City Council - Planning Meeting Agenda



Monday, September 14, 2020, 6:30 p.m. Remote meeting live streamed on guelph.ca/live

Changes to the original agenda are noted with an asterisk "*".

To contain the spread of COVID-19, City Council meetings are being held electronically and can be live streamed at <u>guelph.ca/live.</u>

For alternate meeting formats, please contact the City Clerk's Office at <u>clerks@guelph.ca</u> or 519-822-1260 extension 5603.

Pages

1. Notice - Electronic Participation

1.1 City Council

This meeting will be held by Electronic Participation in accordance with the City of Guelph Procedural By-law (2020)-20515.

- 2. Call to Order
- 3. Open Meeting
 - 3.1 O Canada
 - 3.2 Silent Reflection
 - 3.3 First Nations Acknowledgement
 - 3.4 Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest and General Nature Thereof
- 4. Public Meeting to Hear Applications Under Sections 17, 34 and 51 of The Planning Act

(delegations permitted a maximum of 10 minutes)

4.1 Statutory Public Meeting Report 1159 Victoria Road South Proposed Red-line Amendment to an Approved Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment File: OZS20-007 and 23T-07506 Ward 6 - 2020-123

Staff Presentation:

Lindsay Sulatycki, Senior Development Planner

Recommendation:

- 1. That report IDE-2020-123 regarding a proposed red-line amendment to an approved Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment application submitted by IBI Group on behalf of Victoria Park Village Inc. to permit an additional two (2) residential lots on lands municipally known as 1159 Victoria Road South, and legally described as Part of Lot 5, Concession 8 (Geographic Township of Puslinch), City of Guelph from Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise dated September 14, 2020, be received.
- 4.2 Statutory Public Meeting Report 120 Huron Street Proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment File: OZS20-005 Ward 1 - 2020-117

Staff Presentation:

Katie Nasswetter, Senior Development Planner

Delegation:

Jody Larson

Correspondence:

Jody Larson

Recommendation:

 That report 2020-117 regarding proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications (File OZS20-005) by GSP Group Inc., on behalf of the owner, Alice Block Inc., to permit a fifth storey and an additional 30 apartment units on the lands municipally known as 120 Huron Street and legally described as Parts 3 and 6 on Plan 61R-21616 and part of the lands legally described as: Plan 61R4274, except Parts 4 & 5 61R21616 City of Guelph; and being part of PIN 71341-0195 (LT), City of Guelph, from Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise dated September 14, 2020, be received. 19

4.3 Statutory Public Meeting Report 1242-1260 Gordon Street and 9 Valley Road Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments File: OZS20-004 and 23T-20001 Ward 6 - 2020-124

Staff Presentation:

Lindsay Sulatycki, Senior Development Planner

Delegations:

Astrid Clos, Astrid J. Clos Planning Consultants, agent on behalf of the applicant Claudia Espindola Bruce Wilson Tony Campagnolo Lisa Haines Tamara Baggio Adam Carapella, Tricar JP Thornton, Kasian Architecture Ontario Incorporated Daniel Eusebi, Stantec

Correspondence:

Maria Lammers Walter Urban Derya Salter Bruce Wilson Tony and Tiziana Campagnolo Anne H. Michelle McDonald Judy Pavlis Anne Marie and Chris Doyle Tamara Baggio Valerie Gilmor Claudia Espindola George and Carolyn Annette Susan Watson

Recommendation:

 That report 2020-124 regarding proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications submitted by Astrid J. Clos Planning Consultants on behalf of Tricar Properties Limited for a Draft Plan of Subdivision containing a residential block with two, 12-storey apartment buildings with a total of 377 apartment units, a municipal park block and an open space block on lands municipally known as 1242-1260 Gordon Street and 9 Valley Road, and legally described as Part of Lot 6, Concession 8 (Geographic Township of Puslinch) and Lot 15, Registered Plan 488, City of Guelph from Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise dated September 14, 2020, be received.

5. By-laws

Resolution to adopt the By-laws (Councillor Hofland).

6. Mayor's Announcements

Please provide any announcements, to the Mayor in writing, by 12 noon on the day of the Council meeting.

7. Adjournment

Staff Report



То	City Council
Service Area	Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise Services
Date	Monday, September 14, 2020
Subject	Statutory Public Meeting Report 1159 Victoria Road South Proposed Red-line Amendment to an approved Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment File: OZS20-007 and 23T-07506 Ward 6

Recommendation

 That report IDE-2020-123 regarding a proposed red-line amendment to an approved Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment application submitted by IBI Group on behalf of Victoria Park Village Inc. to permit an additional two (2) residential lots on lands municipally known as 1159 Victoria Road South, and legally described as Part of Lot 5, Concession 8 (Geographic Township of Puslinch), City of Guelph from Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise dated September 14, 2020, be received.

Executive Summary

Purpose of Report

To provide planning information on a red-line amendment to an approved Draft Plan of Subdivision and associated Zoning By-law Amendment application for the lands municipally known as 1159 Victoria Road South to permit an additional two (2) residential lots on an approved draft plan. This report has been prepared in conjunction with the Statutory Public Meeting for these applications.

Key Findings

Key findings will be reported in the future Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise recommendation report to Council.

Financial Implications

Financial implications will be reported in the future Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise recommendation report to Council.

Report

Background

Applications for a red-line amendment to an approved Draft Plan of Subdivision and an associated Zoning By-law Amendment have been received for the lands municipally known as 1159 Victoria Road South from IBI Group on behalf of Victoria Park Village Inc. The applications were received by the City on June 1, 2020 and deemed to be complete on July 22, 2020.

The proposed two additional lots are within an approved draft plan of subdivision located on the west side of Victoria Road South, between MacAlister Boulevard and Arkell Road. The approved draft plan of subdivision is included in Attachment 7. The subject lands were formally known as the Victoria West Golf Course lands and the whole subdivision development is referred to as Victoria Park Village (VPV). The subject lands have a total area of 39.3 hectares.

The subject draft plan originally received draft plan approval on January 14, 2011 and the related Zoning By-law Amendment was approved on February 28, 2011. The original draft approved plan of subdivision proposed a total of 489 dwelling units.

Since the original draft plan approval, the owner requested red-lined revisions with an associated Zoning By-law Amendment to the approved draft plan of subdivision. These previous applications were appealed to the former Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) and subsequently approved by the OMB in November 2013 through a settlement between the City and appellant.

The owner requested a three (3) year extension in 2016 to draft plan approval, which was approved by Council on September 12, 2016. A second request for a three (3) year extension to November 22, 2022 was approved by Council on October 16, 2019.

Phase 1A of the subdivision was registered as 61M-217 on June 19, 2017 and included an open space block, stormwater management block and a block zoned for townhouses, which is now developed with 98 townhouse units.

Location

The area subject to the current applications is located within the approved draft plan of subdivision (see Attachment 1 - Location Map and Attachment 2 – Aerial Photograph). Surrounding land uses for the approved plan of subdivision include:

To the north: a residential subdivision;

To the south: lands zoned for agricultural uses under the Township of Puslinch Zoning By-law and designated in the City of Guelph Official Plan for residential purposes;

To the east: Victoria Road South, beyond which are lands located within the Township of Puslinch and presently used for agricultural and residential purposes; and,

To the west: Provincially Significant Wetland.

Existing Official Plan Land Use Designations and Policies

The lands subject to these applications are designated as "Low Density Greenfield Residential" in the Official Plan which permits low density residential housing including single detached dwellings. The larger subdivision is designated as "Low Density Greenfield Residential" and "Significant Natural Areas and Natural Areas".

The relevant policies for the applicable land use designations are included in Attachment 3.

Existing Zoning

The lands subject to this Zoning By-law Amendment are currently zoned "Conservation Land" (P.1) according to Zoning By-law (1995)-14864, as amended.

The existing zoning can be found in Attachment 4.

Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment

The purpose of the Zoning By-law Amendment application is to change the zoning from the "Conservation Land" (P.1) Zone to a "Specialized Residential Single Detached" (R.1C-xx) Zone to permit two (2) additional residential lots on an approved draft plan.

The applicant is requesting a "Specialized Residential Single Detached" (R.1C-26) Zone for these two additional lots to match the zoning for the adjacent lots within the draft plan. In addition to the regulations set out in Table 5.1.2 – for the "Residential Single Detached" (R.1C) Zone of Zoning By-law (1995)-14864, as amended, the following specialized regulations have been requested to facilitate this proposal:

- To permit a minimum lot area of 360 square metres, whereas 370 square metres is required;
- To require a minimum front yard of 6 metres to an attached garage and 4.5 metres in all other cases, whereas a minimum front yard of 6 metres is required; and,
- To require a minimum side yard of 1.2 metres on one side and 0.6 metres on the other side, whereas a side yard setback of 1.2 metres is required for both side yards.

Proposed Red-line to the approved Draft Plan of Subdivision

The applicant is requesting to red-line Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-07506 to permit an additional two (2) residential lots. No changes are proposed to the road pattern or lot layout of the remainder of the subdivision.

The applicant is requesting the Zoning By-law Amendment to reflect and implement the proposed modifications to the draft plan of subdivision.

The area subject to the proposed amendments is shown in Attachment 6.

Supporting Documents

The following information was submitted in support of the application and can be found on the City's website under 'Current Development Applications':

- Planning Justification Report, prepared IBI Group, dated April 2020;
- Red-lined Draft Plan, prepared by J.D. Barnes Surveying;

- Scoped Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Natural Resource Solutions Inc., dated April 2020;
- Landscape Plan, prepared by Adesso Design Inc., dated May 2020; and,
- Servicing Brief, prepared by Urbantech, dated December 2019.

Staff Review

The review of these applications will address the following:

- Evaluation of the proposal for conformity and consistency with Provincial policy and legislation, including subdivision control review criteria in the Planning Act, the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement and A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe;
- Evaluation of the proposal's conformity with the Official Plan;
- Review of the proposed zoning, including the need for any specialized zoning regulations;
- Review of the proposal's land use compatibility with adjacent and established land uses;
- Review of site servicing and grading;
- Review how the proposed development addresses applicable sections of the Community Energy Initiative update;
- Review of supporting documents submitted in support of the applications; and,
- Address all comments and issues raised during the review of the application.

Once the applications are reviewed and all issues are addressed, a report from Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise with a recommendation will be considered at a future meeting of Council.

Financial Implications

Financial implications will be reported in the future staff recommendation report to Council.

Consultations

A combined Notice of Complete Application and Public Meeting was mailed August 6, 2020 to local boards and agencies, City service areas and property owners within 120 metres of the subject lands. The Notice of Public Meeting was also advertised in the Guelph Tribune on August 20, 2020. Notice of the applications has also been provided by signage on the subject lands and all supporting documents submitted with the applications have been posted on the City's website.

Strategic Plan Alignment

Priority

Building our future.

Direction(s)

- Continue to build strong, vibrant, safe and healthy communities that foster resilience in the people who live here
- Help increase the availability of housing that meets community needs

Alignment

This will be reported in the future Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise recommendation report to Council.

Attachments

Attachment 1 – Location Map and 120m Circulation

Attachment 2 – Aerial Photograph

Attachment 3 – Existing Official Plan Land Use Designations and Policies

Attachment 4 – Existing Zoning

Attachment 5 – Proposed Zoning

Attachment 6 – Area Subject to Proposed Red-line Amendment – Proposed Lots 16 and 17

Attachment 7 – Proposed Red-line to Approved Draft Plan of Subdivision

Attachment 8 – Public Meeting Presentation

Departmental Approval

Not applicable.

