

Attachment-8 Department and Agency Comments



MEMO

FILE: 16.131.001

TO: Lindsay Sulatycki, Senior Development Planner
FROM: Infrastructure, Development and Environmental Engineering
DEPARTMENT: Engineering and Transportation Services
DATE: May 19, 2022
SUBJECT: 12 Poole Street (Block 91 of 61M244) Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Application (OZS-22-002)

The application for an Official Plan Amendment has been received for the lands municipally known as 12 Poole Street from IBI Group on behalf of the owner, Victoria Park Village Inc. to redesignate the subject lands from the "Low Density Greenfield Residential" land use designation to a "High Density Residential" land use designation with a site-specific policy to allow a maximum net density of 208 units per hectare.

The applicant is proposing to develop the subject lands with 308, four-storey stacked townhouse units and a six to ten storey stepped apartment building containing 185 units, for a total of 493 units and a density of approximately 208 units per hectare.

The comments below are based on the review of the following plans & reports:

- Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, prepared by MTE Consultant Inc., dated December 15, 2021;
- Servicing and Grading Plan, prepared by MTE Consultant Inc., dated February 18, 2022;
- Groundwater Mounding, prepared by MTE Consultants Inc, dated September 22, 2020
- Traffic Impact Study, prepared by Paradigm Transportation Solutions Limited, dated December 2021.

Traffic Study, Access, Parking and Transportation Demand Management:

While the TDM section of the Traffic Impact Study (December 2021) is appreciated, Staff do not feel the location is appropriate for the proposed density, as opportunities for non-auto travel are significantly limited. This location is isolated from nearby destinations and amenities with the only access provided via a major arterial roadway (i.e., Victoria Road). As such, a lower density residential development would be preferred as the majority of residents will likely be inclined to drive for many of their trips. As well, based on the current zoning by-law for this proposed development, parking is over-supplied, which contradicts TDM objectives and does not align with the modal split targets identified in the updated Transportation Master Plan.

The following design elements should be considered at site plan stage.

**Infrastructure, Development & Environmental
Engineering**
Engineering and Capital Infrastructure Services

MEMO

- The proposed loading space should be designed to accommodate a Heavy Single Unit (HSU) truck.
- The proposed waste storage area is identified as apartment waste collection area, however there is no feasible waste collection area for the stacked townhouses. The proposed waste pick-up area for the site may be unfeasible to accommodate the 500+ residential dwelling units.
- The drive aisle width shall conform to City's Development Engineering Manual. Single-loaded parking to be provided with a 6.5m drive aisle and double-loaded parking to be provide with a 7.0m drive aisle.
- As per the zoning by-law, within the corner lot 9m X 9m sight triangle, neither building nor any form of structure shall be located. A fence, hedge, shrub or foliage may be located within the sight line triangle provided its height is not more than 0.8m above the level of the travelled portion of the abutting street.

As per the conclusions of the Traffic Impact Study, traffic control signals are warranted at the intersection of Decorso Drive and Victoria Road by 2028 (i.e., five years after the built-out of the development). Without traffic control signals, the eastbound left-turning traffic would wait for over 7 minutes before a suitable gap becomes available in the mainstream traffic on Victoria Road during AM peak hours. To alleviate this traffic congestion condition, Staff support the proposed full signalization of this intersection. The developer shall pay the cost of the traffic signal design and installation.

Grading:

Overall the proposed grading plan is generally satisfactory and will be further assessed during the detailed design stage. Please note that all grading shall conform with the subdivision's overall grading and drainage plan.

Municipal Services:

Keegan Court/Poole Street/Decorso Drive

Municipal services are located along the subdivision streets

Servicing Capacities:

Sanitary Sewer Wastewater Collection System and Water Supply/Distribution System.

As per the FSR, the consultant used linear interpolation to assume a flow rate for the site based on the City's Development Engineering Manual (DEM) 6.5L/s/ha. Resulting in a peak sanitary flow to be 15.4L/s/ha. But, based on the number of units proposed, the City requires that 7.0L/s/ha be used to determine the peak flows for the sanitary.

The FSR failed to show the domestic water demand calculations, such as average day demand, maximum day demand and peak hour demand.

