



Adam A. Donaldson @adamadonaldson

Jul 3, 2024 · 131 tweets · adamadonaldson/status/1808557467665650019

Coming up at 2 pm, it's this month's Committee of the Whole meeting. This is what's coming up on the packed agenda:



Committee of the Whole Preview – What's on the Agenda for the July 3...

A lot of municipal policy is going to come to a head at July's Committee of the Whole meeting. From demolition by neglect to light pollution to lobbying, there's a lot to cover in what ...

<https://guelphpolitico.ca/2024/06/21/committee-of-the-whole-preview-whats-on-the-age...>

Closed session is going long...



Council is emerging from closed, so the meeting is about to begin!

One item from closed session: Letters of Intent to Acquire Municipal Property - Unsolicited. Mayor Guthrie says they received info, and gave direction on same.

Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest or General Nature Thereof? Nope.

First, staff recognition. Ian White from Legal and Court Services has been called to the bar.



Now we dig into the Public Services agenda with Chair Downer. First item: Heritage Minimum Standards - Property Standards By-law Amendment. No staff presentation, but there are two designations.

Staff have prepared a draft bylaw to combat “demolition by neglect” by requiring proper maintenance on heritage attributes and proactively stopping the deterioration and damage to vacant heritage buildings.

The bylaw sets the requirements for upkeep, the necessity of using original materials when possible, and repairing before replacing, and it sets a minimal standard for utilities in vacant and/or damaged heritage buildings.

First, Susan Watson who's appearing via telephone from Northern Ontario. She's in favour of this, it's long overdue, but concerned that it only applies to designated buildings and not the listed ones. Also, we need a vacant buildings registry.

Second, Werner Zimmermann. He applauds the bylaw, but says what makes Guelph unique is the older parts of the city and its maintenance. What's missing is protecting the overall look of a neighbourhood and protect that character.

Allt/Richardson move Recommendation:

That Council approves the draft by-law 2024-20944, as attached to this report, and that staff be directed to place the by-law on the July 23, 2024, agenda for final adoption, after which the by-law will come into effect on July 31, 2024.

Caron says this has been on the City's radar since 2005, and asks staff about what happens with the heritage list expires at the end of the year. GM of Planning Walkey notes that the expire has been extended to 2027...

...there are 300 designated and 1,700 listed, so if they were to extend the bylaw to all listed properties that would eat up extra staff resources.

Caron asks about non-residential heritage assets like bridges, who's responsible for that? Staff says that his bylaw focuses on residential, but they can take that away.

Gibson asks if a decision to add the full registry is tabled, then this would create another round of public consultation? GM of Operations Godfrey says yes. Gibson says that's important to make landowners aware of such changes.

Klassen asks about a vacant building registry, what's the deal? DCAO Lee says staff are looking at ways to manage the data, but the ability to aggregate it and develop policy based on that is at issue.

Klassen: Is a report coming?

Lee: TBD.

Klassen: Can ppl report issue through the app?

Lee: Yes, or a phone call will suffice.

Busuttill asks if the stored limestone is made available to homeowners that need heritage repairs? Walkey says there's a policy being developed, but it is available for no charge to designated properties.

Downer asks if the 300 includes the ones in the heritage district. Walkey says there are 160 additional properties on top of the 300 when you include the Brooklyn and College Hill HCD.

Lee says strategy on vacant home tax is coming forward through the Affordable Homes Strategy, which will be coming to council later this year.

Caron says that she's not as concerned about the designated properties as she as buildings on the register, and encourages members of the public to submit concerns to property standards.

Motion approved unanimously.

Next, Not for Profit Facility Lease Renewals – The Guelph Youth Music Centre, the Royal City Tennis Club Corporation and the Navy League Guelph Branch all need to renew their leasing contracts with the City of Guelph.

Since these agreements are 10 years in length (20 years in the case of the Tennis Club) this falls outside the usual standard delegated authority of staff so it needs committee approval.

Again no presentation. Two delegates: Samantha Zimmerman and Liz Sandals, exec director and chair (respectively) of the Guelph Youth Music Centre. Sandals wants to address the term.

