

Policy Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
1	Patrick Quirk	March 7, 2011	Request for a hard boundary for the Gordon Street intensification corridor to protect Lowes Road and Dawn Avenue from development that does not respect the size and scale of the existing neighbourhood.	<p>The intensification corridor as displayed on Schedule 1 was approved through OPA 39. The proposed "Medium Density" designation along Gordon Street on the west side of Gordon Street at Lowes Road does not extend to Dawn Avenue. The intent of the proposed designation is to allow intensification that is oriented towards Gordon Street. Dawn Avenue at Lowes Road is proposed to remain within a low density residential designation and any development proposed for this area would be required to meet the development criteria in Chapter 10 and the Urban Design policies of the draft Official Plan. The draft Official Plan policies state that where infill and intensification is permitted it must be compatible with the immediate vicinity.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u>: New policy proposed for Intensification Corridors to state that development be directed and oriented towards arterial or collector roads.</p>
2	Karen Armstrong Wellington-Dufferin- Guelph Public Health	August 19, 2011	Comments related to suggestions for revisions to existing policies and suggestion for new policies to enhance community, individual and environmental health.	<p>Revisions have been made to the Plan where appropriate to make it more explicit that the policies of this Plan are directed at enhancing physical activity and well-being. Chapter 3 includes a section specific to the development of Healthy Communities.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u>: Policy revisions.</p>

Policy Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
3	Ryan Hayhurst Guelph-Wellington Food Round Table	August 27, 2011	Provided recommendations for the inclusion of policies related to urban agriculture, sustainable food systems and food security.	<p>Policies for urban agriculture including community gardens are included in the draft Official Plan. Many of the proposed changes are beyond the scope of an Official Plan and staff are not recommending their inclusion. However, a policy has been included to acknowledge broader food system related issues and to indicate the City's commitment to engage on these issues in the future through collaboration with appropriate partners.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> addition of policies in Urban Agriculture section.</p>
4	Jane Londerville Guelph Wellington Housing Committee	September 29, 2011	Supportive of the targets for affordable ownership and rental housing and for accessory apartments. Supportive of annual Affordable Housing Implementation Report. Expressed concern with implementation of the targets.	<p>Housing policies have been simplified from the April 2010 draft and staff recommend that implementation strategies for affordable housing be developed during the update of the Housing Strategy in coordination with Wellington County.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Future work program for Affordable Housing to address implementation strategies.</p>

Policy Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
5	Victor Labreche Labreche Patterson & Associates Inc on behalf of the Ontario Restaurant Hotel and Motel Association (ORHMA)	May 20, 2010	Objects to the prohibition of drive-throughs in all land use designations other than Commercial Service.	<p>City staff have met with Victor Labreche and members of the ORHMA and reviewed the materials provided by them relating to drive-throughs. As a result, staff recommend removal of language from the Official Plan that specifically prohibits drive-throughs as a use. Rather, policies in the Urban Design section of the Official Plan are proposed to provide direction as to design and site matters for drive throughs. City staff recommend that a review of drive-throughs and associated policies and regulations be conducted as background to the Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review with the intent to regulate drive-throughs and where they may be permitted through the Zoning By-law. This would allow careful consideration of the issue and allow Council, the public and stakeholders input into the process and any proposed regulations.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Policy changes to permitted uses and to strengthen urban design provisions.</p>
6	Dennis Coumo Upper Grand District School Board	May 17, 2010	Request for an additional potential school site to be shown on Schedule 2 in the area of Grange Road and Cityview Drive North.	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Potential school site symbol added to Schedule 2 as per comment.</p>