**Infrastructure, Development & Environmental
Engineering**
Engineering and Capital Infrastructure Services

MEMO

Storm Water Management:

Engineering has reviewed the proposed stormwater design from a high-level perspective and finds it generally satisfactory with respect to stormwater quantity and quality control. However, modelling results for how the impervious area was determined will be required for the development prior to site plan approval. Additionally, engineering would like to see the weighted calculation of how the impervious area was determined.

The site currently has low permeability, as stated in the groundwater mounding report. In-situ testing was completed in July 2019, revealing that the ground condition was saturated, and a relatively shallow groundwater condition was documented on-site. In the report, Soil-Mat engineering also stated that "...infiltration galleries are not considered feasible for Block 107 lands". MTE reports state that the Granular B Type 1 will be imported for the proposed infiltration gallery locations. Please note that once that fill material is placed, the City will require permeameter tests to be conducted in the field (in-situ) in accordance with the Development Engineering Manual (DEM). It is unclear if a 1.0m separation can be achieved from the bottom of the galleries to seasonal high elevation. This information will be required prior to site plan approval.

The subdivision report requires this block to have an infiltration target of 916 mm/year or 5,003 m³ annually (please refer to drawing C-421 prepared by Urbantech west, dated April 27, 2020). MTE's FSR states that Granular B Type 1 will be imported for the proposed infiltration gallery locations in order to achieve this infiltration rate as was done throughout the subdivision. However, the water balance calculation provided in the FSR are based on an assumption, as infiltration rate mm/hr is not determined to date; therefore, Staff cannot confirm whether these infiltration targets can be achieved, we expect this to be addressed during the site plan stage. In addition, the placement and sizing of infiltration galleries shown on the P1 Underground Parking Plan drawing do not match the Engineering Drawings. Please note that a Detailed design will be required for all the infiltration galleries at the site plan stage.

Staff Recommendation

Engineering staff recommends that the plans and/or reports be updated and resubmitted.

Shophan Daniel, C.E.T
Engineering Technologist III

Mary Angelo, P.Eng
Manager, Development and
Environmental Engineering

**Infrastructure, Development & Environmental
Engineering**
Engineering and Capital Infrastructure Services

Attachment-8 Department and Agency Comments (continued)

Internal Memo



Date May 10, 2022
To **Lindsay Sulatycki, Senior Development Planner**
From Leah Lefler, Environmental Planner
Service Area Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise Services
Department Planning Services
**Subject 12 Poole Street Official Plan Amendment
Environmental Planning comments OZS22-002**

Introduction

An application for an Official Plan Amendment has been received for the lands municipally known as 12 Poole Street to redesignate the subject lands from "Low Density Greenfield Residential" to "High Density Residential". The applicant proposes to develop the subject lands with 308 four-storey stacked townhouse units and a six (6) to ten (10) storey stepped apartment building containing 185 units, for a total of 493 units.

The subject lands are part of a larger subdivision that was draft plan approved in November 2013 and registered in September 2021. Through the draft plan of subdivision approval, an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) and Environmental Implementation Report (EIR) were prepared and approved by City staff. Note that these approvals were based on consistency with the City's previous greenlands system policies and predate the City's current natural heritage system policies. Further refinements to water balance calculations and the management of stormwater were made through detailed design and subdivision registration of Phase 1B of the Victoria Park Village Subdivision in September 2021.

Environmental planning staff reviewed the following materials:

- 12 Poole Street Concept Plan, IBI Group, 28 January 2021
- Planning Justification Report, Victoria Park Village – Block 107, IBI Group, December 24, 2021
- 12 Poole Street Draft Official Plan Amendment, December 2021
- Engineering Drawings, MTE Consultants, 15 December 2021
- Functional Servicing Stormwater Management Report, MTE Consultants, 15 December 2021
- Groundwater Mounding Calculations, MTE Consultants, 18 February 2022
- Pedestrian Wind Assessment, SLR Consulting Ltd., 14 December 2021
- Transportation Impact Study, Paradigm Transportation Solutions Limited, December 2021
- Elevations and Shadow Study, aba architects inc., December 2021
- P1 Underground Parking Plan, aba architects inc., December 2021
- Urban Design Brief, adesso design inc., December 2021

- Landscape Concept, adesso design inc., December 2021

Comments

Environmental planning staff offer the following comments based on requirements set out in the approved EIS and EIR, and refinements to water balance and infiltration approved through detailed design:

Stormwater management comments

The proposed stormwater management strategy does not demonstrate that the approved water balance for Block 107 can be met. Therefore, it is unknown whether the proposed development would have an impact on Torrance Creek or to the adjacent Torrance Creek Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW).

