

### Attachment-5 Phase 3 Community Engagement Staff Response Chart

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
1.	Active frontage	Ben Jones, Fusion	Jan. 16, 2022	Consideration needs to be given to how the intent of active frontage is met - recommend it is better implemented through design guidelines and site-specific review. For example, street-level unit entrances provide greater "eyes on the street" and active frontage than a single large retail/commercial unit. There are too many site-specific elements that need to be factored in to enforce through zoning, better addressed on a site-specific level through SPA.	The Commercial Built Form Standards provide direction for ground floor and street edge design. The relationship of building uses along public streets should contribute to a vibrant public realm through appropriate ground floor uses and public amenities that are barrier free and publicly accessible. The Commercial Built Form Standards recommend implementing these design guidelines through zoning bylaw regulations, including requiring ground floor commercial uses, limiting commercial building lengths next to a street, and ensuring that commercial buildings have transparent windows and active entrances when next to a street. These are standard urban design principles that should be incorporated into a site design, and where these regulations cannot be met due to the context of the site, an application for zoning relief would be reviewed.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
2.	Administration and Interpretation	Lyle McNair	Nov. 8, 2021	Concerned that buildings not in conformity with new regulations cannot be rebuilt in case of a fire.	Section 1.4.2 of the proposed zoning bylaw allows for the strengthening to a safe condition or the reconstruction of any legal non-conforming building or structure as long as the repair does not increase the height, size, volume or change the use of the building or structure.
3.	Administration and Interpretation	Guelph Wellington Development Association & Guelph and District Home Builders' Association	Dec. 16, 2021	With the introduction of many more prescriptive regulations, most existing sites will be non-conforming. What happens during regular building permit activities when this is encountered?	In some cases, existing site-specific zones have been carried forward in the new zoning bylaw. If a site has recently received approval for a site-specific zoning bylaw amendment and the development has not been completed, the site-specific zone has been carried forward in the new zoning bylaw. The zoning bylaw also contains transition provisions in Section 1.3 that address how future building permit, site plan and minor variance applications will be handled.
4.	Administration and Interpretation	Chris Corosky, Armel	Dec. 20, 2021	Section 1.3 states that transitional provisions are repealed effective three years after the effective date of this bylaw. Does this mean that if multiple buildings are approved within a site plan approval, they must be constructed within three years of the original site plan approval?	The proposed bylaw introduces additional time for multi-building or phased site plans to obtain building permits within five years of approval, however the first building permit must be applied for within 90 days. The proposed zoning bylaw also adjusts the transition timing,

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
					requiring a maximum of two years under section 1.3.1 and requires a building permit to be obtained within 90 days of site plan approval.
5.	Additional residential dwelling units	Colin Baker	Dec. 14, 2021	<p>Concerns about affordable housing and rents for the future. I would highly consider putting a coach house. At one point I know there was talk of minimum frontage of 50', our property is 49'.</p> <p>I would hope that the new bylaws will allow an accessory building on a 49 ft lot or at least have allowance when the lot is within 12 inches off code. I have four kids their many friends who will need affordable housing in the future.</p>	Additional residential dwelling units are currently permitted in single detached, semi-detached and townhouse dwellings and continue to be permitted in the proposed bylaw in accordance with section 4.12. There are no minimum lot frontage requirements.
6.	Angular plane	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	Angular Plane regulations should not be applied to zones where a maximum 4 storey building is permitted. Please revise the zoning regulations accordingly.	The proposed zoning bylaw has been revised and does not require an angular plane from interior side and rear yards for 4 storey buildings.
7.	Angular plane	Lyle McNair	Nov. 18, 2021	The required angular plane when you have a building meeting the RH.7 criteria adjacent to a property that is in an RL.1 or RL.2 zone is 30 degrees measured from the "property line" (as opposed to 45 degrees at 10.5 metres above grade at the property line). This is simply not practical. That would	The 30 degree angular plane is to ensure there is adequate transition to low density residential surrounding the high density property. This regulation will push the tower portion of a high density building away from adjacent low density property lines.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>mean that a 3-storey high building (this would have to be at least 10 metres tall, even with a flat roof) would have to be 17.32 metres from all the property lines (rear and both sides). Since 3-storey high buildings are permitted throughout the City on every residential lot, this aspect of the draft zoning bylaw is more restrictive on RH.7 zoned properties than it would be in any other residential zone in the City. There are very few detached homes in the city that are more than 2 storeys high that can meet this criterium, even to the rear yard, let alone the side yards. As noted in our conversation on Tuesday evening, the courts have already ruled that residents are not entitled to access to sunlight. There is no restriction on planting a row of trees that can grow to 60 or 70 feet tall along the rear of a residential lot, but this aspect of the draft by-law makes the construction of even a mid-rise building (6-storeys) almost impossible. Even the 45 degree requirement for building in an RM.6 zone requires a minimum of 20 metres from the lot line to the exterior wall at the top of the structure. It certainly appears that the building at the corner of</p>	<p>Existing buildings will vary from the proposed zoning bylaw regulations as they were developed under different zoning bylaw regulations.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>Gordon Street and Gosling Gardens (333 Gosling Gardens – zoned RH.7-13) does not comply with the requirements of the generic RH.7 criteria; the interior side yard setbacks have been set at 5 metres. I also note the property at 85 Westwood Road is in an RL.4 zone while the building is 6 storeys high but does not comply with the RM.6 requirements. The minimum zoning for a 6-storey high building is RM.6. The same situation applies to the property at 80 Speedvale Avenue West. 245 Bristol Street is zoned RH.7(H13) but does not comply with the generic RH.7 requirements. It almost appears that there is no building in the city that is properly zoned RH.7 and is in compliance with the requirements of the draft zoning by-law. Almost all such properties include exceptions to the generic requirements. I think this is an issue that needs to be resolved.</p>	
8.	Bicycle parking	Astrid J. Clos Planning Consultants	Jan. 12, 2022	Table 5.6 includes bicycle parking space requirements that are excessive. Bicycle parking space requirements should not be included in the zoning regulations, but instead be included within urban design guidelines and be implemented through the Site	The proposed zoning bylaw includes bicycle parking space regulations in section 5.8. Zoning regulations are enforceable and provide a legal way of managing land use and future development. In certain instances, staff recommend

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				Plan process. Specific sites will vary in their bicycle parking requirements.	zoning to ensure that objectives and policies of the Official Plan are implemented. The Official Plan provides direction for the zoning bylaw to establish minimum bicycle parking space rates for uses such as employment and commercial, schools, high and medium density residential development and transportation terminals (Policy 5.4.3 iv). These regulations also align with the recently approved Transportation Master Plan. Bicycle parking regulations are commonly found in contemporary zoning bylaws.
9.	Bicycle parking	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jan. 12, 2022	For Section 5.8 and Table 5.6 Required bicycle parking rates in all zones except downtown zones, provides for minimum short term and long term bicycle parking spaces requirements. The corresponding Official Plan Policy 8.12.6 states "Bicycle parking shall be provided and conveniently located in close proximity to building entrances. Sheltered bicycle parking should be integrated into the built form." As there are no bicycle parking requirements under the current By-law, the supply of parking existing on the effective date of passing of the new By-law should	Section 1.4.3 of the proposed zoning bylaw provides the appropriate permission for any existing non-complying building or lot. This section provides appropriate protection for existing uses, lots and buildings/structures and it provides an appropriate permission for enlarging, repairing, and reconstructing existing buildings and structures.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				be deemed to comply with the By-law in order to ensure that existing development remains conforming.	
10.	Bicycle parking	Nancy Shoemaker, BSR&D	Dec. 15, 2021	The requirement for bicycle parking is unclear for commercial uses. Is it cumulative? As proposed the regulation is excessive. If so, very few existing commercial developments could meet this regulation.	Bicycle parking spaces are required for the residential and commercial portions of a mixed-use development. Clarity has been added to the bylaw: "Where a lot contains more than one use, not within a multi-unit building, the required number of bicycle parking spaces is the sum of all spaces required for each use." Bicycle parking rates for multi-unit buildings has also been added to Table 5.6.
11.	Bicycle parking	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	B-24 Bicycle parking space does not include any space requirements. Suggestion: Add space requirements and consider an illustration.	<p>The proposed zoning bylaw has been revised to include bicycle parking space design, location and dimensions.</p> <p>Staff has reviewed comparator municipalities and found that bicycle parking space dimensions are common in contemporary zoning bylaws. This ensures that spaces provided are functional, secure and accessible to residents and visitors.</p>
12.	Bicycle parking	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	C-41 Additional regulations for table 5.7 Item 1 below table: This carve out puts undue space pressure on the tenants of smaller	The intent of this exception is to provide flexibility for small buildings in the Downtown zones. This is carried forward from the 2017 Downtown

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				buildings. Suggestion: Remove this regulation.	Zoning Bylaw Update. This exception does not apply city-wide. No proposed change to the bylaw.
13.	Bicycle parking	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	C-41 Table 5.7 does not include increases for bicycle parking for restaurants, theatres, cinemas, transit stations / transfer nodes or shopping plazas. Suggestion: Consider more bicycle parking for these uses.	Bicycle parking rates for downtown zones were established through the Downtown Zoning Bylaw Update and are proposed to be carried forward. City-wide bicycle parking rates have been developed by IBI Group. Bicycle parking rates have been reviewed and simplified in the proposed zoning bylaw.
14.	Bicycle parking	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	C-41 Table 5.7 does not include any requirement for covered bicycle parking. Suggestion: Consider requirements for covered bicycle parking	Bicycle parking space, long term is defined to require a secure and weather protected area for occupants of a building.  Additional regulations have been included to require secure, weather proof enclosures for long term parking and a percentage of short term weather protected spaces.
15.	Bicycle parking	Andrew Miller	Nov. 22, 2021	The minimum bicycle parking seems punitively low. I've been cycling around the city for a lot of my errands this year and I find there is already shockingly little in the way of bike parking, even along roads with bike lanes. If we are looking to increase bike ridership then providing additional parking facilities should at least	Bicycle parking space requirements for the entire city is being introduced through the new zoning bylaw. These regulations will apply going forward, meaning existing buildings may not be providing bicycle parking to the same standard as the new bylaw. The proposed rates were prepared



No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				help encourage people to use bikes for errands and commuting.	based on the rationale developed by IBI Group in the Guelph Parking Standards Discussion Paper.
16.	Bicycle parking	Matthew Betts	Dec. 5, 2021	Minimum required short term bicycle parking spots for Commercial, Service, Retail should be increased by about 25%	Bicycle parking rates have been developed by IBI Group and are outlined in the Guelph Parking Standards Discussion Paper. These recommendations were based on policies contained in the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals (APBP)'s Bike Parking Guide and bicycle parking rates implemented in comparable municipalities. Bicycle parking rates have been reviewed and simplified in the proposed zoning bylaw.
17.	Buffer strip	Ian Panabaker, Wood Development Group	Dec. 20, 2021	The new proposed by-law defines the Buffer Strip as soft landscape with a minimum dimension of 3m. This sets a hard number where there was practice to allow some elements of exterior hardscaping into the perimeter of a site – for instance allowing a parking row to be 0.5m within a buffer area. This was a very workable system that allowed problems to be solved. The new by-law will create conflict where none was warranted. Avoid hard set numbers where there was already a working system for achieving an objective – such as the existing Buffer Strip definition.	The proposed zoning bylaw provides clarity for what a buffer strip is and ensures consistency in interpreting the intent of the bylaw. Zoning bylaw regulations establish legal requirements to ensure minimum standards are met. The intent of defining a 3 metre buffer strip is to not allow hardscaping and parking areas within that landscaped area.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
18.	Buffer strip	Astrid Clos, Skyline Retail  Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 12, 2022  Jan. 14, 2022	A fence must be included in the definition of a Buffer Strip in the new zoning by-law.	A fence is permitted within a buffer strip in accordance with Section 4.16 (fence regulations) but is not always required. The definition of buffer strip has been updated to add clarity that a fence is permitted within a buffer strip.
19.	Buffer strip	Nancy Shoemaker, BSR&D- 650 Scottsdale Drive	Dec. 15, 2022	The buffer strip requirement under the existing by-law permits a fence to satisfy the buffer strip requirements and this property has been developed accordingly. The new by-law requires a 3 metre wide buffer. This altered regulation changes a conforming property into a legal non-conforming property thereby significantly affecting value. Given the existing approved property layout, it is impossible to meet this new buffer strip regulation without impacting the existing parking supply.	The existing bylaw lacks clarity around what is considered a buffer strip. Additional clarity has been incorporated into the proposed bylaw to ensure consistency for future development applications.  Section 1.4.3 of the proposed bylaw recognizes existing non-complying buildings and lots and would recognize the existing site conditions in this case.
20.	Building length	Astrid Clos, Skyline Retail  Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 12, 2022  Jan. 14, 2022	A maximum building length should not be included in the zoning but should remain as an urban design guideline. There must be flexibility to respond to site specific conditions.	The Commercial Built Form Standards recommended limiting commercial building lengths to 75 metres for buildings that are located within 15 metres of the front or exterior side lot lines. This will allow for larger commercial buildings to be located on the interior of the site. This regulation ensures pedestrian

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
					<p>scale buildings and reduces shadowing impacts.</p> <p>The proposed zoning bylaw has been updated to add flexibility by specifying that this regulation only applies to buildings within 15 metres of a street for the mixed-use zones and the residential RM.6 and RH.7 zones.</p>
21.	Building length	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jan. 12, 2022	<p>Sections 7.3.1(c) and 7.3.3.(c): the proposed maximum building length is "75 m for buildings located within 15 m of a street". The corresponding Official Plan Policy 8.6.8 states "Long building facades that are visible along a public street will incorporate recesses, projections, windows or awnings, colonnades and/or landscaping along the length of the facade to reduce the mass of such facades." In our submission, the maximum building length regulation should be removed since Official Plan policy 8.6.8 is not appropriately implemented.</p>	See building length response above in row 20.
22.	Building setbacks	Astrid Clos, Skyline Retail	Jan. 12, 2022	<p>Minimum Building Setbacks should not be included in the zoning but should be an urban design guideline instead. The Angular Plan regulations already regulate this.</p>	<p>The Official Plan states that buildings above six storeys shall incorporate a distinctive bottom, middle and top (section 8.9 of the Official Plan). This is accomplished through setbacks. The section also</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
					includes limiting floor plate sizes and spacing between towers (section 8.9 of the Official Plan).
23.	Built form regulations	Ian Panabaker, Wood Development Group	Dec. 20, 2021	<p><b>BUILT FORM REGULATION – MINIMUMS TOO HIGH</b></p> <p>A city’s zoning by-law is where the ‘rubber hits the road’ in terms of formalised regulations that must be met. There is no interpretation. We understand the desire to embed as much into the Zoning as possible to create clear direction and avoid interpretive arguments between applicants and staff around urban design. However, the more detail, the more potential for unintended consequences. There is an art to creating that balance. In general, the proposed bylaw sways too far into including too much prescriptive detail.</p>	The proposed zoning bylaw takes the approach to pre-zone lands for the maximum height and density permitted in the Official Plan. This approach reduces the opportunity to review a development proposal through a site-specific development application. Built-form regulations have been included in the proposed zoning bylaw in accordance with Official Plan policy to ensure minimum standards are met to provide appropriate building transition to surrounding areas and ensure the streetscape is not negatively impacted.
24.	Built form regulations	Guelph Wellington Development Association, Guelph and District Home Builders' Association	Dec. 16, 2021	Many of the 'Minimum' regulations appear more like maximums, again contradicting the goal of wanting to streamline solutions. Regulations such as: Ground Floor Transparency, Ground Floor Heights, Landscape Open Space	See pre-zoning explanation above in row 23.
25.	Built form regulations	Nancy Shoemaker, BSR&D- 55 Teal Drive	Dec. 15, 2021	A new regulation requires a front yard setback from a private road to be 6 metres, however should the legal parking space be provided in a garage, the distance between the garage and the	The proposed regulation in Table 6.19, C, requires a minimum setback of 6 metres from a private street for cluster townhouses. This is consistent with the front yard setback for

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				private road can be 5.5 metres. The new 6 metre regulation is greater than what is required when the legal parking space is within a garage. It appears that the setback to private roads are an attempt to regulate urban design matters that are better left as a guideline.	an on-street townhouse as well as a single detached or semi-detached dwelling. In this case the legal off-street parking space is likely provided in an attached garage and a 6 metre front yard setback ensures that a second vehicle can be accommodated in the driveway and will not overhang on the street or sidewalk and to provide green space and an opportunity to plant street trees. The proposed bylaw has not been revised based on community feedback and the general need to accommodate more parking for townhouse units.
26.	Commercial zones	Mike Marcolongo	Nov. 22, 2021	The city has older established neighbourhoods that have RL.1 areas that are punctuated by former commercial establishments. As the city intensifies these locations could once again become viable commercial operations. Has the City considered a Residential Character Commercial zone that can be applied to existing small scale commercial buildings or residential buildings with a current or former commercial use? (City of Hamilton materials provided) Suggesting a flexible approach that acknowledges former	The proposed Convenience Commercial (CC) zone is intended to recognize existing small-scale commercial within residential neighbourhoods. The proposed zoning bylaw has reviewed existing commercial uses within neighbourhoods and applied the applicable CC zone. The proposed zoning bylaw has not taken the approach of reviewing former commercial uses that have been converted to residential.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				commercial use so owners can retain current residential use or revert to a commercial use down the road.	
27.	Commercial gross floor area	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	What is the rationale for the Maximum Commercial Gross Floor Area in the MUC Zone?	This typo has been corrected in the proposed zoning bylaw. The proposed zoning bylaw does not regulate maximum commercial gross floor area in the MUC zone. A maximum commercial GFA is applied to the NCC zone based on Official Plan policy 9.4.5.3, A Neighbourhood Commercial Centre shall have a maximum total commercial gross floor area of 6,500 square metres (70,000 square feet) of gross floor area.
28.	Commercial gross floor area	Astrid J. Clos Planning Consultants- 304-324 Stone Road West and 511 Edinburgh Road South	Nov. 26, 2021	The maximum commercial gross floor area is proposed to be reduced significantly from 12,500 m <sup>2</sup> in the current zoning to 6,500 m <sup>2</sup> (Table 6.2.2 Row 10). Based on the City's recently approved Commercial Policy Review OPA, is this an error and is the 6,500 m <sup>2</sup> a minimum GFA requirement?	See staff response above in row 27.
29.	Commercial gross floor area	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jan. 12, 2022	Section 7.3.4(c) for the MUC zone states the maximum commercial gross floor area is 6,500 sq. m. In our submission, it would be appropriate to carry over the maximum GFA from the existing CC zone of 12,500 sq. m in order to avoid rendering existing buildings as non-conforming. For	See staff response above in row 27.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				example, the existing Zehrs store at 297-299 Eramosa Road, which is proposed to be zoned MUC(PA)(H13), would exceed the proposed maximum GFA.	
30.	Commercial gross floor area	Astrid Clos, Skyline Retail- 160, 170, 200, 210 Kortright Road West	Jan. 12, 2022	The maximum commercial gross floor area is proposed to be reduced significantly from 12,500 m2 in the current zoning to 6,500 m2. Based on the City's recently approved Commercial Policy Review OPA is this an error and is the 6,500 m2 intended to be a minimum GFA requirement?	160-170 Kortright Road West and 200-210 Kortright Road West are designated Neighbourhood Commercial Centre in the Official Plan. Official Plan policy 9.4.5.4 permits the Kortright Road at Edinburgh Road Neighbourhood Commercial Centre designation to provide a maximum of 10,000 square metres of commercial gross floor area (GFA). The two existing properties that form the Kortright Road at Edinburgh Road designation currently exceed the maximum 10,000 square metres of commercial GFA. The site-specific NCC-11 and NCC-12 zones have been applied to the two properties to recognize the existing commercial GFA and implement the Official Plan and directions of the Commercial Policy Review.
31.	Commercial gross floor area	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jan. 12, 2022	Section 7.3.2(a) for the CMUC zone states that the maximum commercial gross floor area is 0.33 floor space index (FSI). Under the existing CC zone, the	The Commercial Policy Review updated the maximum commercial gross floor area (GFA) within the Commercial Mixed Use Centre designation of

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>maximum GFA is 12,500 sq. m. In our submission, it would be appropriate to carry over the existing regulation in order to avoid rendering existing buildings as non-conforming. Alternatively, the regulation could state "0.33 floor space index (FSI) or 12,500 sq. m.</p>	<p>the Official Plan. The proposed zoning bylaw provides a maximum commercial GFA that recognizes existing built GFA on a property and permits a 10% increase in GFA on large sites and a 0.33 commercial floor space index (FSI) maximum for small sites. This has been implemented within the CMUC zone on larger sites through site-specific zones based on the Commercial Policy Review work. Smaller sites are zoned CMUC where the maximum 0.33 FSI has been applied. This change allows for a modest increase of commercial GFA for both large and small properties as-of-right. This allows small properties additional flexibility to allow modest intensification of more than 10% as-of-right up to 0.33 FSI.</p>
32.	Commercial gross floor area	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jan. 12, 2022	<p>Section 7.3.2(b) for the CMUC zone and Section 7.3.4.(e) for the NCC zone state that the minimum commercial gross floor area is "(i) Not less than 25% of the commercial gross floor area (GFA) existing on the date of the passing of this bylaw. (ii) Where no commercial gross floor area (GFA) exists, as of the date of the passing of this by-law, the minimum commercial gross floor</p>	<p>The Commercial Policy Review recommended that minimum commercial gross floor area zoning regulations be applied to commercially zoned properties within Commercial Mixed Use Centres, Mixed Use Corridors and Neighbourhood Commercial Centres on a property basis that requires a commercial density of 0.15 FSI, or 25% less gross floor area than existed on the</p>



No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>area (GFA) shall be 0.15 floor space index (FSI)".  The corresponding Official Plan Policy 9.4.3.10 states "Proposals to decrease the existing commercial gross floor area by more than 25 per cent or to provide commercial gross floor area at less than .15 FSI will require a Commercial Function Study in accordance with the policies of this Plan" and Policy 9.4.5.11 states "Development proposals that would decrease the existing commercial gross floor area within a Neighbourhood Commercial Centre by more than 25 per cent or that would provide commercial gross floor area at less than .15 FSI will require a Commercial Function Study in accordance with the policies of this Plan."  In our submission, since Policies 8.6.10 and 9.4.5.11 provide for tests related to the requirement for a Commercial Function Study and do not provide for prescriptive implementation through minimum gross floor area under the implementing zoning, the regulations are not appropriate and should be removed.</p>	<p>date of the passing of the by-law, whichever is the greater amount of gross floor area.</p> <p>The implementation of these policies will allow the City to determine if the commercial vision and principles will continue to be met and how a reduction in commercial floor space will affect the needs of the community. The potential loss of commercial space is a concern given the long-term need for additional commercial land supply and the evolution of commercial areas into mixed-use developments that allow for additional uses to complement the commercial space.</p>
33.	Commercial gross floor area	Jonathan Rodger,	Jan. 12, 2022	For the existing Zehrs at 1750 Gordon Street, we request clarification as the existing CC-17	The maximum commercial GFA for 1750 Gordon Street has been outlined in the Commercial

