

Attachment-10 Summary of Public Input since the release of the draft Secondary Plan (to date)

The City has been engaging with residents and stakeholders through the Clair-Maltby "Have Your Say" webpage, open office hours and e-mail. To date, City staff have responded to approximately 50 questions both online through "Have Your Say" and the Open House. Many inquiries have been clarifying questions related to the protection of the Natural Heritage System, how the City plans to acquire and implement the Moraine Ribbon, the transit hub, community park and servicing. Other questions, such as development timing, phasing and engagement have also been addressed.

The City has also been in contact with land owners and developers, addressing questions relating to density, infrastructure and development phasing, parkland dedication and financing.

Moving forward, the City hopes to continue to engage with key stakeholders, community members and our indigenous partners in these ways as we work toward the finalization of the Clair-Maltby Secondary Plan.

Detailed Summary of the Questions and Comments

Question: At some point, would someone explain why certain words and phrases are italicized? Is there any significance of which we should be aware?

Answer: If a word or phrase is italicized it means that it's defined in the secondary plan or the official plan.

Question: What is the last date that formal comments can be sent to the City re: the draft materials? Aug 8th? Please confirm. Thank you

Answer: The virtual open house is schedule to run from now until August 8, however, that will not be the end of engagement. We will continue to welcome feedback until the statutory public meeting and beyond.

Question: When is the statutory public meeting scheduled?

Answer: We are working toward a statutory public meeting in early fall, likely September, but exact timing may be dependent upon the feedback we receive over the summer.

Question: When do you expect planning to end and development to begin?

Answer: There are several planning milestones that are required prior to development. These include the Statutory Public Meeting in Fall of 2021 and a Council decision which is expected in early 2022. Following that, there is the possibility of appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT). Once the secondary plan is fully approved and any appeals have been resolved, each landowner or group of landowners that wishes to develop will be development application processes such as Draft Plan of Subdivision, Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan Approval. These development approval processes will include preliminary and detailed design of their sites.

Question: Who are the 'stakeholders' in this exercise? How much Indigenous voice was engaged?

Answer: We have engaged the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, the Six Nations of the Grand River First Nation and the Metis Nation throughout the project.

Question: Beyond the Indigenous population, who are considered to be the stakeholders?

Answer: We consider any person or group that has expressed interest in the project to be a stakeholder. Currently our mailing list has close to 400 people that have requested to remain informed about the project.

Question: Could the City please confirm how much residential land is available in Clair-Maltby once the roads, SWM, schools, moraine ribbon and parks are net out?

Answer: Outside of the Natural Heritage System and other service lands (including roads, stormwater management areas (swm), schools, moraine ribbon and parks) there is approximately 115 hectares of land available for development with 103 hectares of the lands being identified for residential purposes.

This land area includes assumptions that approximately 20% of the total land area in low density residential areas, 15% of the total land area in medium density residential areas and 10% of the total land area in high density residential areas will be allocated for local roads.

Question: Have there been any appeals registered yet?

Answer: Appeals to the Ontario Land Tribunal cannot be made until after Council makes a decision on the final documents. We anticipate a Council decision in early 2022.

Question: When is the fiscal review being released?

Answer: The Fiscal Impact Assessment is underway and will be released prior to the Statutory Public meeting in the fall.

Question: Can you provide more details about the proposed transit hub?

Answer: The secondary plan includes draft policies regarding the proposed transit hub. See section 11.3.6.3 of the [Draft Secondary Plan](#).

For convenience below are the proposed transit hub policies:

11.3.6.3.4 - The Transit Hub identified on Schedule C is intended to accommodate for transfer between local transit routes, and may include transfers to inter-regional transit services. The Transit Hub is intended to include spaces for transit employees and passengers waiting and transfer areas.

11.3.6.3.5 - The terminal location shall be determined in the context of the detailed design of development, but shall generally be in the location identified on Schedule C. Development within this area shall be designed to incorporate the Transit Hub while conforming to the applicable built form and land use policies of this Plan.

11.3.6.3.6 - Vehicular access to the Transit Hub from the east-west main street of the Urban Village Core is discouraged.

Question: It appears the southern roadway has been altered from previous iterations, reason?

Answer: The alignment of the southern roadway (Street E) was established in the Initial Preferred Community Structure, which was endorsed by Council in 2018 (see MESP Figure 1.9). The Updated Preferred Community Structure (see MESP Figure

1.10) was endorsed by Council in 2019, and the Final Preferred Community Structure (Figure 1.11 in MESP) show the same alignment.