Last lease was 20 years, with 10 year renewal and then terminated at request of tenant. Sandals says original lease began before the reno at GYMC building, so there was a lot of stuff in there not needed. Been working on new wording, and they're getting close.

Sandals says that council seems to be reaching for 5 year renewal over 10 years. Would like that 10 year renewal.

Allt says that the recommendation is 10 years, and it is. Sandals says that from the planning point of view as a non-profit, it makes more sense for 10 year lease when making business decisions.

Allt/Goller move Recommendation:

That the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer of Public Services execute the 10-year lease agreement with Guelph Youth Music Centre from August 1, 2024 to July 31, 2034.

(cont'd)

That the DCAO of Public Services execute the 20-year lease agreement w/ Royal City Tennis Club Corporation from July 1, 2024 to June 30, 2044.

That the DCAO of Public Services execute the 10-year lease agreement w/ Navy League, Guelph Branch, from August 1, 2024 to July 31, 2034

DCAO Clack-Bush notes that this is for 10 years and the reason why it's brought to CoW/council is because they only have the designated authority to renew for 5 years.

The motion is approved.

Next, Light Pollution By-law Review. Presently, bylaw only regulates trespass into a window, but this new bylaw will hope to address the kind of lighting that spills over from one property to another.

No presentation here either, but one delegation. Dennis Scherer says that there needs to be some control with halogen lights on garages and front porches, solar lights lit up at all hours of the night. He says his neighbour's back yard is always lit for "some kind of ritual thing"

Proof:



Scherer says that he's tried to go to bylaw but there were unable to do anything because there is no bylaw. Gibson says the key word here is "excessive", and Scherer adds that there should be no lighting that affects the lifestyle of others. Also, think about animals.

Klassen/Caton move Recommendation:

That Council direct staff to create a by-law or an amendment to the existing property standards by-law (2000)-16456 prohibiting light generated from fixtures from trespassing

from one private property to another private property.

(cont'd)

That Council direct staff to create lighting guidelines that encourage the use of full cut off light fixtures. These guidelines will allow the residents to adjust their outdoor lighting to eliminate light pollution.

Billings asks if the second rec is impossible at townhouse units. Godfrey says the definition is any unusual quantity or excessive light, so it's contextual. Billings asks how we're measuring this. Godfrey says think about how we measure excessive noise.

Godfrey: The tools with which we would enforce it depends on how it's written in the bylaw. The intent is to prohibit excessive light, and council could change that to regulate if they wish.

Billings: Any exemptions?

Godfrey: First this deals with light trespass, and second it's about recommending to council how they can eliminate light pollution.

Caron asks about parking lots. Godfrey says that there won't be any grandfathering when it comes to light trespass. General light pollution will be felt with new guidelines, and then staff will look to update after 5 years to see if those guidelines have been effective.

James Parr, Service Performance Development Analyst, notes that owners could add cut off shades to the light to deal with trespass, but the guidelines will encourage property owners to take on light pollution actions on their own initiative. Method up to them.

Caron says that she's notice with problem with light pollution get worse and worse over the decades and hopes this has an impact.

O'Rourke asks about expectations, that photo shows bright light, but doesn't trespass...

Godfrey sez that's correct, but staff is hopeful that residents will look at the guidelines & take their situation into account. City will provide education, not enforcement for light pollute

O'Rourke asks if rule still applies since there's no site plan for <10 units. Godfrey says there will be no requirement under the planning rules as they stand now.

O'Rourke: How will enforcement work?

Godfrey: Complaint basis. Right now City gets between 30-50 calls per year. As always the hope will be that education works first.

O'Rourke: Any proactive conversation with parking lot owners?

Godfrey: More reactive.

Gibson asks about confidence to find a balance with holiday season. Doesn't want to have bylaw called on festive occasions. Parr says holiday/cultural lighting is fine as long as it doesn't trespass in an excessive way. There are exceptions in places w/strict night sky bylaws.

Gibson asks about lighting to mitigate bad behaviour. Parr says the future bylaw will have exemptions for safety-based lighting used by the city like streetlight.

Billings wants to have an amendment to replace with work "eliminate" with "regulate".

O'Rourke seconds.