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
		Zelinka Priamo Ltd.		zone permits a maximum gross floor area of 17,651 sq. m, whereas the proposed CMUC-1(PA)(H13) zone permits a maximum gross floor area of 12,430 sq. m;	Policy Review to recognize the existing GFA for the site and adds a 10% increase (12,430 sq. m). The site-specific CMUC-1 zone only applies 1750 Gordon and not 2, 4 and 50 Clair Road East, that are included in the current CC-17 zone.
34.	Commercial mixed-use zones	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	Why is a minimum residential density required in the MUC Zone? This will potentially discourage intensification on a large site.	<p>This is based on Official Plan policy 9.4.4.11, For freestanding residential development, the maximum net density is 150 units per hectare and the minimum net density is 100 units per hectare.</p> <p>The proposed zoning bylaw has been revised to require minimum density for freestanding residential buildings only. Mixed-use buildings would not be required to meet a minimum density.</p>
35.	Common amenity area	Astrid Clos, Skyline	Jan. 12, 2022	The current zoning by-law has a CAA requirement that is too high when compared with other municipalities and should be reduced in the new zoning by-law. This CAA regulation is one that has been reduced many times in the specialized zoning regulations of the current by-law. The Common amenity area requirement is far too high.	<p>Common amenity area requirements have been revised and simplified in the proposed zoning bylaw.</p> <p>A 2 metre setback applies to interior side yards to prevent overlook. This is not required when rooftop common amenity area is facing a street or rear yard.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>Intensification and housing affordability are critical factors to be considered.</p> <p>This new requirement to have a 2 m setback from rooftop CAA is unnecessary and architects have advised that it will create a potentially dangerous area for maintenance purposes.</p>	
36.	Common amenity area	Astrid J. Clos Planning Consultants	Nov. 26, 2021	<p>The Minimum common amenity area (CAA) is too high when compared with other municipalities and should be reduced (Table 7.8). Where intensification is encouraged and a park over 1 hectare is located within 400 metres, the CAA should not be required at such a high rate and has been reduced many times in specialized zoning regulations. If the property is redeveloped in the future for residential intensification the zoning should recognize the property abuts a municipal park. The City's urban design guidelines anticipate the reduction of the CAA in this circumstance.</p>	<p>Common amenity area requirements have been revised and simplified in the proposed zoning bylaw. Further reductions in common amenity area when a property is located in close proximity to a park would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.</p>
37.	Common amenity area	Ben Jones, Fusion	Jan. 16, 2022	<p>Unclear why different unit types have different common amenity area requirements. In particular, 20 m<sup>2</sup> per unit is very high - refer to approved site-specific exceptions in the existing zoning by-law. Note that large common</p>	<p>Common amenity area requirements have been revised and simplified in the proposed zoning bylaw.</p> <p>Exceptions are provided that exempt properties within the</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				amenity areas increase condominium fees and negatively impact long-term housing affordability, particularly for higher density. Should be 10m2 maximum.	Older Built-up Area Overlay, Schedule B-1 from providing common amenity area. There is also an exception for any building with less than 20 units are not require to provide common amenity area. Additionally, the bylaw provides flexibility for how common amenity area can be provided, allowing a portion of it to be combined with the landscaped open space requirement as well as being permitted on building rooftops.
38.	Common amenity area	Brandon Flewwelling, GSP Group, Debrob Investments Ltd.- 55 & 75 Cityview Drive	Jan. 17, 2022	Common Amenity requirements remain high, particularly for apartment and stacked townhomes, and will likely lead to many unnecessary requests for minor variances or zoning by-law amendments.	See staff response above in row 37.
39.	Common amenity area	Nancy Shoemaker, BSR&D- 47-75 Willow Road	Dec. 15, 2021	Introducing a common amenity area requirement on mixed-use centres similar to those on single use high density sites limits intensification goals. Mixed-use sites function quite differently from single use sites and should have a more appropriate common amenity area ratio.	See staff response above in row 37.
40.	Common amenity area	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	The Common amenity area requirement is far too high. There should be different zones applied to apartment sites located within the Built-Up Area (similar to the	See staff response above in row 37.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				downtown zones) where a Common Amenity Area is not required. Intensification and housing affordability are critical factors to be considered.	
41.	Common amenity area	Trevor Hawkins, MHBC, Forum 601 Scottsdale LP (FEP)- 601 Scottsdale Drive	Dec. 17, 2021	The proposed MUC zone requires 30 m2 per unit for the first 20 units and 20 m2 for each additional unit. If this regulation applied to the proposed building subject to OZS21-012 (which contains 164 `units`), 3,480 m2 of common amenity area would be required, which is the equivalent of more than 2 full floors of a building that maximizes the permitted length (75 m) in the MUC zone or almost 1 acre of land. This regulation should be reconsidered as the required amount of amenity area will be challenging to achieve for intensification projects. For example, the City of Waterloo's Zoning By-law instead allows for consideration of both private and common amenity areas to count towards the overall requirement (e.g. private balconies and terraces) and the requirement is substantially less (3 m2 per bedroom for first bedroom in a unit and 2 m2 for each additional bedroom). FEP supports the provision of common and private amenity area for residential or	See staff response above in row 37.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>mixed-use developments. However, the proposed requirement is onerous and will be very challenging to satisfy for intensification and redevelopment projects that are also subject to height limits. The requirement may have the unintended consequence of reducing the number of units that a project can accommodate, which will result in less efficient use of land, contrary to provincial policies.</p>	
42.	Common amenity area	Scott Hannah	Dec. 20, 2021	<p>Unfortunately, the new by-law has maintained a common amenity area requirement for medium and high density residential uses which is onerous and unnecessary. The requirements are counterproductive to the goal of achieving the residential intensification and density targets outlined by the Official Plan in higher density and mixed-use areas. I recognize that the regulations allow certain interior recreational spaces to be included in the calculations and there is no requirement for common amenity areas in older built-up areas. Unfortunately, the vast majority of the higher density residential and mixed use/intensification areas are located outside of the Schedule B-1 overlay. I have recently been involved in three</p>	<p>See staff response above in row 37.</p> <p>Staff continue to recommend common amenity area and landscape open space requirements to ensure that developments provide adequate amenity space for residents and provide enough space for vegetation and trees. Staff have completed a review of other municipal practices and have reviewed existing development applications. In our review it is typically smaller sites that have more difficulty meeting the requirements. The exceptions that have been built into the bylaw should assist these smaller sites.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>(3) medium density residential projects in the City of Guelph and all three required special provisions to reduce the common amenity area requirement. A review of other similar developments will certainly find a similar trend. So why keep an onerous requirement that in most cases cannot be achieved and where a lesser rate is more than acceptable? Further, most contemporary zoning by-laws, especially those for larger urban centres (e.g. Waterloo, Kitchener, Oakville are just a few examples that I'm familiar with) have eliminated the requirement for common amenity area in favour of a global landscape open space requirement ranging from 10-30% of the lot area. The City of Guelph's new Zoning By-law, in addition to the common amenity area requirement, also requires 40% landscaped open space. Both of these regulations are unnecessary and restrictive. Developers/owners proposing higher density residential developments will provide appropriate amenity areas (passive outdoor spaces, rooftop patios, common rooms, workout rooms/gyms, etc.) to stay competitive in the market place.</p>	

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>The City however should not be dictating the size and type of these areas, especially when they limit the City from achieving the densities contemplated in the Official Plan. Subdividers and developers are also required to dedicate land or provide cash-in-lieu (CIL) payments to the City for parks and recreational purposes, so that future residents are in close proximity to public parks, trails and other recreational amenities. Given the above, I would request that the current common amenity area requirement for medium and high density residential uses be removed and that the landscaped open space requirement of 40% be reduced to 10-25%</p>	
43.	Complementary uses	Chris Corosky, Armel	Dec. 20, 2021	<p>Clarify interpretation for complementary use. Is a medical clinic permitted as of right in a SC zone, or is it only permitted in an SC zone if within a multi-unit building pursuant to Section 4.20?</p>	<p>Medical clinic is permitted as a complementary use in the service commercial (SC) zone in accordance with section 4.20. Section 4.20 (b) requires complementary uses to be within a multi-unit building in combination with a primary permitted use.</p> <p>A complementary use proposed in a stand-alone building would need site-specific permission requested through a development application.</p>



No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
44.	Current development application	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jan. 12, 2022	For the existing No Frills store at 111-191 Silvercreek Parkway North, which is proposed to be zoned CDA, we request clarification as to the intended zone as there appears to be no CDA zone in the Draft By-law.	<p>CDA stands for "Current Development Application". Proposed zoning has been applied to CDA properties based on the Official Plan designations. (CDA) has been included as a suffix for the purposes of the statutory public meeting to recognize the development application on the property. CDA sites will continue to be reviewed and incorporated into the new bylaw on an individual basis as they receive approval.</p> <p>111-191 Silvercreek Parkway North is proposed to be zoned MUC (PA)(H13) at this time.</p>
45.	Definitions	Astrid Clos, Skyline- 160, 170, 200, 210 Kortright Road West	Jan. 12, 2022	The proposed definition of a Retail establishment should be more explicit regarding what is included. Why does the definition state that a postal service and pharmacy "may" be included? The definition should specifically state what is included, not what may be permitted. Please confirm that a bake shop, florist, hardware store, rental shop are all permitted within the definition of a Retail establishment.	The intent of the proposed zoning bylaw is to simplify uses and delete several similar definitions. The definition of retail establishment has been modified to not specifically reference the types of retail uses that are considered a retail establishment as there would be too many to list. The following is provided for clarification: 1. Bake shop would be considered restaurant or take-out restaurant if food is prepared and offered for retail sale and consumption on site or as take out. If food is not prepared on site and is only sold

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
					<p>for consumption off site, this use would be considered a retail establishment.</p> <p>2. Florist is considered a retail establishment.</p> <p>3. A small scale hardware store would be considered a retail establishment where the use is primarily retail of small-scale home goods and tools, and not of the same scale as a home improvement warehouse or building supply use where large scale home improvement materials such as lumber, furniture, appliances, audio visual equipment are sold.</p> <p>4. Retail establishment includes the rental of goods, outside the definition of rental outlet and major equipment supply and service.</p>
46.	Definitions	Ben Jones, Fusion	Jan. 16, 2022	Width of garage is defined as the opening for the overhead door, including dividers if applied to a double garage with two doors. This seems to conflict with the general provisions diagram for garage width.	The garage width illustration has been revised in the proposed zoning bylaw to align with the definition of garage width.
47.	Definitions	Chris Corosky, Armel	Dec. 20, 2021	Vehicle Gar Bars are not defined in the new zoning bylaw. Although it is not clear, we assume Vehicle Gas Bars fall under the definition of Vehicle Service Station – please clarify/confirm. If this is the case, then the definition for Vehicle	A vehicle gas bar is permitted under the vehicle service station use/definition. Clarification has been added to the definition of vehicle service station in the proposed zoning bylaw.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				Service Station should be revised to include Vehicle Gas Bars.	
48.	Definitions	Chris Corosky, Armel	Dec. 20, 2021	What is "net" lot area? The term is used in the definition of density but not defined.	The definition of density has been updated in the proposed zoning bylaw to clarify what net lot area is. The proposed definition aligns with the Official Plan definition of density.
49.	Definitions	Ian Panabaker, Wood Development Group	Dec. 20, 2021	The definition of First Storey is inconsistent. In multi-storey buildings this is defined as floor-to-floor height. In single storey buildings this is defined as floor-to-ceiling height (which aligns with the Ontario Building Code definitions). There can be significant difference in these measurements as structural depth and ducting/HVAC etc. can add up metres above ceiling finishes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not rely on this OBC definition to determine the ground floor height provisions. Each building system typology creates too many variables.</li> <li>• The City should consider using a different measure: Finished Floor to Finished Ceiling and set it at what is desired - 3.6m (12')</li> </ul>	The proposed zoning bylaw has been updated to define "first storey height" to regulate minimum first storey height. First storey height means the height, measured from finished floor to finished ceiling of the first storey.  Commercial uses require ceiling heights greater than typical residential uses to accommodate visual displays, lighting, and mechanical requirements and to ensure commercial buildings are able to accommodate a range of non-residential uses over time.
50.	Definitions	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	B-9 Blue roof definition does not include a definition of any substrate. Suggestion: Blue roof definition should ensure that the roofing material is highly reflective (e.g., white) to ensure the tradeoff of using a so-called	The proposed blue roof definition aligns with the recommended definition included in the Commercial Built Form Standards. A blue roof would be reviewed through the Site Plan process. Details

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				blue roof does not undermine the intent of the proposed bonus.	related to roofing material is better reviewed at the Site Plan stage to allow flexibility for different systems.
51.	Definitions	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	B-18 Floor area heading does not have any illustrations. Suggestion: Consider adding illustrations to make these definitions more clear.	Comment noted.
52.	Definitions	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	B-18 Floor areas include two terms, Ground floor area, and Gross floor area. While one has a short form called out as GFA both could be shortened to GFA. Suggestion: Change Ground floor area to Main floor area.	Comment noted.
53.	Definitions	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	B-18 Floor space index does not have any illustrations. Suggestion: Definition could be improved with illustrations. Additionally, a definition would be made more clear if FSI included all storeys.	Illustration for FSI is provided on page B-19 of the proposed zoning bylaw.
54.	Definitions	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	B-29 The definition of Urban agriculture is a bit vague. Suggestion: Expand the definition to better differentiate Urban agriculture apart from Agriculture.	The proposed definition of urban agriculture aligns with the Official Plan definition. Distinction between livestock based agriculture and vegetation based agriculture is included to add clarity.
55.	Definitions	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	B-29 The definition of Vehicles should include any definition for an E- Bike, Motorized Wheelchair or Motorized mobility device. Suggestion: Call out a definition	E-bike, motorized wheelchair or motorized mobility devices are not required to meet the same parking regulations as vehicles so it would be inappropriate to

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				for these items and where appropriate parking requirements	include them within the definition of vehicle.  Bicycle parking space requirements have been included that require access to an electrical outlet to make sure electric bicycles have access to charging outlets.
56.	Definitions	Lyle McNair	Nov. 16, 2021	There's a definition for "lot frontage" but in several instances (6) in the document you refer to "lot width". I believe it's important and adds to the utility of the document to use the same terms throughout to refer to the same thing.	Terminology has been updated to lot frontage to be consistent and use defined terms.
57.	Definitions	Nancy Shoemaker, BSR&D- 55 Teal Drive	Dec. 15, 2021	The existing bylaw permits a fence to satisfy buffer strip requirements. The new bylaw requires a 3 metre wide buffer, however it is not clear if the 3 metres can form part of a required rear yard and/or side yard.	The existing bylaw lacks clarity around what is considered a buffer strip. Additional clarity has been incorporated into the proposed zoning bylaw. A fence would be permitted in the buffer strip in accordance with Section 4.16. A buffer strip can form part of the required yard. Clarification has been added to the definition of buffer strip.
58.	Definitions	Astrid Clos- 304-324 Stone Road West and 511 Edinburgh Road South	Nov. 26, 2021	A fence must be included in the definition of a Buffer strip.	See staff response above in row 57.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
59.	Definitions	Scott Hannah, Dira Properties	Dec. 15, 2021	Reinstate a definition of Rental Outlet (like what exists now) in the new zoning by-law and permit this use in the SC zone. Rental is referenced in the definition of "Retail establishment", however this is not a permitted use in the SC zone. There are several existing equipment rental facilities in Service Commercial areas. The use should be defined and permitted given the unique nature of these uses and sometimes the need for outside storage.	The rental outlet definition/use has been added to the proposed zoning bylaw and it is permitted in the SC zone.
60.	Document layout	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	As a person with good colour perception, the use of colour makes this document pleasant to use however; colour blind individuals may find the use of colour confusing and or not be able to perceive what the use of colour is attempting to communicate. Suggestion: Remove or restrict the use of colour to decorative function and where it has been used in illustrations in an attempt to call attention to an area, replace colour with a hatch pattern. The result in a final document should make the document more clear to all readers regardless of ability.	The final document will meet all AODA requirements. Colours have been selected to meet the contrast ratio required to meet the WCAG 2.0 AA standard.
61.	Document layout	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	The use of bold text throughout the document is somewhat confusing. Reminding one that if everything is important, then	Bolded text refers to terms that have been defined in the zoning bylaw; this is typical of zoning bylaws. We are limited in the

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				nothing is. There may be a reason for the use of so much bold text that this reader is unaware of, such as hyperlinks for an on-line document for definitions. Suggestion: If required for something such as a hyperlink consider a less distracting way of setting the text apart.	type of text that can be used to meet AODA requirements. For example, underlined or italics cannot be used.
62.	Document layout	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	Not all illustrations are numbered in the title or description. Suggestion: All illustrations should have a title or description as well as a number so they may be referenced in the body of the Zoning Bylaw. The use of a lower case letter should be avoided in illustration's title as this can result in confusing the illustration with a body of text within the Zoning Bylaw. Example, page C-26 the body of the Zoning Bylaw, text contains two lower case letters "a" while the title of one illustration starts with a letter "a".	Noted, document layout has been reviewed for compliance with corporate standards.
63.	Document layout	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	A general rule in drafting is to title a drawing, detail or illustration below the image being described. Suggestion: Consider following this convention in the Zoning Bylaw.	Comment noted.
64.	Document layout	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	Similar to item 3; an inconsistency of spacing between an illustration and, when present, the titles of an illustration is apparent resulting in some	Comment noted.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				confusion and or reduced clarity. Suggestion: A consistent spacing should be established and adhered to on all illustrations.	
65.	Document layout	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	Similar to item 4; when illustrations are used the spacing between the body of the Zoning Bylaw text and the illustration can be inconsistent resulting in some confusion and or reduced clarity. Suggestion: Establish and adhere to a consistent space between the body of text and the Zoning Bylaw	Comment noted.
66.	Document layout	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	Some pages with illustrations, the illustration(s) are sometimes not well laid out resulting in large white spaces leading the reader to wonder the reason for the space, reducing the efficiency of the document. Suggestion: When it is necessary to have an illustration in a largely blank space the illustration should be either resized to take up more page area or laid out to make better use of the page spacing.	Comment noted.
67.	Document layout	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	Where illustrations are present, many pages have more than one illustration and many of these pages often have a letter in a circle calling out a detail, for example a numeric value, an area or a term. In most cases both illustrations will use the same letters but for different items. Suggestion: When more than one	Comment noted.



No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				illustration is present on a page each letter used as a call out should be unique to each illustration unless the call out refers to the same item. eg See illustrations on page C-26	
68.	Document layout	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	A drafting convention is to use upper case lettering in a drawing's title and/or a larger sized font than the font used in other details as an aid to clarity. Suggestion: Consider that all drawing titles use a larger font than the text in the body of the Zoning Bylaw. Alternatively, consider capitalize each letter of an illustration's title	Comment noted.
69.	Document layout	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	Some illustrations' titles are in bold typeface and others are not. Suggestion: Use Bold typeface for all illustration titles.	Comment noted.
70.	Document layout	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	There are many illustrations where there is a great deal of space available to clearly indicate an actual dimension value. Suggestion: To make more clear, and to avoid confusion and to avoid unnecessary graphics and key references use actual values rather than having to refer to a callout then refer to a value through a key in a chart or list.	Graphics have been included in the zoning bylaw to assist in illustrating the regulations and do not form part of the bylaw. Regulations should be referenced in association with the illustrations.
71.	Document layout	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	B-17 Illustration at the bottom of this page the letter "a" is used twice. Suggestion: Choose a different letter for "Finished	The illustration uses a small a and a capital A in a circle. The two are distinguishable from one another. No change made.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				Grade" such as a capital "FG" to make more clear	
72.	Document layout	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	B-18 No illustrations for the definition of Floor Areas. Suggestion: Add an illustration to assist and clarify these definitions.	Comment noted.
73.	Document layout	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	C-4 The illustration at the bottom of this page is missing part of its leader line	Comment noted.
74.	Document layout	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	C-20 Second and third illustrations the call out letters are (from left to right) "C, B, A" while below the values for these letters are laid out as "A,B,C". Suggestion: Consider having these values line up. There may be other examples of this.	Illustration updated
75.	Document layout	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	C-28 Illustration has a call out "B" but no value for "B" is presented.	Illustration updated
76.	Document layout	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	C-37 Illustration is not very clear. Suggestion: Consider revising or adding more detail.	No change proposed
77.	Document layout	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	C-44 Garage Projection illustration is somewhat unclear. Suggestion: Increase the size of this illustration or consider a detail that more clearly illustrates the point of the illustration.	No change proposed
78.	Document layout	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	D-12 Illustration is too small for clarity of the concept. Suggestion: Consider a larger illustration and label one setback as "A" the other setback as "B" and the average setback as "C". Also consider a formula of $A + B \text{ over } C = \text{Average Setback}$ ".	Comment noted.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
79.	Document layout	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	D-37 Permitted use matrix uses the letter "P" in columns for a permitted use. Suggestion: The use of a check mark would be a much more clear indication and would make numbers of footnotes more clear. Removing brackets from these footnote numbers and increasing font size would also add to clarity. These suggestions should be considered for all similar matrices.	Comment noted.
80.	Drive-through	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14 2022	It appears that a Drive-through facility has become a use of land as opposed to being accessory to a permitted use? Please clarify how a Drive-through facility will be permitted in the new zoning.	Drive-through facilities are a defined use and permitted in the CMUC and MUC zones as well as on site-specific NCC properties that permit commercial gross floor area of 10,000 square metres. Drive-throughs are also permitted in the SC zone and some employment zones as a complementary use.
81.	Driveway width	Ben Jones, Fusion	Jan. 16, 2022	Table 5.9 Driveway width- Same comment as on Table 5.8:  Having a maximum garage width in RL.1 and RL.2 zones differ is not functional. For new subdivisions, zoning is approved at the Draft Plan of Subdivision stage, but lot fabric and lot sizing is often implemented later, particularly in multi-phase developments. RL.2 zones could be implemented, but lot fabric may have larger lot widths	The proposed driveway width and garage width regulations have been updated for RL.1 and RL.2 single detached dwellings to allow the garage width to match the maximum driveway width and to recognize approved 12 metre lot frontages (existing R.1C zone).

