MEMORANDUM

Date: March 30, 2021

To: Council

From: Danielle Manton, City Clerk

Re: Items further to the March 30, 2021 Special Council Agenda

Delegations

1. Sandra Sutherland re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

2. Kayla Andrade re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

3. Cindy Watson re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

4. Amy Di Nino re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

5. Samuel Puchala re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

6. Laura Laugalys re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

Presentations

2. Kathy Padgett, Senior Planner-Environment re: 21-081(CD) ROP Review – Major Transit Station Areas – City of Cambridge Opportunity to Respond PP.18

Correspondence

1. Lynn O’Hare re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.26

2. Krys Woods re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.27

3. Alden Isaacs re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.28

4. Don Dewsbury re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.29

5. McKenzie Burrill re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.30

6. Joe Lethbridge re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.31

7. Brent Woodworth re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.32

8. Eva re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.33

9. Sue Balfour and Gord Balfour re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.34

10. Margie Lake re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.35

11. Don Cowan re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.36

12. June Anderson re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.37

13. David Savoie re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.38

14. Matthew Hayes re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.39
15. Amanda Field re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.40
16. Erin Dej re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.41
17. Daniel Camirand re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.42
18. Patti Toporowski re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.43
19. Joana Borges re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.44
20. Bruce Deighan re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.45
21. Bob Howison re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.46
22. Mike Shanks re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.47
23. Gordon Divitt re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.48
24. Michel L. Chagas re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.49
25. Celia Chaplin re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.50
26. Gord Chaplin re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.51
27. Karin Devries re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.52
28. Karen Houston re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification PP.53

Consideration of Reports
12. 21-123 (CD) 2021 Spring / Summer Programs and Services Update PP. 54
13. 21-089(CD) Additional Building Division Staff PP.66
The Ridge at River Mill
155 Equestrian Way Way
Cambridge, ON

Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment Application
City File No: 26Z-16-2005, 26T-16-2001

PUBLIC MEETING
March 30, 2021
Introduction

Owners: River Mill Development Corporation

- Parkview - 324 Equestrian Way
- Bloom - 1905 Maple Grove
- Brooklyn Heights - 314 Equestrian Way
A reduction in minimum private amenity area from 35 square metres to 4 square metres per dwelling unit, provided on a balcony for stacked cluster row houses.
A reduction in minimum private amenity area from 7 square metres to 4 square metres per dwelling unit, provided on a balcony for back to back row houses.
A reduction in minimum private amenity area from 35 square metres to 25 square metres per dwelling unit for cluster row houses.
A reduction in the distance permitted between an access driveway, aisle, parking stall or parking lot in an RM-class zone to the window of a habitable room of a dwelling unit from 6.0 metres to 3.0 metres.

An increase in the maximum density from 40 to 50 units per gross hectare for cluster row houses.

An increase of the maximum encroachment of open or covered unenclosed patios, decks or porches into front, exterior side and rear yards from 2.5 metres to 3.0 metres.

An increase in the maximum encroachment of eaves into a required yard from 0.5 metres to 0.75 metres.
Brooklyn Heights (314 Equestrian Way)
THE RIDGE AT RIVER MILL
(PHASE 3B)
2-STOREY STANDARD TOWNHOMES
CONCEPTUAL BUILDING ELEVATIONS
THE RIDGE AT RIVER MILL
(PHASE 3B)
3-STOREY STANDARD TOWNHOMES
CONCEPTUAL BUILDING ELEVATIONS
THE RIDGE AT RIVER MILL
(PHASE 3B)
3-STOREY DOUBLE FRONT TOWNHOMES FRONT VIEW
CONCEPTUAL BUILDING ELEVATIONS
THE RIDGE AT RIVER MILL
(PHASE 3B)
3-STOREY DOUBLE FRONT TOWNHOMES REAR VIEW
CONCEPTUAL BUILDING ELEVATIONS
THE RIDGE AT RIVER MILL (PHASE 3B)
3-STORY BACK-TO-BACK TOWNHOMES
CONCEPTUAL BUILDING ELEVATIONS
THE RIDGE AT RIVER MILL
(PHASE 3B)
3-STOREY BACK-TO-BACK TOWNHOMES
CONCEPTUAL BUILDING ELEVATIONS
THE RIDGE AT RIVER MILL (PHASE 3B)
CONCEPTUAL PERSPECTIVE
Regional Official Plan Review Project – Major Transit Station Areas
March 30, 2021
Special Council
Regional Official Plan Review

• Region of Waterloo undertaking a review of the Regional Official Plan (ROP) to bring it into conformity with the Growth Plan and to be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

• One component currently under review is the Intensification Strategy which includes:
  ➢ Delineating Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs).

