

## Attachment 4 – Phase 4 Council and Community Feedback Staff Response Chart

**Table 1: Phase 4 Council Feedback**

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/Date	Comment	Staff Response
1.	Accessibility	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	Consideration for the Zoning Bylaw to be reviewed by the Accessibility Advisory Committee (AAC).	The AAC was consulted in December 2021 and provided an update on February 21, 2023. Revisions have been made to driveway width regulations and parking rates in the parking adjustment (PA) areas to address AAC's comments. Planning staff have worked with the City's accessibility staff throughout the project.
2.	Accessibility	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	Consideration for accessibility standards to go above and beyond what is proposed in the draft Zoning Bylaw.	The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) provides a provincial standard. The minimum requirements of the AODA have been incorporated into the Bylaw. Based on data collected through the parking utilization studies, accessible parking was not constrained at the studied sites. It is difficult to require additional

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/Date	Comment	Staff Response
					parking above the Provincial legislation requirements. This is a minimum requirement; more parking can be provided by the developer/property owner.
3.	Bicycle parking	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	Has staff collected data on how many bicycle spaces are used, as it's required as part of Site Plan, especially for commercial and industrial zones. Is there some justification aside from the long-term vision?	<p>Staff do not currently do site inspections after occupancy due to staffing capacity. Conducting an off-site bike parking study could be part of the scope of the Cycling Master Plan update but the scope has not yet been defined (update to start in 2024).</p> <p>The Transportation Master Plan provides direction to establish minimum bicycle parking standards in the Zoning Bylaw:  "3.1.4. The City will use the Zoning Bylaw to establish minimum provisions for on-site bicycle parking and storage of bicycles and other personal transportation devices for new developments."  And</p>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					<p>“3.1.5. The City will develop a strategy to address end-of-trip facilities throughout the City at existing developments when it updates the Cycling Master Plan.”</p> <p>Justification aside from the long-term vision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• End of trip facilities are essential to supporting and encouraging trips by bike</li> <li>• Equity considerations: ability to travel by all modes to any place in the city (Strategic Plan and TMP alignment)</li> <li>• City can’t force private property owners to include bicycle parking post-development application. This is our opportunity to have it included.</li> <li>• When parking isn’t provided, people who choose to bike end up bringing the bike indoors and obstructing entrances, hallways, or having to</li> </ul>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					find informal places to store it. This is a barrier to using this form of transportation.
4.	Definitions	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	Concerned the differentiation between a primary unit with an additional dwelling unit and a small apartment building is not clear. Consideration for revising the definitions for clarity.	<p>Additional residential dwelling units (ARDU) are accessory to the primary dwelling, smaller in size, with a maximum number of bedrooms and interior access required between units. Parking for ARDU's can also be stacked.</p> <p>Dwelling units within an apartment building or triplex are self-contained units that function independently. There are options for tenure of these units, either rental or individual ownership. Individual access to parking spaces is required for this type of development.</p> <p>Both housing types are permitted in the proposed low density residential RL.1 and RL.2 zones.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
5.	Driveway width	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	That staff consider formalizing the current position on Driveway Parking/Enforcement on semi-detached and on-street townhomes in the final recommendation report of the comprehensive zoning by-law. That any residential driveway is no wider than five (5) metres; no impact on lot drainage; That no hard surface shall be located closer than the 1.5 metres setback from a municipally owned or boundary tree and not incur loss or damage to the tree; That the remaining front yard, excepting the driveway (residential) shall be landscaped and no parking is occurring within this landscaped open space; That the boulevard portion of the driveway (residential) does not exceed 3.5 metres, and that City-owned water shut-off valves shall not be located within any portion of the driveway that exceeds the Zoning Bylaw sections as listed above.	Staff are not recommending formalizing the current driveway exemption in the proposed Zoning Bylaw. Refer to Attachment 6 of the staff report– Driveway Width Review and Zoning Bylaw Recommendations for more information.
6.	Driveway width	Council	Statutory Public Meeting	Concerned there has been no discussion on driveway width vs curb-cut width.	Curb cuts are not regulated by the Zoning Bylaw.

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
			July 13, 2022	Consideration for curb-cut widths to be different. Important to address the lack of parking and does not think driveway expansion will greatly impact stormwater/climate issues, but will impact the multi-generational homes, and commuting for residents.	<p>Allowing narrow curb cuts with wider driveways will not solve the issue. Boulevard widths vary in size on different streets within the city and some streets do not have a boulevard or sidewalk. Greenspace is still required on private property to provide space to plant a tree and manage stormwater on site.</p> <p>Refer to Attachment 6 of the staff report– Driveway Width Review and Zoning Bylaw Recommendations.</p>
7.	Driveway width	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	This is a political issue – it should be removed from the process and decided independently.	Driveway width regulations are within the scope of the Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review.
8.	Driveway width	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	Consideration for a minimum greenspace required.	Regulating the width of driveways as a percentage of the lot frontage ensures that the remaining portion of the front yard is greenspace. In some cases, minimum landscaped open space has been added to low

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					density residential zones (RL.1 and RL.2) to ensure a minimum amount of landscaped area is provided for the entire lot. This is to address parking areas in rear yards for apartment buildings and triplexes and ensure trees can be planted and stormwater can be managed on site.
9.	Driveway width	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	That staff consider the following: under General provisions - Maximum residential Driveway widths "To amend 5.11.3 b) Despite section 5.11.3 (a) a surfaced walkway within 1.5m of the nearest foundation wall is permitted providing that is it not used for parking TO REMOVE "providing that it is not used for parking".	Staff are not recommending that the regulation be revised to allow parking on the walkway. Refer to Attachment 6 of the staff report – Driveway Width Review and Zoning Bylaw Recommendations for more information. An illustration has been provided to demonstrate how this regulation is applied to a property.
10.	Garage projection	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	That staff consider eliminating restrictions on garage projections described in section 5.11.2 - Garage location and the requirement to have a roofed porch for a garage projecting a maximum of 2	Staff are not recommending removal of the garage location requirements. Official Plan Policy 8.3.5 provides specific direction for the Zoning Bylaw: "To ensure

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				metres. This is too prescriptive. Let the market dictate this.	<p>garages do not dominate the streetscape in new development and to promote “eyes on the street” the Zoning By-law shall limit their width such that garages do not generally exceed half the width of the house. Furthermore, the Zoning By-law shall limit garage door projection so that most garage doors are recessed and do not project ahead of the front wall of the house.”</p> <p>This is a current regulation in the 1995 Zoning Bylaw for the older built-up area (map 66). The proposed Zoning Bylaw expands this regulation city-wide.</p> <p>No proposed change.</p>
11.	Home occupation	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	<p>Consider more permissive provisions for home based businesses to reflect post-pandemic work-life.</p> <p>Why are home occupations excluded from garages, etc?</p>	An attached garage typically provides the off-street parking space for a dwelling. Permitting a home occupation within an attached garage would remove a parking space for the dwelling.