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>depending on market demand when subdivision is serviced. Garage width for singles should be a function of lot width, but maximum for RL.1 and RL.2 should be the same.</p> <p>Also, a 5m garage is not a double car garage - as per definitions, a two car garage would require 2 x 3m x 6m spaces, therefore opening would need to be 6.0m wide. Recommend further consultation with the development industry to reconcile these issues.</p>	
82.	Driveway width	Lyle McNair	Nov. 16, 2021	<p>Table 5.9- Maximum driveway width- RL.2 zone permits a driveway width of 5 metres which is 55.6% of the lot width. Maximum width for townhouses and semi-detached dwelling should also be set at 56% of the lot width or 5 metres, whichever is the lesser. I also note there is some inconsistency in wording.</p>	<p>Driveway width regulations for townhouses have been updated to 50% of the lot frontage or 5 metres, whichever is less. This allows wider driveways for townhouses that have larger lot frontage and aligns with semi-detached dwelling regulations. Terminology has been updated from lot width to lot frontage which is a defined term.</p>
83.	Driveway width	Wendy Tomlinson	Nov. 30, 2021	<p>Need more parking. Feel for the people with cars that have no place to park. Some areas of the city don't have to deal with this at all. Consider wider driveways for townhouses since some of them have wider frontages.</p>	<p>See staff response above in row 82.</p>
84.	Driveway width	Dana Holmes	Nov. 30, 2021	<p>Concern with limiting parking widths when car still important especially with kids returning home. What about considering</p>	<p>Two parking spaces are required off-street - one setback behind front wall of the house (may be in a garage) and one in</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>need to use permeable pavers for second driveway (additional width) to help with stormwater. Need affordable housing and to accommodate household needs. Parking on-street causes issues with snow plowing. Why protecting grass when it's mostly dead in the summer. Guelph is missing big vision for movement. The Hanlon Expressway is really the only north-south road with 2 lanes both ways.</p>	<p>driveway. On-street parking can also help meet interim needs (kids returning home) which wider driveways would limit due to curb cuts. Overnight parking and snowplows are an operational issue. New driveway width rules are generally maintaining existing permissions with some flexibility added.</p>
85.	Driveway width	George Shaw	Dec. 14, 2021	<p>There is no need to have regulations which preclude homeowners from having two vehicles in their garages given federal government and industry support for zero emission vehicles. Electric vehicle charging will be facilitated with both vehicles in a garage. The comfort of family living should not be compromised for the sake of pedestrian view. Garage size should not be based on the width of a house. The Urban Design Manual should be a flexible guide. Propose that in RL.1 and RL.2 zones garage size be up to 65% of dwelling frontage leaving enough frontage for a main entrance and window. Propose that maximum driveway widths for RL.1 and RL.2 zones be up to 6 metres. Driveway widths for</p>	<p>See staff response above in row 81.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				townhouses should be 4 metres to allow room for accessible parking.	
86.	Dwelling unit width	Ben Jones, Fusion	Jan. 16, 2022	Minimum dwelling unit width of 6.0m for cluster townhouse is too high - many jurisdictions have townhouses that are as little as 4.5m wide.	The Built Form Standards for Mid-rise Buildings and Townhouses provides guidance for on-street townhouse units with an integrated front garage to be a minimum of 6 metres wide to ensure that 50% of the front facade contains windows, doors are facing the street and to provide opportunity for street trees. An exception is provided to Table 6.19 when a detached garage is located in the rear yard, the dwelling unit width can be reduced to 5.5 metres.
87.	Electric vehicle parking	Astrid Clos	Nov. 26, 2021, and Jan. 12, 2022	Electric vehicle parking requirements required to be a minimum 80% of apartment, townhouse and mixed-use development parking should not be included in the new zoning by-law. This is more appropriately a Building Code requirement.	<p>The Ontario Building Code does not provide electric vehicle parking requirements. In order to be future ready and have the infrastructure in place, the proposed zoning bylaw has maintained electric vehicle parking space requirements.</p> <p>These regulations will contribute to supporting the increased demand for electric vehicle parking and will help to reduce barriers to the use of electric vehicles and ensure that this option becomes increasingly practical for consumers. The City of Guelph's Community Energy Initiative identifies</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
					increasing the share of electric passenger vehicles and commercial vehicles by 2030 as key actions in the “low carbon pathway” to becoming a Net Zero Community by 2050. This direction is also supported by the recently approved Transportation Master Plan.
88.	Electric vehicle parking	Ben Jones, Fusion	Jan. 16, 2022	EV parking must also consider available electric infrastructure - recommend that EV parking rates be implemented as guidelines first, in consultation with Alectra, to ensure they can be implemented properly	See staff response above in row 87.
89.	Electric vehicle parking	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jan. 12, 2022	In our submission electrical charging station parking spaces should be optional and not a requirement for all developments. The Guelph Commercial Built Form Standard 3.2.1.9 states “Electrical Vehicle Charging Stations should be provided on commercial and mixed-use sites”, whereby electric vehicle parking is currently encouraged.	See staff response above in row 87.
90.	Electric vehicle parking	Nancy Shoemaker, BSR&D- 650 Scottsdale Drive	Dec. 15, 2021	Section 5.9(b) of the new bylaw imposes electric vehicle parking requirements. It is unreasonable to apply this new parking requirement against existing developed commercial sites.	Existing developments that do not meet the proposed regulations will be considered legal non-complying under section 1.4.3 of the bylaw which allows the building to continue to exist legally and any new additions or changes would need to comply with the new

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
					regulations. If an addition is added to an existing non-complying property, the electric vehicle parking requirement would be required for the new floor area that is added.
91.	Electric vehicle parking	Nancy Shoemaker, BSR&D- 47-75 Willow Road	Dec. 15, 2021	Section 5.9(b) of the new bylaw imposes electric vehicle parking requirements. Appreciate the importance of ensuring electric vehicle parking is available; however what was the basis for the ratio of a minimum of 10% of all parking spaces shall be electric vehicle parking spaces and 20% of those 10% will be designated electric vehicle parking.	Recommendations for the number of electric vehicle parking space requirements was provided by IBI Group in the Guelph Parking Standards Review. These recommendations were based on a review of other municipal practices.
92.	Electric vehicle parking	Dana Holmes	Nov. 30, 2021	What level of EV charges required. Level 2 OK for homes. Need level 3 for commercial uses for a quicker charge.	Electric vehicle parking space definition notes a minimum Level 2 Electric Vehicle Charging Device. Higher capacity chargers can be provided.
93.	Electric vehicle parking	Ian Panabaker, Wood Development Group	Dec. 20, 2021	As drivers of electric vehicles, we understand the desire of the city to address the provision of EV infrastructure and to appear proactive, however this is complex, expensive infrastructure and evolving too fast to enshrine into regulation. The Province added and then quickly deleted provision of these requirements from the Ontario Building Code for this reason. Provision of Level 2 charging is not for short stay needs.	See staff response above in row 87 and 92.



No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>Relatively slow AC charging is appropriate for longer and overnight stays. The real public need for EV supportive infrastructure in the public realm is higher-capacity DC charging that extends the fast-charging network. High capacity DC charging requires significant infrastructure, mainly in the form large transformer banks and associated charging units, usually with overhead protection. The City should review and ensure that the provision of these facilities are anticipated in the Zoning By-law and are not inadvertently prohibited.</p> <p>For ICI – Industrial, Commercial, Institutional, including offices, there can be utility to having some Level 2 chargers available for employee or fleet needs, but the provision, system choices, management and cost-distribution should remain a business decision outside of zoning. The market will drive the adoption of this service and its already happening. Requiring provision through zoning will create additional cost burden and potential undesirable results.</p> <p>For residential uses, the discussion is different. Tenants and unit owners will expect that</p>	

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>units will have reliable access to AC charging which typically can occur overnight. Again, the market is driving this expectation now, and the technical aspects of how to provide, how to manage and operate these systems should be left with the proponents until such time as the Province considers integrating these requirements again into the OBC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proscription of Level 2 EV Parking should be left out of the zoning bylaw.</li> <li>• Anticipate and support the extension of high-capacity DC charging facilities in appropriate locations across the city by ensuring they are enabled in the by-law.</li> </ul>	
94.	Entrance elevation	Ben Jones, Fusion	Jan. 16, 2022	<p>This will likely result in more stairs internal to the building, and less functional floor plans overall. Recommend that entrance heights are not an appropriate consideration for the zoning by-law, but this issue can be dealt with through typical setback/projection requirements</p>	<p>The proposed maximum entrance elevation is based on the recommendations of the Mid-rise Buildings and Townhouse Built Form Standards to ensure that the main dwelling unit doors are on the same level or storey as the garage level to avoid long runs of stairs. Staff recommend this regulation continue to be included in the zoning bylaw as on-street townhouses are not required to go through the Site Plan process and there is little opportunity for staff to review</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
					development proposals. If there is a need to provide an entrance over 1.2 metres above grade, planning staff would want to review the design of the building within the site context.
95.	First storey height	Astrid Clos- 304-324 Stone Road West and 511 Edinburgh Road South	Nov. 26, 2021	The minimum first storey building height of 4.5 m (Table 6.2.2) should not be a zoning regulation and should be addressed through an urban design guideline.	<p>Official Plan policy 8.6.10 outlines that where appropriate, a building's first storey shall generally be taller in height to accommodate a range of non-residential uses. It is also a recommendation of the Commercial Built Form Standards that a minimum first storey height of a commercial building should be 4.5 metres and should be implemented through zoning.</p> <p>Commercial uses require ceiling heights greater than typical residential uses to accommodate visual displays, lighting and mechanical requirements and to ensure commercial buildings are able to accommodate a range of non-residential uses over time.</p> <p>The proposed zoning bylaw has been updated to define "first storey height" to add clarity to the bylaw.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
96.	First storey height	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	Minimum First Storey Building Height should not be included in the zoning but should remain as an urban design guideline.	See staff response above in row 95.
97.	First storey height	Ian Panabaker, Wood Development Group	Dec. 20, 2021	<p>First storey building height of all commercial properties is to be a minimum of 4.5m tall. This is another example of the conversion of a guideline “should be” into a required minimum. This provision interacts with ambiguous definitions of First Storey (see below) but also highlights risk of embedding what was guideline language into regulation that will create many conflicts when it comes to implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specifying floor-to-floor or floor-to-ceiling heights imposes too much on the technical design of each building, its grades, and its internal servicing of these spaces.</li> <li>• We believe that if the city wants to achieve “tall ground floor appearance”, it should specify the clear ceiling height (say of 3.6m (12’) floor-to-finished ceiling) and leave the resolution of floor-to-floors etc. to the building designers.</li> </ul>	See staff response above in row 95.
98.	First storey transparency	Astrid Clos, Skyline Retail- 160, 170, 200, 210	Jan. 12, 2022	First storey 40% building transparency should not be required in the NCC Zone. Does this apply to all sides of a building facing a street? How far away	The Commercial Built Form Guidelines reviewed appropriate transparency requirements to promote active uses along a street and contribute to a

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
		Kortright Road West		does a building need to be before it is not considered to be not facing a street? This should be an urban design guideline instead.	<p>vibrant public realm by recommending that where commercial uses abut an arterial or collector road, a minimum of 40% of the surface area of the first Storey façade measured from the finished grade up to a height of 4.5 metres, should be comprised of a transparent window and/or active entrances.</p> <p>The proposed zoning bylaw has been revised to add clarity and flexibility to the regulation. The proposed zoning bylaw requires a minimum 40% transparency when abutting an arterial or collector road.</p>
99.	First storey transparency	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	Minimum First Storey Transparency should not be included in the zoning but should remain as an urban design guideline. The wording of this regulation is problematic.	See staff response above in row 98.
100.	First storey transparency	Ian Panabaker, Wood Development Group	Dec. 20, 2021	40% minimum transparency is required on the ground floor street facades of commercial properties. The downtown carries an even higher minimum of 60%. Even the most recently approved commercial development in Guelph does not meet this requirement. In many cases, this provision is not the right answer, especially in smaller-scale,	<p>See staff response above in row 98.</p> <p>In addition, the downtown transparency requirement has been reduced to 50% in keeping with previous site-specific reductions that have been supported by staff and Council.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>neighbourhood facing property. This would create a condition where development may occur which may not be appropriate but in order to achieve municipal approval, the proponent may choose to build rather than seek adjustment (which may not be supported by staff).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The percentages should be reviewed. What is being promoted as minimums are actually closer to maximums in most contexts.</li> <li>• Distinction should be made between larger commercial properties which could potentially meet higher minimums from smaller sites that need to take on different characteristics within their specific contexts.</li> <li>• We would suggest: Downtown: 40% min. (from 60%) Commercial (CMUC/MUC): 30% min. (from 40%) Neighbourhood Commercial (NCC): 20% min. (from 40%)</li> </ul>	
101.	First storey transparency	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jan. 12, 2022	Sections 7.3.1(d) and 7.3.3.(c): the proposed minimum first storey transparency. The corresponding OLT approved Official Plan Policy 8.6.1 states "New buildings shall address the street. Buildings will enhance the rhythm and frequency of the immediate vicinity, and where appropriate, will have entrances and	See staff response above in row 98.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>windows that face the street” and OLT approved Policy 8.6.2 states “The principal entrances of commercial and mixed-use buildings shall be oriented toward and/or visible from the street and provide direct user entrances from adjacent streets and walkways. Blank facades facing a street, open space or park shall not be permitted.” Under minutes of settlement for the Loblaw appeal of OPA 48, with respect to Policy 8.6.2 the term “blank facades”, which is not defined, shall not be defined to exclude or preclude the use of glazed windows or alternatively a combination of glazed display windows together with façade articulation and/or spandrel windows in order to facilitate operational requirements. In our submission, the regulations for transparency would be appropriate as guidelines (the Guelph Commercial Built Form Standard 4.2.6 states “Include transparent windows and/or active entrances along the ground floor façades of corner buildings that face a public street or urban square. Do not use highly reflective or mirrored glass”) and should be removed.</p>	

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
102.	Garage width	Ben Jones, Fusion	Jan. 16, 2022	<p>Table 5.8 Garage Width- Having a maximum garage width in RL.1 and RL.2 zones differ is not functional. For new subdivisions, zoning is approved at the Draft Plan of Subdivision stage, but lot fabric and lot sizing is often implemented later, particularly in multi-phase developments. RL.2 zones could be implemented, but lot fabric may have larger lot widths depending on market demand when subdivision is serviced. Garage width for singles should be a function of lot width, but maximum for RL.1 and RL.2 should be the same.</p> <p>Also, a 5m garage is not a double car garage - as per definitions, a two car garage would require 2 x 3m x 6m spaces, therefore opening would need to be 6.0m wide. Recommend further consultation with the development industry to reconcile these issues.</p>	Garage width regulations have been updated for RL.1 and RL.2 single detached dwellings to allow the garage width to match the maximum driveway width and to recognize approved 12 metre lot frontages (existing R.1C zone).
103.	Garage width	Lyle McNair	Nov. 16, 2021	Table 5.8- Concern with garage no more than 50% of the building	See staff response above in row 102.
104.	Garage width	Brandon Flewwelling, GSP Group, Debrob Investments Ltd.- 55 & 75 Cityview Drive	Jan. 17, 2022	The low density zones (RL.2 zone) proposes a maximum garage width of 5 metres for singles and imposes a maximum of 50% of lot width or 5 m for semis. This will not permit double car garages. Permissions for the size of garages and corresponding	Table 5.8 and 5.9 of the proposed zoning bylaw have been updated to allow a 6 metre wide garage and driveway for lots with a 12 metre lot frontage.



No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				driveways should reflect current zoning permissions for the site. Based on the previous R.1C zone, this should be 6.0m.	
105.	General provisions	Ben Jones, Fusion	Jan. 16, 2022	Consideration should be given to adjusting required sight line triangles based on road/access configuration and road classification/speed. Refer to City of Kitchener's current zoning by-law (85-1) site specific regulation 732R for an example of varied approach that has been successful	No proposed change. Site-specific exceptions to sight line triangles would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
106.	General provisions	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	C-4 4.5.1 (b) Not clear to this reader. Is "front yard" the intention of the location of Accessory buildings?	The regulation states that "an accessory building or structure may be located in a yard other than a front yard or required exterior side yard." Accessory buildings are not permitted in a front yard.
107.	General provisions	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	C-8, C-9, C-10 Privacy screening does not seem to be called for. Suggestion: Consider requiring privacy screening based on setbacks less than 2m	Privacy screening is not required for decks and porches.
108.	General provisions	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	C-19 4.16.4 (b) Not clear that the reference to (a) at the end of this paragraph adds to the definition. Consider removing this reference.	Reference to (a) adds clarification that the height with a wire top cannot exceed 3 metres total. No change proposed.
109.	General provisions	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	C-20 Residential fence height, Corner Lot Fence, the usefulness of the callout of "B" is not clear. Suggestion: remove the reference of "B" or define what this means.	Illustration updated to provide clarity.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
110.	General provisions	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	C-44 There does not seem to be rules for detached garages in a rear yard only accessible through an attached garage. Suggestion: As this arrangement tends to work against much of the direction of the Zoning Bylaw and makes firefighting almost impossible, there should be an illustration and description forbidding detached garages only accessible through an attached garage.	The zoning bylaw does not prohibit accessory buildings or structures in the rear yard. Side yard setbacks are applicable to properties to ensure access to the rear yard is possible.
111.	General provisions	Matthew Betts	Dec. 5, 2021	Outdoor patio setback should be decreased to 1 metre.	The proposed zoning bylaw reduces the setback to an outdoor patio to 1 metre.
112.	General provisions	Matthew Betts	Dec. 5, 2021	There should be more restrictions on outdoor lighting to combat light pollution. I suggest a maximum wattage per hectare.	The outdoor lighting regulations (section 4.8) have been carried forward in the proposed zoning bylaw. Bylaw, Compliance and Security will be reviewing lighting and producing a separate bylaw for lighting within the city that will eventually replace the existing zoning bylaw regulations.
113.	General provisions	Brenda Aherne	Dec. 21, 2021	The lighting regulations appear to be the same as the existing rules in the draft new zoning bylaw. An earlier report in 2021, noted the need for focused, downward directed lighting in commercial/industrial zones. Since the City has converted all street lighting to night sky friendly, I think this would be such an excellent opportunity to	See staff response above in row 112.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				introduce more guidance around lighting in residential neighbourhoods.	
114.	General provisions	Scott Hannah, Dora Properties	Dec. 15, 2021	Confirmation that Section 4.20 permits the uses listed as complementary in the SC zone (e.g., office or medical clinic) if one other full permitted use (e.g., restaurant, financial establishment, etc.) is also located on the property.	A complementary use is permitted within a multi-unit building in combination with a primary permitted use.
115.	Green/blue roof	Astrid Clos, Skyline Retail- 160, 170, 200, 210 Kortright Road West	Jan. 12, 2022	The green and blue roof ideas are subject to technical considerations and should not be included in the zoning. They are more appropriate as urban design guidelines where the site-specific considerations can be confirmed through the Site Plan approval process.	The proposed zoning bylaw allows 30% of the required landscaped open space to be in the form of a green roof or blue roof. This is an option but not a requirement, which adds flexibility to how landscaped open space requirements can be accommodated on a property. Green and blue roofs would be reviewed through the site plan process.
116.	Green/blue roof	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	The regulation for 30% of the required landscaped open space area can be in the form of a green roof or blue roof should not be included in the MUC Zone. There are many technical considerations and flexibility is required.	See staff response above in row 115.
117.	Holding provision (H13)	Astrid Clos, Skyline Retail- 160, 170, 200, 210 Kortright Road West	Jan. 12, 2022	The new Holding Zone H13 proposed to be added is punitive and should not be included. Tenants change and buildings are renovated, interior improvements to units occur, drive-through	The (H13) holding provision has been added to properties with increased height and density permissions to ensure adequate municipal services are available prior to development occurring.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				facilities are added etc. The plaza owner must be able to quickly accommodate new tenants to avoid commercial blight. The new proposed Holding Zone should be removed from the subject properties.	The (H13) wording in the proposed zoning bylaw has been updated to apply to new buildings and/or additional residential development. This will ensure changes to existing commercial buildings are not impacted by the holding provision.
118.	Holding provision (H13)	Astrid Clos-304-324 Stone Road West and 511 Edinburgh Road South	Nov. 26, 2021	The new Holding Zone H13 proposed to be added is punitive and should not be included. Tenants change and buildings are renovated, interior improvements to units occur, drive-through facilities are added etc. The plaza owner must be able to quickly accommodate new tenants to avoid commercial blight. The new Holding Zone does not apply to Stone Road Mall which has a greater opportunity for intensification requiring greater servicing capacity. The new proposed Holding Zone should be removed from the subject property.	See staff response above in row 117.  Further review of the H13 application across the city has taken place and the proposed zoning bylaw has been updated for the statutory public meeting.
119.	Holding provision (H13)	Chris Corosky, Armel	Dec. 20, 2021	A holding provision has been added to the CMUC zoning that requires confirmation of infrastructure capacity. Does this apply only to residential intensification?	See staff response above in row 117.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
120.	Holding provision (H13)	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	The new Holding Zone H13 proposed to be added is unnecessary and should not be included. Tenants change and buildings are renovated, interior improvements to buildings occur. The new proposed Holding Zone should be removed from all properties that the University has an interest in. The normal approvals process including site plan approval address these issues appropriately.	See staff response above in row 117.
121.	Holding provision (H13)	Ian Panabaker, Wood Development Group	Dec. 20, 2021	We appreciate that the city is trying to create pro-active conditions for commercial sites identified for mixed-use to have 'as-of-right' status in the bylaw <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Punitive – limiting changes to 10m2 (or installing artificial caps below the permitted FSI) on a whole segment of the zoning by-law is too punitive. This will stall routine investment and improvements of these properties.</li> <li>• Inconsistent – a quick review of the mapping indicates that not all potential sites are marked with the 'H13'. Sites that were found excluded (not exhaustive): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o MUC (Stone Road Mall) – Scottsdale/Stone/Edinburgh</li> <li>o MOC / CMUC at York/Victoria</li> <li>o MOC at Harts Lane/Gordon</li> <li>o NCC at Gordon/Edinburgh</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	See staff response above in row 117.  Further review of the H13 application across the city has taken place and the proposed zoning bylaw has been updated for the statutory public meeting.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o NCC at Arkell/Victoria</li> <li>o NCC at Willow/Westwood</li> <li>• On the flip side, sites that have been recently built that have had the 'H13' installed:</li> <li>o NCC at Samuel Drive (one of our sites)</li> <li>o MOCs at Lowes and Gordon</li> <li>o NCC at Watson Rd and Eastview</li> <li>• There needs to be a collaborative discussion about the best means to provide access to the intensification zoning permissions without shrink-wrapping existing uses.</li> </ul>	
122.	Holding provision (H13)	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jan. 12, 2022	In our submission, the proposed holding provision, which would be applicable to all but one of the Loblaw sites, is impractical in enforcement and would effectively require a holding provision removal application for all improvements to the existing buildings, since the 10 sq. m is a very limited threshold for commercial development.	See staff response above in row 117.
123.	Holding provision (H13)	Guelph Wellington Development Association, Guelph and District Home Builders' Association	Dec. 16, 2021	The by-law proposes to enable the new policy to intensify commercial areas with the ability to construct mixed-use commercial/residential projects, yet places almost all of these property types in the city into a 'Holding' category that shrink-wraps current permissions to 10m2 expansions.	See staff response above in row 117.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is far too punitive and restrictive a mechanism</li> <li>• The 'H13' appears to be inconsistently applied across the zoning maps (e.g. Stone Road Mall is not 'H13' but is a known candidate for major intensification- there are many other examples)</li> <li>• This approach inadvertently hobbles the existing business environment across the city</li> <li>• There needs to be an alternative control established which protects the City from as-of-right major redevelopment servicing pressures while not shrink-wrapping existing properties from routine and valid site alterations.</li> </ul>	
124.	Holding provision (H13)	Nancy Shoemaker, BSD&R- 650 Scottsdale Drive	Dec. 15, 2021	The property is currently zoned (NC) Neighbourhood Commercial with no Holding provisions. The proposed new zoning is (MUC)(PA)(H13). The new zone, regulations and holding provision has a significant effect on the value of existing developments already constructed in compliance with the current zoning bylaw. The new holding provision will affect the use of the property. The holding provision appears to have been introduced to facilitate major redevelopment of properties,	The permitted height and density are proposed to be increased for this property with the proposed MUC zone. The existing NC zone permits a maximum 2 storeys compared to the new MUC zone which permits a maximum of 6 storeys. The (H13) holding provision wording in the proposed zoning bylaw has been updated to apply to new buildings and/or additional residential development. The holding provision would not be