Report Author

Lindsay Sulatycki, MCIP, RPP, Senior Development Planner

This report was approved by:

Chris DeVriendt, MCIP, RPP, Manager of Development Planning

This report was approved by:

Krista Walkey, MCIP, RPP General Manager, Planning and Building Services Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise Services 519-822-1260 extension 2395 krista.walkey@guelph.ca

This report was recommended by:

Kealy Dedman, P. Eng., MPA Deputy Chief Administrative Officer Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise Services 519-822-1260 extension 2248 kealy.dedman@guelph.ca



Attachment 1 – Location Map and 120m Circulation

Attachment 2 – Aerial Photograph



Attachment 3 – Existing Official Plan Land Use Designations and Policies



Existing Official Plan Land Use Designations and Policies (continued)

9.3.3 Low Density Greenfield Residential

This designation applies to residential areas within the greenfield area of the city. The greenfield area is planned to achieve an overall minimum density target of 50 persons and jobs per hectare.

Permitted Uses

1. The following uses may be permitted subject to the applicable provisions of this Plan:

- i) detached, semi-detached and duplex dwellings; and
- ii) multiple unit residential buildings, such as townhouses and apartments.



Attachment 4 – Existing Zoning



Attachment 5 – Proposed Zoning



Attachment 6 – Area Subject to Proposed Red-line Amendment – Proposed Lots 16 and 17

Attachment 7 – Proposed Red-line to Approved Draft Plan of Subdivision





1159 Victoria Road South

Statutory Public Meeting for Proposed Redline Amendment to An approved Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment

File: OZS20-007 and 23T-07506

September 14, 2020

Page 14 of 108¹

Location



Page 15 of 108²

Official Plan Land Use Designations



Zoning

Current Zoning: P.1 (Conservation Land) Proposed Zoning: R.1C-?? (Specialized Residential Single Detached)



Proposed Red-line to Approved Draft Plan of Subdivision



Page 18 of 108⁵

Staff Report



- To	City Council
То	City Council
Service Area	Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise Services
Date	Monday, September 14, 2020
Subject	Statutory Public Meeting Report 120 Huron Street Proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment File: OZS20-005 Ward 1

Recommendation

 That report 2020-117 regarding proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications (File OZS20-005) by GSP Group Inc., on behalf of the owner, Alice Block Inc., to permit a fifth storey and an additional 30 apartment units on the lands municipally known as 120 Huron Street and legally described as Parts 3 and 6 on Plan 61R-21616 and part of the lands legally described as: Plan 61R4274, except Parts 4 & 5 61R21616 City of Guelph; and being part of PIN 71341-0195 (LT), City of Guelph, from Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise dated September 14, 2020, be received.

Executive Summary

Purpose of Report

To provide planning information on Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications submitted for the lands municipally known as 120 Huron Street to permit a fifth storey containing 30 additional apartment units proposed to be affordable and supportive. This report has been prepared in conjunction with the Statutory Public Meeting for the applications.

Key Findings

Key findings will be reported in the future Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise recommendation report to Council.

Financial Implications

Financial implications will be reported in the future staff recommendation report to Council.

Page 1 of 5

Report

Background

Applications for an Official Plan Amendment and a Zoning By-law amendment have been received for the property municipally known as 120 Huron Street from GSP Group Inc. on behalf of the property owner, Alice Block Inc. The applications were received by the City on June 30, 2020 and were deemed to be complete on July 29, 2020.

The site is part of a recent rezoning application (ZC1709) approved on January 28 2019 for 120 – 122 Huron Street (By-law (2019)-20362) to permit the reuse of the existing four storey industrial building at 120 Huron for an 87 unit residential apartment building, with the remainder of the previous industrial site (122 Huron Street) rezoned to permit the development of 59 townhouse units.

Location

The subject site is approximately 0.88 hectares in size and located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Huron Street and Alice Street (see ATT-1 and ATT-2 for Location Map and Orthophoto). The site currently contains a vacant four storey former industrial building. Surrounding land uses include:

- To the north, across Alice Street, a variety of single and semi-detached dwellings;
- To the east, a spur line that connects to the Guelph Junction Railway;
- To the south of the site is currently vacant and planned to be developed shortly as 59 cluster townhouse units;
- To the west, there are two small scale apartment buildings, and a variety of single detached dwellings;
- To the northwest, on the opposite corner of the intersection, is Sacred Heart Catholic Church.

Existing Official Plan Land Use Designations and Policies

The Official Plan land use designation that applies to the subject property is "Mixed Office/Commercial". The Mixed Office/Commercial designation is intended to accommodate a variety of freestanding small-scale commercial, office, residential or mixed use buildings; with residential uses permitted with a maximum density of 100 units per hectare. Further details of this designation are included in Attachment 3.

Proposed Official Plan Amendment

The applicant is proposing a site specific Official Plan Amendment to permit a maximum height of five (5) storeys and a maximum net density of 133 units per hectare.

Existing Zoning

The subject site is currently zoned R.4A-53, a specialized General Apartment Zone. It was rezoned to this zone as noted above in 2019 for the previously proposed 87 unit development in the existing four storey building. The existing zoning is shown in Attachment 4.

Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment

The purpose of the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment is to change the zoning from the current R.4A-53 (Specialized General Apartment Zone) to a Specialized High Density Apartment Zone (R.4B-??) to permit the addition of a fifth storey containing 30 additional apartment units. Existing specialized regulations in the R.4A-53 Zone are proposed to be carried over into this zone. New specialized regulations are required for reductions in common amenity area, landscaped open space and parking. See Attachment 5 for more details of the proposed regulations.

Proposed Development

The applicant has proposed to continue to develop the existing four storey industrial building into an 87 unit apartment building, while adding a fifth storey containing an additional 30 apartment units that are intended to be affordable and containing supportive amenities for the residents.

The proposed site concept plan is shown in Attachment 6.

Supporting Documents

The following information was submitted in support of the applications:

- Planning Justification Report, prepared by GSP Group Inc., dated June 30, 2020, revision 1, July 21, 2020;
- Urban Design Report Update, prepared by GSP Group Inc., dated June 30, 2020;
- Conceptual Site Plan, Building Elevations, Floor Plan and 3D Building Drawings, prepared by Grinham Architects, dated June 2020;
- Affordable Housing Report, prepared by Tim Welch Consulting Inc., dated June 30, 2020;
- Community Energy Initiative Letter, prepared by Alice Block Inc., dated June 30, 2020;
- Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment Update, prepared by CHC Limited, dated June 12, 2020;
- Transportation Study Update, prepared by Paradigm Transportation Solutions Ltd., dated June 2020;
- Servicing Capacity Assessment Letter, prepared by GM BluePlan, dated June 17, 2020;
- Noise Impact Study, Addendum Letter, prepared by GHD, dated July 21, 2020.

Staff Review

The review of these applications will address the following issues:

- Evaluation of the proposal for conformity and consistency with Provincial policy and legislation, the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement and A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe;
- Evaluation of the proposal's conformity with the Official Plan;
- Review of the proposed zoning, including the need for specialized regulations;
- Review of the proposal's land use compatibility with adjacent and established land uses;
- Review of the proposed site layout, built form, parking, and pedestrian connections;
- Review of site servicing;
- Review how the proposed development addresses applicable sections of the Community Energy Initiative update, and

• Address all comments and issues raised during the review of the applications.

Once the applications are reviewed and all issues are addressed, a report from Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise with a recommendation will be considered at a future meeting of Council.

Financial Implications

Financial implications will be reported in the future staff recommendation report to Council.

Consultations

The Notice of Complete Application and Public Meeting was mailed August 13, 2020 to local boards and agencies, City service areas and property owners within 120 metres of the subject lands. The Notice of Public Meeting was also advertised in the Guelph Mercury Tribune on August 20, 2020. Notice of the applications have also been provided by signage on the property, which was installed on August 14, 2020. All supporting documents and drawings received with the applications have been posted on the City's website.

Strategic Plan Alignment

Priority

Sustaining our future

Direction

Plan and Design an increasingly sustainable City as Guelph grows.

Alignment

The review of these development applications will include an assessment of its conformity with the policies of the City's Official Plan, which is the City's key document for guiding future land use and development. The Official Plan's vision is to plan and design an increasingly sustainable city as Guelph grows.

Priority

Working together for our future

Direction

Improve how the City communicates with residents and delivers services.

Alignment

The Public Meeting being held on the proposed development applications provides the opportunity for City Council, residents and community groups to learn more, ask questions and provide comments on the proposed development.

Attachments

Attachment 1 Location Map and 120 m Circulation

Attachment 2 Aerial Photograph

Attachment 3 Official Plan Land Use Designation and Policies

Attachment 4 Existing Zoning

Attachment 5 Proposed Zoning and Details Attachment 6 Proposed Site Concept Plan and Building Elevation

Departmental Approval

Not applicable

Report Authors

Katie Nasswetter, MCIP, RPP, Senior Development Planner

This report was approved by:

Chris DeVriendt, MCIP, RPP, Manager of Development Planning

This report was recommended by:

Krista Walkey, MCIP, RPP General Manager, Planning and Building Services Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise Services 519-837-5615, extension 2395 krista.walkey@guelph.ca

This report was recommended by:

Kealy Dedman, P. Eng., MPA Deputy Chief Administrative Officer Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise Services 519-837-5615, extension 2395 kealy.dedman@guelph.ca

Attachment-1 Location Map



Attachment-2 Aerial Photograph





Attachment-3 Official Plan Land Use Designation and Policies

Attachment-3 continued: Official Plan Land Use Designation and Policies

9.4.6 Mixed Office/Commercial

Objectives

- a) To allow for a variety of freestanding small-scale commercial, office, residential or mixed-use buildings.
- b) To ensure that a *compatible* transition in built-form is provided between uses in this designation and surrounding residential properties.
- c) To allow for a range of *compatible* business uses adjacent to residential areas.
- d) To promote the continued use, revitalization and *intensification* of these areas for a mix of uses.

Policies

- 1. The Mixed Office/Commercial designation as identified on Schedule 2 defines areas where a variety of small-scale commercial, office and mixed-uses including residential may be permitted.
- 2. While a variety of commercial uses may be permitted by the Mixed Office/Commercial designation, office, *convenience commercial*, *retail commercial* and personal service uses that serve the needs of the surrounding neighbourhoods are specifically promoted.
- 3. Commercial buildings incorporating *residential units*, either above or behind the ground floor commercial space or freestanding residential buildings are encouraged.
- 4. The Mixed/Office Commercial designation located peripheral to Downtown includes a variety of small-scale commercial and office operations or mixed commercial-residential uses. This Plan promotes the continued use and revitalization of these distinctive areas.
- 5. New commercial, office or mixed-use *development* within the Mixed Office/Commercial designation will be subject to the following criteria:
 - i) building design should have a street orientation, promote continuity in the streetscape and adhere to the Urban Design policies of this Plan;
 - ii) building, property and ancillary structures are designed to be *compatible* with surrounding properties in terms of form, massing, appearance and orientation;

- iii) adequate parking, loading and access are provided; and
- iv) adequate municipal services are provided.

Permitted Uses

- 6. The following uses may be permitted within the Mixed Office/Commercial designation subject to the applicable provisions of this Plan:
 - i) *convenience commercial* and small-scale *retail commercial*;
 - ii) small-scale office;
 - iii) personal service; and
 - iv) detached, semi-detached, townhouses and apartments.

Height and Density

- 7. The maximum height is four (4) storeys.
- 8. Residential *development* may be permitted to a maximum *net density* of 100 units per hectare.
- 9. Increased height and density may be permitted in accordance with the Height and Density Bonus policies of this Plan.