• Regional Council will receive this information on April 20, 2021.
Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs)

• The area within an approximate 500 to 800 metre (1640 to 2624 feet) radius of a transit station (ION LRT stop), representing about a 10-minute walk.

• MTSAs are planned to achieve:
  - higher densities to provide opportunities for living and working close to higher-order transit; and
  - a mix of residential, office, institutional and commercial development where appropriate.
Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs) Delineation

• Each MTSA has a unique boundary based on the following criteria:
  - Include whole blocks and avoid cutting/dissecting blocks;
  - Use streets, highways, rail corridors and natural features to define the boundaries;
  - Remove areas inaccessible by pedestrians from the boundary;
  - Vacant parcels and lands designated for high density land uses are included in the boundary;
  - Avoid overlapping between MTSAs.

• Larger MTSAs are preferred to maximize the number of potential riders within walking distance to a stop.

• Seven MTSAs are proposed in Cambridge.
Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs) Density Targets

- MTSAs on the ION LRT route are planned to achieve a minimum density of 160 people and jobs/hectare at build out.

- All MTSAs in Cambridge, except Delta Station, are anticipated to be able to meet the minimum density target.

- A request to the Province has been made for an alternative density target for Delta Station of 120 people and jobs/hectare.

- Delta MTSA has restrictions related to the protection of existing employment uses, an existing established residential neighbourhood, and the presence of natural heritage features.

- A lower density target in one MTSA does not result in an increase to another MTSA.
Recommendations


AND THAT Cambridge Council endorse the draft Major Transit Station Areas in Cambridge as outlined in Report 21-081(CD) and recommended by Regional staff;

AND FURTHER THAT Report 21-081(CD) and its resulting resolution be provided to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo.
CONTACT INFORMATION

Kathy Padgett
Senior Planner - Environment
(519) 623-1340 ext. 4826
PadgettK@cambridge.ca
Please councillors consider what a big waste of money these CTS sites are. They do NOT help as they only continue to have the drug user continue their cycle of drug use damaging their bodies further. Mayor McGarry having a background in healthcare, I would hope you would use that medical knowledge to know CTS is not the solution the drug users or the taxpayers need. Please advocate to help get users off drugs using rehab and counselling. We sorely lack funding for this and mental health. Don't waste it on CTS please! They don't work and the only ones trying to convince you they do are companies like Sanguen that are getting rich off of these poor users keeping them perpetually addicted.

Feel free to read this email at any upcoming council meetings.

Thank you,
Lynn
Good Afternoon,
As a life-long resident of Cambridge I am saddened and angry at the way my city is deteriorating. Setting up these sites is not the solution to people's problems. Individual issues need to be addressed and supported, we need to provide mental health support, detox sites and other solutions for these people. There are many reasons why people use drugs and by giving them a constant supply, you are not addressing the issues.
I do not support the CTS sites in Cambridge, they do not work!
I am requesting that my letter be included in the agenda for the council meeting scheduled for Tuesday March 30th.

Regards,
Krys Woods
Hello,

This is an initiative that will not serve our community well. Not only are the locations proposed terrible locations as they are close to schools and families living in the area, it is not safe for children. There is already too much drug abuse happening in our area as we find needles everywhere. I now have a newborn at home and we don't feel comfortable having addicts around our home. We are already scared to walk alone. This CTS site is a band aid solution to a problem that isn't being solved. our taxpayer dollars should not be going into this solution but rather it be contributed to mental health funding and rehab centers and halfway home solutions between rehab so people struggling with homelessness and addiction are not found back in the same position after coming out of rehab.

Please have this letter included in the agenda for the meeting.

Thank you

Alden Isaacs
I write to state I am strongly opposed to any CTS, SIS or any other named addiction enablement program in Cambridge.

It didn't take a lot of research effort to see that since the Kitchener site was opened late in 2019, overdose deaths have in fact increased by a whopping 155% region wide, with 98 in 2020 and 63 in 2019. Hasn't

I take no issue with giving a helping hand to those of our fellow citizens in need but believe this considered approach will only serve to make their addiction more acceptable in the users mind while offering no treatment or deterrent. Sites like this will only serve to be a beacon in bringing more of these troubled people from outside of our city. It will destroy, diminish and devalue whatever community it is placed in.