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>subject to adequate municipal services. This property has little opportunity for redevelopment relative to the Stone Road corridor. The residential designation of the existing townhouses to the east further limits its value to property consolidation. Request that the (H13) provision be removed since this property is fully developed and the holding provision will restrict the ability to respond quickly to tenant changes. In addition clause 9 c) appears to prohibit the replacement of surface parking areas or replacement of the roof.</p>	<p>required to be lifted for tenant changes, replacement of surface parking areas or replacement of the roof.</p> <p>Section 1.4.3 of the proposed bylaw provides appropriate permissions for legal non-complying buildings and lots and provides appropriate permissions for enlarging, repairing and reconstructing existing buildings and structure.</p>
125.	Holding provision (H13)	Robert Mason, Mason Real Estate Limited- 585 Eramosa Road	Dec. 20, 2021	<p>This site does not need to have a H13 provision. At only 0.7 acres it does not have significant intensification capacity and the H13 is not appropriate.</p>	<p>The existing NC zone on this site permits a maximum building height of 2 storeys, whereas the proposed NCC zone permits a maximum building height of 6 storeys and a maximum residential density of 100 units per hectare. This property is being upzoned to align with the Neighbourhood Commercial Centre Official Plan designation and is therefore required to have an H13 applied to it.</p> <p>The (H13) holding provision wording in the proposed zoning bylaw has been updated to</p>



No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
					apply to new buildings and/or additional residential development.
126.	Holding provision (H13)	Robert Mason, Mason Real Estate Limited- 585 Eramosa Road	Dec. 20, 2021	<p>The way this section currently reads in the draft, a landowner may be required to bear the costs of municipal servicing expansions including road improvements even for a minor addition or change to an existing building exceeding 10m<sup>2</sup> (that is, any expansion larger than a typical backyard garden shed).</p> <p>We discussed that that is likely not the intent of this section and that the City should modify this wording so that it would only be applicable to a major intensification only, and probably only for major residential intensification. There needs to be more clarity on what types of redevelopment or intensification would be triggered by this holding zone and a more detailed look at each property with that holding zone designation to determine if it is even needed, as not all sites with the H13 designation are capable of being intensified to such an extent. The concern is that with that designation, the City can unnecessarily hold up a property owner from reasonable changes to the property with the cost of municipal works (of which</p>	See staff response above in row 117.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				some should be funded via development charges) instead pinned on the owner.	
127.	Holding provision (H13)	Scott Hannah, Dira Properties- 570 Kortright Road West	Dec. 15, 2021	Request that (H13) Holding zone provision be removed. The property currently supports a small neighbourhood commercial centre developed on full municipal services. Should the property be intensified or redeveloped in the future, Section 41 of the Planning Act will apply and an assessment of the adequacy of the municipal services, i.e. functional servicing report, can be a requirement based on 4.10. The use of an H for municipal services should be in areas of the City where municipal services currently do not exist or need to be extended.	<p>The existing NC zone on this site permits a maximum building height of 2 storeys, whereas the proposed NCC zone permits a maximum building height of 6 storeys and a maximum residential density of 100 units per hectare. This property is being upzoned to align with the Neighbourhood Commercial Centre Official Plan designation and is therefore required to have an H13 applied to it.</p> <p>The (H13) holding provision wording in the proposed zoning bylaw has been updated to apply to new buildings and/or additional residential development.</p>
128.	Land use zones	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	D-5 Table 6.1 Question: Should this not be numbered Table 6.2.1?	Comment noted.
129.	Landscaped open space	Astrid Clos, Skyline Retail- 160, 170, 200, 210 Kortright Road West and 304-324 Stone Road West and 511	Jan. 12, 2022	The Minimum Landscaped Open Space is proposed to increase from 9% to 25% or one quarter of the property. This does not implement the intensification that is intended for sites in an urban area.	Landscaped open space requirements have been developed for mixed-use zones in the new zoning bylaw. The current 9% requirement is for existing commercial zones. Landscaped open space regulations have been reviewed and revisions have been made

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
		Edinburgh Road South			to the mixed-use zones in the proposed zoning bylaw.  Adequate landscaped open space is required to assist in meeting the city's tree canopy targets and to place an emphasis on soft landscaping, retention and replacement of trees and to ensure that landscaping is not an afterthought in the development process.
130.	Landscaped open space	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	The minimum Landscaped Open Space should remain at the 9% currently required. What is proposed is a significant increase and will not support intensification.	See staff response above in row 129.
131.	Landscaped open space	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	Given the Campus Master Plan requirements, in our view a Minimum Landscaped Open Space regulation is not appropriate in the I.2 Zone, where the Campus Master Plan applies.	The proposed zoning bylaw has been revised to exempt the I.2 zone from providing landscaped open space.
132.	Landscaped open space	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	A 40% minimum landscaped open space requirement is far too high for a maximum 4 storey building to permit the efficient use of land within the urban area. In an infill situation no minimum landscaped open space area should be required. The required setbacks will ensure that an appropriate amount of landscaping will be provided.	The proposed zoning bylaw has been revised to require a minimum 20% of the lot area for building heights from 1-4 storeys to be landscaped open space and 40% of the lot area for buildings from 5-10 storeys to be landscaped open space, to align with the existing requirements in the zoning bylaw.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
133.	Landscaped open space	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jan. 12, 2022	Sections 7.3.1(b) and 7.3.3.(b): Under the existing CC zones for the Loblaw lands, the minimum landscaped open space is 9% of the lot area, whereas the proposed minimum landscaped open space is 25% of the lot area (30% of the required landscaped open space area can be in the form of a green roof or blue roof). In our submission, a minimum landscaped open space of 25% is considerably higher and will render existing developments non-conforming. For new development, the minimum landscaped open space of 25% may be a barrier to redevelopment and could result in less intensive development and may preclude modest expansions and additions to existing buildings. In our submission, the existing minimum of 9% should be maintained.	See staff response above in row 129.
134.	Landscaped open space	Nancy Shoemaker, BSR&D- 47-75 Willow Road	Dec. 15, 2021	The regulation differences are: Landscaped Open Space minimum and Common Amenity Area. Increasing minimum landscaped open space from 9% to 25% is excessive and limits the opportunity of developing/redeveloping mixed-use centres and supporting residential intensification. The	See staff response above in row 129.  30% of the landscaped open space requirement can be in the form of a green or blue roof. This is an option to add flexibility but not a requirement of the bylaw.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				30% restriction of providing not more than 30% of the open space by way of either a blue roof or green roof further limits the creation of mixed-use centres.	
135.	Landscaped open space	Nancy Shoemaker, BSR&D- 650 Scottsdale Drive	Dec. 15, 2021	The current minimum landscaped open space for this zone is 9%. The new by-law increased this to 25%. This property could never meet this new regulation and should not be imposed on a currently legal conforming site.	See staff response above in row 129.  Section 1.4.3, Existing non-complying buildings and lots would recognize the existing site conditions in this case. The minimum landscaped open space requirements of the new zoning bylaw would be applicable if/when the site is redeveloped.
136.	Landscaped open space	Chris Corosky, Armel	Dec. 20, 2021	What is the rationale for increasing minimum landscape requirements and are buffer strips considered part of the landscaped area? The new zoning bylaw increases minimum landscape requirements in some instances from 9% of lot area to 25%. This seems onerous for larger sites.	See staff response above in row 129.  The proposed zoning bylaw regulates that buffer strips be 3 metres wide to ensure developments provide adequate buffers and so that hardscaping such as walkways and parking spaces do not encroach. Buffer strips provide opportunities for a property to meet the landscaped open space requirements and provide space for planting trees which helps to meet the City's tree canopy cover targets.
137.	Landscaped open space	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	D-57 Table 8.6 does not require Landscaped open space to be of a	The goal is to create landscape open space areas that can

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>minimum area. Suggestion: Consider ensuring Landscape open spaces have a minimum area similar to that or surpassing other zones. Consider 20m<sup>2</sup> minimum landscape and amenity areas should exist in all zones to prevent unviable plantings from being implemented.</p>	<p>support/host plantings, however, this level of detail is something that is reviewed at the Site Plan stage of a development to allow for some flexibility. Guidance from the Tree Technical Manual provides direction to ensure minimum soil volume for trees is provided.</p>
138.	Legal non-conforming	Lyle McNair	Nov. 16, 2021	<p>Concern with projection of garages beyond front wall of the dwelling. Need to include something in the bylaw that indicates that homes built prior to the approval of this document are deemed to be in compliance and that this regulation will only apply to future construction.</p>	<p>Existing buildings that do not meet the proposed regulations will be considered legal non-complying under section 1.4.3 of the bylaw which allows the building to continue to exist legally and any new additions or changes would need to comply with the new regulations.</p>
139.	Legal non-conforming	Nancy Shoemaker, BSR&D- 650 Scottsdale Drive	Dec. 15, 2021	<p>Minimum lot area has been increased to 7,500 m<sup>2</sup> which is significantly higher than the current conforming size of the property. This altered regulation changes a conforming property into a legal non-conforming property thereby significantly affecting value and adding unnecessary planning processes should a change be required. Currently, changes to address new tenants or alteration of units within the existing plaza only require building permits.</p>	<p>The minimum lot area in the proposed zoning bylaw is based on the hierarchy of commercial zones. This property has changed from the existing Neighbourhood Shopping Centre (NC) zone to a Mixed-use Corridor (MUC) zone. The new MUC zone permits additional height and residential density, in effect, upzoning the property.</p> <p>Section 1.4.3 provides appropriate protection for non-complying buildings and structures. Any pre-existing legal building or structure, or lot</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
					that does not comply with the new by-law is deemed to conform with the new by-law. Also, this section provides appropriate permission for enlarging, repairing and reconstructing existing buildings and structure.
140.	Loading space	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jan. 12, 2022	<p>We request clarification as to the interpretation of "front wall" and "exterior side wall" that are not defined terms, particularly for sites where existing retail stores have frontage on the side of the building where loading is located (e.g., the No Frills at 191 Silvercreek Parkway North and the Zehrs at 1045 Paisley Road).</p> <p>In our submission, it would be appropriate to include existing loading within a vacuum clause as described above, in order to ensure that the existing condition remains conforming.</p>	<p>"Front wall" and "Exterior side wall" of a building aligns with the front lot line and exterior side lot line of a property.</p> <p>Section 1.4.3 provides appropriate protection for non-complying buildings and structures. Any pre-existing legal building or structure, or lot that does not comply with the new by-law is deemed to conform with the new by-law. Also, this section provides appropriate permission for enlarging, repairing and reconstructing existing buildings and structure. Beyond this permission, either a minor variance application or rezoning application would be required.</p>
141.	Lot coverage	Ben Jones, Fusion	Jan. 16, 2022	Max 50% lot coverage for towns is too low. On a standard 30m deep lot, a 6.0m front yard and 7.5m rear yard gives a building envelope of 16.5m, which amounts to 55% coverage.	The proposed zoning bylaw has been revised to permit 55% lot coverage for on-street townhouses and rear access on-street townhouses.

<b>No.</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Name/ Address</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Staff response</b>
142.	Lot frontage	Nancy Shoemaker, BSR&D- 55 Teal Drive	Dec. 15, 2021	The minimum lot frontage is 30 metres in the proposed new zone in comparison to 18 metres in the current zone.	Minimum lot frontage of 30 meters for cluster, stacked, and back-to-back townhouses is based on internal review of existing development issues and the recommendation of the Discussion Paper. This will ensure enough lot frontage is provided to build a private road and provide for a functional rear yard.
143.	Mapping	Ben Jones, Fusion	Jan. 16, 2022	"CDA" is applied to Metalworks Ph 3 (73 Arthur St S) but would be more appropriately applied to Metalworks Ph 4 (93 Arthur St S). Current proposed zone for Metalworks Ph 4 is RH.7-5.4 (H9).	Mapping has been updated.
144.	Mapping	Scott Hannah	Dec. 20, 2021	The Neighbourhood Commercial Centre Zone is identified in the text as NCC but mapped only as NC on the defined area maps. The acronym should be consistent.	The Neighbourhood Commercial Centre zone has been mapped as NCC.
145.	Mapping	Paul Kraehling- 1354-1398 Gordon St.	Dec. 14, 2021	Don't believe the NCC western boundary is accurate as they relate to the bungalow properties fronting on the west side of Gordon, south of Solstice 1 lands. In comparing the depth of the NCC designations east and west of Gordon St. in the area, the depth of the designation on the subject lands is lesser than the designation as it applies to lands to the east of Gordon, i.e. the Official Plan designation for the	The NCC zone on the east side of Gordon does have a greater depth once the property at 1354 Gordon Street has a zone applied instead of the "CDA" placeholder. This should resolve the concern by accurately implementing the Official Plan designation in this area.



No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				Borealis plaza at 1388 Gordon St. Mapping is included in the email.	
146.	Mapping	Paul Kraehling-1291 Gordon St.	Dec. 14, 2021	Don't believe zone lines in the rear areas to 1291 Gordon accurately depict NHS based on existing/proposed lines in area - Solstice 1 zone change process.	The residential and NHS zone boundaries have been updated to align with the Environmental Implementation Report and approved site plan for 1291 Gordon Street.
147.	Minimum building height	Astrid Clos, Skyline Retail- 160, 170, 200, 210 Kortright Road West and 304-324 Stone Road West and 511 Edinburgh Road South	Jan. 12, 2022	<p>A Minimum building height should not be required in the NCC Zone. This should be an urban design guideline instead.</p> <p>Minimum Building height regulation should be removed for the proposed zoning for this property. When the City has imposed this in the past on other properties, the owner has had to apply to amend the zoning to remove this regulation.</p>	<p>Official Plan Policy 8.6.13- Generally, a minimum building height of 2 storeys will be encouraged to provide definition to streets and open spaces. Regulations for minimum building heights may be incorporated into the Zoning By-law for non-residential uses at key locations such as sites fronting onto arterial or collector roads, identified Main Streets and at intersections.</p> <p>The City's Commercial Built Form Standards also recommended that the zoning bylaw establish a minimum height of 7.5 metres for buildings that are located within 15 metres of the front or exterior side lot line adjacent to arterial and collector roads and main streets. Minimum building height is only required on a portion of the site. This approach is used by a variety of municipalities to help to</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
					intensify and animate major streets.
148.	Minimum building height	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jan. 12, 2022	Sections 7.3.1(c) and 7.3.3.(c) and corresponding Official Plan Policy 8.6.13. In our submission, as the Official Plan provides “encouragement” language, it is not appropriate to incorporate a minimum building height requirement in the implementing zoning on a comprehensive basis. The “may” under Policy 8.6.13 should be interpreted as not mandatory but rather optional or discretionary. In our submission, regulations for minimum building height should be considered on a site-specific basis under future zoning by-law amendments and not through the new comprehensive Zoning By-law.	Once the new zoning bylaw is in effect, it is anticipated that many development projects would not be required to go through a full zoning bylaw amendment process to comply with the Official Plan designation. The purpose of the new zoning bylaw is to pre-zone lands for maximum permissions under the Official Plan. With pre-zoning lands, built form regulations have been applied on a city-wide basis to ensure appropriate development and transitions are built into the bylaw. It is anticipated that minor variances will be the appropriate route to deal with site specific situations.
149.	Minor variances	Astrid Clos-160, 170, 200, 210 Kortright Road West and 304-324 Stone Road West and 511 Edinburgh Road South	Nov. 26, 2021 and Jan. 12, 2022	Please confirm that all approved minor variances continue to apply once the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law is in effect. The Staff Reports/Discussion Papers for the Comprehensive Zoning By-law appear to indicate that this would not be the case	The new zoning bylaw does not propose to carry forward existing minor variances beyond the 2 year transition provision provided in section 1.3.1 c).
150.	Minor variances	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	Please confirm that all approved minor variances continue to apply once the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law is in effect. The	See staff response above in row 149.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				Staff Reports/Discussion Papers for the Comprehensive Zoning By-law appear to indicate that this would not be the case.	
151.	Minor variances	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jan. 12, 2022	Request clarification on section 1.3 c) Minor Variance Transition Provisions- that existing minor variances for garden centres, which require building permits on an annual basis, will continue to apply two years after the effective date of the by-law.	<p>A garden centre associated with a permitted use would be considered an occasional use and is permitted under section 4.17 of the proposed zoning bylaw. The proposed zoning bylaw has added a new exception that allows occasional uses to occupy required parking spaces. This removes the need for existing Committee of Adjustment decisions for seasonal garden centres that occupy the required parking on a site.</p> <p>The new zoning bylaw does not propose to carry forward existing minor variances beyond the 2 year transition provision provided in section 1.3.1 c).</p>
152.	Moratorium	Astrid Clos- 160, 170, 200, 210 Kortright Road West and 304-324 Stone Road West and 511 Edinburgh Road South	Nov. 26, 2021 and Jan. 12, 2022	Please confirm whether there will be a 2 year moratorium on all zone change and minor variance applications once the Comprehensive Zoning by-law has been approved.	See Statutory Public Meeting Staff Report (July 13, 2022) for more information related to the two year moratorium.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
153.	Moratorium	Chris Corosky, Armel	Dec. 20, 2021	With respect to moratoriums, our preference would be for no moratorium. At minimum, if a general moratorium is implemented, a process should be identified to accommodate amendment applications where there is logic and merit for same.	See staff response above in row 152.
154.	Moratorium	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	Please confirm whether the City believes that the approval of this Comprehensive Zoning by-law will trigger a 2-year moratorium on all zoning amendment applications. It does not appear that the legislation would provide for that in this situation.	See staff response above in row 152.
155.	Natural heritage system zone	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	<p>The zoning should clearly state that uses such as, those "that currently exist", parks, trails, pathways, athletic fields, golf courses, stormwater management facilities and agricultural uses should be permitted to continue within the NHS Zone.</p> <p>Imposing the standard of 'legally existing' within the NHS Zone is not appropriate. If the uses exist, they should be permitted to continue. If there is a specific concern about the legality of any existing use on University land which is proposed to be zoned NHS, please let us know. Otherwise, the by-law should</p>	<p>The proposed zoning bylaw is implementing the same language used in the Official Plan, "legally existing uses, buildings or structures" (4.1.2.1 i)). Currently existing versus legally existing have different meaning. We are not recognizing illegally erected uses, buildings or structures through the comprehensive zoning bylaw. This regulation applies to the NHS zone across the city and is not specific to University of Guelph lands.</p> <p>Official Plan policy 4.1.2.9 outlines that legally existing uses, existing utilities, facilities and infrastructure and their</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				provide use "currently existing" instead of legally existing.	normal maintenance are recognized and may continue within the Natural Heritage System.
156.	Occasional use	Astrid Clos, Skyline Retail- 160, 170, 200, 210 Kortright Road West	Jan. 12, 2022	Please increase the number of days for an occasional use, such as a garden centre, to be permitted to 120 days.	The number of days permitted for occasional uses has been increased to 120 days in section 4.17 of the proposed zoning bylaw.
157.	Outdoor patio	Astrid Clos- 160, 170, 200, 210 Kortright Road West and 304-324 Stone Road West and 511 Edinburgh Road South	Nov. 26, 2021 and Jan. 12, 2022	How will the zoning by-law identify the zones where Outdoor patios are permitted? If not listed as a permitted use is an Outdoor patio permitted? Should the new definitions of Restaurant and Take-out Restaurant include an Outdoor patio as being permitted?	Outdoor patios are regulated under section 4.13 of the proposed zoning bylaw and are permitted in association with a restaurant or licensed establishment as indicated in that section.
158.	Outdoor patio	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	If not listed as a permitted use, is an outdoor patio permitted in all zones?	See staff response above in row 157.
159.	Parking	Andrew Miller	Nov. 22, 2021	As climate change is becoming a bigger issue, I'm interested in what the City can do to reduce car dependence while also reducing the size of our parking lots which are a stormwater quality and quantity issue. Have the minimum vehicle parking spot limits been reviewed for whether this is a necessary amount of parking? Where do the numbers come from? Are they calculated or is it	IBI Group prepared a parking discussion paper that provides rationale for the approach to the proposed parking rates in the bylaw. The draft bylaw proposes a geographic based approach to parking that reduces minimum parking requirements and places a maximum parking ratio on lands within the City's identified intensification corridors. You will find a (PA) "parking adjustment" symbol

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				just a standard that we keep using?	after the zone on the map where this applies. Some uses, such as apartment buildings, have slightly lower parking requirements outside of the (PA) area. We've also introduced requirements for bicycle, electric vehicle and compact vehicle parking spaces.
160.	Parking	Astrid Clos-160, 170, 200, 210 Kortright Road West and 304-324 Stone Road West and 511 Edinburgh Road South	Nov. 26, 2021 and Jan. 12, 2022	Table 5.2 required parking rates. The blended parking rates for commercial plazas/shopping mall must be included in the new zoning. The parking requirement cannot change every time a tenant changes. If this has been included in the proposed zoning, please direct us to the section number. We were not able to locate a blended rate for a commercial plaza/shopping mall.	Table 5.2, Row 58 provides a blended rate for a commercial multi-unit building. This would apply to a commercial plaza and pad sites on the same property.
161.	Parking	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	Please confirm that there is a blended commercial parking ratio for a plaza in the draft zoning bylaw.	See staff response above in row 160.
162.	Parking	Astrid Clos-304-324 Stone Road West and 511 Edinburgh Road South	Nov. 26, 2022	Section 5.2.3(c) which does not permit any parking in a front yard or exterior side yard is too onerous. Visitor and accessible parking must be permitted in these yards. Street frontages without buildings must be permitted to have parking.	Official Plan policy 8.12.1 provides direction for building placement in combination with landscaping to be used to screen surface parking areas. In addition, the Commercial Built Form Standards provides direction to not locate surface parking along the front or exterior side yard of a

