

# Planning Advisory Committee Minutes



Tuesday, October 27, 2020, 6:30 pm

---

## **Members present:**

Malcolm McIntosh  
Darren Shock  
Lisa MacTaggart  
Paul Hanusiak  
Indu Arora  
Anu Luthra  
Denese Renaud

## **Members absent:**

Mario Cotroneo

## **Staff present:**

Krista Walkey, General Manager, Planning and Building Services  
Melissa Aldunate, Manager, Policy Planning and Urban Design  
Stacey Laughlin, Planner III Senior Policy Planner  
Natalie Goss, Planner III Senior Policy Planner  
Abby Watts, Project Manager, Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review  
Jason Downham, Planner II Policy and Analytics

## **Item 1 – roll call and certification of quorum**

The meeting was called to order at 6:33 pm

## **Item 2 - declaration of conflict of interest**

There were no declarations of any conflicts of interest

## **Item 3 - approval of minutes**

That the Minutes from the November 7, 2019 meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee, be approved.

Moved by: Darren Shock

Seconded by: Paul Hanusiak

**Carried**

## **Item 4 - nominations and election of chair**

That Darren Shock be elected as Chair for the Planning Advisory Committee.

**Carried**

## **Item 5 - Official Plan Review**

### **Discussion of special meeting of Council to initiate the Official Plan Review**

Stacey Laughlin, Planner III, Senior Policy Planner provided an update to the committee on the proposed scope of the Official Plan Review (OPR) including the purpose of the review. The committee was then provided an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments on the proposed scope of the OPR.

The committee asked the following questions and provided the following comments:

- What year is the Official Plan going to?
- Staff responded that the horizon year for the plan is 2051 in line with A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (APTG)
- How will fulsome public engagement be conducted in this time of COVID?
- Staff advised that a community engagement consultant has been retained to lead the engagement activities through virtual means (e.g. WebEx events) and for in person events when it is safe and permitted to do so
- It was suggested that an educational component be included in the engagement events to help the community understand policies and regulations (e.g., height) and general planning process to seek exemptions to policies and regulations

## **Item 6 - Shaping Guelph Growth Management Strategy**

### **Part 1 - Presentation and discussion of the community engagement results**

Natalie Goss, Planner III, Senior Policy Planner provided an overview of the community engagement results from the residential intensification within the built-up area conducted in August and September 2020

The committee was provided the opportunity to ask questions and provide comments on the materials presented. Additionally, staff posed the August/September community engagement questions and results to the committee for their reactions.

The committee provided the following input:

### **Where should growth be directed in the built-up area**

The committee acknowledged that the community input is what they had expected. The committee shared that they have heard concerns about traffic in the south end particularly on Gordon Street as well as parking and traffic concerns. It was suggested that staff consider these concerns and identify what is already being done or what is being considered to manage or address it.

### **How should growth be distributed throughout the built-up area**

The committee suggested that Edinburgh Road, Victoria Road and other main streets be considered for intensification to take stress off of Gordon Street. Mid-level density, about 4 to 6 storeys in height, would be appropriate. Edinburgh Road between Wellington Street and College Avenue has opportunities for intensification as a 4 lane road, in particular the area around Municipal Street and commercial plaza sites. The committee felt that 4-6 storeys maintains walkability and is more livable.

Some concern was expressed about intensification in the area of Victoria Road, York Road and Elizabeth Street because of potential contamination and brownfield sites. The committee asked whether brownfield sites were considered in the intensification analysis. Staff responded that yes, brownfield sites are considered opportunities for intensification.

The committee thought that single storey retail plazas would be appropriate for residential intensification.

### **Maximum building heights**

Committee members noted that the engagement results for preferences on maximum building heights were not surprising. The committee suggested that there should be some work done to help with understanding the need to strike a balance between maintaining existing maximum building heights in nodes and corridors and the need to accommodate growth in other areas of the city. The committee agreed with the preference expressed by the community about growing up and not out.

## **Part 2 – Overview of upcoming housing analysis community engagement**

Natalie Goss, Planner III, Senior Policy Planner provided an overview of upcoming community engagement for the development of growth scenarios. The committee's input was sought about approaches to engagement for this topic

The committee provided the following comments:

- A workshop approach to engagement would work well and allow staff to show residents what different densities mean. Workshops could be a challenge during COVID but would allow for better feedback.

- 3D modelling and images would help people understand the street level experience of higher density development. Using 3D models in virtual engagement would be valuable.
- When discussing or considering character it is important to use images that have been very carefully selected and are comparable. It is important to consider maintaining the character of areas as intensification occurs.
- It was noted that it seems that people are against 10 storeys but accepting of 8 storeys. In practice, these heights are similar. Consider how to help people understand this.
- Development should be spread out more throughout the city rather than concentrating in south end.
- Suggestion that understanding how transit will work as areas are intensified is important. Need to have reliable transit in place.

## **Item 7 - Additional Residential Dwelling Unit Review**

Abby Watts, Project Manager, Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review, provided an overview of the Planning Act requirements to permit additional residential units and the proposed amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning Bylaw to conform to these requirements.

Abby advised that a statutory public meeting was held in July 2020 which was followed by an online survey that was available from July until September 2020 to gather community input on the draft Official Plan and Zoning Bylaw amendments.

The committee asked the following questions:

- Has the 30% lot coverage rule been tested in a number of scenarios to see if in most cases there would be adequate space to accommodate urban tree canopy? Are these rules going to support the goals of the Urban Forestry Management Plan?

Staff responded that the 30% lot coverage is an existing regulation for detached garages and applies to all buildings on the lot.

- Is the transportation master plan going to be looking at the issues around on street parking? The city should look at parking permits on-street to maintain livability. People rely on street parking.

Staff advised that the Zoning Bylaw doesn't regulate street parking. The Transportation Master Plan is not focusing on on-street parking.

- Are the proposed rules for additional residential units going to be permanent structures or "tiny homes"?

Staff advised that the rules for additional residential units are for permanent structures.

- Will the proposed modifications affect/reduce the potential supply of additional residential units?

Staff advised that they don't believe that these rules add any barriers to creating additional residential units. These rules seek to balance opportunities for these units with rules to ensure appropriate locations and forms on lots.

### **Item 8 - Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review update**

Abby Watts, Project Manager, Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review, provided an overview of the current status of the comprehensive Zoning Bylaw review. Community engagement has been completed on Phase 2 – Discussion Paper. At this time it is anticipated that a first draft of a new Zoning Bylaw will be available for community engagement in spring 2021.

The committee asked whether fence provisions are included in the review. Staff confirmed that these rules are within the scope of the review.

### **Adjournment**

Moved by: Denese Renaud

Seconded by Paul Hanusiak

### **Carried**

Meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.