Question: In terms of the population, what kind of impact will there be approximately? Numbers

Answer: The densities within the proposed Secondary allow for a range of populations. In Section 11.3.2.1 of the Secondary Plan, item 3 notes that 16,300 people and 1,250 jobs are the minimum targets of the plan by 2051.

Question: Where can I find water maps and other details shown in presentation?

Answer: There are a few different locations where you can find more information. The MESP document has the servicing maps (<https://guelph.ca/plans-and-strategies/clair-maltby-secondary-plan/cm-documents/>). The slides from today's session are here: <https://guelph.ca/plans-and-strategies/clair-maltby-secondary-plan/cm-public-engagement-materials/#2021-community-engagement>. The materials for the presentations occurring after this session are also available at that link, which will provide more detail on servicing.

Question: How does the City plan to secure the moraine ribbon land during the development process?

Confirming that the moraine ribbon will be counted as parkland dedication. This should be stated in the Secondary Plan policies

Answer: The moraine ribbon is part of the Open Space System for the secondary plan area. The City will consider the use of a variety of strategies, tools and options to assist with the cost of acquiring open space in Clair-Maltby.

The strategies and options to acquire the open space system in Clair-Maltby will include, but are not limited to:

- a. municipal land purchase;
- b. Parkland dedication;
- c. Community Benefit Charge Strategy;
- d. municipal lease;
- e. partnerships/joint provision of parkland with local partners (e.g. Grand River Conservation Authority, school boards);
- f. easements; and,
- g. donation/bequest, at the discretion of the City.

Question: Why has the proposed cross-section for Gordon Street not been presented for review and been chosen by staff with no consideration of alternatives that would be more consistent with streetscapes suited to the moraine setting?

Answer: Roadway cross sections within the Secondary Plan are generic in nature and are a starting point for future study/design. Due to the anticipated capital cost and change in the number of lanes, Gordon Street is anticipated to require further study as a Schedule C Environmental Assessment. Through this study and through detailed design, the streetscape will be refined and there will be further opportunity for stakeholder input.

Question: Can you elaborate on the Phasing/Phasing plan for Clair-Maltby? and how it will be implemented?

Answer: The suggested phasing plan within the Master Environmental Servicing Plan document demonstrates how the Secondary Plan area could be phased, largely based on servicing. Services will be required to come from the already built-up area of Guelph (north), which is why the plan suggests development from north to south, making use of the existing services and optimizing the timing of upgrades / new infrastructure.

Question: How do these plans affect current residents/land owners in the areas of planning?

Answer: The Secondary Plan provides the framework to allow for the lands to change from their current use to the proposed land uses in the Secondary Plan. This will allow landowners to change the way their land is used, but does not force them to.

Question: How were the wildlife crossing points over Gordon Street determined? Based on current wildlife movement?

Answer: Wildlife movement data was collected as part of the CEIS Phase 1 and 2 study. The movement data confirmed the proposed locations of wildlife crossings in the 2014 NHS. It also informed the addition of 7 additional crossing locations proposed in the Secondary Plan Area.

Question: Will the city expropriate land?

Answer: The secondary plan provides the framework to allow for lands to change from their current use to the proposed land uses in the secondary plan. A secondary plan does not change land ownership or current land uses, but speaks to how land can be developed in the future. Most of that development will be undertaken by private landowners. The secondary plan will allow landowners to apply to change the way their land is used but does not force them to. While the City does have the statutory authority to expropriate land, it is not something that is undertaken frequently and would only be considered after other options have been explored for a specifically identified public need. There are no expropriations currently contemplated in connection with the Clair-Maltby secondary plan.

Question: Does 'elevated storage' mean another water tower?

Answer: Elevated storage means the storage will be above-ground. The type of above-ground storage (i.e. tower or standpipe) will be explored during detailed design.

Question: Still curious which of the 3 above ground options for water storage is preferred in the preferred location.

Answer: The scope of this Municipal Environmental Servicing Plan is to look at alternative solutions, but not alternative designs for those solutions, in accordance with the process for completing Municipal Class Environmental Assessments for Schedule B projects. During preliminary and detailed design, the exact type of elevated water storage will be determined.