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
					<p>commercial or mixed-use property.</p> <p>The location of parking should contribute to barrier-free and efficient circulation for people walking, cycling and driving, and appropriate transitions between the public and private realm. The appearance of parking should not dominate the visible edges of a site and buildings entrances should align with the grade of adjacent sidewalks or public walkways.</p> <p>Section 1.4.3 provides appropriate protection for non-complying buildings and lots. Any pre-existing legal building or structure, or lot that does not comply with the new by-law is deemed to conform with the new by-law. Also, this section provides appropriate permission for enlarging, repairing and reconstructing existing buildings and structure. Beyond this permission, either a minor variance application or rezoning application would be required.</p>
163.	Parking	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	The restriction on parking spaces and parking areas being located in a front or exterior side yard will not work and should be deleted	<p>See staff response above in row 162.</p> <p>In addition, the Official Plan (8.12.9) and the Commercial</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				from the proposed zoning. (sections 5.2.3 (c) and 5.2.3 (e))	Built Form Standards provides direction for surface parking that is located adjacent to arterial roads should not exceed 25% of the length of front and exterior lot lines.
164.	Parking	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jan. 12, 2022	<p>Section 5.2.3 for location of parking a commercial, mixed-use employment, institutional, utility uses- In our submission, in order to avoid rendering existing conforming developments as non-conforming under the new By-law, it would be appropriate to add a "Vacuum" clause to the Draft By-law, where notwithstanding any other provisions of the new By-law, any lot and the location thereon of any building or structure, existing on the effective date of the new By-law, would be deemed to comply and would be permitted by the new By-law. In addition, it would be appropriate to provide an allowance for additions and alterations to legally existing buildings without rendering the existing development as non-conforming as a result of the addition or alteration.</p> <p>For Section 5.2.3(e), the corresponding Official Plan Policy 8.12.9 states "The Zoning By-law may establish the maximum</p>	<p>See staff response above in row 162 and 163.</p> <p>The intent of the proposed zoning bylaw is to pre-zone lands to the maximum height and density of the Official Plan. This will limit the need for individual site-specific zoning bylaw amendments.</p>



No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				length of frontage along arterial roads that may be used for surface parking. This provision may provide different standards for various land uses". Based on Minutes of Settlement resulting from the OLT appeal of OPA 48, for the Loblaw lands the interpretation of Policy 8.12.9 "is intended to be implemented through site-specific applications and shall be interpreted to include flexibility by allowing for the maximum length to be determined through the implementing zoning by-law." Accordingly, further review is required for the Loblaw Lands, whereby site-specific exceptions may be appropriate.	
165.	Parking	Astrid Clos- 304-324 Stone Road West and 511 Edinburgh Road South	Nov. 26, 2021	Section 5.2.3(e) only permits parking along 25% of the frontage of a lot adjacent to an arterial road. This should not be a zoning regulation and should be dealt with as an urban design guideline through the Site Plan process.	See staff response above in row 163.
166.	Parking	Ben Jones, Fusion	Jan. 16, 2022	Consideration should be given to providing off-site parking in relevant areas (e.g. Downtown). This will provide more flexibility in meeting parking requirements, and acknowledge the need in the City's downtown in particular to transition away from providing permanent parking as areas such	Proposed off-site parking should continue to be reviewed on a site-specific basis through a planning application.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				as downtown transition to lower car usage	
167.	Parking	Ben Jones, Fusion	Jan. 16, 2022	Surface materials should be dealt with through Site Plan Approval, not prescribed in zoning, to allow flexibility for staff to work with proponents as appropriate to individual sites	Surface treatment of parking areas and driveways has been updated in the proposed zoning bylaw to carry forward the existing zoning bylaw requirements and exemptions.
168.	Parking	Ben Jones, Fusion	Jan. 16, 2022	(Section 5.2.4) Setback should not apply to parking areas within a parking structure that has appropriate screening to prevent visibility from public areas. Enforcing this setback will further compromise the ability to provide required parking efficiently, particularly in the downtown where below-grade parking is often compromised due to high groundwater levels and therefore above-grade structure parking is required.	A minimum setback for a parking area within the first storey of a building is only required within downtown zones.  This regulation is carried forward from the 2017 Downtown Zoning Bylaw update. There is an emphasis in the Downtown Secondary Plan to include active uses on the ground floors to support the vibrancy of downtown and ensure the built form contributes to attractive, pedestrian oriented streetscapes that support an inviting, comfortable and active public realm.
169.	Parking	Ben Jones, Fusion	Jan. 16, 2022	Parking dimensions: 1. Dimension of parking space inside garage needs to be rationalized with garage width restrictions. See comment on Table 5.8/Table5.9 3. Support this clarification due to misinterpretation of existing	Table 5.1- Minimum parking space dimensions, row 3 has been revised to require a parking space of 2.75 metres wide by 5.5 metres in length excluding any obstructions. Row 4 in Table 5.1 has been deleted.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>zoning by-law requiring 3m x 6m in apartment building parking levels</p> <p>4. Increase in parking space length is not justified if intent is to avoid encroachment of obstruction into parking space. Recommend that this be better worded that the required 2.75m x 5.5m space in row 3 be excluding any obstructions</p> <p>Additional regulation: suggest that further consideration given to storage location of waste/recycling containers rather than a broad brush 20 sq.m required. Preferred approach is that storage area for waste/recycling be located outside of required 3m x 6m parking space</p>	<p>A minimum floor area of 20 m2 for attached garages has not been revised to ensure that adequate space is available for City garbage bins inside garages for single detached, semi-detached and on-street townhouses.</p>
170.	Parking	Scott Hannah	Dec. 20, 2021	<p>Currently, exterior parking spaces for apartment developments in the R.4 zone are allowed to have dimensions of 2.5 m x 5.5 m whereas the new by-law in table 5.1 proposes dimensions of 2.75 m x 5.5 m for exterior parking spaces for apartment buildings and 2.5 m x 5.5 m for exterior parking spaces for all other residential uses. Why the increased requirement for apartments?</p>	<p>Table 5.1 proposes to reduce the interior parking space dimensions for apartment and mixed-use buildings and non-residential uses from 3m wide by 6m length in the existing zoning bylaw to 2.75m wide by 5.5m in length and includes a clause "excluding any obstructions" to make it clear that columns are outside of the parking space dimensions.</p> <p>The proposed bylaw also increases the exterior parking</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
					space requirement for apartment and mixed-use buildings and non-residential uses from 2.5m wide by 5.5m in length to 2.75m wide by 5.5m in length. This is to solve an identified issue with the existing regulation, where 2.5m does not provide sufficient space between vehicles located in a parking area.
171.	Parking	Brandon Flewwelling, GSP Group, Debrob Investments Ltd.- 55 & 75 Cityview Drive	Jan. 17, 2022	The visitor parking rate of 20% for most townhomes is high and will likely lead to many unnecessary requests for minor variances or zoning by-law amendments.	<p>The proposed zoning bylaw requires 1 parking space per unit plus 0.2 visitor parking spaces per dwelling unit for back-to-back, cluster, stacked, and stacked back-to-back townhouses. This aligns with and adds clarity to the existing zoning bylaw requirements.</p> <p>IBI Group provided recommendation for visitor parking in the Guelph Parking Standards Discussion paper based on the observed demand from the off-street parking survey, the findings of the land use policy review, inter-jurisdictional best practices, and consideration of ITE residential parking rates.</p>
172.	Parking	Chris Corosky, Armel	Dec. 20, 2021	Vacant lands west of Elmira, directly north of Paisley have specialized provisions that essentially carry forward the most	Site-specific parking regulations have been deleted from this site (CMUC-13) and other CMUC site-specifics that also apply the

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				recent approved zoning. The parking regulations for multi-unit buildings should apply to this parcel.	parking adjustment (PA) regulations.
173.	Parking	Chris Corosky, Armel	Dec. 20, 2021	What does (PA) mean. It is used throughout the new zoning bylaw.	(PA) refers to the parking adjustment area identified on the zoning maps following the zone for a property. Parking ratios are reduced and maximum parking ratios have been applied within these areas. An explanation of (PA) has been added to section 2, Establishment of Zones and Uses for additional clarity. The (PA) parking rates are found in Table 5.2 of the proposed zoning bylaw.
174.	Parking	Chris Corosky, Armel	Dec. 20, 2021	Table 5.2, row 58, sets out specialized parking provisions for 'multi-unit buildings'. Multi-unit buildings typically can form all or part of a larger plaza, whether it be commercial or industrial. Single user buildings should be afforded the same parking provisions as multi-unit buildings provided they form part of the same plaza, and we ask that this provision be incorporated in the new zoning bylaw.	The proposed zoning bylaw has been revised to add clarity that single use buildings or pad sites associated with a larger plaza (on the same lot) are included within the multi-unit building parking ratio.
175.	Parking	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	In the I.2 Zone please add an exemption to the new zoning bylaw parking rate regulations for the University of Guelph (as defined, see above).	A parking exemption from Table 5.2 has been included in Section 11.3.5 of the proposed zoning bylaw.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
176.	Parking	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	Minimum and Maximum parking rates (PA) are being included in the comprehensive zoning bylaw. Should a zone change really be necessary if more parking is provided? This is especially so on a campus where there is a Master Plan in effect and being implemented. The building program on campus is phased over time. A maximum parking requirement should not be included in the Institutional Zone. What is used as surface parking today could become a building or other use in the future. The (PA) should not apply to any Zones for lands the University has an interest in.	<p>The parking adjustment (PA) has not been applied to lands in the I.2 zone. The (PA) has been removed from the Institutional Research Park (IRP) zones along Stone Road West.</p> <p>Section 5.5(b) has been added to the proposed zoning bylaw to recognize existing parking space maximums on a property if they exceed the (PA) parking maximum in the bylaw. This adds additional flexibility to the bylaw and recognizes existing situations.</p>
177.	Parking	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo	Jan. 12, 2022	<p>For Section 5.5 Required Parking Rates in all zones except downtown zones, under Table 5.2, parking rates for lots identified with Parking Area (PA) suffix have new "minimum required" and "maximum permitted" rates. The corresponding Official Plan Policy 5.11.2 states "The City shall specify off-street parking requirements and may establish maximum parking requirements in the Zoning By-law, where appropriate."</p> <p>Compared with parking requirements under the current</p>	<p>Section 1.4.3 provides appropriate protection for existing non-complying buildings and lots. Any pre-existing legal building or structure, or lot that does not comply with the new by-law is deemed to conform with the new by-law. Also, this section provides appropriate permission for enlarging, repairing and reconstructing existing buildings and structure.</p> <p>In addition, Section 5.5(b) has been added to the proposed zoning bylaw to recognize</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>By-law, we note the following based on a review of selected commercial uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restaurants: Current By-law (Restaurant, Tavern) 1 space per 7.5 sq. m, which translates into 13.3 spaces per 100 sq. m, whereas under the Draft By-law the minimum required parking is 5 spaces per 100 sq. m and the maximum permitted is 12.5 spaces per 100 sq. m of GFA;</li> <li>• Service Establishment: Current By-law (Personal Service) 1 space per 16.5 sq. m, which translates into 6.0 spaces per 100 sq. m, whereas under the Draft By-law the minimum required parking is 4 spaces per 100 sq. m and the maximum permitted is 5 spaces per 100 sq. m of GFA;</li> <li>• Retail Establishment: Current By-law 1 space per 16.5 sq. m, which translates into 6.0 spaces per 100 sq. m, whereas under the Draft By-law the minimum required parking is 1.5 spaces per 100 sq. m and the maximum permitted is 3 spaces per 100 sq. m of GFA; and</li> <li>• Multi-unit building (defined as "a building or group of</li> </ul>	<p>existing parking space maximums on a property if they exceed the (PA) parking maximum in the bylaw. This adds additional flexibility to the bylaw and recognizes existing situations.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>buildings which are planned, developed, managed and operated as a unit in which each building contains two or more units or spaces for lease or occupancy), commercial use: Current By-law 1 space per 18 sq. m (NC Zone and CC Zone), which translates into 5.6 spaces per 100 sq. m, whereas under the Draft By-law the minimum required parking is: a. 0 spaces for the first 500 m2 of GFA; b. Plus 3.7 spaces per 100 m2 of GFA in excess of 500 m2 and 5,000 m2; and, c. Plus 2.7 spaces per 100 m2 of GFA in excess of 5,000 m2; and the maximum permitted is 5 spaces per 100 sq. m of GFA.</p> <p>For existing uses that conform under the current By-law and where the maximum permitted parking under the Draft By-law is exceeded, we submit that it would be appropriate for the supply of parking existing on the effective date of passing of the new By-law to be deemed to comply with the By-law in order to ensure that existing development remains conforming.</p>	
178.	Parking	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	C-25 5.1(a) Suggestion: Consider changing the last two lines to	Document updated to indicate rounding up. Text cannot be



No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				include the following (underlined): "shall be rounded up to the next higher whole number."	underlined in accordance with AODA requirements.
179.	Parking	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	<p>C-37 Illustration of Accessible parking spaces illustrates a curb cut but does not call this out. Suggestion: Call out the curb cut.</p> <p>C-37 Illustration of Accessible parking spaces does not indicate a curb cut to the access to a walkway on the right or left of an accessible parking space where a walkway is parallel to the length of the space. Suggestion: As curb cuts at parallel walkways permits motorists to more easily access walkways requiring curb cuts would greatly improve accessibility. This is especially true in winter as snow clearing often block access to curb cuts at the head of a space.</p>	The curb cut is not a requirement of the Zoning Bylaw. The design would be assessed at the site plan approval stage.
180.	Parking	Lynn Ronconi	Nov. 25, 2021	Adequate parking is needed within each condo development. In the area of Kay Crescent, Poppy Drive and Dallan many students live in the neighbourhood and condominium owners have two vehicles which raises issues. On-street parking fills the streets with cars when allowed, and limited visitor spaces and designated wheelchair spots are used for overnight parking. Overflow parking also appears to head over	The Guelph Parking Standards Review Phase 2 Discussion Paper was developed by IBI Group to support parking regulation changes. The parking discussion paper looked at the City's existing parking rules, trends in other municipalities, parking standards from the Institute of Transportation Engineers and the results of a parking demand survey undertaken for a range of

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				to close by commercial parking lots. Come Dec 1st many townhome condo owners get requests to use their driveways or rent their driveways to people looking for winter parking. When cars are parked along Kay Crescent there isn't enough room for two way traffic. Changing Kay Crescent to a one-way street would really improve the safety of drivers and pedestrians. The expansion of our transit system to Poppy Drive will mostly help students living in the neighbourhood. However, most people work out of town and won't use the local transit system.	locations within the City of Guelph to develop recommendations for Guelph's zoning bylaw.
181.	Parking	Trevor Hawkins, MHBC, Forum 601 Scottsdale LP (FEP)- 601 Scottsdale Drive	Dec. 17, 2021	Section 5.4 of the By-law includes the required parking rates. An Apartment Building requires one space per unit, plus 0.1 spaces per unit for visitors. A mixed-use building requires one space per unit (plus the required non-residential spaces). The City should consider the evolving nature of travel, including: The provision and encouragement of public transit; Public investments in active transportation and a shift towards year-round cycling as a viable commuting option; The affordability of both car and housing ownership for those	See staff response in row 180.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>entering the housing market (either as renters or purchasers); and the shift towards ride sharing. The cost to provide parking spaces, whether surface or structured is substantial, and does not differ between geographic locations (the cost is generally the same in Guelph as it would be in Markham or North York). This is particularly evident with regard to the cost of underground parking, which is the most expensive form of parking. The high cost of underground parking in many ways encourages surface parking. The cost of building parking must be borne by the future residents, either through purchase of the space or through the cost to rent the space. It is recognized that the unbundling of parking spaces from rent or purchase price allows some residents to elect not to pay for a parking space. However, the developer of the building is obligated through the zoning by-law to create the space and must offset the cost of building that parking space through the sale of units or the rental rates. We recommend that the City reconsider the minimum parking rate of 1 space per unit in areas well served by transit and cycling and that have community</p>	

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				amenities in close proximity (such as Mixed-Use Corridors). Reducing the minimum required amount of parking will recognize the impact of oversupplying parking and discouraging alternative forms of travel, as well as the costs associated with that parking that are transferred to the rental rates and/or purchase price of a unit.	
182.	Parking	Nancy Shoemaker, BSR&D- 650 Scottsdale Drive	Dec. 15, 2021	The new by-law proposes that all parking spaces be setback 15 metres from a corner under Section 5.2.3 (d). The parking spaces are currently setback 9 metres from the corner of Scottsdale Drive and Cole Road which meets the existing by-law requirements. By imposing this regulation on this property, the site will lose another 6 parking spaces	Section 1.4.3, Existing non-complying buildings and lots would recognize the existing site conditions in this case. New regulations would only be implemented if redevelopment of the site were to occur.
183.	Parking	Scott Hannah	Dec. 20, 2021	Based on the recommendations coming out of the parking review completed by IBI, the City has correctly adjusted/reduced the parking ratios for various use categories including residential and commercial. Further, the concept of shared parking for mixed use developments has been included.	No staff response required.
184.	Parking	Matthew Betts	Dec. 5, 2021	Minimum parking rates for apartment buildings should be reduced to 0.75/dwelling unit.	See staff response in row 180.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
185.	Parking	Matthew Betts	Dec. 5, 2021	All minimum required parking spots in the "Commercial, Service, Retail and Related Land Uses" section (Table 5.2) should be reduced by about 25%.	See staff response in row 180. No proposed change.
186.	Parking	Matthew Betts	Dec. 5, 2021	All minimum required parking spots in downtown (Table 5.3) should be abolished.	The downtown parking rates were established through the 2017 Downtown Zoning Bylaw update and have been carried forward in the Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review. No changes have been proposed. The Downtown Parking Master Plan has been initiated in Q4 of 2021 and will provide future recommendations for downtown parking rates.
187.	Permitted uses	Astrid Clos- 304-324 Stone Road West and 511 Edinburgh Road South	Nov. 26, 2021	The uses that are proposed to be removed, specifically Medical Clinic, Medical Office, Vehicle Service Station, Automatic Carwash and Manual Carwash must all continue to be included as permitted uses in the new zoning for the subject property. These uses exist on the property and must be allowed to continue and expand as needed. It is not acceptable for these uses to become legally non-conforming. Tenants change within buildings over time and a discontinuance of any of these existing uses could result in the loss of the legal non-conforming status. An expansion	The Mixed-use Corridor (MUC) zone has been updated in the proposed zoning bylaw and permits a medical clinic (medical office deleted as a use), vehicle service station and carwash.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				of these existing uses would require an approval from the Committee of Adjustment. The zoning must continue to include these as permitted uses.	
188.	Permitted uses	Astrid Clos, Skyline Retail- 160, 170, 200, 210 Kortright Road West	Jan. 12, 2022	The uses that are proposed to be removed, specifically Medical Clinic, Medical Office, Personal Service Establishment must all continue to be included as permitted uses in the new zoning for the subject property. These uses exist on the property and must be allowed to continue and expand as needed. It is not acceptable for these uses to become legally non-conforming. Tenants change within buildings over time and a discontinuance of any of these existing uses could result in the loss of the legal non-conforming status. An expansion of these existing uses would require an approval from the Committee of Adjustment. The zoning must continue to include these as permitted uses.	A medical clinic (includes medical office use) and service establishment (includes personal service establishment) are permitted uses in the NCC and site-specific NCC-3 zones.
189.	Permitted uses	Brian O'Grady	Nov. 19, 2021	The purpose statement for MOC includes small-scale office yet Table 7.1 does not permit office in MOC	The proposed zoning bylaw has been updated to permit an Office use in the MOC zone (Table 7.1).
190.	Permitted uses	Scott Hannah	Dec. 20, 2021	The Mixed Office/Commercial (MOC) zone doesn't permit Office as a permitted use in Table 7.2 which is inconsistent with the Official Plan.	See staff response above in row 189.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
191.	Permitted uses	Scott Hannah	Dec. 20, 2021	Office and Medical Office are not included as permitted uses in the NCC zone. This is contrary to the Official Plan which specifically lists "small-scale offices" as a permitted use in the Neighbourhood Commercial designation.	The proposed zoning bylaw has been updated to permit Office and Medical Clinic in the NCC zone
192.	Permitted uses	Scott Hannah, Dira Properties	Dec. 15, 2021	Add Office and Medical clinic as a full permitted use in NCC zone. The Official Plan specifically lists "small-scale offices" as permitted uses. Small scale professional and medical offices should be allowed in the NCC zone as they offer services in close walking distance of other businesses and residential areas.	See staff response above in row 191.
193.	Permitted uses	Ian Panabaker, Wood Development Group	Dec. 20, 2021	Typographic errors in the released draft. Specifically: CMUC / MUC / NCC – Omission of Medical Clinic use, MOC – Omission of Office use	The proposed zoning bylaw has been updated to address typographical errors.
194.	Permitted uses	Robert Mason, Mason Real Estate Limited	Dec. 20,2021	NCC zone uses: We have concerns about the types of uses that will be lost and not permitted in this zone, in particular, medical clinic / office, office, carwash, and drive-through facility. In the October 2019 CZBR Discussion Paper, medical clinic/office and office were proposed as being permitted uses in the NCC zone. During our meeting, staff advised that it was	The proposed zoning bylaw permits a medical clinic and office in the CMUC, MUC, NCC and MOC zones.  Drive-through uses are permitted in site-specific NCC designations that are over 10,000 square metres (in accordance with the Official Plan and Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review Discussion Paper). Existing drive-throughs

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>an error to exclude medical clinic / office from the NCC zone in the draft report and it is intended that those uses will be added to the NCC zone, as well as office use subject to a maximum GFA of 4,000 m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>Although drive-through is a defined term in the current zoning bylaw, it does not appear to be an actual use, whereas in the proposed zoning, it is a use. We believe it is not equitable to exclude drive-through facility as a use under the NCC whereas it is a permitted use in the CMUC and MUC zones. It does not make sense that drive-through facilities can be permitted for example in MUC zones that are smaller than some NCC zoned properties, but function very similar to NCC sites, have a similar mix of commercial uses, attract the same types of customers, but to not allow NCC zones to have drive-through facilities. The bylaw should not penalize sites that function very similarly but have different zoning. This ends up artificially creating winners and losers and forces uses to locate only in certain areas because of the zoning rather than allowing the market to determine where those</p>	<p>have been recognized in site-specific zones within the proposed zoning bylaw. Existing drive-throughs would be considered legal non-complying in accordance with section 1.4.3 if they do not meet the location, setback and stacking space regulations of the new zoning bylaw.</p> <p>Carwash and vehicle service station use permissions have been aligned in the proposed zoning bylaw.</p>