No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					<p>Throughout the Zoning Bylaw Review Staff have heard from the community that additional parking space is generally required. Staff are not recommending that home occupations be permitted in an attached garage for this reason.</p> <p>Revisions have been made to the home occupation provisions to allow a home occupation to occupy an accessory building or structure and an additional residential dwelling unit. Refer to section 4.15 of the proposed Zoning Bylaw.</p>
12.	3 Unit as-of-right permissions on residential lots	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	Concerned that we need to identify the clear goals of inclusionary zoning, and what the impact of accessory units are. How will this address density and amenities (or lack thereof) and correct historical oversights?	<p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw removes exclusionary zoning practices in Guelph.</p> <p>Traditional low density residential lots are now permitted a variety of building types including single and semi-detached dwellings, duplexes, on-street townhouses, small apartment buildings and</p>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					<p>additional residential units. This is in line with Official Plan policies for low density residential areas.</p> <p>This will allow a range and mix of housing types and densities within existing and proposed residential neighbourhoods.</p>
13.	3 Unit as-of-right permissions on residential lots	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	Concerned that 3 units is not enough, should encourage more gentle density.	<p>Residential intensification and density was reviewed through Official Plan Amendment 80 (OPA 80) which updated the Official Plan to conform with the Provincial Growth Plan.</p> <p>OPA 80 amended the density permission on collector and arterial roads within low density residential areas. These permissions will allow additional density. Once OPA 80 comes into effect, the new Zoning Bylaw will be updated within a year.</p> <p>As of right permission for 3 units aligns with Provincial legislation (Bill</p>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					<p>108 and 23) and the Additional Residential Review that staff completed in 2020.</p> <p>The low density residential Official Plan designation permits a maximum 35 units per hectare. Three units would likely exceed this density on most standard residential lots.</p> <p>Through the Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review, 3-Unit Demonstrations Plans have been created to illustrate how additional units can be accommodated on standard residential lots and to test the zoning regulations. These plans demonstrate that a standard residential lot is at full build out with 3 units. This is largely due to the parking requirement of 1 parking space per unit. To consider increasing beyond 3 units, a parking exemption would need to</p>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					<p>be implemented. Further, these demonstration plans indicate that limited landscaped open space can be provided, impacting stormwater management.</p> <p>See Attachment 11, 12 and 13 for zoning review and recommendations.</p>
14.	Minor variances	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	Can we carry forward the previous variances into the new bylaw?	<p>Transition provisions have been provided for existing minor variances in section 1.3.1(c) of the proposed Zoning Bylaw. These provisions provide a two-year transition period for minor variances from the 1995 Zoning Bylaw to obtain a building permit.</p> <p>Existing minor variances are not proposed to be carried forward indefinitely.</p>
15.	Natural Heritage System	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	Motion - That staff consider the following change: 13.3 Regulations for natural heritage system zone (a) Despite Section 4.2 urban agriculture shall not be	Conservation use is defined in the proposed zoning bylaw and is a permitted use in the NHS zone. Conservation use and legally existing uses, buildings and structures

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/Date	Comment	Staff Response
				<p>permitted within the natural heritage system (NHS) zone.</p> <p>(b) Trails and pathways, including pedestrian bridges and boardwalks, are permitted as a Conservation use within the natural heritage system (NHS) zone.</p>	<p>are the only permitted uses in the NHS zone. This aligns with Natural Heritage System policies of the Official Plan.</p> <p>Any new trails and pathways including pedestrian bridges and boardwalks will need to be reviewed to determine if it meets the intent of "conservation use" to ensure there is no negative impact to the Natural Heritage System. Adding the proposed wording would permit pedestrian bridges and boardwalks as of right, without an understanding of the type of structure and construction that it would permit, which could have negative impacts to the Natural Heritage System. This is not in line with the NHS policies of the Official Plan.</p> <p>No proposed change.</p>
16.	Natural Heritage System	Council	Statutory Public Meeting	Allow bridges and boardwalks to be building in floodplains/NHS.	See staff response in Row 15.

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
			July 13, 2022		
17.	Natural Heritage System	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	Clarification on why urban agriculture is not permitted in the NHS. Concerned as Guelph is a bee city and would have no issue with some form of agriculture in the NHS.	As defined in the proposed Zoning Bylaw, Urban Agriculture includes the growing of small-scale crops, community gardens and backyard chickens. These activities represent an impact to the NHS as they require the removal of natural vegetation and continued disturbance and are therefore not supported by NHS policy. Additionally, native plants including trees, shrubs and wildflowers support pollinators, including bees, to a significantly greater degree than crops and community gardens which are mainly comprised of non-native vegetation. The preservation and enhancement of native vegetation is highlighted in the Bee City designation criteria.
18.	Parking	Council	Statutory Public Meeting	Request that staff consider private/public collective	Staff recommend that this be investigated through the city-wide parking

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
			July 13, 2022	parking, rather than parking in front of their unit.	review, a recommendation of the Transportation Master Plan. Refer to Attachment 6- Driveway width review and zoning bylaw recommendations for more information.
19.	Parking	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	I would like to see city-wide parking regulation, though not necessarily for Planning staff to address now.	A city-wide parking review was identified as an action in the Transportation Master Plan.  Refer to Attachment 6- Driveway width review and zoning bylaw recommendations for more information.
20.	Parking	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	That staff give consideration in the final recommendation report of the comprehensive zoning by-law that would remove the PA (Parking adjustment) in the strategic growth areas on Gordon Street from Stone Road to Vaughan Street and consider leaving the parking ratio as is.	Staff are not recommending that the parking adjustment (PA) area within the Gordon Street strategic growth area be removed. Refer to Attachment 7 - Parking Standards Review and Zoning Bylaw Recommendations for more information.
21.	Parking	Council	Statutory Public	Requests the zoning bylaw maintain parking ratios along	Staff are not recommending that the

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
			Meeting July 13, 2022	<p>Gordon between Stone and Vaughan. Parking ranked last in our Guelph satisfaction survey in 2019.</p> <p>Staff to consider conducting an updated off-street parking study for multiple residential (that was done in 2019), include developments that are larger and potentially in the intensification corridor, because the IBI 2019 parking study did not include tall buildings.</p> <p>Concerned that reduced parking minimums are restrictive for veterinarian and medical uses.</p>	<p>parking adjustment (PA) area within the Gordon Street strategic growth area be removed.</p> <p>BA Group was retained to conduct an additional parking utilization survey in 2022-2023 to supplement the data collected in 2019. The 2022 parking utilization surveys were conducted primarily along the Gordon Street corridor and included newer completed developments.</p> <p>Refer to Attachment 7 - Parking Standards Review and Zoning Bylaw Recommendations and Attachment 8- Guelph Parking Standards Review- Update Memorandum for more information.</p>
22.	Parking	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	Concerned that parking is a political issue – parking should be removed from the process and decided independently.	<p>Parking is within the scope of the Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review.</p> <p>Section 34(1).6 of the Planning Act provides</p>



