

Attachment-11 Departmental and Agency Comments

Respondent	No Objection or Comment	Conditional Support	Concerns/ Non-Support	Issues/Concerns
Engineering*			√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No stormwater outlet; inadequate services - Improper water balance - Infiltration inconsistencies
Environmental Planning*			√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No demonstration of 'no negative impacts' - Water balance conclusions - Stormwater management and runoff - Grading - Drainage to wetland - Snow storage and road salt - Trail design
Urban Design*		√		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Built form standards for mid-rise and townhouses
Parks Planning*			√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trail design
Zoning	√			
Transit		√		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bus stop relocation
Canada Post		√		
Upper Grand District School Board		√		
Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA)*		√		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Snow storage and road salt
Guelph Police Service	√			
Fire Services		√		
Enbridge		√		

*Memo or letter attached

Attachment-11 continued: Departmental and Agency Comments



MEMO

FILE: 16.131.001

TO: Michael Witmer
FROM: Development and Environmental Engineering
DEPARTMENT: Engineering Services
DATE: April 28, 2022
SUBJECT: 78 & 82 Eastview Road – Zoning By-law Amendment (OZS19-004)

Engineering Services have prepared comments in response to the review of the following plans & reports:

- Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report (FSR) – MTE Consultants Inc. (Oct. 29, 2021);
- Functional Site Grading, Servicing and SWM Plan 1 & 2 – MTE Consultants Inc. (Oct. 29, 2021);
- Scoped Environmental Impact Study – WSP (Oct. 27, 2021);
- Updated Hydrogeological Assessment and Water Balance – WSP (Oct. 21, 2021);
- Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment Update & Reliance Letter – Premier (Oct. 13, 2021);
- Transportation Impact Study (TIS) – Paradigm (November 2021).

Scoped EIS:

1. City staff have concerns about the information provided in the water balance which was also reflected in section 7.1.6 of the EIS – see comments below.

Hydrogeological Assessment & Water Balance:

1. There appears to be confusion around the content of the water balance. The water balance provided was labelled as a “detailed site specific, feature-based monthly wetland water balance calculations”. Is this then a detailed site specific water balance or a feature based monthly water balance? To be very clear, Engineering staff have been continually asking for a site specific water balance in accordance with the City of Guelph’s Development Engineering Manual (DEM) which is separate from the feature based wetland water balance as required by Environmental Planning staff – these are two separate and distinctly different spreadsheets.

The amount of information provided in this submission combined water balance is overly complex and has been difficult to extract data to confirm the predevelopment and post development infiltration, runoff and evapotranspiration. An approved example of a site specific water balance was provided by WSP in the LVM Scoped Hydrogeology Study for 66 Eastview Road as appended in the Hydrogeological Assessment.

2. Referring to Table 7, Water Balance Summary, how is it possible that the recharge parameter can increase from the second submission to the third submission by

Engineering Services
Infrastructure, Development & Enterprise

T 519-837-5604
F 519-822-6194
engineering@guelph.ca

Attachment-11 continued: Departmental and Agency Comments



MEMO

approximately 2.5 times when the infiltration storage on site slightly increased from 211 cu.m to 233.8 cu.m and the surface area of these infiltration galleries decreased from 547 sq.m to 405.8 sq.m? Without explanation in the response letter and recognizing there are many factors to consider, the infiltration increase is difficult to ascertain or justify.

3. It is not clear if the water balance assumes infiltration for the french drain collecting runoff from the 3:1 slope at the rear of the site.
4. Engineering staff have directed the consultant in both the first and second revisions to refer to the required testing in the City's DEM, section 5.7.7, which clearly indicates that the on-site infiltration test is to be conducted at every soil horizon within 1.5m below the proposed bottom of the infiltration gallery. In this third submission, the in-situ infiltration testing was eventually provided however it was only conducted at a minimal depth as shown in Table 3, below the bottom of the galleries. These testing depths are not in keeping with the City's DEM requirements.

Since the methodology for the in-situ testing depth has not been followed, it is not clear if the soils underlying the proposed galleries are capable to infiltrate as designed.

5. In the second submission Engineering comments, the following comment was provided "*section 4.3 it was outlined that the topography of the site was associated with a 0.1 and 0.11 infiltration factor. This value is not in line with the MECP SWM Planning and Design Manual as the site isn't that hilly.*" It should be clarified that the predevelopment topography of the site was to be revised only to reflect the flatter terrain and that the post development factor is to reflect the proposed topography. As such, the post construction "developable area" should be greater than the assumed average slope of 2% especially considering the steeper slopes on the north and west property lines.