Policy Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
7	Transition Guelph	May 20, 2010	<p>Suggest recognition of the role of green infrastructure. Concern that the Trail Map is confusing with trails on sidewalks.</p> <p>More mixed use areas should be included on the Land Use Schedule to create walkable neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Suggest higher percentage of modal share for trips by transit, walking and cycling.</p> <p>Monitoring section should be more detailed and include context monitoring (e.g., price of fossil fuel, availability of food and groundwater, climate change, etc).</p>	<p>Policies are proposed in the Official Plan dealing with sustainable design features, community energy and low impact development standards.</p> <p>The trail map is developed through the planning process for the Trail Master Plan and updates would be undertaken through the master planning process not through the Official Plan.</p> <p>The Official Plan contains many land use designations that allow a mix of land uses even though the title of the designation does not contain the wording "mixed use area".</p> <p>This Official Plan does include a higher percentage of modal share than the current Official Plan.</p> <p>The monitoring section contains a general list of items to consider as background to the next Official Plan update. The list may be expanded to include other items depending on the scope of future OP Reviews.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> No further changes to policies related to these comments.</p>
8	Keith MacKinnon KLM Planning Partners Inc	May 20, 2010	<p>Height limitations should be removed from the Official Plan to promote compact urban forms. Height and density bonusing will be a disincentive due to the additional fees that will need to be paid to allow for additional height.</p>	<p>Staff do not support the removal of height limits in the Official Plan. Maximum building heights were introduced into the OP as a means of providing greater certainty as to the form of development that is permitted in the designation.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> No changes proposed related to these comments.</p>

Policy Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
9	Jonathon Rodger Zelinka Priamo Ltd on behalf of Loblaw Properties Limited	May 20, 2010	<p>Concerns about the following Urban Design policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - suggest wording change to 7.4.9 to <u>encourage</u> new development to be designed to contribute to a pedestrian-oriented streetscape rather than <u>require</u> - policy 7.8.1 how to apply the policy design to enhance prevailing neighbourhood pattern in greenfield areas - policy to avoid blank facades will impact on commercial operations due to requirements for internal operations - policy 7.5.6 does not provide flexibility in terms of orientation of buildings and the term "visual access" lacks clarity - policy 7.8.8 concern with building design required to be unique and not simply reflect a corporate or franchise design - policy 7.22.1 through 7.22.4 concern with lack of flexibility whereby urban squares shall be included and whether they would be included in the calculation of maximum FSI for the site - avoidance of parking adjacent to buffers to natural heritage feature 	<p>The proposed urban design policies support the Council approved Urban Design Action Plan.</p> <p>Some of the policies have been revised to provide clarity to the intent.</p> <p>Concerns about how a policy would be applied would be addressed by staff at the time of a development application. Many policies will have site specific and development specific solutions to achieving the policy direction.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Changes to urban design policies.</p>

Policy Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
10	Jonathon Rodger Zelinka Priamo Ltd on behalf of Loblaw Properties Limited	May 20, 2010	<p>Concerns about the following Community Mixed Use Area policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - requirement for Secondary Plan for CMUAs - requirement for residential uses and inclusion of residential target - drive-throughs and gas bars not permitted - requirement for main street type environment and freestanding individual retail uses over 5575 square metres to locate on peripheral sites. Lack of clarity as to what peripheral site means. - requirement to meet a minimum FSI of 0.5 - minimum building height of 2 storeys - where underground or structured parking may be required 	<p>The requirement for secondary plans for CMUCs has been deleted and replaced with requirement for concept plan for the overall node.</p> <p>Residential targets have been removed for the CMUC in favour of requiring residential development within the overall node as identified on Schedule 1 of the draft OP. Drive-throughs and gas bars are now proposed to be permitted in CMUCs; gas bars as an accessory use. Peripheral site means that large buildings would be situated away from intersections and main streets to allow for improved building placements along street frontages.</p> <p>Floor space index requirements have been removed from the Plan.</p> <p>Policy related to minimum building height of 2 storeys has been revised to indicate that the minimum height is required only along arterial and collector roads and identified "main streets".</p> <p>The policy for underground and structured parking states that this is encouraged not required as an alternative to large surface parking areas.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> policy changes</p>