1. Previous approvals for Block 107 included infiltration galleries designed to accommodate 40 mm runoff volume from rooftops, with an infiltration target of 916 mm/year or 5,003 m³ annually (refer to drawing C-421 prepared by Urbantech west, dated 27 April 2020). The development proposes a roof area increase from 5,461 m² to 9,326 m². The increase in roof area required a revised plan for stormwater management. The proposed design infiltrates 25 mm runoff volume from rooftops, rather than the approved 40 mm runoff volume. Although the proposed infiltration volumes match the approved 916 mm/year or 5,003 m³ annually, runoff to storm sewers and the receiving stormwater management facility (SWM Facility 200) must increase. The Functional Servicing Report (FSR) does not address the proposed increase in runoff or capacity in SWM Facility 200 to accommodate an increase in runoff without having a negative impact on Torrance Creek.
2. In the approved Stormwater Management Plan for the subdivision approval, design of SWM Facility 200 accommodates drainage from catchment 201 with an area of 6.92 ha. The proposed development appears to also include catchment 600 (0.41 ha) in drainage to SWM Facility 200. Previously, designs accommodated sheet flow from rear yards backing onto the natural heritage system in catchment 600 to maintain surface flow contributions to the adjacent Torrance Creek PSW. Runoff from catchment 600 appears to be redirected to SWM Facility 200 and Torrance Creek, and away from the adjacent Torrance Creek PSW. The FSR does not address proposed changes in runoff directed toward the PSW and does not demonstrate that the proposed development will not have a negative impact on the adjacent PSW.
3. The proposed Landscape Plan does not appear to be compatible with the placement of infiltration galleries. Adequate space for trees and infiltration galleries must be provided, per the City's [Tree Technical Manual](#) and [Development Engineering Manual](#).
4. The placement of infiltration gallery #4 is near the apartment garbage collection area. This is not ideal from a water quality perspective.
5. Placement and sizing of infiltration galleries shown on the P1 Underground Parking Plan drawing do not appear to match what is shown on Engineering Drawings.
6. Best management practices in sediment and erosion control are required to protect the natural heritage system and water quality.

Site plan-related comments

7. Snow storage areas are not shown on the plan. Given the density of development proposed, opportunities for snow storage appear to be limited. Snow storage on top of infiltration galleries is not supported at Site Plan.
8. Permanent dewatering to facilitate underground parking is not supported. Details pertaining to waterproofing underground parking facilities are required at Site Plan.
9. Note that Guelph's [Bird-friendly Design Guideline](#) is applicable to this development. Drawings submitted for Site Plan approval will be required to demonstrate consistency with these guidelines.

Conclusion

From an environmental planning perspective, the proposal is not supportable for the following reasons:

- The proposed stormwater management strategy does not demonstrate that the approved water balance for Block 107 can be met.
- It is unknown if SWM Facility 200 can accommodate the proposed increased runoff.
- It is unknown if the proposed increase in runoff would have a negative impact on Torrance Creek.
- It is unknown whether the proposed reduction in sheet flow runoff directed to the Torrance Creek PSW from catchment 600 would have a negative impact.

Prepared by:

Leah Lefler

Environmental Planner

519-822-1260 extension 2362

leah.lefler@guelph.ca

Attachment-8 Department and Agency Comments (continued)

Internal Memo



Date	May 17, 2022
To	Lindsay Sulatycki, Senior Development Planner
From	Ryan Mallory, Park Planner
Service Area	Public Services
Department	Park and Trail Development
Subject	12 Poole Street Official Plan Amendment - Park and Trail Development comments OZS22-002

Introduction

An application for an Official Plan Amendment has been received for the lands municipally known as 12 Poole Street to redesignate the subject lands from "Low Density Greenfield Residential" to "High Density Residential". The applicant proposes to develop the subject lands with 308 four-storey stacked townhouse units and a six (6) to ten (10) storey stepped apartment building containing 185 units, for a total of 493 units.

The subject lands are part of a larger subdivision that was draft plan approved in November 2013 and registered in September 2021.