Question: Will all external works be complete in Phase 1? Trunkmain on Gordon/Clair. What are the expected impacts of the external works to the existing infrastructure?

Answer: The works required for each phase are described in Section 4.1.5 of the MESP. Phase 1 includes work on Street B, Street A, and external intersection improvements. It also includes a portion of the 600mm transmission main (in alignment with the external road works) and the sewers installed under Street A and B. In planning the external works, an effort has been made to coordinate road works with underground services. During detailed design, further refinement of alignments and coordination with other projects and utilities will mitigate impacts to the existing infrastructure.

Question: How deep are the Gordon street sewers anticipated to be?

Answer: The range of ground elevations along Gordon make it difficult to provide an average depth of the sewers along Gordon. Where possible, the gravity sewers along Gordon will be built with standard cover (however due to the terrain, they may go up to 10m deep), and the forcemains will be built with standard cover.

Question: If the distribution mains are identified to be 300mm diameter - what is the anticipated size of the transmission main?

Answer: The preliminary sizing of the transmission main is 600mm in diameter.

Question: Can you give us an idea of when these services will be reflected in the City's infrastructure budget?

Answer: Some works for the Clair Maltby Secondary Plan were captured in the previous Development Charges Update Study (mostly the mobility infrastructure projects). The Fiscal Impact Assessment is underway and the costs for each of the established projects will be carried forward from that document into the City's capital budget.

Question: When is the elevated water tower required to be constructed and in operation? How does the requirement for the elevated water tower fit with the anticipated servicing and phasing timeline for the Clair-Maltby area?

Answer: The above-ground storage component is required to support Phase 3. The connecting transmission main will be built with road infrastructure throughout Phases 1-3.

Question: How far does the 525mm diameter trunk sanitary sewer extend along Gordon Street (in a southerly direction)?

Answer: The preferred sanitary alternative is shown in Figure 3.2.8 of the MESP. This shows the limits of the 525mm Trunk Sewer just south of the Clair/Gosling Gardens intersection. Further detail on the pipe alignment will be provided during detailed design.

Question: Is the water tower required to be completed before Phase 2 and 3 can proceed?

Answer: For clear phasing details, please refer to the MESP Report: <https://guelph.ca/plans-and-strategies/clair-maltby-secondary-plan/cm-documents/>

Question: How many of the properties were able to be accessed for the assessment of the NHS?

Answer: Regarding property access, access granted varied year to year. If you go to the Clair Maltby webpage, maps showing property access and access type

granted are included within each monitoring report (Year 1, Year 2 and Year 3).
<https://guelph.ca/plans-and-strategies/clair-maltby-secondary-plan/cm-documents/>

Question: Were any of the illegal tree removals by developers captured in the study of NHS?

Answer: Some of the areas impacted by tree by-law violations remain within the NHS, and some overlapped with areas that have Ontario Municipal Board settlement agreements.

Question: Would the consultant be able to define how the Kettle ponds in the area function in the headlands areas?

Answer: Many of the Kettle ponds were looked at in detail by installing shallow monitoring points at their locations. This allowed for the study of several years of data collected on the groundwater system in-and-around these ponds.

The kettle ponds (except Halls Pond) have been observed to be perched above the regional groundwater table, they receive runoff (largely in the spring) that maintains the pond level. Pond levels may change to evaporation, and there is also a component of leakage from the base of the kettle ponds that help to recharge the groundwater system. The ponds are largely not groundwater fed, in fact, the opposite – they provide the function of recharging the groundwater.

Question: In terms of groundwater modelling, were anticipated changes by climate change factored in at all.

Answer: When simulating future conditions in the groundwater model, 15 years of historical precipitation information was used. This provided the team with a range of dry and wet years to ensure results were representative of true conditions.

Within the stormwater management aspect of the project, the surface water capture areas are designed to a hurricane standard, which doesn't have a traditional climate change component to it, however it is larger than a typical 100 year system. Climate change has been factored in when considering surface systems to get the runoff to the surface water capture areas (overland flow systems and piping). As well, the low impact development measures provide a further level of resiliency in the area for climate change mitigation.