Policy Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
11	Jonathon Rodger Zelinka Priamo Ltd on behalf of Loblaw Properties Limited	May 20, 2010	Concerns about the following Mixed Use Corridor policies: - drive-throughs and gas bars not permitted - minimum building height of 2 storeys and whether it applies to building expansions - concern about conflict between policies 8.5.2.4.1 (maximum of 0.5 FSI) and 8.5.2.4.2 (maximum of 2.5 FSI for commercial).	Policy restrictions related to drive throughs have been removed in favour of urban design policies dealing with their location and siting. Service stations are now proposed to be permitted in commercial designations including Mixed Use Corridors. Minimum building height policy has been revised for clarity. Policies related to minimum and maximum FSI have been removed from the Plan. <u>Recommendation:</u> Policy changes.
12	Jonathon Rodger Zelinka Priamo Ltd on behalf of Loblaw Properties Limited	May 20, 2010	Concerns about the following Neighbourhood Mixed Use Centre policies: - drive-throughs and gas bars not permitted - minimum building height of 2 storeys and whether it applies to building expansions - underground or structured parking may be required	See staff responses above (#10 and #11). <u>Recommendation:</u> Policy changes.
13	Hugh Handy GSP Group Inc.	May 20, 2010	- concern about the rationale for the height limitation of 5 storeys for the Medium Density Residential designation	<u>Recommendation:</u> Height limit for the Medium Density designation has been changed to 6 storeys to be consistent with mid-rise building policies.
14	Hugh Handy GSP Group Inc. On behalf of SmartCentres	May 20, 2010	Concerned with Community Mixed Use Centre and Urban Design Policies: - prohibition of drive-throughs - minimum floor space index of 0.5 - minimum height of 2 storeys of usable space - encouragement for underground or structured parking - main street type development and location of free-standing uses on peripheral sites	See comments related to CMUCs above (#10 and #11). Main street development is encouraged as part of the design of CMUCs. Policies related to this have been revised for clarity and to provide greater direction to where this is appropriate and desired. <u>Recommendation:</u> Policy changes.

Policy Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
15	Hugh Handy GSP Group Inc on behalf of The Tricar Group	May 20, 2010	Seeking clarification on how the affordable housing policies and targets are intended to be implemented.	<u>Recommendation</u> : Revisions to affordable housing policies and the target. Implementation strategies to be developed/refined through the Housing Strategy update.
16	John LaChapelle Bell Canada	May 20, 2010	<p>Suggest that policy 5.3.6 be revised to state that electrical and cabled services be located underground where feasible because the burial of cabled services is not always feasible due to safety and maintenance requirements.</p> <p>Request for a new policy as follows: Prior to permitting a development proposal, the City shall undertake discussions with utility providers to ensure that adequate services are or will be in place to serve the development."</p> <p>Recommend changes to policy 5.3.13 to state: "the clustering or grouping of utilities, where feasible, and consideration of the locational requirements of larger infrastructure."</p> <p>Suggest including other required infrastructure into the staging of development policies as an item to consider in the ensuring the orderly provision of services.</p> <p>Introduce a new policy into the transportation policies to consider impacts to and opportunities for replacement of utility infrastructure.</p> <p>Suggest inclusion of policy to encourage utility providers to consider innovative methods for containing services within streetscape features.</p> <p>Suggest inclusion of a definition for "Utility".</p>	<p>Staff agree with the proposed wording to require underground services where feasible.</p> <p>The comment related to undertaking discussions with utility providers prior to development approval is operational in nature and a policy related to this is not required. The Planning Act requires the City to circulate development applications to utility providers for comment and this is current City practice.</p> <p>Staff do not propose to include utility infrastructure as an item to consider in the Development Priorities Plan (DPP). The DPP considers orderly staging of development and the financial impacts on the City. The provision of utility infrastructure such as telecommunications does not impact the City financially. The timing of the provision of utilities is conducted through the subdivision approval process.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u>: Policy changes as described above. No action as described above.</p>