Functional Servicing Report:

1. The drainage area currently being shown discharging to Eastview Drive (catchment 204) has still not been revised as previously requested in the first submission comments. Staff had indicated that the predevelopment site doesn't contribute to this storm sewer so there should not be any proposed post development drainage being directed to it.

This third submission cannot clearly demonstrate that the development design provides an "adequate and available" stormwater outlet as required by the City's Zoning Bylaw (section 4.10). Since the only existing stormwater outlet for the development has been designed to be reliant upon site infiltration, storage and discharge to the adjacent natural feature, based on the concerns identified above, it can be concluded then that Engineering staff cannot support the rezoning application as presented.

- MDT

Engineering Services
Infrastructure, Development & Enterprise

T 519-837-5604
F 519-822-6194
engineering@guelph.ca

Attachment-11 continued: Departmental and Agency Comments

Internal Memo



Date April 11, 2022
To **Michael Witmer, Senior Development Planner**
From Leah Lefler, Environmental Planner
Service Area Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise Services
Department Planning and Building Services
Subject **78 and 82 Eastview Road Zoning By-law
Amendment, 3rd Submission (OZS19-004)**

Environmental planning staff have prepared comments based on the review of the following plans and reports:

- Scoped Environmental Impact Study, WSP, October 27, 2021
- Updated Hydrogeological Assessment and Water Balance – Revised Conceptual Site Plan, WSP, October 21, 2021
- Tree Management Plan, WSP, November 8, 2021
- Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, MTE, October 29, 2021
- Grading, Servicing, Stormwater and Existing Condition Plans, MTE, October 29, 2021

Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report

1. Based on the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report (FSR), flows from the 2-year event (0.024 m³/s), 5-year event (0.060 m³/s) and 100-year event (0.268 m³/s) will occur from the dry pond, yet Section 4.4 Flux Assessment of the Hydrogeological Assessment and Water Balance Report shows no runoff to the wetland in July. This is not supportable.
2. Runoff from Catchment 203 sheet flows toward the wetland via a French drain. Infiltration and runoff (surcharge) to the French drain does not appear to have been factored into the calculations. All the site's catchments must be included in the site water balance including Catchment 203.
3. The FSR states that "No major grading is proposed within the limits of the 10.0m dripline buffer or the 15.0m wetland buffer". Development and site alteration are not permitted in the NHS, except in association with a permitted use provided that no negative impact has been demonstrated. The proposed grading plan is not supportable.
4. The FSR indicates that at a select few locations, adjustments of existing grades within the 10m dripline buffer will be required due to the spacing of existing elevations and existing slopes as well as to allow the French drain to outlet underneath the trail. This does not appear to be consistent with NHS policy, which prohibit development and site alteration, and is not supportable.

Attachment-11 continued: Departmental and Agency Comments

5. Snow storage is proposed immediately adjacent to the infiltration trench. This raises water quality concerns and is not supportable.

Hydrogeological Assessment and Water Balance

6. The updated water balance appears to be a site-based water balance. In addition to a site-based water balance, a feature-based monthly wetland water balance is required, as per the approved Environmental Impact Study Terms of Reference (dated May 1, 2018) and Development Review Committee meeting minutes (dated August 15, 2017). Based on the water balance calculations provided, it is unclear which catchments are included and omitted. Further, additional detail on what each row of data refers to is necessary to gain an understanding of what has been included and what has been excluded from the calculations.
7. Table 7: Updated Water Balance Summary indicates that evapotranspiration will be matched pre- to post-development. It is unclear how this could be possible when more than half the site will change from pervious (vegetated) to impervious (unvegetated).
8. A slope of 2% is used in the water balance calculations yet slopes of >2% (3-5%) are proposed for a large portion of the site. The % slope used in the water balance calculations should be increased to better reflect proposed site conditions.
9. Table 7: Updated Water Balance Summary shows runoff matching, pre- to post-development (5,920 to 5,848 = 72 m³ decrease) yet based on the water balance calculations provided in Appendix I, predevelopment runoff towards the wetland appears to be 4,292 m³ (3,944 m³+ 348 m³ = 4,292 m³) and post development runoff towards the wetland appears to be 5,505 m³ (1,735 m³ + 3,769 m³ = 5,505 m³) which is a difference of 1,213 m³.

