

January 17, 2022

Dear Mayor/Councillors,

Re: Comment on OP Update Proposal Shaping Guelph 2051– the Gordon-Arkell Strategic Growth Area

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I have participated in the OP review over the past several years. My motivation to put pen to paper here is one associated with one small area of the City, the Gordon and Arkell 'Strategic Growth Area'. In reviewing the background planning material I'm told that increased population/job activity is required for this area. I'm uncertain as to why this is so. From my perspective having lived and worked in the area, I believe the new **minimum** density proposal for 120 persons+jobs/ha is too high as this will generate new negative transportation and environmental impacts. To elaborate further:

1) The recently completed transportation EA for the Gordon/Arkell intersection indicated that this section of Gordon was experiencing significant congestion/transport design issues **currently**. The overall arterial/collector grid system in the area is disrupted by the presence of the Hanlon Creek protected NHS, and therefore additional road/intersection-functioning pressures are placed on Gordon, in the Edinburgh to Arkell stretch. In personal observations of the transport workings of this area, there are significant disruptions in traffic flow when the roadway is not functioning properly, i.e., emergency vehicle use, traffic accidents, construction activity. Placing more development in this location will generate additional congestion and the new EA-approved Gordon/Arkell intersection widenings will not assist, i.e., induced traffic demand impact caused by new/proposed development.

2) In reviewing Table 4.3 and the OP land use designations for the area, it can be inferred that the wildlife corridor across the EA-approved 6 lane Gordon St (north of Arkell) has been given up on and additional high-density development is now proposed in this neighbourhood 'strategic growth node'. In my opinion, the balance to protecting the environment/adjacent natural areas and human development activity here is not appropriate, and reflective of a non-resiliency scenario to the future challenges facing us.

Existing OP Land Use:



Proposed OP Land Use:



Thanks for reading,

Paul Kraehling MCIP RPP (Ret.)