Page 29 of 108

Page 30 of 108



Attachment-4 Existing Zoning

Attachment-4 continued Existing Zoning Regulations

5.4.3.1.53 R.4A-53 120 & 122 Huron Street As shown on Defined Area Map Number 46 of Schedule "A" of this Bylaw. 5.4.3.1.53.1 Permitted Uses In accordance with the Uses permitted by Section 5.4.1.1 of By-law Number (1995)-14864, as amended. 5.4.3.1.53.2 Regulations In accordance with Section 4 and Section 5.4.2 of the By-law, with the following exceptions: 5.4.3.1.53.2.1 Minimum Exterior Side Yard Despite Section 4.24 and Table 5.4.2, Row 6, the minimum Exterior Side Yard on Alice Street shall be 2.0 metres. 5.4.3.1.53.2.2 Off-Street Parking Despite 4.13 and Table 5.4.2 Row 14, parking shall be permitted to be located a minimum of 0.6 metres from the Exterior Side Lot Line (Alice Street) and 0 metres from the rear and interior side lot lines. 5.4.3.1.53.2.3 Common Amenity Area 5.4.3.1.53.2.3.1 Despite Section 5.4.2.4 and Table 5.4.2, Row 12, the minimum Common Amenity Area shall be 1470 square metres. 5.4.3.1.53.2.3.2 Despite Section 5.4.2.4 and Table 5.4.2, Common Amenity Area shall be permitted in the Front Yard. 5.4.3.1.53.2.4 Buffer Strip Despite Table 5.4.2, Row 15, a Buffer Strip will not be required along the Interior Side Lot Line. 5.4.3.1.53.2.5 Angular Plane Despite Section 4.16.2, the Angular Plane from the Street shall be 66 degrees from Alice Street.
Attachment-5 Proposed Zoning



Attachment-5 continued Proposed Zoning Regulations

Proposed specialized regulations retained from the current R.4A-53 Zone, requested to be included in the proposed R.4B-?? Zone:

5.4.3.1.53.2.1	Minimum <i>Exterior Side Yard</i>
	Despite Section 4.24 and Table 5.4.2, Row 6, the minimum Exterior Side
	Yard on Alice Street shall be 2.0 metres.
5.4.3.1.53.2.2	Off-Street Parking
	Despite 4.13 and Table 5.4.2 Row 14, parking shall be permitted to be
	located a minimum of 0.6 metres from the <i>Exterior Side Lot Line</i> (Alice
	Street) and 0 metres from the rear and interior side lot lines.
5.4.3.1.53.2.3	Common Amenity Area
5.4.3.1.53.2.3.2	Despite Section 5.4.2.4 and Table 5.4.2, Common Amenity Area shall be
	permitted in the Front Yard.
5.4.3.1.53.2.4	Buffer Strip
	Despite Table 5.4.2, Row 15, a Buffer Strip will not be required along the
	Interior Side Lot Line.
5.4.3.1.53.2.5	Angular Plane
	Despite Section 4.16.2, the Angular Plane from the Street shall be 66
	degrees from Alice Street.

Proposed new, additional specialized regulations for the proposed R.4B-?? High Density Apartment Zone:

Common Amenity Area

Despite Section 5.4.2.4 and Table 5.4.2, Row 12, the minimum Common Amenity Area shall be 1,600 square metres.

Despite Section 5.4.2.4.2, amenity areas shall be allowed to have a length that exceeds 4 times the width.

Landscaped Open Space

Despite Section 5.4.2.4 and Table 5.4.2, Row 13, the minimum Landscaped Open Space shall be 39% of lot area.

Off-Street Parking

Despite 4.13.4.3 the required off-street vehicle parking required will be 0.97 spaces per unit (114 spaces) with 4% visitor parking (5 spaces).





Attachment-6 continued: Proposed Building

Raised oblique view of the proposed building from the northwest:



View of proposed building from the west:





120 Huron Street:

Statutory Public Meeting for Proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments

September 14, 2020

Page 37 of 108¹

Site Context



Official Plan

Current OP Designation:

 Mixed Office/Commercial

Proposed OP Amendment:

 A site specific policy to permit 5 storeys and a density of 133 units per hectare



Zoning

Current Zoning:

R.4A-53

 (Specialized
 General
 Apartment)

Proposed Zoning:

 R.4B-?? (Specialized High Density Apartment)



Requested Specialized Zoning Regulations

- Request to carry over existing specialized regulations in the R.4A-53 Zone
 - Exterior side yard, parking location, common amenity location, buffer strip and angular plane (see Att 5 of report)
- New specialized regulations request for
 - A minimum of 1600 square metres of Common Amenity Area, permitted to have a length more than 4 times the width
 - A minimum of 39% of the site be Landscaped Open Space
 - That parking be permitted at 0.97 spaces per unit (114 spaces total) with 4% visitor parking (5 spaces).

Proposed Development



Page 42 of 108⁶

Statutory Public Meeting Report 120 Huron Street Proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment File: OZS20-005 Ward 1 - 2020-117

General Correspondence

I wish to be able to join the meeting on September 14.

I wish to be notified of the council decision on this application by way of email.

I wish to object to the building of a 5th floor. I am pleased this property is being developed but we do not want 30-60 extra cars on the narrow streets of that area. Alice, Oliver, Manitoba, Ontario Streets are already bearing too much traffic. Given the townhouses and the 87 proposed units that is enough. As you know those streets cannot be widened. Drivers will use them because they are the most direct route to the west. I hope council will keep this in mind when making its decision.

Jody Larsen

Staff Report



То	City Council
Service Area	Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise Services
Date	Monday, September 14, 2020
Subject	Statutory Public Meeting Report 1242-1260 Gordon Street and 9 Valley Road Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments File: OZS20-004 and 23T-20001 Ward 6

Recommendation

 That report 2020-124 regarding proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications submitted by Astrid J. Clos Planning Consultants on behalf of Tricar Properties Limited for a Draft Plan of Subdivision containing a residential block with two, 12-storey apartment buildings with a total of 377 apartment units, a municipal park block and an open space block on lands municipally known as 1242-1260 Gordon Street and 9 Valley Road, and legally described as Part of Lot 6, Concession 8 (Geographic Township of Puslinch) and Lot 15, Registered Plan 488, City of Guelph from Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise dated September 14, 2020, be received

Executive Summary

Purpose of Report

To provide planning information on Draft Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications for the lands municipally known as 1242-1260 Gordon Street and 9 Valley Road to permit a residential subdivision containing a residential block with two, 12-storey apartment buildings with a total of 377 apartment units, a municipal park block and an open space block. This report has been prepared in conjunction with the Statutory Public Meeting for these applications.

Key Findings

Key findings will be reported in the future Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise recommendation report to Council.

Financial Implications

Financial implications will be reported in the future Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise recommendation report to Council.

Page 1 of 7

Report

Background

Applications for a Draft Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment have been received for the lands municipally known as 1242-1260 Gordon Street and 9 Valley Road from Astrid J. Clos Planning Consultants on behalf of Tricar Properties Limited. The applications were received by the City on June 1, 2020 and deemed to be complete on June 30, 2020.

Location

The subject lands are comprised of four residential properties municipally known as 1242, 1250, 1260 Gordon Street and 9 Valley Road. The subject lands are currently located on the east side of the Gordon Street/Edinburgh Road South intersection and south of Valley Road (see Attachment 1 - Location Map and Attachment 2 – Aerial Photograph). The lands are approximately 3.12 hectares in size with approximately 27 metres of frontage along Valley Road and 121 metres of frontage along Gordon Street. The existing residential dwellings on the subject lands have been or will be demolished. Portions of the subject lands also contain features of the City's natural heritage system.

Surrounding land uses include:

- To the north: single detached residential dwelling and a vacant land condominium development, beyond which is Valley Road;
- To the south: five storey apartment buildings;
- To the east: Torrance Creek Wetland; and,
- To the west: Gordon Street, beyond which is a five storey apartment building at the north-west corner of the intersection of Gordon Street and Edinburgh Road South.

Existing Official Plan Land Use Designations and Policies

The Official Plan land use designation that applies to 9 Valley Road is "Low Density Residential". 1242-1260 Gordon Street is designated as "High Density Residential" and "Significant Natural Areas and Natural Areas" in the Official Plan. The "Low Density Residential" land use designation permits residential uses including single and semi-detached dwellings and multiple unit residential buildings, such as townhouses and apartments. Permissible uses within the "High Density Residential" land use designation include multiple unit residential buildings generally in the form of apartments. The minimum height within this designation is three (3) storeys and the maximum height is ten (10) storeys. This designation allows for a maximum net density of 150 units per hectare and requires a minimum net density of 100 units per hectare.

Development is not permitted within areas designated as "Significant Natural Areas and Natural Areas". The applicant has prepared an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) to address development adjacent to the natural heritage system and to recommend appropriate setbacks (buffers) to demonstrate that there will be no negative impacts to the protected natural heritage features and areas or their associated ecological functions.

The relevant policies for the applicable land use designations are included in Attachment 3.

Existing Zoning

The subject lands are currently zoned "Residential Single Detached" (R.1B), with a "Lands adjacent to provincially significant wetlands" overlay and a "Lands with locally significant wetlands, significant woodlots, natural corridor or linkage" overlay according to Zoning By-law (1995)-14864, as amended.

Details of the existing zoning are provided in Attachment 5.

Proposed Official Plan Amendment

The purpose of the Official Plan Amendment is to redesignate the portion of the property designated as "Low Density Residential" and a portion of the property designated as "High Density Residential" to the "Open Space and Park" land use designation. The applicant is also requesting to add site specific Official Plan policies that would allow a maximum height of 12 storeys and a maximum density of 271 units per hectare. The "High Density Residential" land use designation permits a maximum height of 10 storeys and a maximum net density of 150 units per hectare. The limit between the "High Density Residential" and "Significant Natural Areas and Natural Areas" designations are proposed to be refined by the Environmental Impact Study which was submitted in support of the applications. This refinement does not require an Official Plan Amendment in accordance with Policy 4.1.1.17 of the Official Plan.

Further details of the proposed Official Plan Amendment are included in Attachment 4.

Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment

The purpose of the Zoning By-law Amendment application is to change the zoning from the "Residential Single Detached" (R.1B) Zone to a "Specialized High Density Apartment" (R.4B-?) Zone, a "Conservation Land" (P.1) Zone and a "Neighbourhood Park" (P.2) Zone to implement the proposed draft plan of subdivision.

In addition to the regulations set out in Table 5.4.2 – for the "High Density Apartment" (R.4B) Zone of Zoning By-law (1995)-14864, as amended, the following specialized regulations have been requested to facilitate this proposal:

- To permit a maximum density of 271 units per hectare, whereas a maximum of 150 units per hectare is permitted;
- To permit a minimum front yard setback of 0.8 metres, whereas a minimum front yard setback of 6 metres is required;
- To permit a minimum exterior side yard setback of 1.2 metres, whereas a minimum exterior side yard setback of 6 metres is required;
- To permit a minimum side yard setback of 2.4 metres, whereas a minimum side yard setback of 20.74 metres is required;
- To permit a minimum rear yard of 18.4 metres, whereas a minimum rear yard of 20.7 metres is required;
- To permit a maximum building height of 12 storeys, whereas a maximum building height of 10 storeys is permitted;
- To permit a minimum distance between buildings with windows to habitable rooms of 24.3 metres, whereas a minimum of 43.08 metres is required;
- To permit a minimum common amenity area of 3,642 square metres, whereas a minimum common amenity area of 7,740 square metres is required;

- To permit a minimum of 57 surface visitor parking spaces above grade, whereas a minimum of 96 visitor parking spaces are required above grade;
- To permit the underground parking spaces to be provided under the municipal park block, whereas parking spaces are required to be located a minimum of 3 metres from any lot line;
- To permit a minimum underground parking space dimension of 2.74 metres by 5.48 metres, whereas a minimum underground parking space dimension of 3 metres by 6 metres is required;
- To permit a minimum exterior parking space dimension of 2.74 metres by 5.48 metres, whereas a minimum exterior parking space dimension of 2.75 metres by 5.5 metres is required;
- To permit the angular plane from a park to be 77 degrees, whereas a maximum angular plane of 40 degrees is permitted;
- To permit the angular plane from Gordon Street for Building 1 to be 60 degrees, whereas a maximum angular plane of 45 degrees is permitted;
- To permit the angular plane for Building 1 to Street "A" to be 71 degrees, whereas a maximum angular plane of 45 degrees is permitted;
- To permit a building within the 9 metre corner sight line triangle, whereas a building is not permitted within the 9 metre corner sight line triangle; and,
- To permit a maximum floor space index of 3.59, whereas a maximum floor space index of 1.5 is permitted.

Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision

The proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision will create a new municipal road to complete the signalized intersection of Gordon Street and Edinburgh Road South. The proposed subdivision includes a residential block with two, 12-storey apartment buildings with a total of 377 apartment units and 586 parking spaces, a municipal park block and an open space block. The proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision is included in included in Attachment 7 and proposed building renderings are included in Attachment 8.

Supporting Documents

The following information was submitted in support of the applications and can be found on the City's website under 'Current Development Applications':

- Planning Justification Report, prepared by Astrid J. Clos Planning Consultants, dated May 2020;
- Draft Plan of Subdivision, prepared by Astrid J. Clos Planning Consultants, dated February 2020;
- Draft Plan Parking Level 1 and 2, prepared by Astrid J. Clos Planning Consultants dated February 2020;
- Draft Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments, prepared by Astrid J. Clos Planning Consultants, dated May 2020;
- Angular Plane Diagrams, prepared by Kasian Architecture, dated April 2020;
- Elevations, prepared by Kasian Architecture, dated February 2020;
- Building Renderings, prepared by Kasian Architecture, dated March 2020;
- Conceptual Site Plan, prepared by Stantec Consulting Limited, dated May 2020;
- Engineering Plans, prepared by Stantec Consulting Limited, dated April 2020;
- Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Stantec Consulting Limited, dated May 2020;

- Functional Servicing Report, prepared by Stantec Consulting Limited, dated April 2020;
- Geotechnical Report, prepared by CMT Engineering Inc., dated April 2018;
- Hydrogeological Assessment, prepared by Stantec Consulting Limited, dated May 2020;
- Landscape Concept, prepared by Stantec Consulting Limited, dated March 2020;
- Noise Impact Study, prepared by J.E. Coulter Associated Limited, dated February 2020;
- Pedestrian Wind Study, prepared by RWDI, dated March 2020;
- Stage 1-2 Archaelogical Assessment, prepared by Amick Consultants Limited, dated May 2016;
- Traffic Impact Study, prepared by Stantec Consulting Limited, dated May 2020;
- Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan, prepared by Natural Resource Solutions Inc., dated March 2020;
- Truck Turning Plan, prepared by Stantec Consulting Limited, dated March 2020; and,
- Urban Design Brief, including Shadow Study, prepared by Stantec Consulting Limited and Kasian Architecture, dated April 2020.

Staff Review

The review of these applications will address the following:

- Evaluation of the proposal for conformity and consistency with Provincial policy and legislation, including subdivision control review criteria in the Planning Act, the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement and A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe;
- Evaluation of the proposal's conformity with the Official Plan, including the proposed Official Plan Amendment;
- Review of the proposed zoning, including the need for any specialized zoning regulations;
- Review of the proposal's land use compatibility with adjacent and established land uses;
- Review of the proposed subdivision layout, built form, parking and pedestrian connections,
- Review of site servicing and grading;
- Review how the proposed development addresses applicable sections of the Community Energy Initiative update;
- Review of supporting documents submitted in support of the applications; and,
- Address all comments and issues raised during the review of the applications.

Once the applications are reviewed and all issues are addressed, a report from Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise with a recommendation will be considered at a future meeting of Council.

Financial Implications

Financial implications will be reported in the future staff recommendation report to Council.

Consultations

The Notice of Complete Applications was mailed July 9, 2020 to local boards and agencies, City service areas and property owners within 120 metres of the subject lands. The Notice of Public Meeting was mailed on August 20, 2020 to local boards and agencies, City service areas and property owners within 120 metres of the subject lands. The Notice of Public Meeting was also advertised in the Guelph Tribune on August 20, 2020. Notice of the applications has also been provided by signage on the subject lands and all supporting documents submitted with the applications have been posted on the City's website.

Strategic Plan Alignment

Priority

Building our future

Direction(s)

- Continue to build strong, vibrant, safe and healthy communities that foster resilience in the people who live here
- Help increase the availability of housing that meets community needs

Alignment

This will be reported in the future Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise recommendation report to Council.

Attachments

Attachment 1 – Location Map and 120m Circulation

Attachment 2 – Aerial Photograph

- Attachment 3 Existing Official Plan Land Use Designations and Policies
- Attachment 4 Proposed Official Plan Land Use Designations and Policies

Attachment 5 – Existing Zoning

- Attachment 6 Proposed Zoning
- Attachment 7 Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision

Attachment 8 – Proposed Building Renderings

Attachment 9 – Public Meeting Presentation

Departmental Approval

Not applicable.

Report Author

Lindsay Sulatycki, MCIP, RPP, Senior Development Planner

This report was approved by:

Chris DeVriendt, MCIP, RPP, Manager of Development Planning

This report was approved by:

Krista Walkey, MCIP, RPP General Manager, Planning and Building Services Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise Services 519-822-1260 extension 2395 krista.walkey@guelph.ca

This report was recommended by:

Kealy Dedman, P. Eng., MPA Deputy Chief Administrative Officer Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise Services 519-822-1260 extension 2248 kealy.dedman@guelph.ca



Attachment 1 – Location Map and 120m Circulation

Attachment 2 – Aerial Photograph



Attachment 3 – Existing Official Plan Land Use Designations and Policies



Existing Official Plan Land Use Designations and Policies (continued)

9.3.2 Low Density Residential (9 Valley Road)

This designation applies to residential areas within the built-up area of the City which are currently predominantly low-density in character. The predominant land use in this designation shall be residential.

Permitted Uses

- 1. The following uses may be permitted subject to the applicable provisions of this Plan:
 - i. detached, semi-detached and duplex dwellings; and
 - ii. multiple unit residential buildings, such as townhouses and apartments.

9.3.5 High Density Residential (1242-1260 Gordon Street)

The predominant use of land within the High Density Residential Designation shall be high density multiple unit residential building forms. Permitted Uses

- 1. The following uses may be permitted subject to the applicable provisions of this Plan:
 - i. Multiple unit residential buildings generally in the form of apartments.

Height and Density

- 2. The minimum height is three (3) storeys and the maximum height is ten (10) storeys.
- 3. The maximum net density is 150 units per hectare and not less than a minimum net density of 100 units per hectare.

9.11 Natural Heritage System (1242-1260 Gordon Street)

- 1. The Natural Heritage System is comprised of two designations as identified:
- Significant Natural Areas
- Natural Areas

4.1.3.1 General Policies: Significant Natural Areas

- 1. Development or site alteration shall not be permitted within Significant Natural Areas including their established or minimum buffers as designated on Schedule 1, except in accordance with the general policies in 4.1.2 and the Significant Natural Areas policies in 4.1.3.
- 2. In accordance with the applicable policies in 4.1.2 and 4.1.3, development or site alteration may be permitted within the adjacent lands to Significant Natural Areas provided that it has been demonstrated through an EIS or EA that there will be no negative impacts to the protected natural heritage features and areas or their associated ecological functions.

Attachment 4 – Proposed Official Plan Land Use Designations and Policies



Proposed Official Plan Land Use Designations and Policies (continued)

Proposed site-specific policy to be added to the "High Density Residential" land use designation:

Notwithstanding the maximum net density and maximum height in the "High Density Residential" land use designation, the maximum net density shall be 271 units per hectare and a maximum of 12 storeys shall be permitted on the subject lands.

Proposed "Open Space and Parks"

9.7 Open Space and Parks

Open space and parks provide health, environmental, aesthetic and economic benefits that are important elements for a good quality of life. Lands designated Open Space and Parks are public or private areas where the predominant use or function is active or passive recreational activities, conservation management and other open space uses.

Objectives

- a) To develop a balanced distribution of open space, active and passive parkland and recreation facilities that meet the needs of all residents and are conveniently located, accessible and safe.
- b) To co-operate and partner with other public, quasi-public and private organizations in the provision of open space, trails and parks to maximize benefits to the community.
- c) To assist in protecting the City's urban forests, the Natural Heritage System and cultural heritage resources

Attachment 5 – Existing Zoning



Attachment 6 – Proposed Zoning



Attachment 7 – Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision



Attachment 8 – Proposed Building Renderings





1242-1260 Gordon Street and 9 Valley Road

Statutory Public Meeting for Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment

File: OZS20-004 and 23T-20001

September 14, 2020

Page 61 of 108¹

Location



Existing Official Plan Land Use Designations



Proposed Official Plan Land Use Designations



Existing Zoning



Proposed Zoning



Page 64 of 108⁴

Requested Specialized Zoning Regulations

- To permit a maximum density of 271 units per hectare, whereas a maximum of 150 units per hectare is permitted;
- To permit a minimum front yard setback of 0.8 metres, whereas a minimum front yard setback of 6 metres is required;
- To permit a minimum exterior side yard setback of 1.2 metres, whereas a minimum exterior side yard setback of 6 metres is required;
- To permit a minimum side yard setback of 2.4 metres, whereas a minimum side yard setback of 20.74 metres is required;
- To permit a minimum rear yard of 18.4 metres, whereas a minimum rear yard of 20.7 metres is required;
- To permit a maximum building height of 12 storeys, whereas a maximum building height of 10 storeys is permitted;
- To permit a minimum distance between buildings with windows to habitable rooms of 24.3 metres, whereas a minimum of 43.08 metres is required;
- To permit a minimum common amenity area of 3,642 square metres, whereas a minimum common amenity area of 7,740 square metres is required;
- To permit a minimum of 57 surface visitor parking spaces above grade, whereas a minimum of 96 visitor parking spaces are required above grade;

Requested Specialized Zoning Regulations (continued)

- To permit the underground parking spaces to be provided under the municipal park block, whereas parking spaces are required to be located a minimum of 3 metres from any lot line;
- To permit a minimum underground parking space dimension of 2.74 metres by 5.48 metres, whereas a minimum underground parking space dimension of 3 metres by 6 metres is required;
- To permit a minimum exterior parking space dimension of 2.74 metres by 5.48 metres, whereas a minimum exterior parking space dimension of 2.75 metres by 5.5 metres is required;
- To permit the angular plane from a park to be 77 degrees, whereas a maximum angular plane of 40 degrees is permitted;
- To permit the angular plane from Gordon Street for Building 1 to be 60 degrees, whereas a maximum angular plane of 45 degrees is permitted;
- To permit the angular plane for Building 1 to Street "A" to be 71 degrees, whereas a maximum angular plane of 45 degrees is permitted;
- To permit a building within the 9 metre corner sight line triangle, whereas a building is not permitted within the 9 metre corner sight line triangle; and,
- To permit a maximum floor space index of 3.59, whereas a maximum floor space index of 1.5 is permitted.

Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision



Statutory Public Meeting Report 1242-1260 Gordon Street and 9 Valley Road Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments File: OZS20-004 and 23T-20001 Ward 6 - 2020-124

General Correspondence

As a nine-year resident of Valley Road in Guelph (and one born and raised in the Royal City), I would like to comment on applications brought forth that will necessitate official plan and zoning by-law amendments for 1242-1260 Gordon Street and 9 Valley Road.

Guelph, to me has always had its own unique small-town characteristics, even through a steady population growth over many years. Along with my neighbours, I appreciate and enjoy the many nature trails, the parks and other green space, the quiet and peacefulness of small residential streets where neighbours look out for each other.

In the last few years, I have seen many older homes demolished to make way for higher density residences, in the way of multilevel condos and apartments. I understand that this is the means to accommodate the higher demand. But the road traffic on Gordon Street has been horrendous since this started. I dread going out (as a driver or pedestrian) on Gordon Street during peak hours. And, I've seen several accidents occurring at the intersection of Gordon Street and Edinburgh Road S.

This Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment should not be passed by our City of Guelph Council for many reasons. The 5 storey buildings in proximity to our community already appear massive in comparison to our single storey homes, and that limit of 5 storeys should not be surpassed in this area. In a neighbourhood of mainly single storey family homes, the addition of two 12 storey buildings will definitely not blend in well, and our views of trees and sky will be replaced by views of concrete towers. We want to keep that small-town atmosphere in our community.

Traffic and noise are major issues. We already have a "bottle-neck" slowing of traffic during peak times on Gordon Street in this area. I realize that a traffic impact study has been completed, but the reality, in my experience trying to get home, travelling south on Gordon St. and being caught in crawling traffic just south of the Kortright intersection, leads me to believe that this will be much more chaotic with hundreds more trying to turn left to their new 12 storey residence. Congestion and noise will be intolerable with the addition of 377 families and their vehicles. Street parking has already been an issue in this area, with cars from people visiting or living in the 5-storey building across Gordon St., parked on Valley Rd. or both sides of Landsdown. This will become a safety issue when emergency vehicles, service vehicles and school buses cannot navigate through the area due to its much increased, high density population.
I have very serious concerns, that are shared with all my neighbours, about what is happening to the city we love. Guelph is losing its identity behind an accelerating invasion of concrete towers. We don't want to be another community ruined by rampant development. A site-specific policy allowing a maximum density of 271 units per hectare (almost double the 150 per hectare permitted for "High Density Residential"!) should not be agreed to. Two 12-storey residential buildings will most adversely change our neighbourhood. Please do not approve Tricar's request to amend zoning to "Specialized High Density Apartment". We need to value the safety, aesthetics, architecture, urban design and neighbourliness unique to our beautiful city. Let's maintain Guelph's desirable qualities of distinction.

Thank you.

Maria Lammers

PS: Please notify me (to this email address) of the Council decision when one is made.

Dear City of Guelph & City Councillors,

Good evening.

I hope you are all safe and well.

Two weeks ago, I received a letter from the City regarding the proposed development at 1242-1260 Gordon Street and Valley Road.

I am all for growth and development in Guelph, but this seems beyond intense for this location?

I came to Guelph a little over 20 year ago and fell in love with the City's charm and well planned growth.

People continue to flock to Guelph for this very reason.

Building a 12 story high density apartment building in this location is not going to preserve the unique appeal of Guelph.

This is a residential area and very close to some of the nicest and most expensive real estate in Guelph.

Misplaced developments like these will destroy the beauty and appeal of Guelph, property values and play havoc with traffic! While I realize a traffic study was conducted, adding a 12 story building in this area "in reality" will not be good for the children or nearby residents

I see no positive value to this building as currently planned expect to the developers and apartment building owner!

This will be nothing more than a towering eye sore which will destroy the sightlines for many area residents in Ward 5 and Ward 6!

If the developers want to develop something with the look and feel of Mississauga or Brampton, then they should build the project there!

I am 100% for planned growth in Guelph. Its good for all of us!

However, this is inappropriate for this location and I pray the City realized the impact and damage it can do!

Thank you for reading.

Regards,

Walter Urban

President

Urban Dynamics Inc.

Hi,

Guelph is a special, unique city , so please keep it like that. Don't let built high density residential.

Thank you,

Derya Salter

I would like to offer the following comments and observations on the file. Please include me in future correspondence and notifications of public meetings.

I wish to point out that I am writing as an individual home owner. However, I am also the President of the adjacent vacant land condominium on Valley Road.

Recognizing that the City is under some pressure to accommodate growth, I insist that the growth is managed from within and not due to external forces from Queens Park or commercial developers. What this means in principle is that we should design the growth to acknowledge future needs while respecting current lifestyles, urban aesthetics, and character which promotes and represents Guelph.

The "canyonization" of Gordon Street is running antithetical to the character of Guelph, which subjectively is acknowledged by current residents and people moving

here. The proposed development in the file is symptomatic of this unappealing direction, in that tall and ever taller buildings don't bring life to the streets. There is much missing when housing is simply stacked up for density's sake. Neither is it effective in that many of the individual units in high-rises are occupied by students for only part of the year. Annualized calculations of occupancy and relative housing density would be revealing. To be clear, I am completely in support of student housing, off-campus.

Following the development thoughts over the last years I have seen renditions of mid-rise buildings at the addresses in the file, none of which were higher than six stories. Now the zoning suggests even greater heights. I would like to express that this project should not exceed six stories because that has been what was shared with us prior to this point (meetings at Salvation Army, October 2019) and for example, the recently developed taller buildings on Gordon (from Kortright to Clare) are all that height or less (from Solstice at Edinburgh...5 stories to Carousel at 1300 and Heritage Drive...4 stories). Even in illustrations in the City's own documents this is the case. I reference page 20 of Gordon Street Directions Document of March 09, 2018. The visual aesthetics of a sky scraper above singlefamily dwellings is not appealing. As I've heard said, it's like the developer is giving the proverbial finger to Guelph on our skyline. Since height seems to be the order of the day, concentrate it in the Maltby corridor since that has already been accomplished. I don't want to see an awkward mistake made because it's pushed by the developer and pulled by the provincial authorities.

I am concerned about traffic safety as well with the additional vehicle traffic that will accompany any development. Gordon Street is fast flowing. Its intersection with Edinburgh is already the scene of numerous vehicular accidents, despite not making the "Top Three" for Guelph. The future occupants of these buildings are likely driving to the 401 as commuters or north to the University and downtown. More high-speed traffic is not what should be intended.

A little bit of extra parkland, as suggested, is hardly a decent compromise either.

So this needs to be scaled back, re-thought, and re-considered relative to the aesthetics, quality of life, safety, and character of our City.

Thank you.

Bruce Wilson

we are writing to you in regards to the notification we received recently......

We assume the application from the developer has not met with any approvals from the City as yet, so we are not shocked to see the size of the buildings proposed...Fair to assume the developer is trying to maximize the return on their investment and we understand that the previous speculators that owned this property will be compensated based on the size of the buildings erected....

Fair to say we strongly object to this proposal......

1..the size of these buildings will have a significant negative impact on the enjoyment and use of our residence along with all other residents of Valley Rd, Emeny Lane and Lansdowne Dr....

2...we are very concerned about the impact to traffic in and around usnot only from this proposed development but the other condo developments being proposed for Gordon St......Gordon St is already a very busy road...Adding this additional volume will make it more dangerous for those using it on a regular basis.....

3...we already experience parking problems along Landsdowne and the bottom of Valley Road once the students return.....This will only magnify the problem.....

4...the newly proposed Lansdowne /Edinburgh corner will be a nightmare at peak traffic times.....With almost 400 units proposedHas a traffic study been done yet?....and if so, where can we view a copy??

We attended, the public meeting at the Salvation Army in the fall of 2018.....at that meeting the City indicated their plans for the Gordon St corridor included "a pedestrian friendly street framed with **MID RISED buildings**, continuous rows of healthy trees,"....

Those mid rise buildings discussed at that meeting were 4-6 stories......

I would seem that if the City was being **honest and genuine** at that public meeting that this proposal would not be accepted as is by the City

Tony and Tiziana Campagnolo

As homeowners living at Landsdown Drive, we would like to support the comments made by Valerie Gilmor and Bruce Wilson regarding the proposed development at 1242-1260 Gordon.

We are out of town on September 14 and unable to participate in the meeting.

We believe that the City should not approve an amendment to permit 12 storey buildings and an increased density of 271 units.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Anne (Jantje) and George Harauz

To underline the issues for us:

- 1. Parking is inadequate. Look at the recent development at 28 Landsdown. Even with 2 car garages, the development's visitor parking spaces are always occupied. 28A Landsdown currently has 4 cars in the driveway.
- 2. Traffic is already heavy. Gordon has become a nightmare. Large apartment buildings will lead to more accidents.
- 3. This was a quiet neighbourhood for the 27 years we have lived here. Increasingly, it is becoming a student ghetto. Speculators buy cheaply and rent. This doesn't make for a neighbourhood of concerned citizens.
- 4. Environmental concerns : we are still on well water. There has been shifting of the ground and changes to the ecosystem. More trees and hedges have been destroyed/compromised by the recent building than originally planned. We can assume that will also take place at 1242 1260 Gordon.

Anne H.

I would like to offer the following comments and observations on the file. Please

include me in future correspondence and notifications of public meetings.

I am writing as an individual homeowner living on Valley Road.

The proposed development in the file is symptomatic of an unappealing, in that

tall and ever taller buildings don't bring life to the streets. There is much missing when housing is simply stacked up for density's sake. Neither is it effective in that many of the individual units in high-rises are occupied by students for only part of the year.

I would like to express that this project should not exceed six stories because that has been what was shared with us prior to this point(meetings at Salvation Army Oct 2019).

Even in illustrations in the City's own documents the recently developed buildings on Gordon are all the height or less. I reference page 20 of Gordon Street Directions Document of March 09, 2018.

I am concerned about traffic safety as well with additional vehicle traffic. Currently insufficient parking at 1236 Gordon (Solstice) has pushed cars out to Valley Road and Landsdown.

It is a safety concern now on one of the steepest slopes. As a current homeowner when having guests the only option for guests to park is on Landsdown. Bottom line, visitor parking for this development is short of the Guelph Parking By-Law. A little bit of extra parkland, as suggested, is hardly a decent compromise either.

So this needs to be scaled back, re-thought and re-considered relative to aesthetics, quality of life, safety, and character of our city.

Thank you.

Michele McDonald

A concerned friend sent me the details of the proposal for redevelopment in the Gordon St South area. I have been a resident of Ward 6 since returning here over 30 years ago. I currently reside on Megan Place and am reminded of what we, the Rolling Hills residents have gone through to stop the City planners from attempting to destroy property they had no right to. We have spent a lot of money on legal fees in order to keep our neighbourhood intact.

The redevelopment of the entire south end has grown at an incredible rate. I understand the need for urban intensification but our by-laws and zoning laws need to be adhered to. Gordon Street is already an extremely unsafe artery which I avoid using at all costs.

As city planners and members of City Council and staff it is your duty to adhere to the Official Plans for the city. Giving into developers only ensures that they will return time and time again with "deals" for the city which are detrimental to the citizens of Guelph. We need to stop building for Students and "out-of-towners" who find Guelph more affordable. The Hanlon "parking lot" is just one example of the City giving in or cutting corners. The citizens of Guelph wanted an Expressway!

Please follow the Official Plan!

Judy Pavlis

Official Plan and Zoning Amendments

As a homeowner living at Valley Road, I believe the City should not approve an amendment to the Official Plan to permit a site specific policy to allow, either a maximum building height of 12 storeys or an increased density of 271 units per hectare. The Official Plan designation of high density as 6-10 storeys with 100-150 units per hectare should be followed.

Official Plan Amendment

The proposed development of **two 12 storey towers is an anomaly** amid the single family homes and medium density apartment buildings immediately adjacent the site, even though the developer claims their development is compatible in scale, height, setbacks, appearance and site. This is blatantly not so. **Two 12**

storey towers will dwarf all buildings in the vicinity, be they 5 storey, 2 story or 1 storey.

Furthermore the **topography** of the site **means that buildings will appear even taller** than they are, **totally inappropriate aesthetically**, **out of character with existing neighbourhoods and their quality of life and incompatible with the city's Urban Design Concept Plan** which states, "Gordon Street is envisioned to become a vibrant pedestrian friendly street **framed by mid-rise buildings**, continuous rows of healthy trees, and active at grade uses that engage the street and the sidewalk".

Two 5 storey buildings would be much more compatible to existing forms and still **enable the city to meet its goal of increased density and well scaled intensification**.

Attached are drawings, to scale, and prepared by Jack Humphrey, Conestoga APFM Student, which provide a picture of a 12 storey tower in context.

The city's density requirement for this rezoned site is 100-150 units per hectare. However in asking for 271 units per hectare, the **developer is actually seeking a minimum increase of 81% up to 171% in density,** beyond the by-law. Maintaining the City's current standards should be the order of the day and will ensure compatible building forms in this area.