Policy Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
17	Alfred Artinger GWDA	May 13, 2010	<p>Concerned that the OP contains details beyond what is expected and required.</p> <p>Concern that there are unnecessary requirements for Secondary Plans.</p> <p>Concern with affordable housing policies and target specifically the proposed holding zone to require the development of affordable housing.</p> <p>Urban Design concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reverse lotting to be avoided - entrance features discouraged - garage width restriction. <p>Concern with road widening policies.</p> <p>Concern with policies encouraging underground and structured parking.</p> <p>Request to increase maximum height in High Density Residential designation.</p> <p>Request removal of residential targets in CMUCs.</p> <p>Request that drive-throughs be permitted as long as they specified locational criteria.</p> <p>Concern that the density target for greenfield employment areas is too high.</p> <p>Would like clarification as to the legislative authority to require achievement of energy reduction targets.</p>	<p>In general, the proposed Official Plan policies provide a level of detail considered necessary to support the City's vision for development to the year 2031.</p> <p>Requirements for Secondary Plans in CMUCs have been removed from the Plan. Areas where secondary plans are required prior to development proceeding are clearly identified on Schedule 2 of the OP.</p> <p>Affordable housing policies have been revised to remove the policy related to the use of holding zones. The City is required to establish a target for affordable housing by provincial policy and the City's target is based on the City's Affordable Housing Discussion Paper (2009).</p> <p>Urban Design policies have been revised to provide clarity and positive direction to applicants.</p> <p>Road widening policies are similar to the current OP.</p> <p>Policies for road widening are required by the Planning Act.</p> <p>Staff continue to support policies that encourage alternatives to surface parking such as underground or structured parking.</p> <p>Staff are not supportive of changes to the maximum height in the High Density Residential designation.</p> <p>Increases in height may be permitted through a bonusing by-law.</p>

Policy Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
18	Alfred Artinger GWDA (continued)			<p>The residential target has been removed from the CMUC policies (as noted in response #10).</p> <p>Policies related to prohibiting drive-throughs as a permitted use have been deleted in favour of specific urban design criteria.</p> <p>Policies for achieving energy efficiency are based on the recommendations of the Council approved Community Energy Plan. The draft policies include a policy related to the City investigating tools to support the achievement of energy reduction targets.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Policy changes as described above.</p>
19	Michael Hoffman and Linda Clay	May 17, 2010	<p>Concerned about proposed policies for non-designated built heritage resources and non-designated cultural heritage landscapes. Concerned with policy 4.7.6.3 specifically the wording "Council...believes the property to be of cultural heritage value or interest." Concerned that proposed policies can be interpreted to require owners of non-designated properties to provide Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments or Scoped Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments if they apply for a building permit or minor variance. Recommend that all reference to requirements related to matters other than demolition as they related to non-designated properties be removed from the proposed Official Plan.</p>	<p>The policies proposed in the OP update are consistent with the Ontario Heritage Act and the PPS. Some revisions have been made to the Cultural Heritage Policies to provide clarity. The proposed policies state that non-designated properties that are involved in a development application should be conserved unless the proponent demonstrates through a Heritage Resource Impact Assessment that the property is not of cultural heritage value or interest. The requirements for a Heritage Resource Impact Assessment does not apply unless the property is not proposed to be conserved. Further, these policies do not apply to properties that are not listed in the Heritage Registry.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> No changes related to these comments.</p>

Policy Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
20	Michael Hoffman and Linda Clay	May 18, 2010	Recommend that the wording in the Official Plan be changed to permit all forms of housing. The comments include specific reference to housing in small developments that may be gated and include elements of modern or mid-century housing.	<p>The OP supports the provision of a range of housing types and densities to meet the projected requirements of current and future residents.</p> <p>Staff are not supportive of gated communities.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u>: No changes proposed related to these comments.</p>
21	Dr. Dennis Murr	May 20, 2010	Concerned about the Official Plan and its fiscal economic responsibility to taxpayers. Concerned that the Official Plan supports more residential growth that will result in the cutting of services of existing residents.	<p>The Official Plan supports a projected population that has been required by the Province. The Official Plan, in conjunction with other municipal mechanisms, provides policy to manage the fiscal sustainability of the City.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u>: No changes proposed related to these comments.</p>
22	Herb Neumann	May 19, 2010	<p>The comments included the following concerns with the Community Mixed Use Area policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the residential target for the Community Mixed Use Area at Clair and Gordon - the proposed minimum building height of 2 storeys of usable space - prohibition of drive-throughs should be deleted and that locational criteria for drive throughs would be more appropriate - requirement for a secondary plan for Community Mixed Use Areas should be deleted - policy that requires residential uses to be provided primarily above commercial uses should be deleted - policy related to underground or structured parking should be deleted. 	See response to other comments related to CMUCs (response #10 and #11).