Park planning staff reviewed the following materials:

- Planning Justification Report, Victoria Park Village – Block 107, IBI Group, December 24, 2021
- 12 Poole Street Concept Plan, IBI Group, 28 January 2021
- 12 Poole Street Draft Official Plan Amendment, December 2021
- Engineering Drawings, MTE Consultants, 15 December 2021
- Landscape Concept, adesso design inc., December 2021
- Functional Servicing Stormwater Management Report, MTE Consultants, 15 December 2021
- Groundwater Mounding Calculations, MTE Consultants, 18 February 2022
- Pedestrian Wind Assessment, SLR Consulting Ltd., 14 December 2021
- Transportation Impact Study, Paradigm Transportation Solutions Limited, December 2021
- Elevations and Shadow Study, aba architects inc., December 2021
- P1 Underground Parking Plan, aba architects inc., December 2021
- Urban Design Brief, adesso design inc., December 2021

Comments

Park planning staff offer the following comments based the above noted submission:

Background

The proposed development includes 4-storey stacked townhouse blocks with a 6 to 10-storey stepped apartment building for a total of 493 units to be built on Block 107 within the Victoria Park Village subdivision. The block was originally proposed for 168 units as part of the draft plan of subdivision approved by the Ontario Municipal Board.

Parkland dedication was calculated at 5% (0.955 hectares) of the developable land, as part of the overall draft plan. 20.19 hectares of natural heritage system lands were conveyed to the City since they were non-developable. The draft plan has since been registered and parkland was dedicated in accordance with the conditions of approval.

Parkland Dedication

The current proposal represents an increase in density and would be subject to additional parkland dedication in accordance with the current Parkland Dedication Bylaw (2019) – 20366, as amended. Therefore, additional parkland dedication in the form of payment in lieu of conveyance of parkland will be required for this development in accordance with Official Plan Policy 7.3.5.6 and Section 17 d) and Section 30 of Bylaw Number (2019)-20366, as amended.

Final payment in lieu of parkland conveyance will be collected in accordance with the rate that is in effect at the time of the issuance of any future building permit.

Site plan-related comments

1. The proposed retaining wall adjacent to the public trail on Blocks 93 and 94 would negatively impact the trail function and user experience of the natural area. Park and Trail Development staff recommend deleting this structure and creating a softer transition between the private development and public open space.
2. The overall length and height of the retaining wall would effectively separate this development from the public open space and create a strong physical and visual barrier between the public and private realm.
3. Maintenance of the space between the retaining wall and trail would be difficult due to the narrow inaccessible space and required demarcation fence. This could contribute to the build up litter, debris and overgrowth. Regular maintenance of the private land would be required to avoid negative impacts on the trail and user experience.
4. The difference in height between the development and the trail may create areas of overlook without natural surveillance and other sightline issues as areas maybe hidden from above and by overgrowth below.

Conclusion

Park and Trail Development staff do not support the proposed concept plan, specifically the retaining walls adjacent to the public trail and open space required to accommodate underground parking on the site.

Park and Trail Development staff note that, as proposed, additional parkland dedication in the form of payment in lieu of conveyance of parkland will be required for this development in accordance with Official Plan Policy 7.3.5.6 and Section 17 d) and Section 30 of Bylaw Number (2019)-20366.

Final payment in lieu of parkland conveyance will be collected in accordance with the rate that is in effect at the time of the issuance of any future building permit.

Prepared by:

Ryan Mallory

Park Planner

519-822-1260 extension 2298

ryan.mallory@quelfh.ca

Attachment-8 Department and Agency Comments (continued)

Internal Memo



Date April 28, 2022
To **Lindsay Sulatycki, Senior Development Planner**
From David de Groot, Senior Urban Designer
Service Area Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise Services
Department Planning Services
Subject **12 Poole Street: Official Plan Amendment Application – Urban Design Comments OZS22-002**

Introduction

Urban Design staff has the following comments based on the:

- Urban Design Brief dated December 2021 prepared by Adesso Design Inc.;
- Building elevations and Shadow Study prepared by ABA Architects Inc. dated December 17, 2021;
- 12 Poole Pedestrian Wind Assessment prepared by SLR Consulting dated December 14, 2021; and,
- Planning Justification report from IBI Group dated December 24, 2021.