Question: Since all runoff is to be infiltrated to protect groundwater from salt pollution will all paved areas (roads and parking areas) be required to use porous pavement NOTING THAT POROUS PAVEMENT REQUIRES MUCH LESS SALT APPLICATION

Answer: The stormwater management strategy and the City's Source Water Protection Policy must work in concert in the CMSP. Much of the CMSP area does not fall within vulnerable Well-Head Protection Areas, however salt management is still a priority and is discussed in the CEIS and MESP. As part of the MESP, an extensive review of salt management practices around the globe was executed. The MESP has indicated a series of best practices, with salt-reduction on the list.

The MESP identifies several Low Impact Development Best Management Practices (LID BMPs) that could be used to achieve the required capture and infiltration targets, one of which is permeable pavement. LID BMPs that received drainage from paved areas will be pre-treated as discussed on page 187 of the MESP.

Recommended salt management strategies are noted on page 183/184 of the MESP.

Question: How has the citizens committee, Heritage Guelph been consulted regarding Cultural Heritage Assets in the Clair-Maltby area?

Answer: The project has been presented to Heritage Guelph including when the Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment was being prepared and finalized. That document can be found here: https://guelph.ca/wp-content/uploads/Cultural-Heritage-Resource-Assessment_June-2017.pdf

Question: How does the higher density mixed use on the Designated CHL track?

Answer: The designated cultural heritage landscape has a proposed land use designation of 'Mixed Office/Commercial'.

Question: Could you explain the Urban/Rural Transition area

Answer: The Urban-Rural Transition Area is an overlay designation that is 60 metres in depth from the northerly side of the Maltby Road right-of-way and the westerly side of the Victoria Street right-of-way. There are more details in the draft secondary plan including that height in that area is limited to 3 storeys.

Question: How many developers had input to the plan? To best suit them?

Answer: Land owners and developers, as stakeholders of the project, have had the opportunity to review materials and provide feedback and input into the plan.

Question: Why are a large number of at-grade road crossings of the NHS being allowed in Clair Maltby when there are none in the rest of the City including the GID secondary plan?

Answer: The Master Environmental Servicing Plan looked at mobility and the transportation modelling undertaken indicates that a second north-south oriented street (with Gordon Street being the first north-south street) is required, and therefore essential, to connect to Clair Road to accommodate anticipated future traffic demands. The proposed north-south collector road west of Gordon Street fulfills this need.

Where a proposed road crosses the Natural Heritage System it will be subject to the outcomes of an Environmental Impact Study and/or an Environmental Assessment that demonstrates

- no negative impacts to the natural heritage features;
- a net ecological benefit; and,
- the application of mitigation measures

Question: Are these bus details about the electric busses the city is moving to moving ahead?

Answer: Moving forward the City is planning for electric buses.

Question: Will there be individual project Environmental Assessments for Gordon Street reconstruction and the proposed west collector road?

Answer: For reference, any road widening or new road that is anticipated to have a capital cost greater than 2.4M will be required to be studied as a Schedule C project under the Class EA Process. This means that alternative designs for the preferred solution will be explored and evaluated, and also further opportunities for

engagement and consultation. So yes, Gordon and the West Collector will be studied further.

Question: Does the secondary plan include a proposal to upgrade Maltby Road or is that being addressed through another study? Are upgrades to the Hanlon Crossing proposed?

Answer: Maltby Road was studied as part of the CMSP MESP. Upgrades are proposed to urbanize the road and increase access to active transportation infrastructure (sidewalks, cycle tracks). The limits of the study did not include crossing the Hanlon.

Question: From the background servicing information in the June 24, 2021 PIC presentations, the level of servicing required for this unique part of the City involves substantial innovative mechanisms to protect the extensive environmental features of the area. In addition, there will be substantial on-going energy costs to the City to moving water/wastewater through pumping requirements, i.e., no longer a gravity feed system that the rest of the City has relied on for servicing since its inception. Will the fiscal impact study include the requirements for a separate DC fee for the substantial 'above city servicing standards' that this area will require? Will the fiscal impact study also include considerations of the detrimental impacts to the City's energy use footprint for the massive on-going pumping efforts to move water/wastewater through this part of the City?, i.e., how does the approval of this plan impact the City's achievement of its Community Energy Initiative goals for 2030 and 2050?