Policy Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
23	Jonathon Rodger Zelinka Priamo Ltd on behalf of Home Depot Holdings Inc	May 28, 2010	Suggest that there should be wording to provide for flexibility or recognition that Community Mixed Use policies will be implemented and transitioned over the long term. The application of urban design policies may not be appropriate or applicable to individual sites. Concern with Community Mixed Use Area policies related to minimum total floor space index, residential unit targets and minimum building height.	See response to other comments related to CMUCs (response #10 and #11). <u>Recommendation</u> : Revisions to policies to include wording related to the CMUCs and their evolution over the long term.
24	Wendy Nott Walker, Nott, Dragicevic Associates Limited on behalf of Armel Corporation	May 20, 2010	Concern expressed about the residential targets for Community Mixed Use Areas given that the lands around the Paisley/Imperial node is already designated for medium and high density residential. The restriction of the proposed mix of uses to the commercially zoned lands will result in the lands not being able to accommodate the proposed 42 000 square metres of retail space. Suggest that there is no need for a secondary plan for the Community Mixed Use Area. Concern with minimum and maximum densities and building heights.	See response to other comments related to CMUCs (response #10 and #11).
25	Steve Harris Guelph and District Homebuilders Association	June 14, 2010	Concern about the proposed affordable housing policies. Suggest that the targets are not realistic and are not supported by a financial incentive program. The existing housing stock is significant in the provision of affordable housing. Requirements for secondary plans are burdensome and unnecessary.	See response # 17 related to affordable housing. The requirements for Secondary Plans for development within Community Mixed Use Centres have been removed from the Plan. <u>Recommendation</u> : implementation strategies for affordable housing to be developed through the Housing Strategy.

Policy Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
26	Dwayne Evans Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	June 25, 2010	The Ministry of Natural Resources suggests that a policy framework should be established in the Official Plan that provides for the long-term protection of mineral aggregate resources, making resources available close to markets and protecting resource areas and operations from incompatible development.	<u>Recommendation</u> : Mineral Aggregate policies have been included in Chapter 6 of the draft Official Plan. These policies focus on resource recovery during development and the need to ensure that mineral aggregate operations in adjacent municipalities is compatible with City interests.
27	Ian Brown	May 4, 2010	Recommends inclusion of policies in the Urban Design section to address the use of mobile signs.	The placement of mobile signs is best dealt with through the City's Sign By-law due to their temporary nature and movability. <u>Recommendation</u> : No changes to policies related to these comments.
28	Albert Willis	April 21, 2010	Suggests that a bridge to connect York Road to Wellington Street is needed to direct traffic away from downtown. Suggests the use of ring roads to aid in traffic circulation. Suggests the use of traffic circles to calm traffic and reduce need for traffic lights. Recommends reverting the City to a square grid plan to simplify transportation and bus routes. Introduce tramway lines to run north-south to serve villages and Wellington County. Recommends planning a green belt around the City to accommodate farmers' markets and a tramway. Supports amalgamation with Wellington County to simplify government and planning.	These comments have been directed to Engineering staff for consideration as part of the future review of transportation master plans or studies. The transportation policies in the Official Plan are based on the recommendations of the Transportation Master Plan and the Guelph-Wellington Transportation Study. The suggestion for a green belt is beyond the City's jurisdiction as the lands in question are part of Wellington County. Comments and concerns related to amalgamation are a political decision and are not part of an Official Plan or related planning processes. <u>Recommendation</u> : No changes proposed related to these comments.

Policy Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010

	Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
29	Alfred Artinger GWDA	October 11, 2011	Requests that the lands designated "Reserve Lands" be designated to other uses as part of the Official Plan Review.	Staff have determined that the lands that are designated "Reserve Lands" require a comprehensive review related to future land uses and servicing. Staff recommend that these lands be subject to a Secondary Planning process. The Secondary Plan for the Clair/Maltby area has been included in the 10-year Capital Budget forecast. <u>Recommendation</u> : No changes proposed related to these comments.