No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>uses more conveniently serve their customers.</p> <p>Furthermore, the October 2019 CZBR discussion paper referenced only restrictions on new drive-through facilities in NCC zones, but not for existing drive-through facilities, just as none of the new drive thru proposed rules for stacking, location, setbacks etc. are applicable to existing drive-throughs. The proposal to not permit drive-throughs in NCC zones, and to only permit a certain number of existing drive-throughs is arbitrary and does not reflect market realities, demand or supply. One only needs to look at any drive-through in the City to see their popularity with the public. If there is going to be limits on existing drive-throughs in the NCC zone, why no limits on the number of drive-through facilities in the new SC, MUC or CMUC zones? In summary, NCC zones should have drive-through facility as a permitted use without restriction in the same way as the other zones where it is a permitted use.</p> <p>Carwash should be a permitted use in more than just the CMUC and SC zones, but in any zone where vehicle service station is a permitted use. If vehicle service</p>	

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				station (which is often a gas bar) is permitted in a zone, so should a carwash as the two uses are often operated together and it makes more sense to group these uses together instead of forcing them to operate separately	
195.	Permitted uses	Nancy Shoemaker, BSR&D- 650 Scottsdale Drive	Dec. 15, 2021	In comparing the current permitted uses with the proposed new zone the following uses were excluded and will impact the continued successful operation of this plaza: Library, Medical Clinic, Medical Office, and Vehicle Gas Bar. Medical office and medical clinic should continue to be permitted uses. Library should also be a permitted use to allow expansion of the use which would become difficult if the use becomes legal non-conforming.	The MUC zone in the proposed zoning bylaw permits a library within the definition of community centre, medical clinic is permitted and there is no longer a distinction between medical office and medical clinic and medical office has been deleted, vehicle services station is permitted.
196.	Permitted uses	Nancy Shoemaker, BSR&D- 47-75 Willow Road	Dec. 15, 2021	While the draft zoning bylaw places the property in the CDA (Current Development Application) Zone, it is anticipated that the project will be reviewed with the uses and regulations associated with the new Commercial Mixed-use Centre (CMUC) Zone. The site is currently zoned (CC) Community Commercial and the zone change application is to permit the redevelopment of the site as a mixed-use centre with a	47-75 Willow Road received Council approval for a site-specific zoning bylaw amendment. The approved amendment has been carried forward in the proposed zoning bylaw as NCC-15. The following uses are permitted in the NCC zone: library is permitted as a community centre, medical clinic, small scale rentals are permitted within the retail establishment use, vehicle

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>specialized regulation permitted a maximum building height of 6 storeys, as opposed to the current 3 storey maximum building height. In comparing the current permitted uses in the CC zone with proposed permitted uses in the CMUC zone the following uses were excluded and will impact the proposed redevelopment of this plaza: Carwash, Automatic, Carwash, Manual, Library, Medical Clinic, Medical Office, Rental Outlet, Vehicle Gas Bar and School, commercial (permitted through a minor variance). Medical office and medical clinic should be permitted uses and are appropriate within a mixed-use centre. The commercial school is currently permitted on the site and will allow the creation of a school to provide "English as a Second Language" classes.</p>	<p>service station (previously vehicle gas bar) and commercial school. A carwash is not permitted within the NCC zone and a carwash does not exist and is not planned for the site.</p>
197.	Permitted uses	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jan. 12, 2022	<p>For the proposed CMUC, MUC and NCC zones, in our submission the following use that is currently permitted in the CC zone should be carried over into the Draft By-law:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Current By-law: Medical Office (means a Place in which 2 or fewer medical practitioners provide consultative, diagnostic and treatment services for humans); and</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed zoning bylaw permits a medical clinic in the CMUC, MUC, NCC and MOC zones. Medical office is not a proposed use in the new zoning bylaw.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				o Draft By-law Medical Clinic (means a premises where Provincially licensed medical professionals provide consultative, diagnostic or treatment services for persons on an out-patient basis including physicians, dentists, chiropractors, opticians and drugless professionals and which may include an accessory administrative office, laboratory, dispensary or other similar use, but does not include a medical treatment facility, hospital or other facility in which is provided overnight patient accommodation).	
198.	Permitted uses	Astrid Clos, Skyline Retail- 160, 170, 200, 210 Kortright Road West	Jan. 12, 2022	Current permitted uses must be maintained in the new zoning. With respect to current permissions including uses, drive-thrus and outdoor patios, it must be ensured that these are all maintained as permitted uses. This is an operating shopping centre with all of the uses listed as now being permitted and if a current use changes, Skyline Retail must be permitted to re-tenant the spaces accordingly. Leasing is difficult at this time. Key uses normally found in a shopping centre must not be removed from what is now permitted. To be clear, recognizing the existing uses as	160-170 Kortright Road West is proposed to be zone NCC-11 (PA)(H13) and 200-210 Kortright Road West is proposed to be zoned NCC-12(PA)(H13).  The site-specific zones permit 1 drive-through on each property in line with the Official Plan policy for NCC designations that are 10,000 m2.  NCC use permissions align with the Neighbourhood Commercial Centre Official Plan designation. Drive-throughs and outdoor patios continue to be permitted.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>legal non-conforming is not sufficient. The current permitted uses must all be carried forward to the new zoning. Skyline must maintain the current permissions on these properties.</p>	<p>Some uses previously permitted in the CC zone do not align with the Neighbourhood Commercial Centre Official Plan designation and have not been included in the NCC zone. Uses such as a carwash, commercial entertainment, nightclub and garden centre do not align with the neighbourhood level commercial provided at this location and are no longer permitted.</p> <p>Staff have reviewed the existing uses of these properties to ensure an existing use will not become legal non-conforming in this situation.</p>
199.	Permitted uses	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	<p>Does a Retail establishment include a bake shop, florist, hardware store, rental shop etc. and the other retail uses proposed to be removed from the MUC Zone as permitted uses?</p>	<p>A bake shop would be considered a restaurant or take-out restaurant if food is prepared and offered for retail sale and consumption on site or as take out. If food is not prepared on site and is only sold for consumption off site, this use would be considered a retail establishment.</p> <p>A florist is considered a retail establishment.</p> <p>A small-scale hardware store would be considered a retail establishment where the use is</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
					<p>primarily retail of small scale home goods and tools, and not of the same scale as a home improvement warehouse or building supply use where large scale home improvement materials such as lumber, furniture, appliances, audio visual equipment.</p> <p>A retail establishment includes the rental of goods, outside the definition of rental outlet and major equipment supply and service.</p>
200.	Permitted uses	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph	Jan. 14, 2022	Within the GC Zone at Cutten Fields, all existing uses such as banquet facilities, tennis courts etc. should be included as permitted uses.	A public hall use has been added to the proposed zoning bylaw to add clarity that banquet facilities remain a permitted use in the GC zone. A recreation facility is permitted in the GC zone which would allow tennis courts and other recreational uses.
201.	Permitted uses	Ben Jones, Fusion	Jan. 16, 2021	<p>Table 6.2 appears to be contrary to the stated intent of the zoning by-law to simplify the uses in residential zones. Some key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stacked townhouses are only permitted in one zone (RM.6) where in reality they are often combined with cluster townhouses, apartment buildings, mixed-use buildings.</li> </ul>	<p>The residential permitted uses have been revised in the proposed zoning bylaw as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stacked townhouses have been added to the RL.4 zone in addition to the RM.6 zone</li> <li>• Back-to-back townhouse permissions have been</li> </ul>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Back-to-back townhouses can be provided in a freehold setting, so should be part of the RL.3 zone</li> <li>• Recommend that the following zoning categories be amalgamated/eliminated: RL.1 and RL.2 zone be combined. Lot fabric as determined through subdivision design is a better control of density</li> <li>• RL.3 and RL.4 zones be combined as a "freehold townhouse" zone</li> <li>• RM.5 and RM.6 zones be combined as a "condominium medium density zone". Permit all residential building types (singles, semis, towns, stacked, apartments) with min/max</li> </ul>	<p>added to the RM.5 zone in addition to the RM.6 zone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permitted uses have been expanded in the RL.1 and RL.2 zones to allow small apartment buildings and on-street townhouses (to a maximum of 3 units)</li> <li>• Cluster townhouses have been added to the RM.6 zone and removed from the RM.5 zone (which is on-street related townhosues)</li> </ul>
202.	Permitted uses	Brandon Flewwelling, GSP Group and Debrob Investments Ltd.- 55 & 75 Cityview Drive	Jan. 17, 2022	Stacked townhouses would no longer be permitted as-of-right in the RL.4 zone, which replaces the R3.A zone. This does not affect this development as a site-specific exception permits stacked townhomes, however we believe stacked townhomes should be considered as-of-right in the RL.4 zone. This may also require other regulations within the RL.4 zone to be updated (ie. lot coverage, landscaping requirements, private amenity area requirements) in	Stacked townhouses have been added to the permitted uses in the RL.4 zone in the proposed zoning bylaw.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				line with previously-approved site specific regulations.	
203.	Permitted uses	Nancy Shoemaker, BSR&D- 55 Teal Drive	Dec. 15, 2021	<p>Property is currently zoned R.3A and the owner has submitted plans and reports for Site Plan approval for a mixed townhouse development of traditional and stacked townhouse units. The proposed new zoning for the property is RM.5 does not align with the permitted uses and regulations of the current zone.</p> <p>What is the purpose of changing the current bylaw and creating separate zones that do not allow the uses specified under the current R.3A zone? The proposed new zone does not permit stacked townhouse.</p>	The RM.6 zone has been revised to allow cluster townhouses and stacked townhouses and the proposed zoning bylaw has applied the RM.6 zone to 55 Teal Drive to address the issue.
204.	Permitted uses	Chris Corosky, Armel- 493 Imperial	Dec. 20, 2021	Request that townhouses and apartments be permitted. Local demand for commercial space is already served and the site has greater long term potential for residential use. The site is proposed to be rezoned from CC to NCC.	The Official Plan designation for these lands is Neighbourhood Commercial Centre and the site is proposed to be zoned NCC. Mixed-use buildings are permitted in the NCC zone in conformity with the Official Plan designation. The Neighbourhood Commercial Centre Official Plan designation does not contemplate permitting stand-alone apartment buildings or townhouses and therefore the zoning bylaw has not been updated to permit these uses.



No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
205.	Permitted uses	Chris Corosky, Armel- 715 Wellington	Dec. 20, 2021	Request confirmation that all currently permitted uses (specialized zone and approved use variances) be carried forward to the site that is proposed to be rezoned from specialized service commercial to a standard service commercial zone.	The proposed zoning bylaw includes a site-specific SC-4 to allow a retail establishment in order to recognize existing uses for this property.
206.	Permitted uses	Chris Corosky, Armel	Dec. 20, 2021	All existing uses permitted in the CC zone should continue to be permitted in the CMUC zone. For example Club, Medical Office and Library.	Medical clinic is a permitted use in the CMUC zone. This was a typo and the bylaw has been updated. Club as a defined term has been deleted from the bylaw and is now considered a conference and convention facility. A conference and convention facility is permitted in the CMUC zone. Library has also been deleted from the bylaw and is now considered a community center and is permitted within the CMUC zone.
207.	Permitted uses	Chris Corosky, Armel	Dec. 20, 2021	The Silvercreek corridor lands have been consolidated into an intensification/mixed-use zone (MUC). We want to ensure that all currently permitted uses on our properties will be carried over into the new zoning bylaw - some such as bake shop, liquor store, hardware store, gas bar appear to no longer be permitted. We note that "apartments' or "mixed-use buildings" are permitted, however residential units are not permitted	Bake shop is considered either a retail establishment or a restaurant depending on the nature of the use and both are permitted in the MUC zone.  Liquor store is considered a retail establishment and is permitted in the MUC zone.  Gas bar is considered a vehicle service station and is permitted in the MUC zone (limited to 1

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>on the ground floor. We believe this regulation is not appropriate in universal application and that provision should be provided for residential use on the ground floor. Further, we believe various forms of townhouse development should also be permitted in the MUC zone. We note that density of 100 to 150 uph is permitted in the MUC zone – this density is typically associated with building heights of 8 to 10 storeys, notwithstanding that the new MUC zone generally permits a maximum building height of only 6 storeys (we think this should be increased).</p>	<p>per intersection in line with the Official Plan permission)</p> <p>Ground floor commercial is required in the MUC zone to address public rights-of-way and to provide active uses at grade. This is in line with the recommendations of the Commercial Built Form Standards.</p>
208.	Permitted uses	Chris Corosky, Armel	Dec. 20, 2021	<p>Request that a wider range of non-industrial uses, including apartment and townhouses, be permitted on our vacant lands south of Speedvale and west of Elmira. The zoning is proposed to be changed from B.3 to B. The existing zone permits a wide array of non-industrial uses such as banks, offices, and personal service establishments.</p>	<p>The Official Plan designation for these lands is Corporate Business Park and these lands are required to be zoned Business Park (BP) to conform with the Official Plan designation. Non-industrial uses such as apartments and townhouses do not conform to the Official Plan designation and cannot be added as a permitted use in the BP zone.</p> <p>The BP zone continues to permit office as a use and a financial establishment is permitted as a complementary use (within a multi-unit building). A personal</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
					service establishment (now service establishment) use does not conform with the corporate business park Official Plan designation. This is also not an existing use on these lands.
209.	Permitted uses	Chris Corosky, Armel	Dec. 20, 2021	Request that all existing permitted uses are carried forward for vacant Speedvale corridor lands, including those with current specialized SC zoning. Further request that townhouses and/or apartments be permitted, particularly as the majority of this land backs onto existing residential development.	<p>Uses that have not been carried forward from the existing site-specific Service Commercial zones (SC.1-12 and SC.1-13) include retail uses (liquor store, pharmacy, office supply, florist). These uses have been deleted and are considered a retail establishment. Retail uses have not been carried forward in the new SC zone as they are not permitted within the Service Commercial Official Plan designation and are not existing uses on the property.</p> <p>Artisan studio and research establishment are also not permitted in the SC zone as they do not conform with the Official Plan designation.</p> <p>Residential townhouse and apartment uses are not intended to be permitted in the Service Commercial zone; this does not conform with the Official Plan designation.</p> <p>No proposed changes.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
210.	Permitted uses	Chris Corosky, Armel	April 22, 2022	<p>Would like to add "Warehouse" as a permitted use to 301 Elmira Road, 604 Speedvale to 456 Imperial Road, and 453 Imperial Road. Rationale for the request is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Our sites are vacant and we believe 'developability' of these sites would be greatly enhanced with the addition of Warehouse as a permitted use.</li> <li>2. The only new development along this strip in the past 10 – 15 years has been the Royal Storage self store facility, a use generally similar to Warehouse.</li> <li>3. Storage Facility is a permitted 'as of right' use in the Service Commercial category in the zoning bylaw update – Warehouse is not.</li> <li>4. In terms of compatibility with existing residential to the south, we believe Storage Facility and Warehouse are similarly innocuous – both being space intensive with a relatively low degree of on site activity other than site traffic movement associated with drop off and pick up of goods</li> <li>5. We note that other 'as of right' uses recommended for the Service Commercial zone include Building Supply, Home Improvement Warehouse, Major Equipment Supply and Service,</li> </ol>	<p>Permitting a warehouse in the Service Commercial zone does not align with the Service Commercial Official Plan designation.</p> <p>No proposed changes.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				Contractors Yard, Transportation Depot, and Vehicle Repair Establishment. From a compatibility perspective we submit that all of these uses would have higher land use intensity use characteristics than a Warehouse. 6. More flexible zoning will benefit the City in terms of enabling development that adds to the local tax and employment base.	
211.	Permitted uses	James Smith	Jan. 27, 2022	D-5 Table 6.1 Suggestion: Consider some minor retail, office and restaurant uses.	The RH.7 high density residential zone permits a convenience store within an apartment building. Office and restaurant uses are not proposed to be permitted within residential zones as this does not align with the residential high density Official Plan designation.
212.	Pre-zoning	Scott Hannah	Dec. 20, 2021	Pre-zoning: I am extremely pleased to see that the release of the new zoning by-law has created mixed use zoning categories and places these zones on lands designated for mixed use developments in keeping with the official plan. Well done! This is what land use planners are supposed to do. Without the assistance of a planning justification report, urban design study, traffic impact study, noise report, shadow study,	No staff response.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>environmental impact study, geotechnical study, functional servicing report, wind study, affordable housing report, preliminary site plan or elevations etc., staff have examined the policies of the Official Plan and created appropriate mixed use zoning categories with permitted uses and regulations (height, density, setbacks, parking, etc.) supported by the OP policies. This will allow staff to deal with the details of the development as part of a Site Plan Approval application which is the correct and appropriate planning process.</p>	
213.	Private amenity area	Ben Jones, Fusion	Jan. 16, 2021	<p>The stacked townhouse built form is essentially a hybrid between apartment and townhouse typologies, and as such relies heavily on patios/balconies/terraces for the purposes of providing outdoor amenity space. As you can imagine, providing a 4.5m deep balcony is not a feasible approach to amenity spaces, and so it is entirely appropriate that the minimum depth does not apply when amenity area is provided on balconies. However, ground-level units (which is a condition that can be difficult to define, depending on the building configuration) also have</p>	<p>The proposed zoning bylaw has been updated to require ground level private amenity area for stacked townhouses to be a minimum of 10 m2. No minimum projection has been included to allow for flexibility. Where a private amenity area is proposed below finished grade, a new regulation has been added to require a minimum of 50% of the private amenity area to be unencumbered by the balcony above to ensure adequate sunlight. See new illustration included on page D-22.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>challenges in providing this 4.5m deep area because the buildings are quite often oriented with entrances/parking on one side of the building and the public realm on the other side (see attached site plan). These units will often have patios that are similar depth/dimensions to the balconies of the units above.</p> <p>Suggestion for stacked townhouses is to avoid differentiating between "ground-level units" and other units to avoid unnecessary variances for future developments.</p>	
214.	Rear yard setback	Chris Corosky, Armel	Dec. 20, 2021	In some instances (e.g. mixed use zones) minimum rear yard setback requirements are increased to 7.5 metres from 3 metres. What is the rationale, can there be a rear yard in a through lot of regular geometry, can there be a rear yard in a corner through lot?	A minimum rear yard setback of 7.5 metres has been introduced for the new mixed-use zones. With additional height permission, additional setbacks, building setbacks and angular planes are applied to ensure adequate transition to adjacent properties. Additionally, parking and loading location as well as buffer strips are required in the interior side or rear yards. 7.5 metres is needed to address the new regulations.
215.	Rear yard setback	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jan. 12, 2022	For the proposed CMUC, MUC and NCC zones, we have the following comments for the Lot and building regulations under Section 7.3:	See staff response above in row 214.  Existing conditions are considered legal non-complying

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sections 7.3.1(b) and 7.3.3.(b): Under the existing CC zones for the Loblaw lands, the minimum rear yard is "One-half the Building Height but not less than 3 metres", whereas the proposed minimum rear yards are 7.5 m, which could render existing developments non-conforming. In our submission, the existing minimum rear yards should be maintained or a "Vacuum" clause should be incorporated as noted above.</li> </ul>	<p>in accordance with section 1.4.3, where any pre-existing legal building or structure, or lot that does not comply with the new by-law is deemed to conform with the new by-law. This section also provides appropriate permission for enlarging, repairing and reconstructing existing buildings and structure. Beyond this permission either a minor variance application or rezoning application would be required.</p>
216.	Rear yard setback	Nancy Shoemaker, BSR&D- 650 Scottsdale Drive	Dec. 15, 2021	The minimum rear yard has increased from half the building height but not less than 3 metres to 7.5 metres. The building has a current rear yard of 5.9 metres which complies with the regulations under which this property was developed. This altered regulation changes a conforming property into a legal non-conforming property thereby significantly affecting value.	See staff response above in row 214 and 215.
217.	Residential zones	Dylan White	Dec. 13, 2021	The city should consider developing a flexible intermediate zoning between residential and apartment buildings. Some properties in our city may support safe and comfortable occupancy for 4, 5 or even 6 residential units within a single structure or across two existing structures. Currently, building more than 2 units within	The proposed zoning bylaw introduces small apartments and on-street townhouses (to a maximum of 3 units) within the RL.1 and RL.2 zones.