Zoning By-law Amendments

The developer wants to **decrease all setbacks** (front yard, exterior side yard, rear yard), **minimize distances between buildings**, **reduce common amenity areas by almost 50%** in order to maximize the buildings' footprints. In addition **angular planes** from the buildings to the park and street **are 60% to 92% greater** than required by law, creating a canyon like effect at street level, unsympathetic to a pedestrian environment. How can life be best lived and enjoyed by residents of any new building or by neighbours when physical distances and vibrant and attractive areas are minimized?

Parking is an **ongoing concern.** Neighbourhood streets, Landsdown Drive and Valley Road, already act as parking lots for the townhouses and apartment block on the west side of Gordon. This will only get worse with this development as visitor parking is 40 spots shy of what is required and some residents of the towers simply won't have parking spaces on site. How will this be addressed?

Perhaps the city might **institute parking permits** for those using streets as parking lots because insufficient on-site parking is provided. Interestingly, over **400 parking spaces** have been allotted to **bicycles**. Where is the research that indicates, vehicle use will decrease in this time of electric cars and bicycle use will increase as a means to get to work, go to dinner or grocery shop in Canada's climate?

Traffic will increase even more. The proposed road will spill many of the 377 vehicles onto Gordon Street, either at the new intersection or where Landsdown meets Gordon at the north end. The intersection at **Gordon and Edinburgh is already deficient in managing both traffic volume and flow**. The developer estimates 92 outbound trips will occur in peak AM hours, only 24% of the buildings' capacity. This is hard to believe.

There is **no left-turn lane** at the new intersection, an obvious omission, which means extra long wait times to simply enter the intersection, never mind turning right or left or going straight ahead. **Critical corner lot sight lines** are **not in compliance** and will result in reduced visibility.

Additionally, Landsdown Drive North will see a dramatic increase in traffic volume and safety issues will arise for residents. The Urban Design Concept Plan clearly states, "*design Landsdown Road as a two-way residential street, not as a service lane"*, and yet a service lane is exactly what is being planned.

Environment 707 trees now. 101 trees left standing. 606 trees destroyed, removing habitat for a variety of birds, creating erosion issues and potential for invasive plant species on neighbouring properties, all for ease of construction . Can we not do better?

Intensification is one driver of development in Guelph's south-end. **But it should not be the most significant one.** I also believe **people**, their desires and the communities they create **are an essential and critical driver** to determining the future housing options, residential environments, small businesses and green space. How we shape our physical world directly affects how we see, experience and know our neighbourhoods, our cities and ourselves.

The challenge here is to refine this proposed development into a well scaled intensification plan that creates meaningful, human scale and quality residential and inviting public spaces, that contribute to people's health, happiness and wellbeing. By doing this, we can preserve, enhance and protect the high quality of life which, historically, has been one of Guelph's greatest strengths. August 12, 2020

To: Mayor Cam Guthrie

From: Tamara Baggio

RE: Application/File number 0ZS20-004 Property located at 1242, 1260 Gordon St & 9 Valley Rd

It is my understanding that the properties at 9 Valley Rd, 1242 Gordon St, and 1260 Gordon St are owned by the developer Tricar based in London Ontario. From posted signage and review of the City of Guelph website, there is an application from the developer Tricar seeking to *permit a residential subdivision containing a residential block with 377 apartment units in two, 12 story buildings, a municipal park block and an open space block* located on the above stated lands. I wish to voice my very strong objections to the unnecessary Zoning and By-Law Amendment set forth in this application. I have outlined below in length as to the reasons why a development of this magnitude is highly objectionable for this neighborhood.

As a concerned resident, whose property is adjacent to the land in review, I have been following the literature and attending the public meetings for this development. I have some concerns with the proposal for safety reasons and the preservation of our Natural Green Space.

Parking & Traffic-Safety Concerns

Parking within our neighborhood is currently a large issue, which will only be increased with buildings of this magnitude. Since the construction of the large unit located at 1219 Gordon St, Landsdown Dr has been inundated with the overflow of parking. See Appendix 1. This is a photograph of parking located along Landsdown Dr on a weekday in October 2019. As you will notice, there are multiple cars parked on both sides of the street. This presents a major safety concern, as Emergency Vehicles are unable to maneuver easily through this traffic, therefore delaying response time putting peoples' safety in jeopardy. On at least one occasion emergency vehicles have had to reverse and use the other entrance located at Valley Rd.

As part of my research and as it will apply to the current development, I reviewed the information presented in The Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Discussion paper, as well as the Parking Standards Discussion Paper. I was alarmed to find that this paper recommends reducing the parking minimums and capping maximums in intensification corridors ie. Gordon Street. Under the current bylaw an apartment building has to provide 1.5 parking spaces/unit for the first 20 units and 1.25 for every unit over 20. This includes visitor parking. Under the proposed recommendations from the Parking Discussion Paper, this falls to 1 parking space/unit and 0.1/unit for visitors. If a 100 unit building was built on Gordon this would mean a shortfall of 20 spaces under the new proposed bylaw. The application indicates that there will be over 500 parking spaces in the new building. Although this sounds like a lot of parking. It doesn't account for any visitor parking.

The parking on Landsdown Dr. will be an even larger issue as it will now have to sustain the overflow/spill over of these current buildings plus the overflow it is experiencing now. With this parking issue plus the fact that there will only be 2 entrances for the emergency vehicles to the current subdivisions plans, I feel you are putting the residents safety at risk. Landsdown drive cannot withstand the traffic that 377 units are going to produce.

Another major concern, with regards to parking and traffic is the safety of the children in our neighborhood and the school bus. Wellington Catholic Transportation services has stated on numerous occasions that due to the parking on Landsdown Dr, the school bus is unable to maneuver the turn at Valley Road and the bend on Landsdown. The result is the bus stop for our neighborhood children is located at Gordon and Landsdown which is a major traffic artery in our City. This bus stop is used for 3 different sets of students and therefore stops traffic 6 times a day on this major artery during rush hour traffic. Due to the stops location, you can sit and count the numbers of times a day that an individual vehicle fails to stop for the bus lights. The addition of 377 units in this neighborhood is going to add lots of extra traffic and parking issues to both Gordon street and Landsdown. Making it even more unsafe for the school bus to stop and pick up children.

Natural Green Space

As you will notice in the Subdivion plans, this area is surrounded by a lush, natural green space. In preparation for the development, a Tree study was completed by Natural Resource Solutions Inc. (NRSI) in October 2019 for Tricar Developments Inc. This report indicates that in the location of the proposed subdivision there are approx. 707 trees on the subject property and adjacent properties. Of which 606 will be removed in order to house the foot print of these 12 story buildings. I am truly disheartened to learn that 85% of this natural green space will be destroyed.

The City Of Guelph has an Urban Forest Management Plan which states:

"All of these trees form part of the City's green infrastructure, which sustains the community by filtering air pollution, providing shade, contributing to flood control, reducing local energy use, sequestering carbon, and bringing nature to the City. These services are well documented, and trees are known to save municipalities millions of dollars in air pollution control and storm water management. Natural tree cover also provides a wide range of human health benefits that have yet to be fully valued. Contact with nature, and treed areas, has been shown to lower blood pressure, speed up recovery from surgery, enhance mental development and creativity, and reduce aggressive behavior. The shade, cooling and air quality benefits provided by trees also helps reduce the risks of skin cancer, heat stroke and respiratory ailments."

The community in the South End of Guelph is fortunate enough to have this beautiful natural green space to help offset the intensification and high density developments that are happening. Why destroy it with even bigger buildings. If the building were smaller in size (i.e. 4-6) stories, similar to what has already been developed it would require less removal of this natural green space. The City and the developer needs to be conscientious stewards of this natural resource in our South End so that the trees can continue to provide many benefits.

Also of note, in the Fall of 2019, Tricar hired a company to start with the tree removal process without City approval. At this time By-Law and The City were notified by a resident and the tree removal was halted. I would like to know if the appropriate tress were removed, as it appeared that when they were clear cutting they were removing just about everything. Please see Appendix 2 for pictures of the affect area.

I strongly disagree with the proposed plan for 12 story buildings. I understand that the City has the vision for high density areas. What I am very concerned about is the need for the 12 story buildings alongside single story homes. Reading in the tribune on July 9 2020, I was surprised to see an article tilted, "Proposed Building is Too Tall, Dense for Downtown'. This article explains that a building of 25 stories in the downtown area, "is incompatible with the character of the surrounding lower density neighborhood." I found it rather interesting that this point of view would be taken, as there are 2-3 buildings in the downtown area which are already 20 stories high and yet it is felt by some that a building with 25 stories will be too much. The same argument can be said when there is a proposal to develop a 12-story building adjacent to a residential area with single story family homes. You will note that the other buildings in our area are 6 stories at the maximum. I am in agreement that the proposal for the 25-story downtown development is too large, likewise is a 12 story building in a residential neighborhood.

I pride myself in the distinctiveness that the City of Guelph has to offer with its quaintness and small City feel. I would appreciate it if you would reject the proposal and keep us informed of the progress.

Sincerely,

Tamara Baggio Guelph, On





Landsdown Drive on October 30, 2019. Note-Due to parking, emergency vehicles are unable to maneuver through the cars.





This area was a dense green natural space prior to the clear cutting of the area.



Trees which were removed by TriCar in preparation for the application to develop the land.

Hello Lindsay

To the best of my knowledge there has been no invitation for the public as yet to make comment about the proposed Tricar development for Gordon/Valley Road. However, I would like to few comments at this time and will follow-up with additional input later when invited.

First I would like to say that as a citizen of this city, I abide by the laws and by-laws in place and in fact I am held accountable for my actions and penalized if I should violate any of these laws.

So I am a little distressed to see that the same expectation of compliance with laws and bylaws in this city, do not seem to be expected from developers, otherwise a developer would not seek to bend or unfollow the existing rules. It would seem the developer regards the existing regulations as a starting point for negotiations and the city appears to be a willing partner to this position. Why?

In brief, here are my comments.

According the the City's Official Plan, the site in question is regarded as future High Density, in my opinion that's a given, whether I like it or not. And I don't, but I understand that increasing density is a reality. It would be wonderful if the city would consider changing that designation to Medium Density as that would mean that the building(s) would blend into the existing neighbourhoods, both old and new and not stand out like a sore thumb. Can and how do we do this?

Within the existing regulations, Tricar wants to UNFOLLOW rules.

Tricar wants not just to UNFOLLOW the City's definition of High Density – 10 storeys but to CHANGE the definition to the 12 storeys that they want on this site. In addition to more floors, more people are to be squeezed in, 271 units per hectare vs the policy of 150 units per hectare, over an 80% increase.

Furthermore, Tricar wants to UNFOLLOW 17 of 27 - 62% - of zoning regulations with respect to High Density Apartments.

Do any of these things seem reasonable?

The following excerpt is from a City of Guelph document, with bolding added for emphasis, by me.

Purpose of a Zoning By-law

A Comprehensive Zoning By-law is a precise documentused by the City to regulate the use of land. It **states exactly** what land uses are currently permitted in Guelph and provides other detailed information such as: - where buildings or structures may be located; - types of uses and dwellings permitted; - **standards** for lot size, parking requirements, building height, and required yards.

Guelph's Zoning By-law is needed to help the City implement the objectives and policies of the Official Plan. The Zoning By-law acts as a legal tool under Ontario's Planning Act for managing the use of land and future development in the City.

Zoning By-laws **also protect property owners** from the development of conflicting land uses. Any use of land or the construction or use of any building or structure not specifically authorized by the By-law is prohibited.

The City's Official Plan and bylaws need to be followed.

The city needs to walk its talk by holding itself accountable for maintaining the standards it has set in place and making sure developers work to those standards. The City and the developer need to be held to the same standard of conduct, obeying all the laws, as its citizens are.

I understand that there is a September 14th Council Planning meeting. I would appreciate it if this correspondence would be included on the agenda. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

Valerie Gilmor

I offer these comments about the proposed development at 1242-1260 Gordon Street and 9 Valley Road and ask that they be part of the record for the the September 14th meeting.