*Dennis Scherer

Recommendation:

1. That Council direct staff to create a by-law or an amendment to the existing property standards by-law (2000)-16456 prohibiting light generated from fixtures from trespassing from one private property to another private property.
2. That Council direct staff to create lighting guidelines that encourage the use of full cut off light fixtures. These guidelines will allow the residents to adjust their outdoor lighting to **eliminate** light pollution.

Correction: Here's the new wording...

Light Pollution By-law Review - 2024-286



1. That Council direct staff to create a by-law or an amendment to the existing property standards by-law (2000)-16456 regulating light generated from fixtures from trespassing from one private property to another private property.
2. That Council direct staff to create lighting guidelines that encourage the use of full cut off light fixtures. These guidelines will allow the residents to adjust their outdoor lighting to eliminate light pollution.

Amendment approved.

Amended recommendations approved.

Now, Mayor Guthrie will take over the chair again for the Governance agenda.

Next, Mayoral Direction B3 - Strategic Real Estate Partnerships on Underutilized City-Owned Assets.

First, a presentation featuring:

-Luke Jefferson, Strategic Property Advisor

-James Goodram, General Manager, Economic Development and Tourism

First, Goodram notes that the city is trying to fight a housing crisis, and secure more parkland. He says that they did not know that this was where staff ended up, and they feel conflicted about it too, but action on this matter is urgent.

They looked at all sites owned by City and ONgov, but they only had a limited timeline. Parking lots may have restrictions that require more research or lack infrastructure. If CoW wishes to proceed there's more work that needs to be done including testing, and REI.

The goal here is to get high density units, and affordable. Also, bachelors and 1-bdrm would be ideal. The goal to get affordable units for no less than 25 years. Also, they're working on several other initiatives with Housing Accelerator Funds.

Inventory of city owned land will continue and a will hopefully be complete by the end of the year. A report should come back sometime afterward.

For now, Jefferson takes over.

Areas of Focus and Key Information

- **Areas of focus from Mayoral Direction:**
 - Provide an update by end of Q2
 - Preference for assets that can be developed quickly
 - Focus on affordability
- **Key Information:**
 - If the site is expensive to build, it will be expensive to buy or rent
 - Adjacent density informs service capacity (target high-density neighbourhoods for high-density development)
 - Sites that are technically challenging require time and investment to develop
- **Key Takeaway:** To build fast and affordable, focus on sites that have existing servicing capacity, do not have technical challenges and are highly developable

-Affordable rentals require affordable construction

-Density creates affordability, so need neighbourhoods that can handle that density.

-Land needing technical work cannot be developed quickly so they're out.

Staff look at 14 parking sites, including all surface lots downtown. Many of them have buried infrastructure that would be expensive to move, so they couldn't be redeveloped quickly. Others cannot be redeveloped w/o impacting other projects.

Build Quickly, Build Affordable

Unencumbered green tableland presents the best opportunity to develop quickly

Unprogrammed or under-utilized park spaces fit this criteria

BUTTTTTTTTTTTTTT...

This will be a challenge to the Official Plan Park service levels and any impacts of a decision will need to be evaluated as part of future park acquisition strategy and future budget impacts

That leads us to these 2 proposals:

Site 1: Hugh Guthrie Park

Hugh Guthrie Park:
1.3 acres for
consideration; retain
approximately 4.5
acres of parkland



Site 2: Sleeman Park

Sleeman Park:
1.5 acres for
consideration;
retain
approximately 2
acres of parkland
Baseball diamond
would be removed



The Sleeman ball diamond is booked two nights a week, plus there's lots of neighbourhood use. That would have to be absorbed by the City rec department.

More info coming back in Q1 2025.

For now, this is the Recommendation:

- That the report titled Mayoral Direction B3 – Strategic Real Estate Partnerships on Underutilized City-Owned Assets dated July 3, 2024, be received.

Five delegates for this starting with Elena Harte, Central Ontario Co-operative Housing Federation. She says they have not seen the levels of funding now available for co-op housing in 30 years. Encourages council to think about *permanent* affordable housing, hence co-op.