Based on comments 6 through 9, the Hydrogeological Assessment and Water Balance does not demonstrate "no negative impact" and is not supportable.

Environmental Impact Study

10. Under pre-development conditions, drainage sheet flows across the site toward the wetland. Post-development, drainage from the developable area flows directly or indirectly via LID features to the proposed stormwater management facility which overflows to the wetland or to the French drain which overflows to the wetland. Therefore, the sheet flow pattern of runoff in pre-development conditions will shift to the proposed stormwater management pond outlet/spreader berm and proposed French drain outlets. The EIS does not provide an assessment of impacts resulting from pre- to post-development changes to patterns and volumes of runoff, does not demonstrate "no negative impact" and is therefore not supportable.
11. A trail corridor with a width of 3.7m is proposed in the minimum 10m Significant Woodland buffer and minimum 30m Significant Wetland buffer. Trails consistent with the definition of "passive recreational use" in the City's Official Plan may be permitted in the NHS subject to feature-specific policies and demonstration of no negative impact per Chapter 5: Design guidelines of the Guelph Trail Master Plan. A tertiary trail with a 1.2-2m width and 0.15m clear zone is recommended

Attachment-11 continued: Departmental and Agency Comments

to reduce the trail footprint, demonstrate no negative impact and meet the policies of the Official Plan.

Since "no negative impact" to the Natural Heritage System has not been demonstrated, Environmental Planning staff do not support the plans and reports submitted for the proposed application (OZS19-004).

Leah Lefler, Environmental Planner
Planning and Building Services, **Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise**
Location: City Hall
519-822-1260 extension 2362
leah.lefler@guelph.ca
Copy: Michelle Thalen, Mallory Lemon, Scott Cousins

Attachment-11 continued: Departmental and Agency Comments

Internal Memo



Date	April 25, 2022
To	Michael Witmer
From	Mallory Lemon
Service Area	Public Services
Department	Park and Trail Development
Subject	78-82 Eastview Road - Proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment – OZS19-004

Park and Trail Development has reviewed the application for the above noted proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment including:

- Notice of Revised Application dated December 24, 2021;
- Third Submission Cover Letter and Response Matrix, dated November 17, 2021;
- Conceptual Site Plan, dated November 3, 2021;
- Updated Hydrogeological Assessment and Water Balance, dated October 21, 2021;
- Scoped Environmental Impact Study Update, dated October 27, 2021;
- Tree Management Plan and Existing Vegetation Report, dated November 8, 2021;
- Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, dated October 29, 2021;
- Civil Engineering Plans, dated October 29, 2021
- Transportation Impact Study Update, dated November 2021;
- Environmental Site Assessment Comment Response, dated October 29, 2021;
- Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment Update, dated October 13, 2021; and
- Reliance Letter, dated October 13, 2021.

Park and Trail Development offers the following comments:

Zoning Bylaw Amendment

Park and Trail Development has no objection to the proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment to rezone the subject lands from the current Urban Reserve (UR) zone and Specialized Residential Single Detached with a Holding Provision (R.1B-39(H)) zone in part to the General Apartment (R.4A) zone, Cluster Townhouse (R.3A) zone, Wetland (WL) zone and Conservation Land (P.1) Zone. Please address the following items:

Parkland Dedication

Park and Trail Development recommends payment in lieu of conveyance of parkland for the development.

Attachment-11 continued: Departmental and Agency Comments

Payment in lieu of parkland conveyance will be required for this development in accordance with City of Guelph Official Plan Policy 7.3.5.6 and the City of Guelph Parkland Dedication By-law (2019)-20366 as amended by By-law (2019) 20380 or any successor thereof.

Section 17.(c) of By-law (2019)-20366 states that the rate will be the greater of the equivalent of Market Value of 1 hectare per 500 dwelling units; or 5% of the total Market Value of the Land.

For this development the 1 hectare per 500 dwelling unit rate is greater so the payment in lieu of parkland is currently 7.22% of the market value of the subject property.

A narrative appraisal report of the subject property will be required to determine the Payment in lieu of Parkland amount, prior to submission of any building permit applications, at least a month in advance. As per Section 21 of Bylaw (2019)-20366, the appraisal is only considered valid for one (1) year. The appraisal report shall be prepared by a qualified appraiser who is a member in good standing of the Appraisal Institute of Canada. The property owner is responsible for the cost and to arrange for the appraisal. We recommend submitting the appraisal two months ahead of the building permit application to avoid delays.