General Comments

Urban design staff has concentrated on reviewing applicable urban design policies of the Official Plan and the Built Form Standards for Mid-Rise Buildings and Townhouses.

Zoning Bylaw information including conformity with the existing Zoning Bylaw has not been provided. This has made review of the application difficult to evaluate given the information submitted. For example, a calculation of common amenity area and landscape area has not been provided. Not meeting these and other Zoning regulations assist in understanding if the density in combination with the height are appropriate on this site. As another example, as per the Zoning By-law (5.3.2.5), townhouse blocks shall provide direct access to outdoor Private Amenity space for ground floor units that are 4.5m in depth, whereas the concept plan does not appear to provide a ground floor private amenity of this depth.

The concept plan also appears to be missing some elements including:

- the stairways between the underground parking and the stacked townhouses; and,
- the balconies of the tall building that appear to further impact setbacks given the balcony columns shown.

Microclimate Review

The submitted sun and shadow study has not been prepared in accordance with the City of Guelph terms of reference (TOR).

For example the following information has not been submitted:

1. The dates and times have not been provided as per the City's Terms of Reference (e.g. hourly times not provided, April 21 date not provided etc.).
2. The criteria as outlined in the terms of reference have not been evaluated. The massing model is not detailed enough to review against the criteria (e.g. sidewalk locations, adjacent development not shown etc.).
3. Has Daylight Saving Time been accounted for?
4. As per the City's TOR, scale bars should be included on each sheet to allow for interpretation.

Based on the above, the applicant has not provided enough information to evaluate the impact of the shadows proposed.

Urban design staff has no comments on the pedestrian wind study submitted.

Official Plan and Built Form Standards for Mid-rise and Townhouses

The Official Plan states that in the greenfield area will be planned and designed to create high quality site design and urban design standards (3.12.2v). The Official Plan also promotes planning a design an attractive urban landscape (2.2.6).

From an urban design perspective, the proposed combination of density and height represented are not supportable and do not meet the intent of the Official Plan to create high quality site design. This is evident in the submitted concepts plan which does not conform to the Built Form Standards for Mid-rise and Townhouses in a number of ways. For example:

- Rear yards for townhouses are to be 7.5m where around 4m is shown in some locations (8.1.7).
- Balconies should be required to be recessed or partially recessed whereas the concept generally does not show this (7.13.7.7).
- Soft landscaping and trees cannot generally be accommodated on the internal streets given the lack of setbacks to the 10 storey buildings or to the 4 storey townhouses whereas wide landscaping and street trees are to be provided (7.0, 8.0).
- For front yard tree plantings, 1 medium or large stature tree should be planted for every two townhouse units facing a street (6.5.12). As proposed, there are many situations where inadequate space is provided. Soil volume requirements, as set out in the City's Tree Technical Manual, should be referenced to ensure suitable soil per tree is being achieved in all areas. As well, the proximity of proposed trees to townhouse blocks and apartment blocks, utilities and infrastructure, should consider tree size at maturity to avoid future conflicts that could be damaged by tree branches and root systems.
- The separation between the two stacked townhouses should be a minimum of 15 metres where 13.52m is provided (8.1.10).

- Where a rear yard of one townhouse is adjacent to a side yard of another 9 metres is to be provided whereas 7.5m is shown (8.1.9).
- Townhouses should have a minimum exterior side yard setback of 4.5 metres to allow for the planting of trees along the sidewalk of the building to frame street whereas approximately 3.5m is provided (8.1.6).
- The setback along the public street is to be 6 metres whereas in one location 4.55m is provided.
- The midblock connections are 3.6m wide whereas a minimum of 5 metres is to be provided (6.6).
- Pedestrian walkways/sidewalks in midblock connections are to generally 2 metres in width whereas 1.5m is proposed (6.6.2).
- The midblock connection between the tall building and mid-rise should be 11 metres whereas 7.93m is provided (6.6).
- For the tall building a stepback of 1.5m between the 4th and 5th storeys whereas no stepback is proposed (7.1.6).
- The proposed building does not have a distinctive building top as required for tall buildings (Official Plan policy 8.9.1i).