No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					authority for a Zoning Bylaw to regulate parking.
23.	Shipping container	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	<p>Clarification on similar uses (i.e. semi-truck/shipping container). Concern for size and number of containers per lot.</p> <p>Consideration for non-heated/plumbing shipping containers to potentially bypass development applications or building permits.</p>	<p>A shipping container definition has been added to the proposed Zoning Bylaw and the maximum number of shipping containers permitted on a lot has been removed.</p> <p>Refer to Attachment 9- Shipping Container Review and Zoning Bylaw recommendations for more information.</p> <p>Information related to the Ontario Building Code can be found in section 6 of Attachment 9.</p>
24.	Shipping container	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	<p>Concerned about health, safety, security, policing, and accessibility for emergency services re. shipping containers. Are there density issues when shipping containers are converted to a faux building? Clarity on storage vs shipping in definition, and 1 container per .4 hectare.</p>	<p>Proposed shipping container regulations refer to the outdoor storage area requirements, ensuring that shipping containers are located in rear and side yards, are visually screened from neighbouring properties, and are located outside of buffer strips, natural areas, parking spaces and fire routes.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					<p>Shipping containers converted to buildings, or in accordance with the criteria outlined in Section 6 of Attachment 9, would be regulated under the Ontario Building Code</p> <p>Refer to Attachment 9- Shipping Container Review and Zoning Bylaw Recommendations for more information.</p>
25.	Shipping container	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	Have staff given consideration to shipping container use for architectural installation in a building, like Stackt in Toronto?	The proposed Zoning Bylaw includes a provision that if a shipping container is used as a building material, it will be reviewed through the Ontario Building Code by way of a permit and a development application- see section 4.27(d) of the proposed Zoning Bylaw.
26.	Shipping container	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	<p>Questioning the process of legal non-conforming status for existing shipping containers.</p> <p>Request that staff look into how we can address or accommodate existing situations that are inconsistent</p>	<p>Section 1.4.1 of the proposed Zoning Bylaw provides permission for legal non-conforming uses.</p> <p>The existing Zoning Bylaw (1995)-14864 permits the</p>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				with the objectives of the bylaw.	use of shipping containers as storage in the industrial B.1 and B.2 zones.
27.	Shipping container	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	<p>That staff consider increasing or removing the cap on the number of shipping containers permitted in commercial and industrial zones.</p> <p>Is there a way we could have a permit system where fees are collected, rather than going through the development review/building permit process.</p>	<p>Refer to Attachment 9- Shipping Container Review and Zoning Bylaw Recommendations for more information.</p> <p>The development review and building permit processes are regulated by Provincial legislation (Planning Act and Ontario Building Code Act). When required, these processes cannot be by-passed.</p>
28.	Shipping container	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	Consideration for shipping containers to be regulated like outdoor storage.	<p>Staff are recommending that shipping containers be regulated in accordance with the outdoor storage area regulations.</p> <p>Refer to Attachment 9- Shipping Container Review and Zoning Bylaw recommendations for more information.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
29.	Site-specific- Jeffery Drive	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	Consideration for a site-specific allowance for homes on Jeffery Dr (facing Eastview), to allow for a rear yard fence, whereas the bylaw currently does not permit it.	<p>Site-specific requests are not within the scope of the Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review</p> <p>The on-street townhouses along Jeffrey Drive, facing Eastview Road, were designed to be through lots with two front yards. The townhouses have a front door and walkway connecting them to Eastview Road.</p>
30.	Supportive housing	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	That staff consider including a review of "as of right permissions" for supportive and affordable housing in the zoning bylaw through the 2023 Affordable Housing Review Project.	<p>Staff are recommending as-of-right permission for supportive housing where residential uses are permitted and where access to community facilities are provided in mixed-use areas of the city.</p> <p>Refer to Attachment 10 – Supportive Housing Review and Zoning Bylaw Recommendations for more information. Affordable housing will be reviewed through the Affordable Housing Strategy update in 2023/24 and zoning</p>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					recommendations from the strategy will be incorporated into the zoning bylaw as a future amendment.
31.	3-Unit urban design guidelines	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	What urban design guidelines/built form standards will be guiding 3 unit apartments?	3-Unit Demonstration Plans have been developed to offer a range of high-quality and feasible architectural plans that are cognizant of proposed zoning regulations, existing neighbourhood compatibility, technical site planning requirements and the need for accessible units in the city. Refer to Attachment 11 for 3-Unit Review and Zoning Bylaw Recommendations and Attachment 12 for 3-Unit Demonstration Plans.
32.	First storey transparency	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	Consideration that staff consult with commercial owners regarding glazing requirements. Is this limiting what can be put in the building (for example, placement of a kitchen) because of these requirements?	Commercial glazing requirements were studied and recommended as part of the Commercial Built Form Standards (CBFS) review.

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					<p>While interior layout is not something Planning can regulate, the commercial built form standards did review and consider this issue and ensure that clear glazing standards will work with interior layouts generally (<a href="#">see page 34</a>). The CBFS recommended including this requirement in the Zoning Bylaw when facing an arterial road, collector road or a main street. Commercial businesses were engaged through the CBFS process as well a retail consultant.</p> <p>Since this time Bill 23 has come into effect which limits the scope of site plan approval. Staff are recommending that this regulation be expanded modestly to also apply (at a reduced rate) to the SC zone.</p>
33.	Additional residential dwelling units	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	Consideration for changing the provisions that limit basement dwellings, from 2 bedrooms to 3 bedrooms.	In the Additional Residential Unit Review (2020), Staff recommended that the maximum number of

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					<p>bedrooms be increased from two bedrooms to three bedrooms for a unit located within the primary dwelling. Council amended the proposed bylaw to reduce the number of bedrooms to two.</p> <p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw has been amended to allow additional residential dwelling units located in a basement to have 3 bedrooms.</p>
34.	Other	Council	Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	Consideration for adding a preamble in the zoning bylaw so residents have context.	A preamble will be provided on the City's Zoning Bylaw webpage once the new Zoning Bylaw is in effect. This will assist the public in understanding how to use the Zoning Bylaw.

**Table 2: Phase 4 Community Feedback**

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
35.	Active Transportation	Anonymous	Public Open House July 6, 2022	Include more active transportation.	Comment noted.
36.	Active Transportation	Anonymous	Public Open House July 6, 2022	Build for: 1. Pedestrians 2. Active Transportation 3. Transit 4. Cars in this order of priority.	Comment noted.
37.	Bicycle Parking	Ruchika Angrish, Upper Grand District School Board	Email and virtual meeting August 3, 2022	Concerns about the 4% bicycle parking requirement and clarity regarding whether schools require short or long term bicycle parking.	<p>Clarification provided that 4% of the required parking is required for both short term and long term bicycle parking spaces.</p> <p>The proposed zoning bylaw includes bicycle parking space regulations in section 5.8. 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</p>



No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					also align with the recently approved Transportation Master Plan.
38.	Bicycle Parking	Anonymous	Public Open House July 6, 2022	Make secure bicycle parking mandatory.	The proposed zoning bylaw includes bicycle parking space regulations for secure parking in section 5.8.
39.	Bicycle Parking	Anonymous	Public Open House July 6, 2022	Require bicycle parking.	The proposed zoning bylaw includes bicycle parking space regulations in section 5.8.
40.	Commercial uses in residential neighbourhoods	Mike Marcolongo	Email October 28, 2022	<p>The challenge of course with the current zoning approach to residential character commercial buildings (also known colloquially as "front-lawn businesses") is two-fold:</p> <p>1) It's not a proactive approach to zoning and continues the tradition of exclusionary zoning by not listing potential permissive uses for residential character commercial spaces. As I noted in my original email, the City of Hamilton (as one example) provides us with a best practice with this type of circumstance.</p>	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	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				<p>2) It misses an opportunity to encourage the redevelopment of these properties that will result in more walkable communities, revitalized and more animated street corners. The current approach also introduces significant red tape for property owners who wish to revert the use back to a commercial setting (i.e. having to go to the Committee of Adjustment for a change of use).</p>	<p>The non-residential uses in residential designations policies of the Official Plan (9.3.1.2) speak to preserving the amenities of residential neighbourhoods and locating them on arterial or collector roads. This Official Plan policy would need to be revised to outright permit commercial uses within residential neighbourhoods on local streets. This could be investigated through a future Commercial Policy Review. The previous Commercial Policy Review looked at maintaining neighbourhood commercial areas within walking distance from residential to retain this level of commercial uses and prevent conversion.</p> <p>A project postcard was mailed to every property in the city to advise residents of the zoning bylaw review. This issue</p>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					was not raised by property owners.
41.	Electric vehicle parking	Ruchika Angrish, Upper Grand District School Board	Email + Virtual Meeting August 3, 2022	<p>Clarity requested on electric vehicle requirements for schools that include: electric vehicle parking spaces and designed electric vehicle parking spaces.</p> <p>For any of our properties that are legal non-complying uses, will we have to comply with new zone provisions when applying for additions/portables to existing schools?</p>	<p>Electric vehicle parking space 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 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.</p> <p>Existing developments that do not meet the proposed regulations will be considered legal non-complying under section</p>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					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. 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.
42.	Mapping	Paul Kraehling, University of Guelph	Email July 13, 2022	The city storm water management ponds are zoned sometimes as Open Space and other times as Natural Heritage System; don't understand the distinctions and inconsistencies; the large property on Niska at Pioneer is 'not zoned' - Why?	Stormwater management areas identified as Restoration Areas of the Natural Heritage System on Schedule 4 of the Official Plan have been included in the Natural Heritage System zone. All other stormwater management areas have been included in the Open Space zone.  Mapping has been updated regarding the large property at Niska at Pioneer.
43.	Natural Heritage System	Hugh Whiteley	Email July 7, 2022	Concerned regarding the proposed NHS zone definition.	In one-zone areas, the entire regulated