Valerie Gilmor

Re: Official Plan and Zoning Amendments

As a homeowner living at 18-15 Valley Road, I believe the City should not approve an amendment to the Official Plan to permit a site specific policy to allow, either a maximum building height of 12 storeys or an increased density of 271 units per hectare. The Official Plan designation of high density as 6-10 storeys with 100-150 units per hectare should be followed.

Official Plan Amendment

The proposed development of **two 12 storey towers is an anomaly** amid the single family homes and medium density apartment buildings immediately adjacent the site, even though the developer claims their development is compatible in scale, height, setbacks, appearance and site. This is blatantly not so. **Two 12 storey towers will dwarf all buildings in the vicinity**, be they 5 storey, 2 story or 1 storey.

Furthermore the **topography** of the site **means that buildings will appear even taller** than they are, **totally inappropriate aesthetically**, **out of character with existing neighbourhoods and their quality of life and incompatible with the city's Urban Design Concept Plan** which states, "Gordon Street is envisioned to become a vibrant pedestrian friendly street **framed by mid-rise buildings**, continuous rows of healthy trees, and active at grade uses that engage the street and the sidewalk".

Two 5 storey buildings would be much more compatible to existing forms and still enable the city to meet its goal of increased density and well scaled intensification.

Attached are drawings, to scale, and prepared by Jack Humphrey, Conestoga APFM Student, which provide a picture of a 12 storey tower in context.

The city's density requirement for this rezoned site is 100-150 units per hectare. However in asking for 271 units per hectare, the **developer is actually seeking a minimum increase of 81% up to 171% in density,** beyond the by-law. Maintaining the City's current standards should be the order of the day and will ensure compatible building forms in this area.

Zoning By-law Amendments

The developer wants to **decrease all setbacks** (front yard, exterior side yard, rear yard), **minimize distances between buildings**, **reduce common amenity areas by almost 50%** in order to maximize the buildings' footprints. In addition **angular planes** from the buildings to the park and street **are 60% to 92% greater** than required by law, creating a canyon like effect at street level, unsympathetic to a pedestrian environment. How can life be best lived and enjoyed by residents of any new building or by neighbours when physical distances and vibrant and attractive areas are minimized?

Parking is an **ongoing concern.** Neighbourhood streets, Landsdown Drive and Valley Road, already act as parking lots for the townhouses and apartment block on the west side of Gordon. This will only get worse with this development as visitor parking is 40 spots shy of what is required and some residents of the towers simply won't have parking spaces on site. How will this be addressed?

Perhaps the city might **institute parking permits** for those using streets as parking lots because insufficient on-site parking is provided. Interestingly, over **400 parking spaces** have been allotted to **bicycles**. Where is the research that indicates, vehicle use will decrease in this time of electric cars and bicycle use will increase as a means to get to work, go to dinner or grocery shop in Canada's climate?

Traffic will increase even more. The proposed road will spill many of the 377 vehicles onto Gordon Street, either at the new intersection or where Landsdown meets Gordon at the north end. The intersection at **Gordon and Edinburgh is already deficient in managing both traffic volume and flow**. The developer estimates 92 outbound trips will occur in peak AM hours, only 24% of the buildings' capacity. This is hard to believe.

There is **no left-turn lane** at the new intersection, an obvious omission, which means extra long wait times to simply enter the intersection, never mind turning right or left or going straight ahead. **Critical corner lot sight lines** are **not in compliance** and will result in reduced visibility.

Additionally, Landsdown Drive North will see a dramatic increase in traffic volume and safety issues will arise for residents. The Urban Design Concept Plan clearly states, "*design Landsdown Road as a two-way residential street, not as a service lane"*, **a**nd yet a service lane is exactly what is being planned.

Environment 707 trees now. 101 trees left standing. 606 trees destroyed, removing habitat for a variety of birds, creating erosion issues and potential for invasive plant species on neighbouring properties, all for ease of construction. Can we not do better?

Intensification is one driver of development in Guelph's south-end. **But it should not be the most significant one.** I also believe **people**, their desires and the communities they create **are an essential and critical driver** to determining the future housing options, residential environments, small businesses and green space. How we shape our physical world directly affects how we see, experience and know our neighbourhoods, our cities and ourselves.

The challenge here is to refine this proposed development into a well scaled intensification plan that creates meaningful, human scale and quality residential and inviting public spaces, that contribute to people's health, happiness and wellbeing. By doing this, we can preserve, enhance and protect the high quality of life which, historically, has been one of Guelph's greatest strengths.







HAVE A VOICE

1242-1260 Gordon St and 9 Valley Rd Guelph, ON.

AUGUST 30

Impact statement

Page 90 of 108

Introduction

Who we are?

Good evening Mayor and members of the council, city members and public in general, my name is Claudia Espindola, and I have participated in several projects set to be build within my resident area.

In this case, I represent almost 800 Guelph residents, whose signature appear on the petition below, these are actual Guelph/Ontario residents, volunteers and myself did personally distributed this petition on social media and in person throughout the city to raise awareness about the densification plans for Gordon St. corridor.

https://www.thepetitionsite.com/455/291/833/save-guelph-conservation-area-fromdestruction/?

Our petition is simple: Stop allowing high density buildings around the Conservation area and Torrence Wetland,

this area cannot support any further densification until traffic concerns are addressed for the whole area,

We are also asking how the city plans to protect the ecological functioning of what remains of the Torrance Creek Wetlands,

As citizens, we need the city's commitment to safeguard our valued natural heritage areas as they were originally designated,

The densification setup along Gordon street is having consequences for both, residents and wildlife,

Environmental Impact

The environmental study paid by the **construction company** shows the following, and I quote:

file:///C:/Users/g635034/OneDrive%20-%20General%20Mills/Desktop/1242-Gordon-Street-Environmental-Impact-Study-May-2020.pdf,

- Appendix I2: Four locally significant bird species were identified in the study area according to the City of Guelph's Locally Significant species list: Barn Swallow, Eastern WoodPewee, Northern Flicker and Hairy Woodpecker
- Appendix A: Wildlife cameras photographed a total of 178 animals of three species. White-Tailed Deer (158 records) Coyote and Gray Squirrel also recorded. Based on this (observations) it appears that most of the wildlife movement, particularly white-tailed deer, is through the cultural meadow in the center of the subject property. Individuals were recorder at all hours of the day
- Table 5: Bat Maternity colonies Potentially present in significant woodland in the study area, turtle wintering and deer wintering congregation areas presented in wooded areas within the subject property and study area

City of Guelph has clearly identified a deer pass exactly where this project is set to take place, same can be said for the projects at Arkell Rd. 190-216 Arkell Rd, 220 Arkell Rd and the recently approved project on 1300 Gordon St.



Density Impact

Below is a screen shot of all the projects set around Torrence Wetland and Conservation area – Gordon Street/Victoria Rd and Arkell Rd and Kortright as it appears on City website August 24, 2020.



A summary of current projects as per City of Guelph development website surrounding this area total eleven

1	33 Arkell Road	97 units, condos and towns
2	190-216 Arkell Road	66 new residential units
3	220 Arkell Road	31 single and 60 townhouses
4	388 Arkell Rd	High School
5	1242-1260 Gordon Street	12-storey apt bldg 377 units/ park block/open space block
6	1300 Gordon Street	32 apartment units
7	1354 Gordon Street	88 units apartment, gas station, retail
8	1353-1389 Gordon St	50 Townhouse units
	1533-1557 Gordon St & 34 Lowes Rd	
9	W	89 units
10	1871-1879 Gordon St	Six storey unit - 43 apartment units
11	19-59 Lowes Rd W.	36 units

I do not have a list of the current projects under construction, but I have included a visual image of the Conservation ara from Goolge, it is clear that there are considerable size projects already approved and happening in the area at this time, those projects only have two main roads to connect to Downtown Guelph – Victoria St and Gordon St.



Traffic Impact

According to the Guelph Collision report 2015-2019, "Traffic collisions are a primary cause of death, injury and property damage, on the City's roads:

https://pub-guelph.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=7031

- 1 Collision occurs every 230 minutes
- 1 person is injured in a collision every 9 hours
- 1 road fatality occurs every 130 days
- 1 pedestrian collision occurs every 10 days
- 1 cyclist collision occurs every 10 days.

In this report, Gordon Street is mentioned 17 times,

Table 4 shows the top 10 intersection locations with the Highest percentage of injury collisions, and **30% of those happen over Gordon St**.

The study quotes "Between 2015-2019, midblock collisions accounted for 45% of total collision locations. Gordon St. between Clairfields Dr. W and Claire Rd W. where 50% of the total collisions resulted in injury,

I applaud the city for widening a section of Gordon St. this will somewhat alleviate the current congestion seen over Gordon St. and the traffic that will generate projects six to eleven,

The image below shows the area proposed for expansion (blue line), and it is exactly where the six developments will take place.



I would like to remind the city that 1242-1260 Gordon and 9 Valley Rd are North of the proposed widening of Gordon, people that will leave on this project will have only two exit points, one over Gordon and the second via Valley Rd.

In regards to the exit facing Gordon:

The front of 1242-1260 Gordon St faces the turn right lane to enter Edinburgh St from Gordon, the cars going South will have to exit Valley Rd, cars leaving Gordon will have to merge on Gordon going South, or cross to Edinburgh st.



This is already a high density area, the proposed municipal right of way, that would be build with taxpayers money, to accommodate this project, would result on an exist that will cross two pedestrian crossings, a bike lane, and would merge to a two lane road, on two of the most transit streets, Edinburgh and Gordon.



Valley Rd Exit

The second exit proposed for this project would be exiting the property via 9 Valley Rd, there is already a high-density town homes there, and there is currently a development been build in that street, the only exit for these two developments is Lansdown, Lansdown only exit is Gordon St.



This is a very narrow street, with developments already taking place, the city has it on their densification plans to build even more townhouses and condos along Lansdown, How are emergency vehicles enter in case of a fire happening on any of these developments?, how are they going to be transported to the Hospital, which is North, over an already maxed out street?

Here is a visual of the actual entrances to Valley Rd and Lansdown



I also include a video from 9 Valley Rd for a better visual of the street that is expected to support traffic to 377 units AND the development already under construction on this area, notice the two community mailboxes along Lansdown.



Gordon Street Improvements and its impact on this project.

https://guelph.ca/city-hall/planning-and-development/environment-planning/environmental-assessments/gordon-street-improvements/,

As mentioned, this street improvement will not benefit South end residents moving towards the downtown/North area.

https://guelph.ca/wp-content/uploads/1242-Gordon-Street-Traffic-Impact-Study-May-2020.pdf

In regards to the traffic study presented by the developer, I would like to quote their findings **AS OF MAY 2020**

"There are relatively high volumes during PM peak hours", and quote "The stop controlled eastbound approach at **Gordon St Lansdown Dr** experience delays high enough to reach a LOS of "F"",

It would be interesting to understand when these observations happened, during the pandemic, that started in February, traffic diminished in the area, I would like to ask if the data collected on this report shows the pre-pandemic figures.

1242, 1250, 1260 GORDON STREET AND 9 VALLEY ROAD

Existing Conditions May 21, 2020

- Gordon Street & Arkell Road: The northbound through movement experiences a relatively high volume to capacity ratio during the PM peak hour due to the combination of high northbound volumes and a constrained signal split due to the southbound left advanced turn phase.
- Gordon Street & Harts Lane: The westbound approach operates under a relatively high delay during the PM peak hour due to the high uncontrolled north-south volumes along Gordon Street which result in few available gaps for left turning vehicles.
- Gordon Street & Landsdown Drive: The eastbound approach operates under a very high delay during the PM peak hour due to the high uncontrolled north-south volumes along Gordon Street which result in few available gaps for left turning vehicles.
- Gordon Street & Vaughan Street: The eastbound approach operates under a relatively high delay (LOS of "E") during the PM peak hour due to the high uncontrolled north-south volumes along Gordon Street which limits the available gaps for eastbound left and through vehicles.