Harte says that they want to be part of the conversation as council goes through this process. She has a letter in the agenda: <https://pub-guelph.escrimemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=49495>

Chew asks about other projects they've got going on. Harte says they're working on one in Brant geared to seniors, first of its kind in the area, since seniors are in need of downsizing options.

O'Rourke asks about timing. Harte says that there are upcoming funding opportunities early next year, but she can't talk about concerns around lost of greenspace, which is something else O'Rourke asked about.

Susan Watson is back. She says she's concerned that the housing crisis which left housing to private developers is being used to offer up public land for cheap to those same developers. Notes that GRCA is about to declare Niska lands surplus, which were bought by CofG in 70s.

She also notes the burgeoning parkland shortfalls and how Sleeman Park is in the park-deprived west end. Also notes that it's not like there's a lot of money for buying new parkland either. Also, Guelph has been zoned for housing beyond the capacity for water to keep up.

Next, Ryan Deska from Habitat for Humanity Guelph Wellington. He says that the housing crisis has become a familiar conversation, and notes that they're actively building 200 units over the next 3 years. The need has never been greater.

Deska says that he knows everyone's working hard, and there's a willingness from community leaders to ask what's possible. Land is expensive and hard to come by, especially for peeps who build affordable. Notes City of Kitchener recent donated land to Habitat.

He also notes that a donation of land was key to the development of Shelldale, which opened last week. He does argue that there should be a convo about what type of housing is appropriate here, needs to be a whole of community decision to find what works.

O'Rourke asks if the land in Kitchener was a park. He says it was a piece of land already designated for residential. O'Rourke asks if its imperative to make decision today b/c council's going to get more info. Deska says there is a sense of urgency, but talk \neq action.

Chew asks about P3 he's taken part in thru Habitat. He says that they're able to serve more people with partners, and it expands their impact since they're to having to leverage market units to get affordable ones built.

Goller asks how the City should handle the hand off to ensure something gets done in short order. Deska says an expression of interest is a good idea, but he's not saying Habitat is the right partner for this. They need org that can get action & experience doing similar projects

Downer asks if they've ever approached the U of G for land? Deska says they're always exploring different orgs, tho he's not sure he wants to share a list. They would pursue any project of that scale.

Arlene Slocombe from Water Watchers is next. She has "deep" concerns about handing over parkland to developers due to water capacity. We need prudent and sustainable urban planning, otherwise, answer where new supply is coming from.

Last delegate, Werner Zimmermann is back! His point is simple: When a park's gone, it's gone. It's a family place for the neighbourhood, and near his place on Glasgow Street there is vacant land and building available. Need more green, more trees. (And yes, more housing.)

Chew asks if Zimmerman sees how a project might revitalise a park space. He says that it's tough to see, but he's worried about giving away parkland one chunk at a time till there's none left.

Busuttil notes that there's no safe way to cross the street for people to get to Sleeman Park, is that something Zimmerman's thinking about. He says that's very important. Also, make a place where you can play or you can sit. Just enjoy the outdoors.

One more delegate, Deb Newcombie. She lives in the area of Hugh Guthrie park and doesn't want to see it developed, and believe that 30% is a starting place for how much parkland will be lost. More like 50%. Also, there was a landfill under Hugh Guthrie Park (?)

Chew/Klassen move to receive the report.

Downer asks if the City's ever approached the U of G about their land holdings. Goodram says no with respect to this report, but as they go forward they will look at federal, county,

school boards and U of G once they get a handle on City lands.

Busuttil asks to confirm parkland shortage. Jefferson says that current park service levels meet minimum in the OP (2 acres/1000 people, should be 3.3/1000).

Busuttil: Is there a shortage of land?

Walkey: 4.1 yr in short-term, 17 yr supply long-term.

Busuttil asks about changes in parkland dedication since 2022. Jefferson says he doesn't have exact specs, but ONgov introduce 10% cap and exemptions for affordable housing.

Busuttil: Reduced by 50% for land and cash?

Jefferson: Correct.

Busuttil asks about safe crossing for Sleeman Park, any plans there? DCAO Clack-Bush says she'll have to get back to Busuttil after Guthrie grumbly allowed the question to proceed since it's technically off topic.