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				<p>It says this zone applies (1) to lands designated as significant natural areas and natural areas and (2) to the floodway portion of the regulatory floodplain in the Official Plan. I understand that in the portions of the Speed and Eramosa River valley that have two-zone floodplain designation the portion of the regulatory floodplain that is the hydraulic floodway is mapped in the Official Plan and thus the area to be zoned (NHS) is clearly identified. I am not clear on what portion of the regulatory floodplain should be zoned (NHS) in the one-zone portions of the Speed and Eramosa river valleys or the valleys of tributaries to the Speed and Eramosa Rivers. Please explain how (NHS) zoning applies to one-zone floodplain portions of river and tributary valleys. In particular is the whole floodplain considered a hydraulic floodway in one-zone areas?</p>	<p>floodplain is the hydraulic floodway. Therefore, in one-zone areas the entire regulated floodplain should be zoned NHS in the proposed new Zoning By-law. The draft Zoning By-law mapping (July 2022) inadvertently did not include the portions of the one-zone floodway and two-zone floodway that are located outside of Significant Natural Areas and Natural Areas within the NHS zone. This has been corrected.</p>
44.	Natural Heritage System	Hugh Whiteley	Delegate, Statutory Public Meeting	<p>Requests two changes to the CZBL: 1. Section 13.1: to add a</p>	<p>1.This request has been considered and language has been updated to align</p>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
			July 13, 2022	<p>phrase to the purpose of the NHS zone - the purpose of this zone is to protect natural heritage features and areas and provide visual and physical access to nature and prohibit new development in the floodway.</p> <p>2. Section 13.1: Add the phrase "trails and pathways, including pedestrian bridges and boardwalks, are permitted as a conservation use within the natural heritage system zone."</p>	<p>with Section 4.1, Natural Heritage System section of the Official Plan.</p> <p>2. Conservation use is defined in the proposed Zoning Bylaw and is a permitted use in the NHS zone. Conservation use and legally existing uses, buildings and structures are the only permitted uses in the NHS zone. This aligns with Natural Heritage System policies of the Official Plan.</p> <p>Any new trails and pathways including pedestrian bridges and boardwalks will need to be reviewed to determine if it meets the intent of "conservation use" to ensure there is no negative impact to the Natural Heritage System. Adding the proposed wording would permit pedestrian bridges and boardwalks outright, without an understanding of the type of structure and construction that it would permit, which could</p>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					have negative impacts to the Natural Heritage System.
45.	Natural Heritage System	John Fisher, Guelph Hiking Trail Club	Email July 15, 2022	Support for Hugh Whiteley's delegation to council in regard to the Natural Heritage System be included in the Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw.  Provide residents with access to the river corridors, trails and open spaces, including maintenance of existing and future trails, boardwalks and bridges, provided they protect natural features.	See staff response in Row 44.
46.	Natural Heritage System	Anonymous	Public Open House July 6, 2022	Protect Natural Areas from encroachment.	The Natural Heritage System is being zoned in the proposed Zoning Bylaw and the only permitted uses are conservation use (as defined) and legally existing uses, buildings and structures. No development is permitted within the NHS zone.
47.	Natural Heritage System	Anonymous	Public Open House July 6, 2022	Identify Indigenous "wayfinding" marker trees for protection.	This is outside the scope of the Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review.

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
48.	Parking	Chris and Anne Marie Doyle	Email July 10, 2022	Concern for reducing parking minimums. Any suggestion to “reduce parking minimums for high intensity buildings” should be treated as reckless to the safety and well-being of the community. So please don’t even consider it.	<p>Staff are not recommending changes to the parking rates proposed in the draft Zoning Bylaw (released July 2022).</p> <p>Parking rates have been developed based on observed parking demand through parking studies conducted by IBI Group (2019) and an updated off-street parking survey conducted by BA Group (2023), as well as the findings of the land use policy review, interjurisdictional best practices, and consideration of ITE parking rates.</p> <p>Refer to Attachment 7- Parking Standards Review and Zoning Bylaw Recommendations for more information.</p>
49.	Parking	Anonymous	Public Open House July 6, 2022	Remove parking minimums for cars and enforce maximums for cars.	See staff response in Row 48.
50.	Parking	Erin Caton	Delegate, Statutory	Highlighted the need for increased accessible parking	Accessible parking rates were updated to meet



No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
			Public Meeting July 13, 2022	as the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) standards are not enough. They also commented that there is a need for increased accessible parking as the disabled population far outweighs the minimums. It was noted that the City's local transit and cycling infrastructure is not there yet, and that transit is not accessible to all types of disabilities and people need to see specialists in other cities.	AODA requirements in (July 2022 draft) and the proposed Zoning Bylaw has been revised to ensure that accessible parking space requirements are not reduced within the parking adjustment (PA) areas of the city, meaning the number of accessible parking spaces required for development is consistent across the city.  Refer to Attachment 7- Parking Standards Review and Zoning Bylaw Recommendations for more information.
51.	Residential zones	Anonymous	Public Open House July 6, 2022	Eliminate exclusionary zoning except perhaps for heritage districts.	Section 6 of the proposed Zoning Bylaw outlines permitted uses for residential zones. The low density RL.1 and RL.2 zones permit single detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings and duplex dwellings, as well as small apartment buildings and on-street townhouses (up to 3 units). These new permissions assist in

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					eliminating exclusionary zoning in Guelph.
52.	Residential zones	Anonymous	Public Open House July 6, 2022	Concern for overly prescriptive residential provisions. Eliminate restrictions unless based on safety.	The proposed Zoning Bylaw pre-zones sites for maximum height and density permitted in the Official Plan. In doing so, existing regulations have been reviewed and built form standards have been included to ensure buildings have a positive impact on neighbouring properties and fit within the context of the streetscape. In some cases, regulations have been deleted from residential zones, for example, additional setbacks are no longer required for the third storey of a single detached dwelling.
53.	Shipping Container	Anonymous	Public Open House July 6, 2022	Theft is a big problem for local businesses. Shipping containers are used to mitigate this. This will create barriers for attracting new business in Guelph.	Staff are recommending changes to the draft shipping container regulations.  Refer to Attachment 9- Shipping Container Review and Zoning Bylaw

