to protect the woodlots.

John D. Stirling spoke on behalf of Courtney Alberta Inc./Tim Hortons. He raised concerns with respect to traffic capacity. The Hanlon has two interchanges and there have been intersection improvements at Laird & Clair, but he wants to advise that the construction of these improvements must take place before development takes place. He stated concern that development will use up traffic capacity before the interchanges are completed and will adversely affect their business expansion plans.

Jim Horton, traffic specialist, on behalf of the applicant provided information with respect to the traffic capacity in light of the improvements at Laird & Clair that are due to be completed by the end of November. He advised that the expansions have been taken under consideration with the traffic study.

Dr. Hugh Whiteley, was present to advise that this development has the opportunity to be a template for Moraine protection within development. He believes planning policy documents should be developed before individual applications are addressed. He stated set planning principles should be in place and the City should observe how they can be applied and make necessary changes. He

stated there are inconsistencies in what GRCA best storm water management states compared to what is being proposed. The City needs to clearly identify objectives and compare technologies against those objectives. He advised the issue of surplus water raises as much difficulty as limited or no recharge occurring. So staging elements need to be put into place and the City should proceed by developing moraine specific policy.

Mrs. Laura Murr was present to express concerns regarding the Moraine and submitted the following requests/comments:

- Planning approval of any major project on the moraine areas of Guelph should be given only after a comprehensive moraine-function-protection
- The importance of the moraine areas in Guelph with respect to recharge and wildlife needs to be kept in mind
- The moraine-function-protection policy will be (a) reduction of surplus water from development sites through enhanced evaporation from roofs (b) requirements for matching natural recharge amounts and patterns and (c) provision of continuous corridors in retained natural areas
- Protection of the entire remaining natural heritage features on site
- Enactment of a Tree Preservation By-law as soon as possible

Ms. Murr also read correspondence submitted from Mr. B. Wozniak with respect to the protection of the Moraine and the importance of considering the whole moraine and its protection regardless of the location and the different community groups or residents involved.

Mr. Robert Milburn, an existing business owner for almost 40 years stated that he is concerned with the road closures affecting his business and possible expansion plans. His business is the last property on Crawley Road and when Clair Road gets updated and cut off at the Hanlon and when Laird Road is in place, he will be without any real entrance to service his public customers and doesn't know how his business would remain viable in that situation.

Discussion of this application raised issues with potential runoff contaminants and what prohibitive uses might prevent that from happening. Staff was asked to look at best practices with respect to protection of the moraine and link that to the timing factor of the Moraine Protection Policy and legislation. Staff was also asked to report back with respect to traffic capacity of new and existing businesses. Staff was requested to provide current air photos with a high resolution of the site and surrounding properties to provide councillors with a better context of the development.

1. Moved by Councillor Billings  
Seconded by Councillor Burcher

Mr. J. Riddell THAT Report 07-97 dated November 5, 2007 regarding a Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision and associated Zoning By-law Amendment to allow an Industrial Subdivision applying to property municipally known as 264, 348, 408, 452 Crawley Road and 385 Maltby Road West, City of Guelph, from Community Design and Development Services be received.

IN FAVOUR: Councillors Beard, Bell, Billings, Burcher, Farrelly, Findlay, Hofland, Kovach, Laidlaw, Piper, Salisbury, Wettstein and Mayor Farbridge (13)

AGAINST: None (0)

Carried

### **108 Forest Street**

Ms. M. Castellan, Senior Development Planner provided information on this application. The subject property is located on the south side of Forest Street, approximately 100 meters east of the intersection of Forest Street and Edinburgh Road, approximately one hectare site with an existing building that was formerly a school. The proposed Official Plan Amendment proposes to amend the designation of the eastern portion of the property from General Residential to Mixed Office Residential to permit the re-use of the existing school building for medical and professional offices with maximum gross leasable floor area of 1500 square meters. There is also an addition on top of the existing school building being proposed to accommodate 9 residential apartment units. The Zoning amendment proposes to amend the Zoning from the Institutional Zone to a new Specialized Office Residential and a new Specialized Cluster Townhouse Zone. Two specialized regulations being requested are:

- Maximum front yard (9.4 metres where 7.5 metres is permitted)
- Buffer strips (seeking exemption of requirement only for the buffer to the proposed new specialized R.3A Zone on the same property)

and propose to limit the proposed office space to a maximum floor area of 1500 square metres of which Medical Office would be limited a maximum of 471 square metres with the proposal to remove Personal Service Establishment from the list of permitted uses.

Specialized regulations have been requested for the zoning application which includes:

- Lot frontage (2.24 metres where minimum of 18 metres is required)

- Minimum side yard for windows to habitable rooms (3 metre side yard where 7.5 metres is required)
- Minimum distance between buildings with windows to habitable rooms (3 metres where 15 metres is required)
- Minimum distance between Private Amenity Area and wall of another buildings (3 metres where 6 metres is required) and between Private Amenity Area and wall of another building with windows to habitable rooms (e metres where 12 metres is required)
- Minimum Private Amenity Area (minimum depth and width of 2.5 metres where 4.5 metres is required).

She advised that four facilitation meetings have been held with the public and the applicant and the main issues as articulated through the process are highlighted in Schedule 5 of the planning application report.

Ms. Nancy Shoemaker, Planning Consultant, on behalf of the applicant was present to provide information on this application. She stated that the growth plan emphasizes intensification and maximizing usage of existing infrastructure. She advised there are a number of constraints on this property such as the existing school not being suitable for development; a heritage elm to be preserved presents grading challenges. She stated that the site plan was revised to relocate two townhouse units to protect the elm tree and green space; two units have been shifted around to face Dean Avenue instead of Edinburgh Road due to setbacks. She stated the parking areas are contained within two car garages and driveways and the requirement is only one space. She advised that overnight parking would be utilizing the office parking. It was requested that elevators be provided and this is being accommodated. She stated that the residential aspect of the application is committed to the wet/dry system. She also advised that the grading has been lowered to reduce the height of the stacked townhouse units. Parking for professional office has been reduced to 63 spaces eliminating six spots at back to allow greater setbacks and buffer units between Dean Avenue and parking stalls of commercial development. The parking module has shifted to the west to address the church's concern to allow buffering of the play area. They will also provide a mix of privacy fencing and landscaping on that side of the development. A redesign of residential units has allowed the lowering of roof facades to the east and front façade of the medical building has more windows and planting materials on the ground level. The applicant has also changed the access to the medical buildings to reduce traffic impact. Ms. Shoemaker also stated that a traffic study indicated that this development will not generate any more traffic than the previous school use and is well within limits in the Official Plan and neighbouring zoning. The application also meets city criteria for emergency vehicles and abilities of larger vehicles to enter the site. It was determined that one entrance is sufficient.

Mr. Lloyd Gringham, Architect on behalf of the applicant, advised the school building was constructed in 1964 with an addition in 1991, and the balance of the property is currently playing fields. He stated that retention and reuse of the existing structure is preferable to demolition, and that adding residential usage was viable. He provided details of the square footage and number of residential units that would be a part of the building structure. He stated that privacy issues and living areas and walkout areas have been moved away from 106 Forest Street to accommodate some of the concerns expressed. He advised that there will be internal and external stair/elevator access from the parking structure and arbour pathway. Two of three would face adjacent property but are well removed and fitted with obscured filtered glass. He said the applicant is cognizant of the proximity to neighbouring properties and they are trying to be sensitive to that. He stated that the shadowing effect has been addressed as well. He also stated that although the building can support residential units on the upper floors, they are not suitable for ground level due to privacy issues and access.