Caron says that there's a housing affordability strategy ongoing, as is the complete land inventory. When they coming back to council? Goodram says year end for the inventory, but just city-owner portion. Sept 10 an update for affordability strategy, Oct 10 is the draft.

Caron says council is obligated to make evidence based decisions, and there's still some info missing. (She know the motion is only to vote to receive.)

Caron says she's not heard access to land is an issues, it's almost red tape, infrastructure, other factors. Is land a significant factor? Goodram says there's no shortage, but it isn't free and represents a significant cost. Combined with interest rates, construction costs.

Acting CAO Holmes says that the mayor's direction was to find land that could be developed quickly and that's what this represents. They now waiting to see where council wants to go from here.

Caton asks why special olympics use of the ball diamond at Sleeman Park not as valued as use at other parks. Clack-Bush says that's not the intent, it was just noted that they were the ones booking the space. Special Olympics could be accommodated elsewhere.

Goller asks if there's any consideration for making up parkland loss. Jefferson says that there are a number of activities being undertaken, so whatever happens on this would have to be factored into future strategies for acquisition.

Goller asks about potential negative impact on water table. City engineer Terry Gayman says that they would look at that pre- and post-development.

Goller asks about water taking. Holmes says there is a cap on water capacity in 2051 and any piping would be a massive provincial project. There are options in the water servicing master plan for more conservation, but that might also require more capital investments.

Goller asks if future projects might be cancelled because the City reaches its water capacity. Holmes says that's correct.

Guthrie tries to refocus because there's a lot of questions about planning justifications, and the motion is only to receive the report. Questions now are getting at possible motion about going out for expression of interest.

Goller asks if pace wasn't an issue, could parking lots be on the menu. Goodram says they could look at that, but some would require an EA or a risk assessment.


Allt says he cannot support the motion to receive the report as it's a dangerous precedent and opens up greenspace for possible redevelopment. Parks aren't the problem or the solution, and Guelph has 4k-6k units approved, not constructed. Don't need land fire sale.

Caton says she will also vote against because she doesn't want to make a decision without all the information. That's not a slight against staff.

Motion to receive passes 7-6. Busuttill, Richards, Allt, Billings, Caron, and Caton all against.

Motions from Chew seconded (at the last minute) by Gibson. Motions direct staff to study making the park market ready with \$400k from Housing Accelerator fund, plus release Request for interest.

Mayoral Direction B3 - Strategic Real Estate Partnerships on Underutilized City-Owned Assets, 2024-308



1. That staff be directed to initiate the required studies, applications, and actions to create development ready sites at Hugh Guthrie and Sleeman Parks, as outlined in report 2024-308, and that an amount not to exceed \$400,000, funded from the Housing Accelerator Fund, be allocated to complete this work.
2. That staff be directed to develop and release a Request for Expressions of Interest, following the completion of all required studies, applications, and actions, to seek a proponent to develop affordable units at Hugh Guthrie and Sleeman Parks, as outlined in report 2024-308.

Downer declares conflict since she lives within 100m of Guthrie Park. Asks for Sleeman to be separated out so she can vote on that one.

O'Rourke asks if there are other parks nearby that would be easy substitutes for the surrounding community? Goodram says they did look at area parks, but they don't have demographics handy. Jefferson adds they did some park equity mapping, so they can follow-up.

O'Rourke asks if they looked at adaptive reuse like the pottery studio. Goodram says that this is part of the additional work they're doing.

O'Rourke asks about expectation with REI, will they have to accept one of them? Goodram says they will work that out with the purchasing team, but there will be a likelihood of moving forward with a project and having to be clear with criteria.

O'Rourke asks about ironclad measures to guarantee it's affordable housing. Goodram says they will work that out too, and part of House Accelerator is to come up with those metrics and assurances. Walkey adds that affordable targets set by City every year. Rate has to meet target

Purchase rate is \$398k this year, for example.

Clack-Bush notes that the pottery studio is on the longer term side of things because there are setbacks for Metrolinx that have to be observed.