The amount of cash in lieu of parkland dedication will depend on the details of the approved development, parkland dedication rate in effect at the time of the issuance of the first building permit and the estimated market value of the land a day before issuance of the first building permit.

Conceptual Site Plan, Preliminary Grading and Servicing Plans

City Trail Parcel

The Guelph Trail Master Plan (GTMP) indicates a proposed secondary trail route leading from Eastview community Park along the wetland to Carter Park. The city's trail standards have recently changed with the GTMP update in 2021. Due to the 10m natural area buffer width, a narrower trail and clear zones is appropriate. A 1.2m wide granular trail surface with 0.15m wide clear zones on both sides of the trail is recommended.

It appears from the preliminary grading plans that the trail surface can be designed to meet FADM requirements of 5% longitudinal slopes and 2% cross slopes.

The clear zones/mow strips on both sides of the trail are required to have a maximum 2% cross slope for maintenance purposes. It appears that clear zone cross slopes are greater than 2% in some locations, which is not supportable.

As per previous comments, please show proposed property lines between the future city parcel and the development site on the conceptual site plan. The city trail, including 0.15m wide clear zones on both sides, should be entirely located on city property and will not count toward the applicant's common amenity space.

Park and Trail Development is not supportive of the use of a boardwalk over the dry pond outlet. Boardwalks are only considered acceptable in environmentally sensitive areas like wetlands, swamps or wooded areas that are already disturbed by ad-hoc trails. Operationally boardwalks are more difficult and expensive to maintain and the surface tends to be more slippery for users than asphalt or compacted stonedust.

Park and Trail Development is supportive of french drains located upland of the trail, passing under the trail surface and outletting on the low side to prevent surface drainage

Attachment-11 continued: Departmental and Agency Comments

over the trail. It is unclear however how much capacity the french drains have and if/how often they will surcharge and potentially flood the trail.

Please note that the cost for private trail connection to the city trail will be a direct developer responsibility as a local service in accordance with the Local Service Policy.

Summary

The above comments represent Park & Trail Development's review of the proposed development.

Regards,

Mallory Lemon, Park Planner
Parks, **Public Services**

T 519-822-1260 x 3560
Mallory.lemon@guelph.ca

Attachment-11 continued: Departmental and Agency Comments

INTERNAL MEMO



DATE March 4, 2022
TO **Michael Witmer**
FROM Ryan Mallory
DIVISION Planning Services
DEPARTMENT Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise
SUBJECT 78-82 Eastview Road: Urban Design Comments
File: OZS19-004

Urban Design Staff have the following comments based on the following plans and reports. The applications have had several revisions and the following comments are based on the most recent submission.

Reports and Plans Reviewed:

- Cover Letter and response matrix by Robert Russell Planning Consultants Inc. dated November 17, 2021
- Conceptual Site Plan by BJC Architects, revised November 5, 2021
- Planning Justification Report, by Robert Russell Planning Consultants Inc. dated November 20, 2020

Background

Urban Design policies from the Official Plan were reviewed. In addition, City Council approved the Built Form Standards for Mid-rise Buildings and Townhouses. The comments below also reflect the review of these documents.

Staff Comments on the Site Plan

- a) Maintain pedestrian circulation as direct as possible. Cross walks need to connect common amenity areas to sidewalks when crossing over driveways
- b) Ensure the number of risers for Type C & D units meet the Built Form Standards for Mid-rise and Townhouse Dwellings. Carefully consider the grading and topography so that door sills do not exceed 1.5 metres above the adjacent sidewalk.
- c) Consider the use of existing materials in the area. Please use a predominantly masonry finish. Avoid vinyl finishes.
- d) Additional details will be discussed during the site plan review stage. Refer to the Built Form Standards regarding cladding, materials, landscaping, street trees, etc.
- e) Detailed elevations will be required for site plan approval. Conceptual elevations and/or renderings may help convey the design at the zoning stage.
- f) Provide an entrance to the apartment building facing the public street (i.e., Eastview Road).
- g) Upgraded elevations shall be provided for townhouse unit siding onto Eastview Road. Ensure to wrap the porches around the corner as well as glazing and other material changes on these elevations. The front door should face the public street (i.e., Eastview Road).