Dr. Doug Friars, the owner of the property, advised that this will be a high end condominium development and that he has been looking for a location within a built-in area of the city. He stated that the initial agreement of purchase and sale gave him the opportunity to look at feasibility of being able to open a practice, but extensive consultation and new legislation made it obvious that full commercial use would not be acceptable, and under Places to Grow there needed to be mixed usage on the property. He has been practicing medicine in Guelph for over 21 years and states that with the shortage of physicians, there is a need to provide high end offices.

Tom Kriszan, President and Owner of Thomasfield Homes and a partner in this venture stated this application is exactly what Places to Grow subscribes. No new roads or infrastructure need to be built and public transit is available and the office use of the existing building is most viable. He stated this development would speak volumes about how serious the City is in bringing new doctors to Guelph, and the priority of mixed use of a property and how much neighbours can affect a proposed development.

Mr. Mark Bailey, a local resident, advised that the Places to Grow legislation (PTG) is intended to protect green space, reduce sprawl and increase commerce and this should occur in a sustainable fashion. The CIP states that the key neighbourhood issues are to protect neighbourhood uses while protecting neighbourhood character. The OUNRA (Old University Neighbourhood Residents Association) believes any development should occur within the framework of PTG and the CIP. He stated the focus group meetings have failed because PTG appears to trump the CIP

and the onus remains on staff shoulders to prove how the development meets the CIP. He advised the residents feel the Mixed Use zoning does not suit this property and the compatibility between CIP and PTG targets for intensification do not correspond. He suggested that Forest Street be kept residential but the corner of Edinburgh Road and Municipal Street could be developed commercially because it would be walkable and infrastructure is in place. The OUNRA would prefer six residential homes with lots of trees and up to 21 units and they are willing to compromise on scale but not the manner. He also stated that intensification is acceptable but mixed use would erode the integrity of the community's character and they want this property to be a model infill project. He stated that collaboration among all sectors should be promoted to achieve the vision and the City has the opportunity to create a process and model.

Mr. John Campbell, an area resident, was present to express concerns with this application. He stated the buildings are too high, too close to each other and too close to the abutting properties and the residents don't want offices at all due to traffic issues. He also advised the residents are concerned it will lead to more offices. He stated the consensus of the residents is that the existence of the school is the only reason for the proposed offices which otherwise wouldn't be considered in such a residential area. The neighbourhood is concerned about mixed use development and they think professional offices are automobile friendly and not pedestrian friendly. He also advised the CIP selected Edinburgh Road for commercial development due to its physical proximity. He stated this development would be a poor example of mixed usage of a property and it makes five houses on Forest Street vulnerable.

Sara Lowe, a resident of the area who participated in the facilitated meetings stated that the development proposal is not compatible because most units in the neighbourhood are bungalows built in the 40s and 50s and there are no three storey houses. She said the scale is too large and too much intensification for the neighbourhood and that the extensive parking lot is excessive and there is a serious lack of green space. She advised the school is already 2-3 metres higher than the neighbouring properties and three storeys would not be suitable. She stated there are a number of unacceptable impacts such as: inadequate buffers/transition zones, loss of privacy, too much noise and light from office use, cars, lit signage and building security, drainage issues, snow plowing, garbage disposal and increased traffic concerns. She also advised there are too many unknowns because a site plan has not been completed and the residents would like the development proposal reworked. They advised they would like conditions of approval put in place including: a two-storey maximum, no reduced setbacks, wider buffers, more green space, preservation of

the elm tree, and site plan control to be a public process, She advised the OUNRA would prefer only residential usage on the property.

2. Moved by Councillor Laidlaw  
Seconded by Councillor Burcher

That the procedural by-law be suspended to allow the meeting to continue until midnight.

Carried

Mr. Bruce Ryan, a local resident living in proximity to the entrance of the property stated he is in support of residential intensification but is firmly opposed to this development proposal. He stated he is in support of residential intensification on this property but is opposed to office use. He advised he is concerned about proximity to neighbours of the entrance, and the lighting and said that non-residential uses should be on an arterial road and not on this residential street.