Additional General Comments on the Concept Plan

- It appears there is a lack of tree planting opportunities if the balconies of townhouse blocks are factored into the elevations/plans, both front and back yards. This seems especially true for those units that back onto the natural feature/open space block.
- The Official Plan states the new development shall be integrated with the existing topography where possible (8.1.3). Proposed retaining walls of approximately 4/4.5m high prohibit desirable opportunities from either the townhouse block side and especially the future trail side, which will be situated at the base of the proposed wall (8.1.14, 8.1.15). Where built form will abut natural areas, an appropriate transition that provides visual and physical connection and contributes to the creation of a high-quantity public realm will need to be provided.
- Based on the Grading Plan, the location of the proposed retaining walls along the natural feature/open space block are set back from the property line, which may further eliminate opportunities for trees along this edge, as proposed on the Landscape Plan Concept. Appropriate townhouse block setback should consider required engineering infrastructure and the desire to plant trees along the rear of these blocks to help support the canopy cover targets of the Urban Forest Management Plan.
- Based on the Grading Plan placement of infiltration galleries conflict with proposed trees along Keegan and Poole Street, as shown on the Landscape Plans, as well as those trees proposed within the Apartment Block Common Amenity space, as shown on the Underground Parking Plan. Engineering infrastructure must consider the limited spaces provided for trees and help support the canopy cover targets of the Urban Forest Management Plan. Consideration to locate such infrastructure under hard surface areas is desired.
- Waste Management Plans shall be submitted through the Site Plan process, however, space for garbage storage and collection for the townhouse blocks

seems to be lacking but should be considered at the early stage of development to ensure adequate areas are provided that do not impact pedestrian accessible routes or plantable spaces (6.9).

- Pedestrian circulation and connectivity from the underground parking to the surface via proposed stairwells appear to conflict with treed islands at the apartment block entrance. However, efforts should be made to ensure barrier free access is provided without impacting plantable spaces.
- Desired long term bike storage facility locations associated with the townhouse blocks should be considered in the early stage of development to ensure adequate spaces are provided that do not impact pedestrian accessible routes, plantable spaces or common amenity space requirements.
- Look for opportunities to provide accessible townhouse units with no stair access from the street (8.0).
- Utility meters, including transformers and private services, and City water meter/backflow chambers should be located during the early design phases and placed on the side of buildings, out of view from the street level and/or incorporated into the building footprint (6.9).
- Provide barrier free underground parking facilities as per the AODA.

Conclusions

Information regarding compliance with the existing Zoning By-law has not been provided. This information should be provided.

In addition, the applicant has not provided the necessary Sun and Shadow Study information in conformance with the City's Terms of Reference to evaluate the proposed increased height.

However, given the information submitted the proposed combination of density and height does not create high quality site design. The concept plan is not in keeping with urban design policies of the Official Plan and is not consistent with the City's urban design standards. The concept plan also does not appear to be able to conform to the Zoning By-law. The Official Plan Amendment as submitted is not supported by Urban Design Staff.

Prepared by:

David de Groot

Senior Urban Designer

519.822.1260 ext. 2358

David.deGroot@guelph.ca

Attachment-8 Department and Agency Comments (continued)



Administration Centre: 400 Clyde Road, P.O. Box 729 Cambridge, ON N1R 5W6
Phone: 519-621-2761 Toll free: 1-866-900-4722 Fax: 519-621-4844 www.grandriver.ca

April 8, 2022
OZS22-002

Via email

Lindsay Sulatycki
Senior Development Planner
Planning and Building Services, City of Guelph
1 Carden Street,
Guelph, ON N1H 3A1

Dear Ms. Sulatycki,

Re: OZS22-002
12 Poole Street
Victoria Park Village Inc., C/O IBI Group

Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) staff has reviewed the above-noted application for an Official Plan Amendment, pertaining to an increase in density for a residential development.

Recommendation

The Grand River Conservation Authority has no objection to the proposed Official Plan Amendment application.

Documents Reviewed by Staff

Staff have reviewed the following documents submitted with this application:

-
- February 18, 2022 Groundwater Mounding Calculations, 12 Poole St. Block 107, MTE Consultants
- December 15, 2021 Victoria Park Village Block 107 (12 Poole St.) Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, MTE Consultants
- December 2021, MTE, Engineering Drawings
- December 2021, MTE, Groundwater Mounding Calculations
- December 2021, MTE, Concept Plan

GRCA Comments

GRCA has reviewed this application as per our delegated responsibility from the Province to represent provincial interests regarding natural hazards identified in Section 3.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS, 2020) and as a regulatory authority under Ontario Regulation 150/06. GRCA has also provided comments as per our MOA with the City of Guelph and as a public body under the Planning Act as per our CA Board approved policies.