No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>a single structure triggers apartment building zoning, which comes with various prohibitive requirements that all but rule out the development of (for example) 4-plexes. I am asking the city to consider an intermediate zoning that incentivizes the development of these multi-unit structures. I want Guelph to reach its projected 200,000 over the next 30 years without unchecked sprawl. I want to live in a city of 200,000 where the countryside is still just a short ride away. I want high density neighbourhoods to allow our local businesses to thrive all over the city, and to house a wide diversity of people.</p>	
218.	Residential zones	Dylan White	Dec. 13, 2021	<p>The city should consider allowing additional residential units within duplexes. I believe that allowing third units within duplexes, or houses with accessory apartments, is in keeping with the city's objectives for higher density and occupancy and is more fair and consistent with the detached ARDU mandate. Firstly, if building code and safety elements are met, I cannot see any reasonable or fair rationale for allowing detached third units on a property, but NOT allowing attached third units, which might</p>	<p>Draft Zoning Bylaw updated to allow detached additional residential dwelling units on duplex properties. The bylaw does not propose to permit an ARDU within a duplex. Flexibility has been added to the proposed zoning bylaw by allowing small apartment buildings (3 or less units) within the RL.1 and RL.2 zones.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>be contained within or contiguous with an existing structure.</p> <p>Secondly, open space on a property is a very valuable commodity for both the property owner, and for the common good of our city. Water infiltration and retention, carbon draw-down and sequestration, air quality improvement, urban wildlife habitat and vegetative shading are some of the very practical and tangible benefits of retaining - where possible - open yard spaces. In fact, I strongly believe we should be significantly incentivizing non-lawn, native landscaping to further enhance these environmental services.</p>	
219.	Residential zones	Matthew Betts	Dec. 5, 2021	On-street Townhouses should be allowed in RL.1, RL.2, RL.3 and RL.4	The proposed zoning bylaw has been revised to allow on-street townhouses within the RL.1 and RL.2 zones (to a maximum of 3 units) in addition to the RL.3 and RM.5 zones.
220.	Residential zones	Matthew Betts	Dec. 5, 2021	Minimum frontage is too high for RL.1 and RL.2. I suggest decreasing it to 10m	The RL.1 zone is proposed to have a minimum lot frontage of 15 metres, in line with the existing R.1B zone. The RL.1 zone is applied mainly in the older built-up area and recognizes the existing character of the older area. The RL.2 zone is proposed to have a minimum lot frontage of 9

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
					metres, in line with the existing R.1D zone. The RL.2 zone aligns with newer residential development within the city.
221.	Setbacks	Ben Jones, Fusion		Increased setback for RL.1 zone not justified. Should be 1.2m, especially since the RL.1 zone is currently the only zone that would truly allow a double car garage. Demand for singles with double car garages is high, and increased setback requirements for this housing type would have the knock-on effect of reducing density in low-rise subdivisions in the City, contrary to Provincial policy direction	The existing R.1B zone (15 metre lot frontage) has been used as base for the proposed RL.1 zone and the 1.5 metre side yard setback has not been increased. This recognizes the existing built form in older areas of the city. A double car garage continues to be possible based on the standard RL.1 zone regulations.
222.	Shipping containers	Craig Dool	Dec. 14, 2021	Strongly opposed to the new provisions regarding shipping containers. Owns numerous containers on site that house building materials for many small businesses across our city. It is a cost effective solution that currently follows all bylaws. Small business owners cannot afford other space in the city, cannot find space in the city and service our community in many trades/construction/services. These people need this space.	The draft zoning bylaw includes new regulations for shipping containers to add clarity for the use of shipping containers and outdoor storage within the city. The city's employment lands are valuable, and we want to ensure that they are being utilized appropriately. In order to achieve our forecast employment growth, we need to make more efficient use of lands within our employment areas. We also have a target of 15% of future employment coming from intensification of existing employment areas, reinforcing the need to make efficient use of our employment lands. We

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
					<p>also have very little surplus employment land beyond 2051 and will need to carefully monitor our employment lands over time to ensure that we are staying on track to meet our vision and goals for our proposed employment areas. If multiple shipping containers are being added to sites to address a space issue instead of adding to the floor area of a building, we are not utilizing employment lands for the highest and best use. Shipping containers added to a property do not go through the development process, meaning the property is not paying for additional development charges, it is not taxed appropriately, as well as other site design impacts such as generating additional traffic, occupying requiring parking spaces and not addressing adequate transition to adjacent properties and providing adequate visual screening.</p>
223.	Shipping containers	Greg Hartmann	Dec. 14, 2021	Strongly opposed to the new provision limiting shipping containers to 1 per 0.4 hectares. As a small business owner rely on shipping containers as affordable storage facilities and the proposed	See staff response above in row 222.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				limitations would force the need to find alternative storage that simply does not exist.	
224.	Shipping containers	Harry Oussoren, Insitu Holdings.	Jan. 5, 2022	<p>The restriction of having no more than one shipping container per acre of land will severely impact some businesses operating in Guelph. The proposed change will not allow for manufacturing business to operate efficiently in that they must receive, hold and send containers of raw and finished product in multiple shipping containers in quantities which are driven by supply and demand. Temporary storage of these items cannot be done economically by loading them in permanent structures which may result in partial and seasonal occupancy only.</p> <p>If the issue is visual impact, it seems to me that outside storage of lumber, steel, vehicles and such have no greater aesthetic appeal than a well-maintained shipping container. In my opinion, shipping containers can be useful in eliminating unsightly stored items particularly when placed in an orderly fashion. It would be reasonable for the proposed bylaw to require a minimum standard with regard to the visual appearance of the containers.</p>	See staff response above in row 222.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>If the issue is the city's lack of revenue which it might otherwise get from building space, shipping containers do not make use of the city services (water, sewerage, electrical power) and so do not burden the city.</p> <p>The proposed bylaw does not differentiate between shipping containers of different sizes. Would one 16.76 m (55 ft) container per acre be acceptable while two 6 m (20 ft) containers per acre be unacceptable?</p>	
225.	Shipping containers	Richard Preiss	Dec.14, 2021	The new provision limiting shipping containers to 1 per 0.4 hectares would be disruptive to our business as well as other businesses that work in the area. We rent shipping containers from landlords and own a shipping container that is used to store equipment.	See staff response above in row 222.
226.	Shipping containers	Murray Hall, Halltech Aquatic Research Inc. Halltech Environmental Inc.	Dec. 17, 2021	This letter is to express our concern over a proposed by-law changed restricting the number of storage containers on commercial property. I have tenants that rely on the containers for protecting company assets. We have had many break in's in our neighbourhood and these are the most effective and affordable method of securing	See staff response above in row 222.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				valuable property. On behalf of myself and my tenants, I am adamantly opposed to this proposal and encourage council and staff to abandon this initiative.	
227.	Shipping containers	Robert Mason, Mason Real Estate Limited	Dec. 20, 2021	<p>Outdoor storage &amp; storage containers</p> <p>(i) Outdoor storage is permitted only to store equipment and things being made or used in the associated business that runs inside the building. There are many businesses in the city that need storage or yard space but not necessarily a building, or where such users have a building, but require overflow storage elsewhere without an associated 'building' use with such storage. Please comment on where stand-alone outdoor storage is permitted and how the bylaw will ensure these users are not stranded and do not lose a place to operate their business.</p> <p>(ii) The language about storage containers in the proposed bylaw report are overly restrictive and punitive. There are many businesses (small and large) that rely on using storage containers as a substitute, or a complement to their main business location, or as their main business location. There are many</p>	See staff response above in row 222.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>sites, particularly in the industrial and service commercial zones where multiple storage containers on smaller lots are utilized and function fine without more regulation.</p> <p>Why is there a prohibition on shipping containers on lots less than 1 acre and overall cap on the number of shipping containers at 4, but no such restrictions on the use and storage of tractor trailers? Both function the same, with tractor trailers being no more than storage containers on wheels. The City may well find that if they restrict storage containers people will just store trailers instead. The better solution is to remove these unnecessary restrictions on storage containers and allow them to be used. It is critical to allow shipping containers to remain without these restrictions.</p>	
228.	Transition	Chris Corosky, Armel	Dec. 20, 2021	<p>In the hypothetical situation where a new planning application on an older existing commercial development is submitted (say for a use variance or a severance that does not change the day to day functioning of the existing site), would the expectation be that variances would be required to address non-compliance with all 'new' regulations that have been</p>	<p>Any new development on an existing site would be required to meet the new zoning regulations once in effect. If those regulations cannot be met, a variance would be required. For instance, if a legal non-complying building is adding an addition, the addition will need to meet the new regulations (setbacks, electric</p>



No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				introduced with the new zoning bylaw (eg, requirement for electrification of parking, bicycle parking, glazing requirements on 1st storeys of buildings, etc.)?	vehicle parking, bicycle parking, transparency, etc.). The rest of the existing building and uses are not subject to the new regulations and can continue to exist as legal non-conforming.
229.	Trees	Guelph Urban Forest Friends (GUFF)	Dec. 2021	<p>We were very encouraged to read on the City of Guelph website when this new draft bylaw was introduced that it is an improvement to the old bylaw as it would align with Guelph's Official Plan to increase resiliency to climate change and protect and enhance tree canopy cover among other things. But we are not able to see that these important goals have been achieved in the new document.</p> <p>Our Urban Forest Management Plan has a goal of 40% canopy coverage in the city. Has this Zoning document been reviewed to determine if the specified setbacks, Landscape Open Space and lot coverage are conducive to achieving this goal?</p> <p>Trees are synonymous with water absorption, a must in a city that relies on groundwater as its source for drinking. Has this document been looked at with permeability in mind as well? Will we have requirements for permeability in our Landscaped Open Spaces and perhaps in the</p>	<p>Retention of existing trees and providing space to plant additional trees has been taken into consideration in drafting the proposed zoning bylaw. Although the zoning bylaw is not able to regulate the number of trees that should be planted on a lot (this is best dealt with through the site plan process), the zoning bylaw does regulate things like landscaped open space, buffer strips, amenity areas, building setbacks, and driveway widths, all which provide opportunities to plant trees.</p> <p>We have received a number of comments through this project requesting that landscaped open space, common amenity area and buffer strip regulations be reduced in the proposed zoning bylaw. Staff are not recommending a significant reduction for these regulations as we recognize they are key regulations that help the city in achieving its target to achieve</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>hardscape such as driveways and walkways?  As we read the document the reference to trees is muted and almost non-existent, except in the definition of Landscaped Open Space as land that "contributes toward storm-water management, tree canopy cover, and biodiversity". But this space also includes "grass, flowers, shrubbery, natural vegetation and native species and other landscaping". And to add pressure to this space it may also harbour "any buffer strip, surface walk, surface patio, green roof, swimming pool or similar area" (Pg B-20). That seems to leave precious little space for trees of medium to large size.  In the regulations there are further references to maximum lot coverage, setbacks and percentage of dedicated Landscape Open Space but the reality is that trees of a size to provide shade require space both vertical and horizontal, good soil, and water permeability. The commonly accepted criteria for a tree is 30 sq. m. when planted singly and 20 sq. m. each when grouped. The area must be free of underground and overhead utilities, covered by an optimum</p>	<p>40% tree canopy. Planning staff continue to work with Forestry Staff on the Tree Planting Strategy to ensure zoning bylaw regulations are appropriate to achieve City targets.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>amount of soil, have proper site drainage and not subject to compaction. Do the regulations as laid out ensure this happens? Do the regulations prevent the compartmentalizing of space into parcels too small to support a tree? Have the plantable spaces been considered in the context of contiguous space that allows Have the plantable spaces been considered in the context of contiguous space needed for ecologically sustainable habitat, movement of wildlife (including pollinators) and synergies between trees, their root systems and mycorrhizae? Will spaces that are large enough on the surface be compromised by underground utilities precluding tree planting? Can we make sure "Tree Zones" exist where these planting standards are met, and we are ensured of 40% canopy in Guelph as declared in our UFMP? Zoning regulations are the basis upon which plantable spaces, suitable for trees, will be available. Then layered on top of this are the tree bylaws, site approval processes, and bylaws governing Storm-Water Management, the Natural Heritage System and Heritage. All of these by-laws and regulations must</p>	

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>work together if we are to ensure that trees will be a feature of our city going forward whether they are existing and protected or newly planted. We believe the zoning document should be reconciled with these other bylaws to ensure they are supported, and this reconciliation should be transparent. We suggest that consistency with the Urban Forest Management Plan be one of the requirements to be met at the time of site approval of any development proposal.</p> <p>GUFF, in its review of the draft Zoning By-law document, has asked the question – do the regulations in the new bylaw ensure our vision of a well-treed city and a healthy and sustainable urban forest? Regretfully, we conclude that they do not.</p>	
230.	General questions/comments	Guelph Wellington Development Association, Guelph and District Home Builders' Association	Dec. 16, 2021	What known issues are being solved? And solved for whom?	The existing zoning bylaw is from 1995 and does not implement the City's current Official Plan. The Planning Act requires that zoning bylaws be updated after a new Official Plan comes into effect. Updating the zoning bylaw will align zones with Official Plan designations, pre-zone lands for maximum height and density anticipated in the Official Plan, simplify uses to add some flexibility and

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
					<p>streamline the development review process, meaning that there will generally be less site-specific zoning bylaw amendments needed to develop to a property in line with the Official Plan permissions.</p> <p>An updated zoning bylaw will benefit the general public by providing more certainty for what can be constructed within the city, benefits developers as pre-zoned lands should not need to go through a full rezoning application to align with the permissions of the Official Plan, and the new bylaw will benefit the city by reducing time dedicated to planning applications and provide more clarity and consistency in how regulations are applied.</p>
231.	General questions/comments	Guelph Wellington Development Association, Guelph and District Home Builders' Association	Dec. 16, 2021	What new directions (and therefore new site configurations) are being imposed and why?	The proposed zoning bylaw aligns with the direction of the current Official Plan. The Planning Act requires that a Zoning Bylaw be updated to align with a municipal Official Plan. The zoning bylaw has taken the approach pre-zone lands to align with the height and density of the Official Plan. In doing so, new built form regulations have been added to the zoning bylaw based on

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
					Official Plan policy and recommendations developed through the City's Urban Design Manual and Built Form Standards. These regulations ensure that adequate transition is provided to surrounding properties and neighbourhoods and that developments will have a positive impact to the street and public realm.
232.	General questions/comments	Guelph Wellington Development Association, Guelph and District Home Builders' Association	Dec. 16, 2021	Does this update actually streamline building approvals? Has this been tested?	The proposed zoning bylaw aligns with the Official Plan land use designations. Lands have been pre-zoned to allow for the maximum height and density within the designation and will be less likely to need rezoning. It is anticipated that some developments should be able to go straight to the site plan and building permit process. It is expected that minor variances may be needed depending on the site-specific context and this process is much less time consuming and less costly than a full rezoning of a property.
233.	General questions/comments	Guelph Wellington Development Association, Guelph and District Home Builders' Association	Dec. 16, 2021	What are the implications for Guelph's built environment? Does everyone understand the outcomes of the bylaw?	See staff response above in row 231.  Community engagement has been occurring throughout the project and further engagement is planned with the release of the draft bylaw.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
234.	General questions/comments	Guelph Wellington Development Association, Guelph and District Home Builders' Association	Dec. 16, 2021	Does the proposed zoning bylaw help address the intensifying housing supply and affordable crisis we are facing?	The proposed zoning bylaw pre-zones lands, allowing more development permissions for a wider range and mix of housing types, as well as opportunities for infill and intensification. Permissions for a wider range of built form within zoning categories assists in providing a range and mix of housing types.
235.	General questions/comments	Guelph Wellington Development Association, Guelph and District Home Builders' Association	Dec. 16, 2021	<p>Recognizing that there is a natural underlying tension between providing 'clarity' by prescribing fixed solutions vs. enabling the creative flexibility required to fit unique contexts and opportunities across the city fabric, we note that the proposed by-law tilts very much in the 'prescribed solutions' category. What have to date been 'Urban Design Guidelines' able to respond to site specific circumstances through Site Plan development between proponents and staff, are now inscribed as requirements in the zoning, leading to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Process Duplication- by embedding so much of the guideline material into regulation, does this simplify Site Plan negotiations?</li> <li>2. Stifling of Creativity- to avoid prolonged approvals for unique conditions, the prescribed solution</li> </ol>	See staff response above in row 231.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>will be the fallback. The proposed by-law may encourage the wrong answers being built.</p> <p>3. Uniformity- with the increase in prescription comes a standardised response.</p>	
236.	Site-specific	Steve Petrie- 91 Duke Street		<p>Request that "Office" and "Tradesperson's Shop" be added to the RL.1-25 permitted uses at 91 Duke Street. The property is presently zoned B.4-1. The Committee of Adjustment added "Office" or "Tradesperson's Shop" as permitted uses. The proposed site specific provisions only lists the allowable RL.1 uses and a previously permitted use of "Metal Manufacturing Industry". Also wondering if the property could be listed under a different residential zone such as RL.3, RL.4, RM.5 or RM.6 to allow townhouse development.</p>	<p>The RL.1-25 zone that permits a metal fabricating industry has been deleted from the proposed zoning bylaw as the use is no longer active on the site and the site is within a residential neighbourhood. A metal fabricating industry isn't intended to be a continued use and is not compatible with the low density residential neighbourhood.</p> <p>The new zoning bylaw does not propose to carry forward existing minor variances beyond the 2 year transition provision provided in section 1.3.1 c). If these uses continue to exist, they will be considered legal non-conforming.</p> <p>The property remains in the RL.1 zone, in line with the immediate area surrounding the property.</p>
237.	Site-specific	Cas Maiocco- 11 Arthur Street North	Dec. 17, 2021	<p>The subject property is currently zoned R4A-20 and permits up to 7 units as the result of an OMB approval. The proposed new zone</p>	<p>11 Arthur Street and 32-46 Regent Street have been included in the proposed companion Official Plan</p>



No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>is RL.4 without site specific provisions. The property should be zoned RM.5 with a site specific provision. The reasons for a medium density zone include: property's long established density is double that permitted in RL.4; proximity to other medium and high density properties; immediate proximity to downtown and central transportation hub; corner property with multiple site specific provisions; Official Plan intensification directive; and property blends in architecturally with adjacent residential neighbourhood. Site specific regulations requested include lot frontage, yard setbacks, buffer strips, landscaped open space, common amenity area, parking and angular planes.</p>	<p>Amendment for the Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw. The proposed OPA includes a site-specific policy for both properties to recognize the existing building height and residential density and to permit a residential density of 100 units per hectare.</p> <p>The two sites are not proposed to be redesignated to medium density residential due to anticipated development constraints, their ability to meet zoning regulations, potential heritage value and location within an established residential neighbourhood. The proposed OPA recognizes the existing buildings and recognizes the additional density.</p> <p>The proposed RL.4-20 zone permits 100 units per hectare, maintaining the existing density permission for these sites.</p>
238.	Site-specific	C.A. Maiocco- 11 Arthur Street North and 32-46 Regent Street	Dec. 16, 2021	<p>The Subject Property is currently zoned R4A-20 as shown on Schedule A, Map #35. The site consists of about 0.1 hectare. The Current zoning permits up to 7 units and received Ontario Municipal Board approval. The</p>	<p>See staff response above in row 237.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>current draft proposes to re-zone the site to Low Density Residential (RL.4) without site-specific provisions. It is my respectful submission that the property is more appropriately zoned Site Specific Medium Density (RM.5) in view, among other considerations, of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The long established density of the subject property (7 units have currently existed on the property for almost 4 decades) is double that permitted in a Low Density Residential (RL.4).</li> <li>• The close proximity in the neighbourhood of other medium density properties, e.g. the Hampshire Terrace, at 32-46 Regent Street, a purpose built (circa 1903) 9-plex apartment building --which like the subject property--is ideally located between the prestigious St. George's Park neighbourhood and also located just steps from Guelph's Historic downtown core.</li> <li>• The immediate proximity of the subject site to the Central Business District, with pedestrian access to public downtown amenities as well as parks and river trails means tenants can avoid automobile use.</li> </ul>	

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The subject property is also located directly opposite high density, multi-story, residential towers; and steps away from the central transportation hub for Guelph and inter-city travel;</li> <li>• The fact that the subject site is a corner property (bordering on three streets) with multiple required site-specific adjustments already permitted to Side and Front Yard, Usable Open Space and Parking, Buffer Strip and Corner Lots provisions.</li> <li>• The directive of the Official Plan for residential intensification. Intensification is particularly considered desirable by the Official Plan in the area where this property is located since municipal services have ample capacity to accommodate intensification.</li> <li>• The subject property blends in architecturally with the adjacent residential neighbourhood.</li> </ul>	
239.	Site-specific	Mario Maiocco- 11 Arthur Street North and 32-46 Regent Street	Dec. 19, 2021	11 Arthur Street North, a seven unit building comprising of the original circa 1883 structure and a complimentary addition constructed approximately 40 years ago. The Second is the Hampshire Terrace at 32-46 Regent Street, constructed circa 1903 and is currently a 9-plex apartment building. Both properties are located in one of	See staff response above in row 237.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>the earliest residential neighborhoods that grace our City. Both properties provide affordable housing. Both provide housing diversity and a range of residential accommodations suited for diverse lifestyles. Both afford the option of having less reliance on the automobile. Both have existed lawfully as a multiple residence for decades. And regrettably, both are now threatened under the proposed new Zoning Bylaw.</p> <p>The long established density of 11 Arthur St. N. is 7 units. These seven units have continuously existed on the property for almost four decades. I note that this density is double that permitted in the current draft of the proposed Bylaw which is Low Density Residential (RL.4) zone.</p> <p>Similarly, with respect to the Hampshire Terrace, at 32-46 Regent Street, Here again, under the proposed zoning, should this property be redeveloped, there would again be a dramatic reduction in the number of units and the loss of a historically significant structure which defines the character of the neighborhood. Surely, this is not the stated intent of the Official Plan.</p>	

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>The subject properties are located directly opposite high density; multi-story, residential towers and they complement these very dense recent developments by offering a variety of alternative medium density low rise accommodation and engender a greater sense of community. 11 Arthur St. N. is a corner property bordering on three streets and has multiple site-specific requirements in the existing Bylaw. These tailored provisions permit side and front yard, usable open space, parking, buffer strip and corner lot requirements necessary for the structure to exist. Without these provisions the existing development could not exist. The proposed new zoning removes all these tailored provisions and substitutes new broad provisions that simply do not recognize the nature of this site. Surely, provisions can be made in the proposed new zoning so as to afford retention of the existing requirements and allow any future redevelopment to maintain the existing density, architectural attractiveness, and desirable nature of this property within this neighborhood well into the future, just as it has existed for decades.</p>	

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>I believe a similar situation exists with respect to the Hampshire Terrace. You might consider using site specific zoning for the examples I have cited.</p> <p>Alternatively, make the zoning of each category in the proposed Bylaw, less restricted and more flexible, so as to embrace a wider variety of development be it in a residential, commercial or industrial zone. I believe you will discover that this seemingly lessening of control is in fact affording the community far more. Moreover it may help preserve our precious urban legacy</p>	
240.	Site-specific	Astrid Clos, Skyline Retail-160, 170, 200, 210 Kortright Road West	Jan. 12, 2022	The current specialized zoning regulations in the CC-4 Zone should be carried forward the new zoning using the exact wording.	See staff response above in row 30 and row 198.
241.	Site-specific	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph- 245 Edinburgh Road South, 492-502 Edinburgh Road South	Jan. 14, 2022	The proposed MUC(PA)(H13) Zone for the Metro plaza should remove the Holding and (PA) and maintain the same wording as the current by-law in the new by-law. A number of uses now permitted are proposed to be removed. All of these current permitted uses should remain in the new Zone.	The existing zoning of this property has more restrictive minimum lot frontage, minimum front yard and maximum building height regulations, there is no maximum building floor area in the MUC zone, the standard parking space for an apartment building, mixed-use building and other non-residential uses is consistent with the proposed bylaw. The MUC zone permits apartment

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
					<p>buildings and mixed-use buildings outright. Staff do not agree with maintaining the existing zoning of this site.</p> <p>An exception has been added to the parking adjustment (PA) area to recognize the existing parking rate as the maximum to recognize the existing parking rate in places where the maximum is less than what the site already provides.</p> <p>The (H13) holding provision is being revised to only impact new buildings and/or additional residential intensification and will not impact any commercial changes to a property.</p>
242.	Site-specific	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph- 1 Stone Road, 50 Stone Road West, 80 Stone Road West	Jan. 14, 2022	For all of the university Research Park lands (including the Delta Hotel, OMAFRA and Movati) please use the exact language in the current zoning bylaw and carry it forward to the new zoning bylaw unchanged.	<p>1 Stone Road (OMAFRA)- IRP-4 Additional IRP uses are permitted. IRP uses have been compared to the existing I.2-3 zone. Drug manufacturing and print or publishing establishment have been added to the permitted uses. All site-specific regulations have been carried forward. (PA) has been removed from the site.</p> <p>50 Stone Road West - Delta Hotel- IRP-1 I.2-5- Minimum setbacks from a city street or service road</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
					<p>regulations added. Additional height is permitted and a significantly reduced parking rate is standard. Building height and parking regulations have not been carried forward. (PA) has been removed from the site.</p> <p>80 Stone Road West - Movati-IRP-2 I.2-4- Recreation facility use, minimum setback from city street or service road and off-street parking and parking regulations have been carried forward. (PA) has been removed from site.</p>
243.	Site-specific	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph- Village by the Arboretum	Jan. 14, 2022	For the RL.1-21 and RM.6-6 Zones in the Village by the Arboretum please use the exact wording in the current zoning by-law and carry it forward to the new by-law.	The RL.1-21 and RM.6-6 zone carry forward the regulations in the existing RR.1 and RR.2 zones. Minor terminology changes have been made to align with the new uses/definitions in the draft bylaw. For example, long term care facility replaces "home for the aged" and "nursing home" in the draft bylaw.
244.	Site-specific	Ian Panabaker, Wood Development Group- 2-10 Samuel Drive	Dec. 20, 2021	Neighbourhood Commercial Centre – NCC(H13) USES: While this site benefits from the additional residential uses brought into the commercial land use, there are some	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The (H13) holding provision is maintained on the site as the proposed NCC zone provides additional height permission. The (H13) holding provision</li> </ul>