Another part of the study quote: "New residents may not be aware of the transit and active transportation facilities available in the area, awareness of sustainable modes of transportation include bicycle parking space and transportation infrastructure"

This recommendation is highly unlikely to be effective as the majority of people moving into Guelph commute to the GTA area for work, it is an unreasonable expectation to set up projects "hoping" that people will bike or use public transportation as a solution to traffic planning,

Our petition

We respectfully request the council not to allow the request to allow the density requested of 271, which is almost double what the current density allowance is for this area (150)

Consider the safety of the current and future residents in the area, if a major fire occurs in any of the current or future developments along Gordon St or inside the Lansdown area, it will be extremely difficult for residents to leave the area on time, and for first responders to access these homes and reach the hospital on time,

As it is mentioned on the traffic study presented by the developer, the current situation in the area, as of May 2020, shows high volume of traffic at PM peak hours, and the city traffic study shows Gordon St. as one of its top streets with the most accidents, more people without a solution to the North part of Gordon street should not move forward.

The expense to widen Gordon to the North of Edinburgh to even Stone Rd would be extremely expensive, all the hydro light poles would have to be removed as they are, in both sides, 1-2 feet from the street, this is an enormous amount of money that would have to come out of the City.



This is not Toronto where people move by public transport, suggesting for people to use public transport or use other means of transportation to work is just ridiculous

https://pub-guelph.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=7031

September 2, 2020

Guelph City Hall 1 Carden St. Guelph, Ontario. N1L 3A1

Re: 1242 -1260 Gordon St. and 9 Valley Road Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment

Ms. Sulatycki,

As per the City's invitation to provide written comment on the above referenced amendments, we wish to provide the following:

We would request the provision of an adjusted design that would block the line of site from our property backyard to the proposed building 2 front entrance, visitor parking and to the traffic along the proposed street A.

Current

Future



We would also request retention of the current woodlot rather than the currently proposed parkette. In the event that the final appearance of the woodlot area and proposed vegetation is not able to block the line of site and buffer noise, we would request the design include a fence of adequate structure and height to provide our backyard with privacy from line of site, lights and noise.

Cc: dominique.orourke@guelph.ca

 \bowtie

REQUEST #2 & MORE IMPORTANTLY

We would also request that the City give consideration to **declining the request for density adjustment.** The original research and plan for the Gordon Street intensification recommended much lower density than is being proposed. Ignoring the recommendations of a very expensive, well researched and previously accepted plan would be, in our opinion, mismanagement, fiscally irresponsible and breach of council's commitment to its citizens.

We encourage sticking with the original density plan. Gordon Street is already at or exceeding capacity. The original plan, even with the proposed road widening, did not allow for the inevitable increase in traffic that will occur as a result of this proposal. We would also point out, that this project is not in isolation and other projects already approved in the vicinity that will be adding to the inevitable traffic and pedestrian safety issues.

Increased promotion of public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian movement is commendable and supported but the reality is that cars are required for many daily urban activities. Even with the adoption of alternatives their use will continue for the foreseeable future. The density increase proposed will potentially compromise emergency vehicle movement, business and residential parking as well as routine road maintenance and snow removal.

Please use your foresight to prevent a regrettable future.

We would be willing and are available to attend the September 14th meeting to answer any questions Council may have regarding our comments and request.

Regards,

George & Carolyn Annette

Cc: dominique.orourke@guelph.ca

 \bowtie

Mayor Guthrie and Members of Council:

I would like to understand why our Parkland Dedication By-law has not been applied to parkland calculations for 1242-1260 Gordon St. and 9 Valley Road.

I know that parkland dedication has been in flux for more than a year as a result of changes at the Provincial level, but it is my understanding that our Parkland Dedication By-law, as updated, is still currently in force. The implications of which Parkland Dedication calculations are applied are significant.

Ms. Clos asserts in her Planning Report that the 0.209 ha park proposed by Tricar exceeds the requirements of the Planning Act and that Tricar should be granted a credit towards another property in Guelph.

Applying "alternate rates" set out in the Planning Act (which I'm not clear have yet been repealed), in conjunction with our updated Parkland Dedication By-law yields very different results: in addition to conveying 0.209 ha of land to the City, Tricar would owe the City the cash-in-lieu equivalent value of 0.628 ha of land. According to Area Land Values set out in the draft of the Parkland Dedication By-law, residential land in this area of the City may be worth as much as \$1,800,000 per acre. *This would translate to an additional cash-in-lieu conveyance to the City of almost \$2.8 million dollars.*

Below, I set out the process by which I calculated these numbers, as well as the sections of the Planning Act and Parkland Dedication By-law on which I relied.

Before I detail that information, I want to address the larger parkland context.

As the City grows, population pressures on existing infrastructure also grow. In order not to overwhelm that infrastructure, we need to add or upgrade. This is self-evident in the capacity issues on Gordon St. Approval of additional housing results in extra traffic, which is now exceeding the carrying capacity of the road. Upgrades are required.

As the City grows, we also need to add parkland. At the beginning of the pandemic, we saw how inadequate parkland in high-density areas of Toronto was overwhelmed by people seeking access to the outdoors.

This particular development proposes adding 377 units of housing to this stretch of Gordon St. Applying Guelph's average household size of 2.5 residents per household, we can anticipate that 943 people will live in these apartments. The minimum parkland to population ratio enshrined in our Official Plan is 2 ha of combined neighbourhood and community parkland per 1,000 people. For this development, the Official Plan therefore requires 1.89 ha of parkland to meet the needs of these residents. The amount of actual parkland that Tricar proposes to convey to the City is 0.209 ha, 11% of the minimum required by the Official Plan.

In relation to the proposal from Ms. Clos, I would like to start with this question:

The 0.209 ha park proposed by Tricar represents 6.7% of the area of the 3.12 ha site. However, in Ms. Clos' calculations, the 0.209 ha is put forward as 11.43% of the property area. This higher number is achieved by "netting out" the Open Space Block.

Is "netting out" open space a standard City practice? It would appear that this would depend on the interpretation of the wording of the Planning Act: "5 per cent of the land included in the plan."

The "plan" can be interpreted as the entire 3.12 site, or it can be interpreted as the land net of Open Space. One interpretation seriously reduces the amount of parkland or cash-in-lieu conveyed to the City, not just for this location, but potentially for other developments. I am curious to understand how the interpretation of this wording is generally applied by the City.

I have tried to lay out the process by which I arrived at my numbers as clearly as possible so that staff can check both the accuracy of my calculations and the underlying assumptions. I am working with the following information from the planning documents

Lot size: 3.12 ha # of units: 377 Density - greater than 100 units/ha Parkland cap: not more than 30% of site (Parkland dedication By-law).

The By-law cap is 30% of the site. Parkland cannot exceed 0.936 ha, which is 30% of 3.12 ha. Cash-in-lieu cannot exceed 30% of the market value of the land.

For 377 units, if we apply the parkland calculation of 1 ha/300 units, that would be 1.26 ha - only the cap of 0.936 would kick in.

For 377 units, if we apply the cash-in-lieu calculation of 1ha/500 units, that would be 0.736 ha, not to exceed 30% of the market value of the land.

Working with a combination of parkland and cash-in-lieu, here's one scenario of how that calculation could happen:

Under section 51.1 (2) of the Planning Act, alternative rates can be applied to high density developments. This section of the Planning Act was slated to be repealed and replaced by the Community Benefit Charge, but as far as I can ascertain that change has not yet been implemented. Here is the text of that section:

Other criteria

(2) If the approval authority has imposed a condition under subsection (1) requiring land to be conveyed to the municipality and if the municipality has an official plan that contains specific policies relating to the provision of lands for park or other public recreational purposes, the municipality, in the case of a subdivision proposed for residential purposes, may, in lieu of such conveyance, require that land included in the plan be conveyed to the municipality for park or other public recreational purposes at a rate of **one hectare for each 300 dwelling units proposed** or at such lesser rate as may be determined by the municipality. 1994, c. 23, s. 31.

Note: On a day to be named by proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor, subsection 51.1 (2) of the Act is repealed. (See: 2019, c. 9, Sched. 12, s. 15 (2))

This alternative rate is also enshrined in Section 10 of our Parkland Dedication By-law.

Where Conveyance of a Portion of the Land Required: [amended by by-law (2019)-20380]

10. Where it has been determined that a portion of the Land will be required to be conveyed to the City as Parkland, the following shall apply:

(*d*)Where land is located outside of Downtown and is to be Developed or Redeveloped for residential purposes with a total proposed density equal to or greater than one-hundred (100) Dwelling Units per one hectare (1ha), **the greater of:**

i. a portion of the Land not exceeding 1 hectare (1ha) per three hundred (300) Dwelling Units, but in no case to exceed thirty percent (30%) of the total area of the Land, or; *ii.* five-percent (5%) of the total area of the Land; shall be conveyed to the City for Parkland.

0.209 hectares is equivalent to 63 units using the 1ha : 300 unit ratio. That would leave a balance of 314 units out of the total 377 for calculation of Cash-in-lieu.

Cash-in-lieu is calculated at a lower rate of 1ha per 500 units. For 314 units, the area of land to be used for calculation of cash-in-lieu would be 0.628 hectares.

Land values are commonly expressed in acres. 0.628 hectares converts to 1.552 acres.

According to Schedule A of the Parkland Dedication By-law update, land values for this area of the City run as much as \$1,800,000 per acre: (pages 10 and 11 of this link):

https://quelph.ca/wp-content/uploads/parkland-dedication-bylaw.pdf

At a land value of \$1,800,000 per acre, parkland dedication cash-in-lieu for this site could be worth as much as \$2,793,600 to the City for 1.552 acres (0.628 ha)

The Section of the Planning Act relating to alternative rates for Cash-in-lieu is 51.1 (3.1). Again, this section has been slated to be repealed, but my understanding is that the transition and determination of the Community Benefit Calculation has not yet been enacted:

(3.1) If the approval authority has imposed a condition under subsection (1) requiring land to be conveyed to the municipality and subsection (2) applies, the municipality may require a payment in lieu, calculated by using a rate of **one hectare for each 500 dwelling units** proposed or such lesser rate as may be determined by the municipality. 2015, c. 26, s. 32 (2).

Note: On a day to be named by proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor, subsection 51.1 (3.1) of the Act is repealed. (See: 2019, c. 9, Sched. 12, s. 15 (4))

This alternative rate for cash-in-lieu is also enshrined in Section 17 of our Parkland Dedication By-law.

Payment of Money in Lieu of Conveyance:

17. Where it has been determined that the payment of money will be required in lieu of a conveyance of a portion of the Land for Parkland, the following shall apply:

(d) Where Land in the City located outside Downtown will be Developed or Redeveloped for residential purposes with a total proposed density greater than or equal to one-hundred (100) Dwelling Units per one hectare (1ha), the payment required in lieu of the conveyance of a portion of the Land for Parkland **shall be the greater of:**

i. the equivalent Market Value of 1 hectare (1ha) per five-hundred (500) Dwelling Units proposed to be added by the Development or Redevelopment, but in no case to exceed thirty-percent (30%) of the total Market Value of the Land, or;

ii. Five-percent (5%) of the total Market Value of the Land

The underlying principle expressed in Section 18 of our Parkland Dedication By-law is that calculations be carried out in a way that will result in the greatest total payment to the City.

18. Where a Development or Redevelopment will include a mix of uses, and two or more of the requirements under section 17 a) - e) may apply to the Development or Redevelopment, the payment required in lieu of a conveyance of a portion of the Land to the City for Parkland shall be determined in accordance with **whichever single requirement** under section 17 a) – e) applies to the Development or Redevelopment which will result in the greatest total payment to the City being **required**.

Both Council and the community will benefit from any clarity which Planning Staff can provide on this matter.

Sincerely, Susan Watson