Answer: The CMSP lands are higher in elevation than much of the rest of the City. The City's water distribution system is currently being expanded in the south side of Guelph through a new pressure zone (Zone 3) that will operate at elevations that are suitable for the CMSP Lands. Zone 3 is now live with pumping into the zone from Zone 1, however as demand increases in its service area, it will require storage to meet mandated operating requirements. As such, a new storage tank was studied in the MESP. The more energy efficient option (above-ground vs. below-ground) was selected as the preferred option. The Clair Road Booster Pumping Station (BPS) was constructed in 2012 to service new development areas consistent with the CMSP lands, as a part of Zone 3 development. In 2016, the City completed a Zone 3 implementation plan that studied energy savings if the hydraulic grade line was gradually raised as development progressed. The BPS will pump into the new CMSP above-ground storage system from Zone 1, which will then feed the study area by gravity.

Operations and maintenance costs for the water servicing alternatives are discussed in the MESP Section 3.1.4, and it is noted that energy costs for the BPS are included. These are carried forward into the Fiscal Impact Assessment.

There are currently 7 sewage pump stations within the City to facilitate conveyance of wastewater into the gravity system. The two competing constraints in planning for wastewater servicing in CMSP are minimizing pumping (to conserve energy) and to minimize sewer depths (to minimize construction costs and impacts, and to prevent future maintenance access issues). The preferred wastewater servicing alternative for CMSP does include 3 new sewage pump stations.

Operations and maintenance costs for the wastewater servicing alternatives are discussed in the MESP Section 3.1.5, and it is noted that energy costs for the pump stations are included. These are carried forward into the Fiscal Impact Assessment.

One of the City's corporate goals is to use 100% renewable energy by 2051. The Energy team at Guelph is working out the details on how that goal will be achieved. During detailed design of the pump stations and water infrastructure, the source of energy will be studied with the corporate goal in mind.

Within the Fiscal Impact Assessment, there may be a recommendation that an area-specific set of fees is established for the CMSP area due to its unique land use and needs. Upon release of that document, we'd be happy to answer further questions.

Question: A question from the June 24, 2021 virtual PIC Session 5 Mobility: It is unclear on what basis the north-south collector road east of Gordon was removed from further analysis? (see slide 18). This decision works against a fine grained arterial-collector grid through this new planning area. A grid with another north-south collector road would build in additional transport flow contingency capacity when transportation on Gordon is disrupted, i.e., closed or reduced traffic flow due to repair work, accidents. "Putting all your traffic flow eggs into the Gordon Street corridor basket" doesn't make sense in consideration of your stated guiding principles of that overall area that is 'interconnected and interwoven'. Can you elaborate further why you are proposing a Hurontario Street-type arterial road on Gordon to handle both City through-traffic plus the traffic generated from the Clair-Maltby's 16000 new residents/1000 jobs?

Answer: Regarding the north-south street east of Gordon:

The future mobility requirements are discussed in detail in the Master Environmental Servicing Plan in Section 3.4.3.3 under the sub-heading "Vehicle Traffic Assessment".

The MESP looked at mobility and the transportation modelling undertaken indicates that a second north-south oriented street (with Gordon Street being the first north-south street) is required, and therefore essential, to connect to Clair Road to accommodate anticipated future traffic demands. The proposed north-south collector road west of Gordon Street fulfills this need.

The transportation modelling also concluded that a third north-south oriented street connecting to Clair Road, initially considered during the planning process, is not required to accommodate anticipated future traffic demands. Accordingly, the north-south collector road that was originally proposed east of Gordon Street was removed from the plan. This aligns with the "environment first" approach as the street alignment east of Gordon Street interacted with the Natural Heritage System at several locations.

Regarding the Gordon Street cross section:

The typical arterial cross section presented within the Secondary Plan includes a maximum of four travel lanes with turning lanes where required, cycle tracks, sidewalks, and other boulevard features. The travelled roadway includes capacity for transit vehicles.

The detailed design of Gordon Street will be addressed through a class Environmental Assessment when Gordon Street is scheduled for reconstruction. At

that time, design alternatives for the road Right-of-Way will be explored in more detail. Please note that the Transportation Master Plan is a "macro-level" master plan Environmental Assessment that looks at the overall network, not street by street. It will recommend new "typical cross sections" for the street types to reflect the recommendations of the Plan. It will not provide detailed designs for each street corridor. In addition, typical cross-sections are being developed for arterial, collector and local roads within the Clair-Maltby Secondary Plan area. These cross-sections and the cross-sections developed through the Transportation Master Plan have been developed collaboratively to ensure the two projects are generally aligned. The cross-sections inform but do not replace the detailed design process.