Property Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010*

	Respondent	Date	Property	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
30	Robert Mason Mason Real Estate Limited	undated	363-369 Gordon St and 1 College Ave	Request subject properties to be designated "Neighbourhood Commercial".	The properties are designated "General Residential" in the current Official Plan. Staff propose to designate the existing commercial property located at 363-369 Gordon Street as "Neighbourhood Commercial Centre". Commercial designations are not recommended to be applied to the existing adjacent residential property at 1 College Avenue West. <u>Recommendation:</u> No changes.
31	Robert Mason Mason Real Estate Limited	undated	363-369 Gordon St and 1 College Ave	Opposed to road widening at the intersection of Gordon Street and College Avenue. State that widening on the west side of Gordon Street or the north side of College would severely impact the value, use and functionality of the property. Road widening should only be taken on the east side of Gordon or south of College.	The road widening for the Gordon and College intersection is intended to provide for alternative right-of-way design options. The inclusion of the intersection indicates to property owners that future right-of-way adjustments may be required, but there is flexibility given as to the location for the dedications, i.e. east side of Gordon rather than west. Detailed intersection design only occurs at a capital improvement stage, therefore it would not be appropriate to remove the general requirement of this corner for future intersection improvements. In addition, the Transit Growth Strategy indicates that the Gordon/College intersection is of strategic importance for future transit priority measures. <u>Recommendation:</u> No changes.

Note: Generally, property owner requests for site specific designation changes are not supported by staff because they are outside the scope of this Five Year Review of the Official Plan.

Property Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010*

	Respondent	Date	Property	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
32	Robert Mason Mason Real Estate Limited	undated	Victoria Road North and Eramosa Road	Reference in the Official Plan to road widening of Victoria Road North approaching Eramosa Road and Eramosa Road approaching Victoria Road North should exclude widening at the intersection because the City has just completed reconstruction of the intersection. If further widening is necessary it should be taken from the City park on the northwest corner.	The intersection improvements noted in Table 5.2 of the draft Official Plan do not include Victoria-Eramosa as a road intersection improvement area. <u>Recommendation:</u> No changes.
33	Tom Krizan Thomasfield Homes	March 28, 2011	2054 Gordon Street	Request change in designation from "Open Space" to Residential.	2054 Gordon Street is located within the area of South Guelph that is subject to a future Secondary Plan process. It is premature to consider changes to land use designations ahead of the required secondary plan process. <u>Recommendation:</u> No changes.
34	Mike Salisbury EarthArtist Planning and Design	October 4, 2011	211 Silvercreek Parkway South	Request change in designation from "General Residential" to "Community Mixed Use Centre".	Staff are not supportive of a change in designation at this time because site specific redesignations are not within the scope of the OP Review. Further information is needed to assess the proposal and this is more appropriately dealt with through a site specific development application process. <u>Recommendation:</u> No changes.

Property Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010*

	Respondent	Date	Property	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
35	Meg Thorburn	undated	Regent Street	Request change in classification of Regent Street from "Collector" to "Local" road. Regent Street is disconnected, is a steep hill, is difficult for motorists to reverse out of driveways and is dangerous for pedestrians to cross at the corner of Regent Street and Grange Street.	Staff do not propose a change in road classification for Regent Street through the OP update. <u>Recommendation:</u> No changes.
36	Fritz and Theresa Marthaler	May 20, 2010	1858 Gordon St	Request that designations for this property not change in the updated Official Plan to allow them to continue operating their business or potential expanding it.	No designation changes are proposed for this property. <u>Recommendation:</u> No changes.
37	Keith MacKinnon KLM Planning Partners Inc. On behalf of Watson 5-3 Inc	May 20, 2010	1 Starwood Drive	Concerned that their lands located north and south of Starwood Drive immediately west of Watson Parkway North are proposed to have three different land use designations including High Density Residential, Medium Density Residential and Community Mixed Use and that the lands are too small to accommodate all of these uses. Concerned that the retail permissions for this Node are too high and cannot be achieved. Preference is for the site to be developed solely as Medium Density Residential.	Staff are not supportive of the site being designated solely for Medium Density Residential. Staff recommend that the extent of the designations be revised and that the three designations remain with the Community Mixed Use Node. Revisions to the designations are displayed on Schedule 2 of the OP. <u>Recommendation:</u> Modifications to the boundaries of the proposed designations to maintain mix of uses in this area.