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					Recommendations for more information.
54.	Shipping Container	Harry Oussoren	Delegate, Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	<p>Concerned that regulating shipping containers will hurt small businesses who use them for cost-effective storage and may discourage businesses from coming to town.</p> <p>Consideration for the use of shipping containers to be permitted, granted with some controls.</p>	See staff response in Row 53.
55.	Shipping Container	Morgan Danny	Delegate, Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	Concerned that, in the City's effort to meet our net-zero targets, regulating shipping containers will limit the number of contractors able to store material in Guelph to complete the necessary retrofits.	See staff response in Row 53.
56.	Shipping Container	Sharron St-Croix, Rider Training Institute 15 Malcolm Road	Email July 7, 2022	Concerns the proposed shipping container regulations may compromise ability to maintain operations in the city. We are hopeful that our current storage facility meets current zoning permissions, and therefore be eligible for legal non-conforming status. We respectfully request that the property at 15 Malcolm Rd	<p>See staff response in Row 53.</p> <p>Legally existing uses and structures that do not meet the proposed regulations will be considered legal non-complying under section 1.4 of the bylaw, which allows the use/structures</p>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				be reviewed to confirm that the site meets current zoning permissions. Please consider extending the compliance deadline for businesses affected by the proposed amendment.	to continue to exist. Any new additions or changes would need to comply with new regulations.
57.	Shipping Container	Robert Mason, Mason Real Estate Ltd 32 Douglas Street	Email July 7, 2022	Shipping container language is overly restrictive, arbitrary, and punitive. Many businesses rely on shipping containers as a substitute, or a complement to their main business location. Concerned that more regulation isn't necessary particularly in the industrial and service commercial zones where multiple storage containers on smaller lots are utilized. Shipping containers are utilized to securely store machinery, goods, or inventory and to prevent theft. Concerned of second draft changes that further restrict their usage to the primary use in an on-site building. Clarity as to why shipping containers need to be addressed at this time, and why the proposed rules only allow shipping containers to be placed on sites greater than 0.4 hectares (1 acre) and	See staff response in Row 53.

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				<p>capped out at 4 regardless of the land parcel size. Restricting or eliminating the use of shipping containers now does not offer a solution to those currently using shipping containers as a critical component for operating their businesses. The city needs to provide those businesses making use of shipping containers reasonable and objective answers (and alternatives) to their continued use, in particular because of the rapid major changes and upheavals most businesses have faced over the past two years of the pandemic. Targeted communication and broad consultation on this specific issue may be necessary.</p>	
58.	Shipping Container	Chris Parsons, Parsons Maintenance 101 Beverley Street	Email July 8, 2022	I strongly oppose shipping container regulations. Please do not move forward with this as it will cause a severe hardship for many businesses and business owners including myself. I own and operate a small contracting business, Parsons Maintenance, based in the city of Guelph. Due to the ever increasing costs of	See staff response in Row 53.

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				commercial rent in Guelph it is impossible to rent an affordable shop/warehouse space for my business as storage for our tools, supplies and equipment while still remaining competitive and fair to our customers with regards to pricing. For the last 4 years I have rented 3 sea containers from Craig Dool Property Maintenance at 101 Beverley St. Guelph. This has allowed me to have secure storage for all the supplies and equipment that I need to run my business and to have access to it whenever I need. Having these sea containers allows small businesses like mine to continue operating. These sea containers are essential to my business. Without this storage option, I will have no choice but to either shut down my business and/or move out of the city of Guelph.	
59.	Shipping Container	James Steeds, 120 Dawson Road	Email July 7, 2022	Concern for proposed shipping container restrictions for businesses. If passed it would be extremely detrimental to local manufacturing and construction businesses, hindering our ability to supply	See staff response in Row 53.

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				<p>them as an electrical parts distributor. Supply chain issues have given us no choice but to take on more inventory than ever to mitigate the lengthy lead times of crucial materials. Taking away this needed storage would disrupt the supply to important businesses such as Linamar and Skyjack who rely heavily on us. So please reconsider this because it will impact all of us.</p>	
60.	Shipping Container	Darren Strachan, Acorn Waste	Email July 8 and 13, 2022	<p>Strongly opposed to the shipping container provisions and the limited time and outreach to small businesses provided by staff. Sea Cans have blended into the scenery and have been in use all over this city and others for many years. They have several practical uses for example offices, storage, housing, to grow food and even in Toronto there's a popular outdoor market called "Stackt". Shipping Containers are the perfect solution for many problems we face today. They are versatile, climate change proof, completely recyclable at the end of their lifespan and</p>	See staff response in Row 53.

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				<p>from my personal experience they can be easily moved as my business grows and changes. We should be celebrating and encouraging their use, not restricting and banning. This proposal sounds like it is one person's effort in bylaw or zoning to push through this ban. We shouldn't let the opinion one person harm and limit business and to ruin any future chance Guelph has of providing creative and innovative solutions to some of the biggest problems facing society today and believe me Sea Cans will be a big part of this.</p>	
61.	Shipping Container	Peter Bernardi, Bernardi Precast 412 Elizabeth Street	Email June 26, 2022	<p>We have been in business for over 60 years and find it tougher every year that passes. We are against the proposed limit to containers on a property since they really help out in dealing with extra storage requirements from time to time. Since we cannot afford to build a building for this extra storage, containers really do help out.</p>	See staff response in Row 53.



No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
62.	Shipping Container	Craig Dool	Delegate, Statutory Public Meeting July 13, 2022	<p>Concerned that shipping container regulations will have devastating impacts on small businesses. This closes another door for the vendors who rent his commercial space. Delegate strongly suggest that the city council discuss and assess this situation in depth and understand the land use and financial implications in which these businesses will face.</p> <p>Limitations with new zoning bylaw on contractor yards.</p>	See staff response in Row 53.
63.	Site-specific property	Sal Rahmaty, 113 Emma Street	Email September 21, 2022	Currently zoned R.4A with single detached dwelling. CZBL proposes to be down zoned to RL.1 in line with existing use. Current owners have plans to build an apartment building similar to 109 Emma.	<p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw is required to conform to the Official Plan. The proposed Zoning Bylaw also reviewed existing built form and uses to ensure the appropriate zone is applied to every property in the city.</p> <p>In the case of 113 Emma Street, there is an existing single detached dwelling within the low density residential designation. The new applicable zone for this</p>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					property is RL.1 which would permit a single detached dwelling, semi-detached dwelling, additional residential dwelling units, on-street townhouses (up to 3 units) and an apartment building (up to 3 units). Staff cannot make a recommendation in the zoning bylaw that does not conform to the official plan designation.
64.	Site-specific property	Nancy Shoemaker, J.D Barnes Limited 47-75 Willow Road	Email June 30, 2022	Concerns about the proposed NCC-15 zoning for the recently approved zone change for the property at 47-75 Willow Road. This project can only meet the buffer strip requirements if the buffer can be satisfied by the provision of a fence. Although the new definition includes fence, the by-law still requires 3 metres so this development, although thoroughly vetted before a recommendation report to Council, will not meet the by-law requirements when it moves forward to site plan approval. We are requesting either the definition of buffer be changed in the by-law to	The site-specific NCC-15 zone has been updated to not require a 3 metre buffer strip in line with the approved development application.