O'Rourke asks if they've talked to the county about building subsidised housing, b/c that waitlist is loooooong. Goodram says that would be a new direction, and not the one that they were doing to prepare for this report. Clack-Bush says they can have that talk.

Caron says that they've been told again and again that the barriers to building are interest, red tape & construction costs, never land availability. Parkland doesn't belong to the city, it belongs to ppl and if we're turning parks into housing, then developers have failed.

Klassen asks if this would have to be a land sale, or a long-term lease? Goodram says they can look at both. Klassen adds that she's concerned that the first item on the menu is parks. The City should lead, but now residents feel like the City is taking space away.

Busuttil says that it's important to have public land and takes that responsible seriously as a steward. New parks popping up are more like parklettes and concerned about the value judgment of a park not being used and not asking why.


Goller has an amendment to add city parking lots and specify government owned social housing for the development. Chew seconds that, but we're waiting to see the wording.

Guthrie clarifies that the work about parking lots is ongoing, and would like to avoid scoping the project now and have this come back to council for that debate. Doesn't want to try and limit things.

At issue is the the fact that Downer has declared a conflict for Guthrie park, so it's got to be applied to two motions. O'Rourke notes concerns that there's not enough money to go around.

Amendment fails 2-11 (Chew and Goller for).

Mayoral Direction B3 - Strategic Real Estate Partnerships on Underutilized City-Owned Assets, 2024-308 (Hugh Guthrie Park)
Councillor Goller



That the motion be amended to add "City Parking Lots" and replace 'affordable housing' with 'government owned social or co-operative housing' to read the following:

1. That staff be directed to initiate the required studies, applications, and actions to create development ready sites at **City Parking Lots** and Hugh Guthrie Park, as outlined in report 2024-308, and that an amount not to exceed \$200,000, funded from the Housing Accelerator Fund, be allocated to complete this work.
2. That staff be directed to develop and release a Request for Expressions of Interest, following the completion of all required studies, applications, and actions, to seek a proponent to develop **government owned social housing or co-operative housing** units at **City Parking Lots** and Hugh Guthrie Park as outlined in report 2024-308.

Chew says it's important to look at the merits of what's being proposed regardless of how council feels about it. It's an opportunity to continue a conversation around revitalising spaces and developing more houses. Public/private partnerships are getting stuff done.


Chew says that he gets that there's reservations, but these sites are next to transit, mature neighbourhoods and amenities. Don't need to be fearful about opportunities. This is what council is here for.

Caton says we should be putting effort toward truly affordable units, but easy and fast is not always the right choice with the downsides of using parkland.

Caron makes a motion to defer, a failure of leadership and stewardship to make a quick decision. Billings seconds deferral.

Deferral passes 10-3 (Chew, Guthrie and Gibson against).

Mayoral Direction B3 - Strategic Real Estate Partnerships on Underutilized City-Owned Assets, 2024-308
Councillor Caron



1. That any action on the Item 10.1 Mayoral Direction B3 - Strategic Real Estate Partnerships on Underutilized City-Owned Assets, 2024-308 be DEFERRED until the Housing Affordability Strategy has been received by Council.

Guthrie says he's gleamed from the convo today is that council wants public land to answer real need. Would that be part of criteria staff would bring back? Goodram says that there will be analysis of the type of land and how quickly it can be actioned, then council can decide.

Two more items on the agenda, but Guthrie calls a 20-minute break till 6 pm.

Next, Lobbyist Registry By-law. Mayor Guthrie calls the meeting back to order.

Dylan McMahon, Acting General Manager, City Clerk's Office/City Clerk will present. He calls the a significant addition to the council's transparency and accountability directive. The framework came back in April, and this bylaw is largely based on that work.

One universal direction coming from consultation: make it as easy as to use as possible and as easy to understand as possible. Staff are trying to make the process as simple as possible, and the system will be easy to use on any platform.

The purpose of the registry isn't to dissuade anyone from lobbying but to encourage transparency so that anyone can see where and how anyone has a financial stake in any of the lobbying happening at city hall.

The registry will be enforced by a registrar. Suzanne Craig will be Guelph's. With approval at the end of the month, the registry will go live in Oct and be enforced in Jan. Look for promo in Sept.

...