Mr. Unto Kihlanki, lives in the area and is President of TALO Architect company hired by the OUNRA and expressed their concerns regarding the stability of the residential neighbourhood. He advised they wish to keep commercial uses and residential uses separate and would like the focus on the main issue of the idea of adaptive reuse of the school. He would like the City to evaluate why to keep the building – cultural value; or to conserve resources but doesn't want to throw out other planning considerations. He stated the neighbourhood believes this development is an incompatible use with obtrusive massing; blocking more sunlight, providing less privacy, too much lighting, and a need for retaining walls, He stated the process of extreme engineering is just as great an expenditure of resources as demolishing the building would be because they could recycle the steel and other materials. He stated the gain of keeping the existing building would be inexpensive development for proponent but doesn't see what the community would gain. He requested the City ask for new proposal.

Daphne Wainman-Wood, consultant for OUNRA, and architect advised the residents want development to occur in an appropriate manner. They want low-slung, residential character, with green and open nature and salvaging the old elm tree, and the walkability of the neighbourhood maintained. She advised the residents have no attachment to the old school and presented an alternative plan. The conceptual counter proposal includes 21 traditional-type townhouses with the front entrances off the public road or internal road and not the alleyway on the property. She stated a traditional townhouse site, not stacked will not bring privacy issues and would be appealing to a broader range of occupants. She

suggested two styles of units - two-storey units and one-storey units or (loft style 1 ½ storeys). The proposal included six buildings on site with the first building fronting onto Forest Street and situating larger units in centre of block with the setbacks being considerate of neighbours, preserving green space and a storm water management facility which would effectively double the density of the current neighbourhood

Mark Sears, on behalf of Harcourt Memorial United Church addressed two issues. The first was the potential for storm runoff onto their property at 87 Dean Avenue. He stated the developers have produced a plan that includes a catch basin system with back fill in the area to the east of the existing structure to the point drainage will be reversed. He stated the proposed retaining wall would be 1.8 m high and does not want such a high wall. He is opposed to the commercial development and requested further input on details of the site plan to ensure drainage is addressed as well as fences, garage, and appearance of wall, with a request for a 3 metre buffer strip. His second issue dealt with traffic noise, light pollution, litter and potential impact on church activities and the existing pre-school which would be immediately adjacent to the parking area. Increased height of parking area and the constant movement of vehicles will have an impact on church and preschool. He requested that consideration be given to these impacts and to require at least some restrictions in planning the proposed use of the site to alleviate these impacts and hopefully consider a more appropriate use.

Ms. Laura Maxie, owner of property on Edinburgh Road South in the vicinity of the development proposal expressed concern with the potential loss of privacy, and the increase of traffic, and she advised she is supportive of the residents and their objections. She stated she is against the amendment to change the Official Plan because it would set a precedent in the neighbourhood and open the door for other such developments. She would like the City to review the other delegates concerns and offer a reasonable compromise that would support a rejection of this application in its present form and one that would withstand the test of the OMB.

Mr. Peter Gill, a neighbourhood resident for just over 30 years stated appreciation for the focus groups held in the summer to try to create a win-win situation for the residents and developer. He stated he has seen five examples of successful infill on the street and sees this property can do the same thing but not as it is presented. He said the intent of the proposed mixed use makes no sense and design of the proposed structure is totally incompatible with existing neighbourhood. He agreed with previous delegations and would like to see the owner be present on the property, and

stated commercial services on a close by arterial road instead of at the proposed site would be more compatible with the neighbourhood.

3. Moved by Councillor Burcher  
Seconded by Councillor Wettstein

THAT the procedural by-law be suspended to allow the meeting to continue until 12:10 a.m.

Carried

Ann Lotter, a resident of the area agreed with the previous delegations and stated she does not believe the doctors' offices would make it a walkable community as most would be from other neighbourhoods and would drive there. She advised she did not see this proposal as forward looking and doesn't believe there is enough green space, and there are not enough old trees for shade or ability for trees to grow within this proposal.