Portions of the subject lands are within the regulation limit of an adjacent wetland and are therefore regulated by GRCA under Ontario Regulation 150/06.

Comment

- Ensure that the design of the retaining wall allows for continued maintenance and repair without requiring encroachment into the wetland or wetland buffer.

Should you have any questions, please contact Ben Kissner at 519-621-2763 ext. 2237 or bkissner@grandriver.ca.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Fred Natolochny". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized initial "F".

Fred Natolochny, MCIP, RPP
Supervisor of Resource Planning - North & South, Resource Planning
Grand River Conservation Authority

Attachment-8 Department and Agency Comments (continued)



**UPPER GRAND
DISTRICT SCHOOL
BOARD**

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Board Office: 500 Victoria Road N. Guelph, ON N1E 6K2

Email: municipal.circulations@ugdsb.on.ca

Tel: 519-822-4420 ext.821 or Toll Free: 1-800-321-4025

2 May 2022

Lindsay Sulatycki
Senior Development Planner
City of Guelph
1 Carden Street
Guelph, ON N1H 3A1

Dear Ms. Sulatycki:

Re: **OZS22-002, 12 Poole Street, Guelph**

Planning staff at the Upper Grand District School Board have received and reviewed the above noted application for an Official Plan Amendment to develop the subject lands with 308, four-storey stacked townhouse units and a six to ten storey apartment building containing 185 units for a total of 493 residential units.

Board's previous comments to the applications for a Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment for the proposed subdivision (23T-07506) addressed the need for a Primary Trail Connection ("PTC"). The purpose of the PTC is to provide a safe, year-round convenient access between the site and the lands to the north of the proposed subdivision, including students walking from the development to Ecole Arbour Vista PS.

Please be advised that the Planning Department **does not object** to the proposed application for an Official Plan Amendment, subject to the following conditions to be addressed via future Site Plan Control and/or Plan of Condominium Applications:

- The collection of Education Development Charges is required prior to the issuance of a building permit(s).
- Planning staff request that the developer provide the Upper Grand District School Board with a digital file of the plan containing parcel fabric and street network.

Upper Grand District School Board

• Linda Busuttill; Chair
• Barbara Lustgarten Evoy; Vice-Chair

• Mark Bailey
• Mike Foley

• Jolly Bedi
• Martha MacNeil

• Gail Campbell
• Robin Ross

• Jen Edwards
• Lynn Topping

- In an effort to ensure children can walk safely to school or to a designated bus pickup point, the Board requests that adequate sidewalks, lighting and snow removal (on sidewalks and walkways) be provided.
- That the developer advises all purchasers of residential units and/or renters of same, by inserting the following clause in all offers of Purchase and Sale/Lease:

“In order to limit liability, public school buses operated by the Service de transport de Wellington-Dufferin Student Transportation Services (STWDSTS), or its assigns or successors, will not travel on privately owned or maintained right-of-ways to pick up students, and potential busing students will be required to meet the bus at a congregated bus pick-up point.”

- That the developer advises all purchasers of residential units and/or renters of same, by inserting the following clause in all offers of Purchase and Sale/Lease:

“Whereas the Upper Grand District School Board has designated this subdivision as a Development Area for the purposes of school accommodation, and despite the best efforts of the Upper Grand District School Board, sufficient accommodation may not be available for all anticipated students from the area, you are hereby notified that students may be accommodated in temporary facilities and/or bussed to a school outside the area, and further, that students may in future have to be transferred to another school.”

Furthermore, please be advised that our previous conditions submitted in response to the subdivision application associated with this plan (23T-07506) remain applicable.

Should you require additional information, please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,



Adam Laranjeiro
Planning Technician

PLN: 22-028

File Code: R14

cc: Ruchika Angrish, Manager of Planning, UGDSB

Heather Imm, Senior Planner, UGDSB

Upper Grand District School Board

• Linda Busuttill; Chair
• Barbara Lustgarten Evoy; Vice-Chair
• Mark Bailey
• Mike Foley
• Jolly Bedi
• Martha MacNeil
• Gail Campbell
• Robin Ross
• Jen Edwards
• Lynn Topping