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				note that a privacy fence can satisfy the buffer requirement without the need for the 3 metres or a further change to the Specialized NCC-15 be added that allows a privacy fence to replace the 3 metre buffer strip requirement.	
65.	Site-specific property	Brian O'Grady, Search Warrant Online Marketing 304 Woolwich Street	Email June 20 & July 4, 2022	I was thrilled that you were able to edit or correct the proposed MOC zoning to include small-office as a permissible use. I don't see 304 Woolwich mentioned in your list so maybe it's already updated? The proposed zoning map identifies my property as MOC (H13). My reading of that definition in 17.1.13 suggests that such a structure may not be used as a residence prior to the removal of the hold. If my reading is correct, that might make an existing house used as a residence non-compliant? Part (a) suggests this is only meant to apply to new buildings but part (b) seems to void residential use, so I'd welcome clarification.	<p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw has been updated to permit an office use within the mixed-office commercial (MOC) zone. This was a previous typographical error.</p> <p>The intent the (H13) holding provision is that the existing residential uses are permitted but new residential, or additional height and density proposed on the property would require the holding provision be lifted. The holding provision language has been revised for clarity.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
66.	Site-specific property	Dawson Mckenzie, MHBC 5102 Whitelaw Road	Email June 21, 2022; Meeting Aug 2, 2022	We requested that a medium density residential 6 zone be applied to the property. Our client's property was left off the notice. Could you provide some clarification on why our client's property was not listed? Will the medium density residential 6 zone be considered for our client's property at this public meeting? Or perhaps are these properties listed being considered for a more site specific policy?	5102 Whitelaw Road does not meet the criteria to be included in the Official Plan Amendment to be designated medium density residential.  This property is within the Low Density Greenfield Residential Official Plan designation. A Low Density Greenfield Residential Overlay Schedule B-13 has been added to the proposed Zoning Bylaw to ensure the height and density permissions are provided in the new bylaw. This property has been zoned RL.4 in line with the low density greenfield residential permissions.
67.	Site-specific property	Robert Mason, Mason Real Estate Ltd 32 Douglas St	Email July 7, 2022; Meeting October 27, 2022	1. Neighbourhood Commercial Centres – Kortright and Gordon Node  The Official Plan has designated this node to have a maximum of 10,000 m <sup>2</sup> of commercial GFA, but the existing commercial GFA in the properties that make up this node (proposed to be	1. Staff have removed the maximum commercial GFA regulations from the proposed zoning bylaw.  2. Existing drive-throughs would be considered legal non-complying in

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				<p>designated as NCC-4, NCC-5, NCC-6, and NCC-10) have all been capped in the aggregate of about 7,180 m<sup>2</sup>, which appears to be the sum of the sites existing as-built commercial GFA. All sites at this node except NCC-10 have had their site specific maximum commercial GFA reduced in this second draft of the bylaw from the first bylaw draft. Consideration should be given to either proportionally increasing the commercial GFA of each site at this node so that the node can support up to 10,000 m<sup>2</sup> of commercial GFA in aggregate, or otherwise provide some other permissible way for increases in commercial GFA to accommodate future footprint changes to allow this node to serve its neighbourhood function.</p> <p>2. Drive-through Facility: Concern that existing drive-throughs would be unable to become compliant with section 1.4.3 and the proposed defined permitted use of 'drive-through facility'. There will also be</p>	<p>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>The site-specific (NCC-4) zone has been updated to recognize the location of the existing drive-throughs. Any redevelopment of the drive through would need to meet the in effect zoning bylaw regulations.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				<p>properties that have a legal non-compliant existing drive-through and 'drive-through facility' as a permitted use; concern these definitions are not interchangeable.</p> <p>A legal non-conforming drive-through being re-occupied by another drive-through user would appear to have an as-of-right to continue such use without having to comply with the proposed drive-through regulations, but if for common commercial reasons the building housing the existing drive-through needs minor modifications, reconstruction or redesign of some sort to accommodate a new user, will the existing drive-through have to meet the new drive-through regulations pursuant to Section 1.4.3 as staff have suggested? If so, this could effectively preclude the potential adaptability and use of an existing drive-through notwithstanding that a 'drive-through facility' may be a permitted use on such property, making the permitted 'drive-through</p>	

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				facility' use not only unfeasible in many situations but a misleading token "throwaway" use that can't even be utilized.	
68.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo 115 Watson Pkwy N; 1750 Gordon St; 1045 Paisley Rd; 297-299 Eramosa Rd; 111- 191 Silvercreek Pkwy N; 35 Harvard Rd; 160 & 170 Kortright Rd W	Email and Virtual Meeting July 7, 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In general, Loblaw wants to ensure that the development potential and existing zoning permissions for their stores and lands will not be compromised by the Draft By-law. In addition, Loblaw wants to ensure that the permissions previously secured through approved minor variances affecting their lands remain intact.</li> <li>• In our comments dated January 12, 2022, we submitted that 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,</li> </ul>	<p>Section 1.4.3 of the proposed Zoning Bylaw provides the appropriate permission for any existing non-complying building or lot and can be considered a "vacuum clause". 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.</p> <p>New development would be required to meet new Zoning Bylaw requirements. This applies only to additions and new buildings/structures. This appropriately implements Official Plan policies.</p>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				<p>existing on the effective date of the new By-law, would be deemed to comply and would be permitted by the new Bylaw. 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 1.4.3 includes "repair" and "renovation" provided that the repair" or "renovation" complies with all other applicable provision of this by-law", whereby we our concerned that the repair or renovation to the existing retail stores would trigger a minor variance or rezoning application. Accordingly, we continue to suggest that it would be appropriate to include a provision that the location of parking legally existed on the effective date of the by-law are exempt from the new requirement and</li> </ul>	



No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				<p>that further review is required for the Loblaw Lands, whereby site-specific exceptions may be appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accordingly, we continue to suggest that it would be appropriate to include a provision that loading spaces legally existed on the effective date of the by-law are exempt from the new requirement.</li> <li>• In our comments dated January 12, 2022, we submitted that it would be appropriate to include existing loading within a vacuum clause in order to ensure that the existing condition remains conforming where a minimum 3 m wide buffer strip is not currently provided. We continue to suggest that it would be appropriate to include a provision that loading spaces legally existed on the effective date of the by-law are exempt from the new requirement.</li> <li>• Our comment dated January 12, 2022 submitted that as there</li> </ul>	

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				<p>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 be deemed to comply with the By-law in order to ensure that existing development remains conforming. We are concerned that the repair or renovation to existing retail stores will trigger the need for a minor variance or rezoning application. We continue to suggest that it would be appropriate to include a provision that the supply of bicycle parking that legally existed on the effective date of the by-law is exempt from the new requirement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We reiterate our comment that the installation of electrical charging stations should be optional and not a requirement for all developments.</li> </ul>	
69.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo 115 Watson Pkwy	Email and Virtual	For Section 7.31(a), the lands at 115 Watson Parkway at approximately 64,500 ha,	A site-specific exception has been added to the CMUC-9 zone (previously