No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>omissions and deletions that need to be addressed.</p> <p>HOLD: The 'H13' to prevent any enlargement beyond 10m2 is punitive.</p> <p>REGULATIONS: The site meets or exceeds many of the updated regulations, except however for some of the new built form controls many of which are inappropriate for the NCC zone.</p> <p>FEEDBACK:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• H13 – This site was planned and built over 2018-2021. The site was underbuilt to accommodate a Day Care as a lead tenant, but should that use leave there would be room to expand. While the GFA cap on NCCs was greatly expanded (from 1,875m2 to 6,500m2) in the proposed zoning by-law, on this site, even to stay within the FSI concept of 0.33 would create an additional 289m2 beyond its current 811m2. At a minimum the 0.33 FSI should be available for expansion outside of the development control.</li> <li>• Medical Clinic needs to be re-confirmed as a permitted use</li> <li>• Office – it wasn't clear if this was an omission or on purpose, but this use needs to be re-installed as permitted in the NCC zone.</li> </ul>	<p>wording has been updated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medical clinic is a permitted use in the NCC zone.</li> <li>• Office is permitted in the NCC zone.</li> <li>• Art gallery is not permitted in the NCC zone as the Neighbourhood Commercial Official Plan designation is primarily intended to serve the shopping needs of the surrounding neighbourhoods. The NCC zone does propose to permit retail establishment and artisan studio. Both uses would allow the display and sales of art.</li> <li>• See staff response in row 98 regarding transparency requirements.</li> <li>• See staff response in row 147 regarding minimum building height</li> <li>• See staff response in row 95 regarding first storey height.</li> <li>• See staff response in row 87 regarding electric</li> </ul>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Art Gallery should be brought back into this zone. (We can understand major institutional uses being restricted to larger capacity sites, but private galleries are not high-intensity uses and would be appropriate within NCC sites).</li> <li>• 40% Transparency – this is not the case in a lot of Neighbourhood Commercial, nor should it be. See general note.</li> <li>• Building Height of 7.5m – when combined or in contradiction with First storey building height means builders will be faced with extraordinarily tall single storey buildings. Or, is this regulation meant to induce two storey buildings as a minimum? Either way, the concept needs to be addressed, particularly in NCC zones and new regulations drafted to get the correct result on the street.</li> <li>• First Storey Building Height of 4.5m – see general notes.</li> <li>• EV parking requirements in zoning by-law are inappropriate for commercial properties – see general notes.</li> </ul>	vehicle parking requirements.
245.	Site-specific	Ian Panabaker, Wood Development	Dec. 20, 2021	Community Mixed Use Commercial – CMUC-3(PA)(H13) Since it was constructed, Westminster Square has been and continues to be the	City staff confirm that a medical clinic is permitted in the CMUC-3 zone in the proposed zoning bylaw. The site-specific regulation for maximum

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
		Group- 31-33 Farley Drive		<p>preeminent medical services facility in the south end of Guelph, which were fully permitted uses in the existing zoning.</p> <p>USES: While this site benefits from the additional residential uses brought into commercial lands,</p> <p>SPECIALISED: the specialised “-3” removes drive-through facility as a permitted use, reflecting its current specialised zone, but adds a GFA cap for commercial use of 4,450m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>HOLD: H13 – see general notes.</p> <p>PARKING: (PA) – which allows for the mixed-use parking ratio calculations</p> <p>REGULATIONS: The site would have significant challenges meeting many of the updated regulations.</p> <p>FEEDBACK:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medical Clinic needs to be re-confirmed as a permitted use</li> <li>• H13 – is an inappropriate control on the property. The city needs to find a different mechanism to regulate intensification under the mixed-use permissions being granted.</li> <li>• EV parking requirements in zoning by-law are inappropriate for commercial properties – see general notes</li> </ul>	<p>commercial gross floor area of 4,450 square metres implements the maximum commercial gross floor area for the commercial mixed use centre designation as established in the Commercial Policy Review. This recognizes the existing and planned commercial developments within the CMUC designation and adds 10% additional commercial capacity to these sites.</p> <p>The H13 holding provision has been revised in the proposed zoning bylaw.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specialised "-3" GFA Cap of 4,450m2 -- We do not know where this GFA maximum came from as the current by-law does not limit GFA this way. Please provide rationale for this limit.</li> </ul>	
246.	Site-specific	John Cox, JL Cox Planning Consultants Inc.- Guelph Campus Co-op, 1-9 Forest Hill Drive	Jan. 7, 2021	On behalf of our client, Guelph Campus Co-op, we want to advise that our client has concerns about how the subject property is proposed to be zoned in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law review. The property is currently zoned R.4A in the City's Zoning By-law, which permits a maximum density of 100uph. The property is proposed to be zoned RL.4 in the new comprehensive bylaw, which would only permit a maximum density of 35uph. It is noted that the property has a site area of 0.6950ha and currently contains 40 residential units, which is a density of approximately 65uph.	1-9 Forest Hill Drive has been included in the companion Official Plan amendment. The Official Plan Amendment proposes to redesignate these properties to medium density residential to recognize the existing buildings on site and the existing zoning density permission of 100 units per hectare.
247.	Site-specific	Scott Hannah, Dira Properties- 404 and 450 Speedvale Ave West, and 226-230 Speedvale Ave West	Dec. 15, 2021	Provide a mixed-use corridor or mixed office commercial designation for properties along the south side of Speedvale Avenue West between Edinburgh Road and Imperial Road, including 404 and 226-230 Speedvale Avenue West. This would be a logical extension of the new "Mixed Use Corridor" or "Mixed Office Commercial" designation and allow flexibility for more	This is outside the scope of the Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review. This could be considered through a future Official Plan review.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				mixed-use development, including mid-rise residential. This would assist the development of 404 Speedvale Avenue which is currently vacant and the redevelopment of 226-230 Speedvale Avenue West which is underutilized.	
248.	Site-specific	Trevor Hawkins, MHBC, Forum 601 Scottsdale LP (FEP) -601 Scottsdale	Dec. 17, 2021	Proposed MUC-2 Site Specific Provision: The Draft Zoning By-law includes a proposed site specific regulation for the subject lands, included in Section 18.9.2, and identified as MUC-2. The regulation permits a maximum building height of 8 storeys, which reflects the existing permission that applies to the lands through the current Zoning By-law. FEP strongly supports the inclusion of this site specific regulation, as it carries forward an existing permission. Furthermore, permission for additional height in this location is appropriate – the lands are well separated from low-rise residential developments, they have excellent access to shopping, transit and active transportation and have excellent access to the broader road network, including the Hanlon Pwky. As per the previous comments, any other site specific performance standards that may be approved by Council through	Site-specific zoning bylaw amendments that receive Council approval and are in effect will be incorporated into the new bylaw prior to being brought forward for Council approval.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				OZS21-012 should also be included in MUC-2 for ease of implementation and consistency.	
249.	Site-specific	Preet Kohli, Community Living- 87 Silvercreek Parkway North	Mar. 2, 2022	<p>The RL.1-4 (the site specific) has only additional uses attached to it without considering the existing built form.</p> <p>My concern is that the existing built form does not reflect - single detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings and duplex dwellings as said in the purpose of this zone. In addition, it is on the arterial road.</p> <p>I am hoping to understand how the proposed zoning will affect our ability to renovate the building and use it to its full potential. This building is old and we are looking at the number of options. However, the proposed zoning suggests single detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings and duplex dwellings only. Are we looking at potential down zoning on our property?</p>	The proposed zoning bylaw has zoned 87 Silvercreek Parkway North RL.4-19 to better recognize the existing built form and site-specific zone permissions.
250.	Site-specific	Astrid Clos, Skyline Retail- 160, 170, 200, 210 Kortright Road West	Jan. 12, 2022	A Drive-through facility should be included as a permitted use or accessory to a permitted use within the new zoning for the subject property.	A maximum of 1 drive-through facility is permitted in the site-specific NCC-11 zone (160-170 Kortright Road West) and NCC-12 (200, 210 Kortright Road West).

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
251.	Site-specific	Astrid Clos- 304-324 Stone Road West and 511 Edinburgh Road South	Nov. 26, 2021	A Drive-through facility should be included as a permitted use or accessory to a permitted use for the subject property.	A drive-through is a permitted use in the proposed MUC zone.
252.	Site-specific	Henry Kedra- 35 Niska Road	Dec. 23. 2021	Do not agree with the proposed RL.1 zoning, this is a farm property that is currently zoned UR.	35 Niska Road is proposed to be zoned RL.1 in line with the low density residential Official Plan designation.
253.	Site-specific	Rebecca Hodges	Dec. 2, 2021	Concerned about the zoning for 1055 Gordon St., which is currently zoned R.3A-12 and is zoned RM.5 (PA) in the draft new zoning bylaw.	The property is designated as Medium Density Residential in the City's Official Plan and is currently zoned OR-50. The proposed zone is RM.5 (PA) which implements the Official Plan Medium Density Residential designation. The lands behind the property and lands behind existing development along Gordon Street are designated as Significant Natural Areas & Natural Areas in the Official Plan. The proposed zone in the draft new zoning bylaw is Natural Heritage System. The only permitted uses are conservation use and legally existing uses, buildings and structures. These lands are currently zoned UR and WL.
254.	Site-specific	Heather Sewell-87 Inkerman Street	Nov. 30, 2021	I would like the City to consider rezoning the entire stretch of Inkerman Street as RL.2 where it abuts the commercial zone. There are a number of other properties	This would be considered a site-specific request and is not within the scope of the Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review (CZBR). The CZBR is

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				along the street where the City is proposing the same and it would provide opportunities for infill and intensification.	recognizing the existing built form throughout the low density residential designation. A site-specific application would be required to rezone the site.
255.	Site-specific	Dawson McKenzie-Scott Robinson and Rolf Deter, MHBC- 5102 Whitelaw Road	Dec. 10, 2021	Request that the City consider zoning the portion of the property, designated as Low Density Greenfield Residential in the City's Official Plan, as Medium Density Residential RM.6. Currently the property is proposed to be zoned Low Density Residential RL.2 from Urban Reserve (UR). A higher density zone on the property would help the City achieve its minimum density targets set out in the Growth Plan. The property can support a higher density which is consistent with the Official Plan for a number of reasons. Surrounding uses are a mix of residential uses and densities. A medium density development would fit within the character of the existing neighbourhood and create a mixed neighbourhood with a range of housing types. The property is located in proximity to many public services and amenities, well served by public transportation, dedicated bike routes and on an arterial road.	This would be considered a site-specific request and is not within the scope of the Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review (CZBR). The CZBR is recognizing the existing built form throughout the low density residential designation. A site-specific application would be required to rezone the site.
256.	Site-specific	Harry Bakker, University of	Jan. 14, 2022	It is also important that once the defined term for the University	This wording has been carried over from the existing I.2-1



No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
		Guelph- 100-174 Stone Road West		uses is in place, that it properly encompasses "any directly related operations" and that it be used consistently to avoid confusion. For example, we are unclear on the effect of certain site-specific zones (e.g. section 18.20.3 IRP-3 (ix)).	zone. No change to the existing zoning has been made.
257.	Site-specific	Scott Hannah	Dec. 20, 2021	1. Specialized Zones: From my review of the by-law there has been a significant effort to reduce the number of specialized zones throughout the by-law. This will eliminate the need for future use variances and zoning amendments to add uses that the Official Plan says should be permitted.	No response required.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
258.	Site-specific	Robert Mason, Mason Real Estate Limited- 987 Gordon Street	Dec. 20, 2021	<p>i. The zoning in the mapping shows as NCC(PA)(H13) whereas in the documentation it shows as NCC-4.</p> <p>ii. The NCC-4 only permits one drive-through facility whereas there are currently two approved drive-through facilities on the site. We have looked at every property in Guelph that has a drive-through, and the proposed zoning has not eliminated, reduced, or modified any of those existing drive-through uses other than for our site. Please see our additional comments on drive-throughs in NCC zones in Section B above. We strongly request that our two existing drive-through facilities be recognized in the NCC-4 (and as a use in the NCC zones) and that any new provisions of this bylaw only relate to new drive-through uses.</p> <p>iii. We have concerns that this property at 11,983 m<sup>2</sup> is far in excess of the maximum lot area permitted in the NCC zone and is capped at 4,400 m<sup>2</sup> of GFA. The Urban Design Concept Plans for the Gordon St Intensification Corridor from 2018 envisioned a multi-</p>	<p>i. The proposed zoning map has been updated to indicate that this property is zoned NCC-4(PA)(H13).</p> <p>ii. The site-specific NCC-4 zone has been updated to recognize the 2 existing drive-throughs on the property.</p> <p>iii. This property is designated as a Neighbourhood Commercial Centre in the City's Official Plan. It is out of scope of the Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review to re-designate this property. This property is located within one of the existing Neighbourhood Commercial Centres (multiple properties at Kortright Road and Gordon Street) that is permitted to have a maximum of 10,000 square metres of commercial gross floor area. The Commercial Policy Review calculated the total commercial gross floor area for individual properties within the NCC designation and the zoning bylaw has been updated to implement those directions. The</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>use building with a heavy residential component at some point in the future on this site. We commented on this study and were not supportive of that design or concept for several reasons; however, the zoning should recognize a more flexible palate of non-commercial uses more sympathetic to long term adaptation of this site and node. Furthermore, it seems as this site would be more appropriately placed in a CMUC zone because of the land size, because its currently functions more as a CMUC site than a NCC site, and its current commercial uses are more compatible with the uses and function of its now CC zoning (compared to the current NC zoning).</p>	<p>proposed zoning bylaw has been updated to permitted 2,570 square metres of commercial gross floor area on this property. This site in combination with 1007, 1027 and 951 Gordon Street make up the neighbourhood commercial centre designation in this area.</p>
259.	Site-specific	Robert Mason, Mason Real Estate Limited- 45 Airpark Place	Dec. 20, 2021	<p>This site has a Committee of Adjustment (C of A) decision on file allowing automotive uses in two of the units in the building and improvements were made to these two units to utilize those additional uses. Please comment on the ability of these uses to</p>	<p>The proposed zoning bylaw does not intend to recognize previously permitted uses approved through a minor variance. Section 1.3.1(c) provides transition provisions related to minor variances. In some cases, existing uses</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>survive rather than becoming legal non-conforming uses. These uses should not be lost or become legal non-conforming only because of the bylaw update. It appears from many of the site specific zones contain uses that were granted in the past, possibly from C of A, that have been brought forward as permitted uses in this review. Please explain how some sites have retained such uses and why it appears that others have not.</p>	<p>permitted through a minor variance may be permitted through the new zoning bylaw if the use aligns with the Official Plan designation.</p> <p>A-35/07- permits vehicle specialty repair and vehicle repair uses at 45 Airpark Place. 45 Airpark Place is proposed to be zoned Industrial (B), which does not outright permit vehicle repair uses. It does not appear that the vehicle repair use is currently operating at this location. No proposed change.</p>
260.	Site-specific	Robert Mason, Mason Real Estate Limited- 590 York Road	Dec. 20, 2021	<p>We have several Committee of Adjustment decisions on file for this property for additional uses. Please review and comment on the ability of these uses to survive rather than becoming legal non-conforming uses. These uses should not be lost or become legal non-conforming only because of the bylaw update. It appears from many of the site specific uses, uses that were granted in the past, possibly from C of A, have been brought forward as permitted uses in this review. Please explain how some sites have retained such uses and why it appears that others have not.</p>	<p>In 2007 a minor variance was granted (A-60/07) to allow an office and fenced storage facility at 590 York Road. The existing site-specific Service Commercial, SC.2-10 does not currently permit a storage facility and office use. The Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review has deleted the site-specific zone and zoned this property the new general Service Commercial (SC) zone, which permits additional service commercial uses. A storage facility is permitted within the SC zone. An office is permitted as a complementary use in the SC zone in accordance with section 4.20.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
261.	Site-specific	Robert Mason, Mason Real Estate Limited- 614 York Road	Dec. 20, 2021	Generally, we are pleased that the city has removed many of the inappropriate specialized service commercial uses with redundant and irrelevant uses. We have a Committee of Adjustment decision on file for this property for a tradespersons shop and a rental outlet. Now that both of those uses are proposed in the SC zone, what happens to this C of A decision and what is the effect?	This property has two approved minor variances to permit a tradesperson's shop and a rental outlet (A-119/02 and A-12/03). The Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review has proposed to zone this property Service Commercial (SC), where both a tradesperson's shop and a rental outlet are permitted. The Committee of Adjustment decisions become redundant when the new zoning bylaw comes into effect.
262.	Site-specific	Scott Hannah, Dra Properties- 200 Edinburgh Road North	Dec. 15, 2021	Place property into standard CC zone. The site is occupied by a mixed-use development, 2 small offices and 2 residential units. The current specialized R.1B-1 zone uses and regulations are virtually carried forward into the new specialized CC-7 convenience commercial zone. However the OP designates the site as Convenience Commercial and it is uniquely located along a major traffic street and near residential areas. This property should be zoned for the full range of convenience commercial uses in keeping with the City's desire to eliminate specialized zones. This would allow a number of uses such as a convenience store, service establishment, take out restaurant or day car within	Property rezoned CC-3 to permit general CC zones and recognize existing office use on the property.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				walking distance of many residential areas without the need for a use variance. The existing offices would become legal non-conforming, but the use of the CC zone would allow future transition to the other uses allowed by the CC Zone without the need for further planning approvals.	
263.	Site-specific	Ian Panabaker, Wood Development Group- 64 Duke / 69 Huron / 45 Elizabeth Street	Dec. 20, 2021	<p>In general the proposed zoning reflects the Downtown Secondary Plan overlay and Master Plan requirements and is an improvement from the historic 'H' zones established in the 1990s. Our own Master Plan process will be establishing new specialised zones in any case. What is proposed opens up more uses and built form possibilities and doesn't remove any permissions.</p> <p>ISSUES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RM.7 Correction -- Zone RM.7 needs to be corrected to RM.6 (Medium Density Residential as confirmed by Abby)</li> <li>• Mapping of H5 – this needs to be applied to NP – Neighbourhood Park as these lands also don't become public park until the master plan is completed.</li> <li>• Building Heights in RL.4 and RM.6 don't reflect Downtown Secondary Plan Schedule D heights:</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RM.7 corrected to RM.6</li> <li>• Mapping of H5 updated</li> <li>• Building Heights in RL.4 and RM.6 don't reflect Downtown Secondary Plan Schedule D heights as they are based on the residential designations applied city wide</li> <li>• See Statutory Public Meeting Staff Report (July 13, 2022) for more information related to the two year moratorium.</li> </ul>

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				<p>o RL.4 is limited to 3 storeys while the DSP allows 2-4 storeys</p> <p>o RM.6 is limited to 4 storeys while the DSP allows 4-8 storeys</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (H5) – with the new holding provision it includes capping of additions to 10m<sup>2</sup> and façade improvements only, which is an additional limit that was not present in the current (H3). While we understand this copies the language from 'H13' used throughout the proposed zoning by-law as an intensification control – this site will not accept this language where none existed before and it is made redundant in that 'H5' itself requires a Municipal Servicing study before intensification.</li> <li>• Ability to Amend the By-law -- This site needs to be exempted from any consideration of the 2-year prohibition on by-law amendments. The Urban Design Master Plan will cause new zoning to be adopted.</li> <li>o We would suggest a general exception for the proposed by-law: "All areas identified in the Zoning By-law as requiring 'Urban Design Master Plans' are excluded from the two year amendment prohibition."</li> </ul>	
264.	Site-specific	Chris Corosky,	Dec. 20, 2021	Request that this site be zoned UR to reflect the existing	The vacant site has been rezoned UR.1.

No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
		Armel- 3 Elmira Road South		characteristics of the site. The vacant site is currently zoned P.1 to reflect the restricted present development potential of the site given its size and topography. The proposed new zone is CMUC-13(PA)(H13).	
265.	Site-specific	Chris Corosky, Armel- 511 Whitelaw and 0 Fife Road	Dec. 20, 2021	Request that these sites be zoned to permit on-street and/or cluster townhouses. They are currently zoned UR and the proposed new zoning is for singles and semi-detached.	Site-specific zoning requests are out of the scope of this project. This site has been zoned RL.2 in line with the adjacent properties.
266.	Site-specific	Harry Bakker, University of Guelph- 127 Stone Road West	Jan. 14, 2022	The proposed MUC-4(PA)(H13) Zone for the Canadian Tire site should remove the Holding and (PA) and maintain the same wording as the current by-law in the new by-law.	Existing SC.1-52 carried forward in MUC-4 zone to recognize OMB decision. (PA) and (H13) have been deleted as the site-specific zone does not permit any additional intensification on the property.
267.	Site-specific	David Bernstein- 31 Glasgow Street North	Jan. 20, 2022	I was anticipating and hoping that the new by-law would to the best extent possible reflect the actual circumstance of my property and my neighbours' properties. I don't believe that the designation of RL.1 does that. I respectfully suggest that either RL.3 or RL.4 is a better reflection of the status quo and will reduce the extent of any existing nonconformity.	The proposed zoning bylaw mapping has been reviewed to zone existing row houses in the older built-up area RL.3.
268.	Site-specific	Ben Jones, Fusion	Jan. 16, 2022	18.1.18, 18.1.19- This area of John Brabson Crescent consists of semi detached units. Setback for RL.1 zone is 1.5m which does not work with the approved (and	Properties updated to RL.2-18 and RL.2-19.



No.	Theme	Name/ Address	Date	Comment	Staff response
				registered) lot fabric. Change to RL.2-19.	
269.	Site-specific	Brandon Flewwelling, GSP Group, Debrob Investments Ltd.- 55 & 75 Cityview Drive	Jan. 17, 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lots adjacent to Keating Street that back onto the natural heritage area are currently zoned R.1C-27. The new by-law proposes to zone these lots in two separate zones: RL.2-4, which is similar to the current R.1C-27 zone, and RL.4-5, which is a zone that is proposed to apply to higher density blocks. We are not sure where the RL.4-5 upzoning has come from. It appears the proper zone for this entire block should be RL.2-4.</li>   <li>• With the exception of the above, the majority of the lands currently zoned R.1C-27 are proposed to be zoned RL.2-4. One block located east of Everton Drive and south of Silurian Drive is proposed to be zoned RL.2-2. This different site-specific exception contains provisions related to underground infiltration galleries and does not include the reduced front yard setback provision of exception 27 in the current by-law and exception 4 in the proposed by-law. It appears the proper zone for this block should be RL.2-4.</li> </ul>	Mapping errors have been updated.