Elizabeth Snell, a resident from the north end of the city stated she views the proposal as a precedent-setting development. She believes the proposal meets the Places to Grow criteria and sees it as energy efficient, compact and connected. She stated that consultation is a key to meeting the challenge. She suggested that the City involve community input all along the process; use models or simulators – i.e. to show what it would look like after trees grow to help ease fear of the unknown; and, as infill increases, the City should increase the number of skilled facilitators; and allow for feedback for what they liked and didn't like. She also suggested the City investigate other municipalities; that all participants stress flexibility; possibly rent parking spaces to allow for movement and more green spaces or reduce parking allotments. She stated that all parties need to understand the big picture and our role and cooperatively set up a process to avoid the cost of an Ontario Municipal Board hearing. She stated that we will set a precedent under the Places To Grow and hopes it will benefit the community but wants the City to investigate how to improve the process to get there.

Mr. Bruce Monkhouse, a resident, stated more thought is needed and the current process is flawed.

Laura Murr, a city resident, inquired about parkland dedication and wanted to know what was going to happen to air quality as we intensify. She suggested rain gardens for water management. She stated that the City needs to address aspects of the policy and did not think the CIP results were addressed thoroughly. She also stated that the PTG density targets need clarity and policy framework around the Official Plan and Zoning By-law puts the onus on residents but should be on the proponent to prove test of

how they passed. She suggested the proponent come forward with digital imagery and simulations on this site with respect to site plan, and footprint. She also wanted clarification of interior site versus arterial site and what is considered to be mixed use. She suggested staff consider what the most appropriate use of the site would be if it were vacant.

Councillor Burcher made several requests of staff to address with respect to this application including:

- That staff document the Old University-Centennial Neighbourhood Community Improvement Plan results and their influence on and implications for the planning and design of this project. That staff communicate the link between the policy framework of the CIP, the link between the CIP and other policies including "Places toGrow" and the implementation of these in the development of the site.
- That staff clarify our policy framework with respect to "Places to Grow" intensification targets for infill outside of the downtown. (Our Growth Management policy framework is looking at 50 jobs and people per hectare through its current process while the applicant is indicating that we should be looking at a mid-point between 50 and 150).
- Request the applicant be asked to demonstrate proactively how the proposed development meets the policy tests of both an Official Plan amendment and zone changes and have the staff report and recommendations communicate this as well. (To date, the onus has been placed on residents to demonstrate why the proposal is not meeting the policy framework and "tests" for OP and zone changes.
- That staff render an opinion on whether this site is considered to be an "interior" site, ie interior to the arterial road network and, therefore, not appropriate for commercial development. Other policy documents indicate that is considered interior and therefore would not be appropriate for commercial development.)
- That the applicant be required to provide digital imagery/simulations of the proposal with a clear indication of the surrounding context and adjacent properties. The documentation presented to council indicates only the proposal on the site with no reference to adjacent properties or surrounding context. This should include 3 dimensional massing imagery, elevations and sections. (This material was requested several times throughout the facilitation process.)
- That the shadow studies prepared by the applicant and submitted tot he planning department be made available to Council and the public.

- That staff provide a definition of "mixed use" development as it relates to the "Places to Grow" policy and how this should support local use and encourage greater community walkability.

4. Moved by Councillor Billings  
 Seconded by Councillor Kovach

Mr. J. Riddell

THAT Report 07-96 dated November 5, 2007 regarding an Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment for property municipally known as 108 Forest Street from Community Design and Development Services be received.

IN FAVOUR: Councillors Beard, Bell, Billings, Burcher, Farrelly, Findlay, Hofland, Kovach, Laidlaw, Piper, Salisbury, Wettstein and Mayor Farbridge (13)  
 AGAINST: None (0)

Carried

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 o'clock a.m.

.....  
 Mayor

.....  
 Deputy Clerk