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
		N; 1750 Gordon St; 1045 Paisley Rd; 297-299 Eramosa Rd; 111-191 Silvercreek Pkwy N; 35 Harvard Rd; 160 & 170 Kortright Rd W	Meeting July 7, 2022	exceed the maximum lot area of 50,000 sq. m, whereby it would be appropriate to include a site-specific regulation under the proposed CMUC-14 zone.	CMUC-14) to recognize the existing lot area.
70.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo 115 Watson Pkwy N; 1750 Gordon St; 1045 Paisley Rd; 297-299 Eramosa Rd; 111-191 Silvercreek Pkwy N; 35 Harvard Rd; 160 & 170 Kortright Rd W	Email and Virtual Meeting July 7, 2022	Section 7.3.1(b): Under the existing CC zones for the Loblaw lands, a planting area comprised of a landscaped strip of land 3 m in width shall be maintained adjacent to the Street Line, except for those areas required for entry ramps, whereas the minimum buffer strip has been revised to require a 3 m wide buffer strip adjacent to interior side and rear lot lines, which could render existing developments non-conforming. In our submission, it would be appropriate to include a provision that existing buffer strips that legally existed on the effective date of the by-law are exempt from the new requirement.	Staff previously responded to this comment in <a href="#">Attachment 5- Phase 3 Community Engagement Staff Response Chart</a> , part of the Statutory Public Meeting Staff Report- July 13, 2022.  Staff are not recommending changes to the Zoning Bylaw.
71.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo 115 Watson Pkwy	Email and Virtual	In our submission, we reiterate our comment that the existing minimum of	Staff previously responded to this comment in <a href="#">Attachment</a>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
		N; 1750 Gordon St; 1045 Paisley Rd; 297-299 Eramosa Rd; 111-191 Silvercreek Pkwy N; 35 Harvard Rd; 160 & 170 Kortright Rd W	Meeting July 7, 2022	9% should be maintained.	<p><a href="#">5- Phase 3 Community Engagement Staff Response Chart</a>, part of the Statutory Public Meeting Staff Repot- July 13, 2022.</p> <p>Staff are not recommending changes to the Zoning Bylaw.</p>
72.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo 115 Watson Pkwy N; 1750 Gordon St; 1045 Paisley Rd; 297-299 Eramosa Rd; 111-191 Silvercreek Pkwy N; 35 Harvard Rd; 160 & 170 Kortright Rd W	Email and Virtual Meeting July 7, 2022	We continue to be concerned with the required minimum building heights and note that for any “repair” or “renovation” of existing buildings under Section 1.4.3 would require compliance. In addition, small building additions to existing commercial buildings such as the enclosure of cart corrals or loading facilities would need to have a minimum building height of 7.5 m under Section 1.4.3. Accordingly, we submit that minimum building height should not be included under the new comprehensive Zoning By-law.	<p>Staff previously responded to this comment in <a href="#">Attachment 5- Phase 3 Community Engagement Staff Response Chart</a>, part of the Statutory Public Meeting Staff Repot- July 13, 2022.</p> <p>Since the Statutory Public Meeting, Bill 23 has come into effect which limits the scope of site plan approval in reviewing exterior design and implementing established guidelines. Staff are not recommending changes to the Zoning Bylaw.</p>
73.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo 115 Watson Pkwy	Email and Virtual	In our submission, we reiterate that the maximum building length regulation	See Staff response in Row 72.

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
		N; 1750 Gordon St; 1045 Paisley Rd; 297-299 Eramosa Rd; 111-191 Silvercreek Pkwy N; 35 Harvard Rd; 160 & 170 Kortright Rd W	Meeting July 7, 2022	should be removed since Official Plan policy 8.6.8 is not appropriately implemented and would be more appropriate as an urban design guideline.	
74.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo 115 Watson Pkwy N; 1750 Gordon St; 1045 Paisley Rd; 297-299 Eramosa Rd; 111-191 Silvercreek Pkwy N; 35 Harvard Rd; 160 & 170 Kortright Rd W	Email and Virtual Meeting July 7, 2022	<p>Sections 7.3.1(d) and 7.3.3.(c): the proposed minimum first storey transparency is "40 % of the surface area of the first storey facing a street, up to 4.5 m from the ground, be comprised of transparent windows and/or active entrances when a building is within 15 m of an existing and proposed arterial and/or collector road, as identified in the City's Official Plan in force and effect on the effective date."</p> <p>While we recognize that Staff adjusted the requirement, we continue to submit that the regulation should be removed as outlined in our previous comment.</p>	See Staff response in Row 72.

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
75.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo 115 Watson Pkwy N; 1750 Gordon St; 1045 Paisley Rd; 297-299 Eramosa Rd; 111- 191 Silvercreek Pkwy N; 35 Harvard Rd; 160 & 170 Kortright Rd W	Email and Virtual Meeting July 7, 2022	While we recognize the recommendations of the Commercial Policy Review, we reiterate our comment that since the Council adopted Official Plan 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.	Staff previously responded to this comment in <a href="#">Attachment 5- Phase 3 Community Engagement Staff Response Chart</a> , part of the Statutory Public Meeting Staff Report- July 13, 2022.  Staff are not recommending changes to the Zoning Bylaw.
76.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo 297-299 Eramosa Road	Email and Virtual Meeting July 7, 2022	Currently zoned CC-6 and proposed to be zoned MUC(PA)(H13), as it is our understanding that existing minor variances will not be pulled through into the Draft By-law, we request that the minor variance File Number A-2/12 to permit a 2.25 m landscape strip adjacent to Stevenson Street, except for those areas required for entry ramps, be pulled through as a site specific exception.	The 2.25 metre landscape strip will become legal non-complying when the proposed Zoning Bylaw comes into effect.  The landscape strip requirements of the existing CC zone have not been carried forward in the proposed Zoning Bylaw. The proposed Zoning Bylaw regulates the location of parking on a lot and requires the parking area to be located a minimum of 3

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					<p>metres from any lot line. Buffer strip requirements are adjacent to interior side and rear lot lines.</p> <p>Redevelopment of the property would need to meet the requirements of the new Zoning Bylaw. However, minor changes to the building or additions would likely not impact the planting area and would not require additional variances.</p>
77.	Site-specific property	Sonya Donovan, University of Guelph, 5 College Ave West, 1 College Ave West, 0 Gordon Street & 363 - 369 Gordon Street	Email July 12, 2022; Meeting Aug 9, 2022	<p>363 – 369 Gordon Street is zoned NCC neighbourhood commercial centre. 5 College Ave West, 1 College Ave West, 0 Gordon Street is zoned RM.5 Medium density residential 5. The University is seeking to have the NCC, neighbourhood commercial centre zoning applied to 5 College Ave West, 1 College Ave West, 0 Gordon Street, to align with the adjacent NCC zoning at 363 – 369 Gordon Street.</p> <p>Please add a site-specific exemption to the new zoning bylaw parking rate regulations for 5 College Ave West, 1</p>	<p>The NCC zoning request for 5 College Ave West, 1 College Ave West and 0 Gordon Street is outside the scope of the Zoning Bylaw Review as the lands are designated Medium Density Residential in the Official Plan. This zone change would require an Official Plan amendment. These lands are not located within a node or intensification corridor as identified in Schedule 1 of the Official Plan – as such, the properties do not meet the criteria to</p>

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				<p>College Ave West, 0 Gordon Street &amp; 363 - 369 Gordon Street.</p> <p>Pertaining to 18.20 Site-specific institutional research park (IRP) zones, the University is seeking a maximum building height of 10 storeys across zones IRP-1, IRP-2, IRP-3, IRP-4, IRP-5. In IRP zones IRP-1, IRP-2, IRP-3, IRP-4, IRP-5. Please add an exemption to the new zoning bylaw parking rate regulations.</p>	<p>apply the parking adjustment (PA) suffix. Requests for parking adjustments can be made through a site-specific development application.</p> <p>Previous correspondence from the University, dated January 14, 2022 requested that "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." Some of the IRP site-specifics include a maximum building height which has been carried forward.</p> <p>Based on the July 12, 2022, request, the IRP zone has been updated to permit 10 Storeys in line with the major institutional designation Official Plan policy.</p> <p>The (PA) area has been added back to the IRP</p>



No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
					lands along Stone Road West.
78.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Tercot Realty Inc. c/o Zelinka Priamo Ltd 115 Watson Pkwy	Email July 7, 2022	As a site specific Zoning By-law Amendment application is expected to be submitted for the subject lands in order to permit a mixed use development, we request clarification as to the transition protocol for the Draft By-law and applicability to lands with active rezoning applications that have not yet received a building permit to allow ongoing processes to be completed within the context of existing policies and regulations.	A formal application for the proposed development has not been received to date on the subject property.
79.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Tercot Realty Inc. c/o Zelinka Priamo Ltd 115 Watson Pkwy	Email July 7, 2022	For the CMUC Zone under Section 7.2 and the permissions for Townhouse uses under Table 7.1, note 16 indicates that the use is in accordance with Section 6.3.5. We request clarification as to the applicable regulations where they are different between the CMUC zone and Section 6.3.5. In addition, for Section 6.3.5, we request clarification as to whether regulations specific to another zone are applicable	Staff have reviewed and made changes to the proposed Zoning Bylaw to add clarity.