Property Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010*

	Respondent	Date	Property	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
38	Nancy Shoemaker BSRD Ltd on behalf of River Valley Developments Ltd	May 19, 2010	Dolime	Objects to the proposed designation of the subject property as "Open Space and Parks". These lands are within a licensed quarry operation.	<u>Recommendation</u> : Place the property within the "Reserve Lands" designation as per the current OP designation on the property.
39	Steven A. Zakem Aird & Berlis LLP on behalf of Silvercreek Guelph Developments Limited	May 20, 2010	35 and 40 Silvercreek Pkwy S	Concerned that proposed urban design policies and land use policies would apply to the subject site and conflict with the OMB approved Official Plan amendment for the site.	The 2010 draft of the Official Plan incorporated the OMB decision for these lands as an approved secondary plan. However, the OMB approved an Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment not a secondary plan. The draft Official Plan has been revised and incorporates the Ontario Municipal Board decision for the Silvercreek Junction lands as a site specific amendment to the Official Plan. As such, the site specific policies apply regardless of the content of the general urban design and land use policies. <u>Recommendation</u> : No changes required related to these comments.
40	Jonathon Rodger Zelinka Priamo Ltd on behalf of Loblaw Properties Limited	May 20, 2010	1045 Paisley Road	The existing Zehrs store has been identified as an Area of Potential Archaeological Resource on Schedule 10. Asking for confirmation on the basis for the designation.	Mapping related to archaeological resources is proposed to be deleted in the second draft of the OP update. Policies for archaeological resources are included to trigger reviews where necessary based on established criteria. <u>Recommendation</u> : No changes required related to this comment. Issue will be dealt with through future development applications on this site.

Property Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010*

	Respondent	Date	Property	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
41	Jonathon Rodger Zelinka Priamo Ltd on behalf of Loblaw Properties Limited	May 20, 2010	115 Watson Parkway North	Concerned with urban design policies related to enhancing prevailing neighbourhood pattern in greenfield areas. Concerned with policy for avoidance of parking adjacent to buffers to natural heritage feature on this site.	All of the urban design policies do not apply to all sites within the City. New development areas may not have a prevailing neighbourhood pattern in the area and therefore this policy would not apply. Staff continue to support the appropriate siting of parking including avoiding areas adjacent to natural heritage features where feasible. <u>Recommendation:</u> Revisions to urban design policies have been made to provide clarity.
42	Hugh Handy GSP Group Inc on behalf of SmartCentres	May 20, 2010	11 Woodlawn Rd W	Concerns include: - requirement for residential in the node (target of 750 units) - need for Secondary Plans and concern about when the process is required and who would conduct the study - site designed and approved to met high level of energy conservation standards, concern that any changes to site plan could require additional studies related to energy usage and environmental design - urban design policies too prescriptive -request transitional wording in OP to recognize current planning approvals for the site	See other staff response to comments on CMUC's and urban design (response #10 and #11). Transitional wording is not required in the OP to recognize existing approvals as these would be subject to relevant provisions of the Planning Act and related regulations. Any new applications for site plan or other type of development would be required to meet the policies in place at the time of application. <u>Recommendation:</u> No further changes proposed related to these comments.

Property Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010*

	Respondent	Date	Property	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
43	Hugh Handy GSP Group Inc on behalf of Tricar Group	May 20, 2010	9 Valley Road 1242 and 1250 Gordon St	<p>Would like to work with staff to determine the appropriate extent of the High Density Residential and Low Density Residential designations on the site.</p> <p>Asking for rationale for the Open Space and Parks designation applied to a portion of the site.</p>	<p>City staff will review the extent of the residential designations through future development applications for these lands.</p> <p>The Open Space and Park designation for this property has been removed from the draft Official Plan. The City has identified a need for a park in this area and the exact location will be determined through future development applications on these lands. Municipal parks are permitted in any land use designation (other than Natural Heritage System) and do not need to be designated Open Space and Park to be developed.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Designation change proposed to remove Open Space and Parks from this property as per comment above.</p>