Attachment-11 continued: Departmental and Agency Comments

Michael Witmer
March 4, 2022
RE: 78-82 Eastview Road – Urban Design Comments
Page 2 of 2

- h) For site plan applications, please note which buildings will require fire separations as per the OBC – gross floor area and building footprint. Projections, including firewalls and rooflines need to be shown on elevations submitted as part of a site plan application.
- i) It is understood that a noise wall to screen private amenity areas may be required by the noise study. These should be integrated into the design of the buildings rather than look like an add-on after the fact. Provide details for the site plan application.
- j) Balconies should be integrated into the massing of the apartment building. Utilize vertical elements and material changes to break up the massing and length of the building.
- k) It is understood that the double road around the 8-unit block is a safety requirement for length of the dead-end lane. If possible, this could be deleted or physically restricted to emergency access only (i.e., knock-down bollards around a wide private walkway) in order to straighten the main lane through the site and allow for more landscaping and greenspace. This can be further explored at the site plan application stage.

Further detailed comments to be discussed include reviewing and finalization of building materials, landscaping materials and other design elements. This includes:

- Provide a detail for pedestrian level lighting and street lighting for the internal streets. Further, a lighting plan shall demonstrate no light spill/trespass on adjacent private properties or the City's Natural Heritage System.
- Architectural details
- Hardscape materials
- Cladding materials details and colours
- Type and material of benches
- Type and location of bicycle parking
- Location of utilities (meters, transformers, pedestals, etc.), venting, A/C units etc.
- Addressing and unit number identification.
- Rooftop mechanical screening details.

Next Steps

- Review the City's Built Form Standards for Mid-rise and Townhouses.

Prepared By:
Ryan Mallory
Planner 2 – Development and Urban Design
519.822.1260 ext. 2492
ryan.mallory@guelph.ca

Attachment-11 continued: Departmental and Agency Comments



400 Clyde Road, P.O. Box 729 Cambridge, ON N1R 5W6
Phone: 519.621.2761 Toll free: 866.900.4722 Fax: 519.621.4844 Online: www.grandriver.ca

January 27th, 2022

City of Guelph
Planning and Development Services
1 Carden Street, Guelph
ON N1H 3A1

Attn: Michael Witmer, Senior Development Planner

Dear Mr. Witmer

RE: 78-82 Eastview Road – Rezoning

Thank-you for circulating the GRCA on the updated submission. The GRCA has now had the opportunity to review the following reports:

- Third Submission Cover Letter and Response Matrix, prepared by Robert Russell Planning Consultants Inc., dated November 17, 2021;
- Conceptual Site Plan; prepared by BJC Architects Inc., dated November 3, 2021;
- Updated Hydrogeological Assessment and Water Balance, prepared by WSP Canada Inc., dated October 21, 2021;
- Scoped Environmental Impact Study Update, prepared by WSP Canada Inc., dated October 27, 2021;
- Tree Management Plan and Existing Vegetation Report; WSP Canada Inc., dated November 8, 2021;
- Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, prepared by MTE Consultants Inc., dated October 29, 2021;

Based on the updated documents provided the GRCA has **no further comments** on the plan at this time. Please find comments below which should be addressed through the permitting or Environmental Implementation Report (EIR) stage of development.

Required Comments:

- MTE Drawing C2.2 Functional Site Grading, Servicing and SWM Plan 2, the proposed snow dump is potentially located on top of the proposed French Drain. This potentially could direct salt/chloride contaminated water to infiltrate into the shallow groundwater or enter into the wetland. At detailed design and within the proposed EIR they should clarify how the snow storage and drainage will be kept separate from the infiltration structures. The site has a Wellhead Protection Area Vulnerability Score of 8 with an Intrinsic Vulnerability Level of Medium.

N:\Resource Management Division\Resource Planning\Guelph\GUELPH SUBDIVISIONS\78 and 82 Eastview Road\Dec 2021 Revised Application\78-82 Eastview Road_Guelph_Jan 2022 comments.docx

Page 1 of

Attachment-11 continued: Departmental and Agency Comments

- At detailed design stage and within the proposed EIR they will need to identify vegetation enhancements within the wetland/woodland buffers to offset the impacts from the development encroachment of the City Trail.

Should you have any questions or comments, please contact me at 519-621-2763 x2237.

Yours truly,



Nathan Garland
Resource Planner
Grand River Conservation Authority