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				for Townhouse uses within the CMUC Zone (e.g., under Table 6.18, Lot Coverage (max), for the RL.4 zone "30%" is indicated), while various Tables reference the RL.4 and RM.6 zones, whereby it is not clear if they are applicable for lands zoned CMUC.	
80.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Tercot Realty Inc. c/o Zelinka Priamo Ltd 115 Watson Pkwy	Email July 7, 2022	For Section 7.3.1(a), the subject lands at approximately 64,500 ha, exceed the maximum lot area of 50,000 sq. m, whereby it would be appropriate to include the lot area as a site specific regulation under the proposed CMUC-14 zone.	See Staff response in Row 69.
81.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Tercot Realty Inc. c/o Zelinka Priamo Ltd 115 Watson Pkwy	Email July 7, 2022	Section 7.3.1(a) regulates minimum and maximum residential density. Since the CMUC zone permits a range of townhouse dwellings in accordance with Section 6.3.5, in our submission there should be consideration as to interpretation whereby the minimum and maximum density would be applicable collectively to the whole of the lands zoned as CMUC, despite	Density requirements apply to a parcel of land. The purpose of the CMUC zone is to provide mixed-use development with residential provided at higher densities. No proposed changes.

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				any future severance or condo registration.	
82.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Tercot Realty Inc. c/o Zelinka Priamo Ltd 115 Watson Pkwy	Email July 7, 2022	Section 7.3.1.(b) for buffer strip (min) requires a 3 m wide buffer strip is adjacent to the interior side and rear lot line. In our submission, for circumstances where there is an adjacent NHS zone, which has incorporated minimum buffers to the environmental feature, a lower minimum buffer should be required.	Buffers to environmental features are included within the NHS zone. Additional 3 m wide buffer strip is required adjacent to interior side and rear lot lines within a proposed development. This requirement will assist in meeting the minimum required landscaped open space, provide areas to plant trees and provide adequate transition to the NHS.
83.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Tercot Realty Inc. c/o Zelinka Priamo Ltd 115 Watson Pkwy	Email July 7, 2022	Section 7.3.1.(b) for landscaped open space (min) requires 20% of the lot area. For the subject lands, if they are divided into smaller development parcels, it would be appropriate for the 20% to be applicable collectively to the whole of the lands zoned as CMUC, despite any future severance or condo registration.	Landscaped open space requirements apply to a parcel of land. No proposed changes.
84.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Tercot Realty Inc.	Email July 7, 2022	In our submission, the angular plane regulations will limit	Since the Statutory Public Meeting, Bill 23 has come

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
		c/o Zelinka Priamo Ltd 115 Watson Pkwy		building heights that otherwise may be achievable up to 10 storeys, whereby the angular plane regulations would be more appropriate as an urban design guideline.	<p>into effect which limits the scope of site plan approval in reviewing exterior design.</p> <p>These built form standards are appropriate in a zoning bylaw under S. 34 of the Planning Act. Lands are being pre-zoned to max height and density to streamline the development review process.</p> <p>Staff are not recommending changes to the Zoning Bylaw.</p>
85.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Tercot Realty Inc. c/o Zelinka Priamo Ltd 115 Watson Pkwy	Email July 7, 2022	In our submission, the maximum floor plate size and minimum building setbacks will limit flexibility for site specific design and context and would be more appropriate as an urban design guideline.	See staff response in Row 84.
86.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Tercot Realty Inc. c/o Zelinka Priamo Ltd 115 Watson Pkwy	Email July 7, 2022	In our submission, maximum building length regulations should be removed since Official Plan policy 8.6.8 is not appropriately implemented	See staff response in Row 84.

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				and the Staff Response relates to commercial uses. Considerations as to Maximum building length would be more appropriate as an urban design guideline.	
87.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Tercot Realty Inc. c/o Zelinka Priamo Ltd 115 Watson Pkwy	Email July 7, 2022	Section 7.3.1(c) related to distance between buildings (min) and first storey building height as well as related to a minimum first storey height of 4.5 m may not anticipate the permitted townhouse building forms. In our submission, the regulations that should relate only to commercial and mixed use buildings and should be reviewed and revised accordingly.	Staff have reviewed and made changes to the proposed Zoning Bylaw to add clarity.
88.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Tercot Realty Inc. c/o Zelinka Priamo Ltd 115 Watson Pkwy	Email July 7, 2022	In our submission, the regulation for transparency may not anticipate the permitted townhouse building forms and would be appropriate as a guideline (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.	Staff have reviewed and made changes to the proposed Zoning Bylaw to add clarity.

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				Do not use highly reflective or mirrored glass"). While we recognize that Staff adjusted the requirement from the initial draft By-law, we continue to submit that the regulation should be removed.	
89.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Tercot Realty Inc. c/o Zelinka Priamo Ltd 115 Watson Pkwy	Email July 7, 2022	In our submission, the minimum tower separation will limit flexibility for site specific context and would be more appropriate as an urban design guideline.	See staff response in Row 84.
90.	Site-specific property	Jonathan Rodger, Tercot Realty Inc. c/o Zelinka Priamo Ltd 115 Watson Pkwy	Email July 7, 2022	In our submission, since Policy 8.6.10 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 regulation is not appropriate and should be removed.	See staff response in Row 75.
91.	Site-specific property	Emily Elliott, MHBC- 103 & 105 Victoria Road North	Email October 22, 2022	We note the proposed zone for the subject lands is RL.1(CDA) – Low Density Residential 1, Current Development Application. We support maintaining the CDA suffix on the subject lands to reflect the ongoing review of	The proposed Zoning Bylaw cannot zone a site Current Development Application (CDA), this would eliminate a zone for the property and any development permissions.

No.	Theme	Name/Address	Source of Comment/ Date	Comment	Staff Response
				the Zoning By-law Amendment application and request that this suffix be reflected on the mapping schedules as they are created. In the event that the Zoning By-law Amendment for the subject lands is approved in advance of Council's consideration of the Comprehensive Zoning By-law, we respectfully request that zoning of the subject lands in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law be revised to reflect the approved zoning of the subject lands.	Current development applications not approved by Council at the time of adoption of the new Zoning Bylaw, will continue on their own site-specific development application process and the property is proposed to be zoned in accordance with the Official Plan designation and existing use in the proposed Zoning Bylaw.
92.	Other	Anonymous	Public Open House July 6, 2022	The myriad of zone types is extremely confusing to anyone not in planning.	Comment noted.
93.	Other	Anonymous	Public Open House July 6, 2022	Include more mixed-use zoning.	Mixed-use zones are provided in accordance with the mixed-use land use designations of the Official Plan. The Zoning Bylaw is required to conform to the current Official Plan.