Property Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010*

	Respondent	Date	Property	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
44	Laura Murr, President Kortright Hills Community Association	May 20, 2010	146 Downey Rd Teal Drive Niska Road	Does not support designation of 146 Downey Road as Medium Density Residential. Does not support the designation of lands on Teal Drive as Medium Density Residential. Designation of lands on Niska Road as Medium Density Residential is inappropriate. Support designation of lands on the north side of Niska Road to Open Space and Park but are not supportive of a major sports complex.	Council passed a resolution on June 7, 2010 stating that the property at 146 Downey Road remains within the General Residential designation and will not be changed in the upcoming Official Plan update . The corresponding designation in the proposed OP is Low Density Residential. 146 Downey Road continues to be designated in this category. The draft OP proposes a medium density designation on the south side of Niska Road; staff are supportive of this designation to allow for a range and mix of housing types in the area and to support the achievement of the City's density target. Lands on the north side of Niska Road are designated Open Space in the current Official Plan, no change in designation is proposed. If a park is to be developed on these lands, the type of park and its uses will be determined through zoning. The current zoning on the property is P.1 Conservation Land which does not permit a major sports complex. <u>Recommendation:</u> No changes.

Property Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010*

	Respondent	Date	Property	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
45	Ray Smith verbal correspondence with staff	February 2011	18 Watson Rd N	Request to include the property in the Industrial designation to be consistent with the designation of neighbouring properties.	Staff are supportive of this request. The mapping in the current Official Plan does not clearly identify the intended designation of these lands. It is appropriate that these lands be designated Industrial in accordance with the prevailing land use designation in this area. <u>Recommendation:</u> Designate property as Industrial.
46	Hugh Handy GSP Group Inc. On behalf of Gordon Creek Development Inc	May 18, 2010	1291 Gordon St	Concerned with proposed Medium Density Residential designation for the subject property and height limit of 5 storeys. The approved zoning for the site permits a height of 6 storeys plus underground parking. Would like to know the rationale for the height limitation and why the east side of Gordon Street is proposed to be designated High Density Residential allowing for a height of 10 storeys.	The maximum height in the Medium Density Residential Designation has been changed to 6 storeys to more closely reflect the proposed urban design policies for mid-rise buildings and to correspond with the height limits in the Zoning By-law for mid-rise apartments. Lands on the east side of Gordon Street have been designated high density residential to support the provision of a range and mix of housing types and to assist in meeting the City's intensification objectives and target. <u>Recommendation:</u> No further changes required. Staff propose a policy revision to permit a maximum height of 6 storeys in Medium Density Residential Designation.

Property Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010*

	Respondent	Date	Property	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
47	Nancy Sullivan on behalf of the University of Guelph	May 17, 2010	University of Guelph lands	<p>Edinburgh and College (17 acres) - does not object to the change from General Residential to High Density Residential.</p> <p>Wellington Woods Student Family Townhouses (11 acres) - Does not support the change from Institutional/Research Park to High Density Residential. The University would like to continue to have the ability to extend the research park in the future should the student family housing cease to exist.</p> <p>Holiday Inn on Stone Road West and U of G Stone Road Retail Lands - The University supports the land use designation change from Intensification Area to Mixed Use Corridor.</p> <p>Turf Grass Institute - The University has no comment on the proposed change from Major Institutional to Special Study Area.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> At the request of the University, the lands where the Wellington Woods Student Family Townhouses are situated continue to be designated Institutional/Research Park.</p>

Property Specific Comments Received Since the Release of the First Draft April 2010*

	Respondent	Date	Property	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
48	Herb Neumann	November 29, 2011	132 Clair Rd W	Request to change the designation of the property to General Residential through a comprehensive municipal review as part of the Official Plan update.	<p>Staff are not supportive of a change in designation as site specific designation changes are not within the scope of the Official Plan Review. The municipal comprehensive review of employment lands concluded that all lands that are designated for employment uses in the south end of the City should be maintained to provide an adequate supply of employment lands to the year 2031. Additionally, this property was the subject of an Ontario Municipal Board hearing in 2001 that dismissed the appeal to change the designation from Corporate Business Park to General Residential.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u>: No changes.</p>
49	Astrid Clos on behalf of Parry Schnick	December 16, 2011	Lowes Road Area (west of Gordon Street)	Request to extend the proposed Medium Density Residential designation in the Gordon Street corridor at Lowes Road. Request that the lands between Gordon Street and the rear of a lot depth facing onto Dawn Avenue would be included in the Medium Density Residential Designation.	<p>The proposed designations within the Gordon Street intensification corridor are intended to provide sufficient land area to allow for redevelopment within the corridor while ensuring that development is directed and oriented towards Gordon Street.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u>: No changes.</p>