My support for this position:
- Not even Sanguen's own website mentions treatment services "supports and referrals" are as close as they get.....pamphlets?
- There were no such issues downtown Galt or Cambridge before Bridges was built, do not add to it.
- Overdose deaths have in fact risen since the first site was opened in KW.
- Will only serve to bring more of these addicts to our city.
- Increased crime in whichever neighborhood it is placed in.

Don Dewsbury
40 year resident of Cambridge
Hello,

I am writing to plead the city that they don’t put an CTS site in either of these locations. We have many families with small children on this street and the street behind that will be put at risk. There are daycares and schools very close to both locations. This is a very public spot and doesn’t serve anyone in the community.

There is already too much drug abuse happening in our area as we find needles everywhere. I now have a newborn at home and we don't feel comfortable having addicts around our home. We are already scared to walk alone in the day and never in the evening. This CTS site is a band aid solution to a problem that isn't being solved. Our taxpayer dollars should not be going into this solution but rather it be contributed to mental health funding and rehab centers and halfway home solutions between rehab so people struggling with homelessness and addiction are not found back in the same position after coming out of rehab.

We are angry that we were not notified of this. We are very concerned for the safety and well-being of the children and families of this community.

Please have this letter included in the agenda for the meeting.

Thank you,

McKenzie Burrill
Hello

I am writing this regarding the two locations proposed for a SafeR injection Site. I refer to it as safer rather than safe because it never completely safe to inject drugs into one’s system, moreso with street drugs cut with fentanyl, heroin and others.

In such a lengthy time I find it difficult to see that only two locations passed muster, yet both are reasonably close to Manchester School and Montessori.

Even with no schools nearby, they are residential areas. Having a CTS should not be seen as a win as others who live, shop or go to school may lose.

A year or so ago at least one councillor hoped it would be within an existing medical facility.

As for wraparound services onsite, what are they exactly? If mental health counselling, the general public should also be permitted to use such services as their cases continue to go unchecked. Trust me when I say teleconferencing or zoom is not the same as one to one interaction.

Even with a CTS in Kitchener numbers are still high. Even if a fatal overdose were to happen at a CTS they do not confirm the death so in a way zero deaths at CTS would be true if only on paper.

Addicts do not all operate on a timeline. They get high when and where they are.

If any proposed CTS were to be, I could only agree to one in an existing medical building or the hospital, not in a residential area.

Joe Lethbridge
Greetings Jan

I am very disappointed in the news today of the selection committee choices for the location of the proposed safe injection sites.
Have we the people of Haddington St not seen enough in the last 5 years, with 32 finally closed our children can venture out to play with other kids on the street, however this will be short lived! The committee who selected these sites must not be looking at the broader picture and only see dollar signs in there field of view.

I have spoken with many businesses in the impacted area of these two proposed sites and all have said the will move there business elsewhere.

You know how passionate the residents of Haddington St have been over the problems seen on this street, can you imagine a drug deeper selling his drugs eight next to a school of day-care, because it will happen, so will the gun violence, the theft, and so on.

What do we as tax paying citizens have to say or do to let the powers that be know that we will not stand for this.

Respectfully yours

Brent Woodworth
The argument is simple: safe injection sites have not delivered on their promises and have caused a significant increase in trash, crime, and disorder. Public health experts have built safe injection facilities with little public input, creating problems for long-time residents. As Ontario Premier Doug Ford told reporters: "If I put (a safe injection site) beside your house, you'd be going ballistic."
An emerging body of evidence suggests safe injection sites may cause more harm than good. In Alberta, public health authorities released a bombshell report that showed the sites did not reduce overall overdose deaths or opioid-related emergency calls. And they led to an increase in crime, discarded needles and social disorder in surrounding neighborhoods.
Residents complained that they were not involved in the process and felt "less safe than before." After the release of the report, Alberta Premier Jason Kenney announced that the provincial government would consider closing or relocating some of the safe injection sites.
Ontario, Alberta and Manitoba are three of the five largest Canadian provinces, and home to the urban populations of Toronto, Calgary and Winnipeg. Premiers Doug Ford, Jason Kenney and Brian Pallister all challenge the ideology of "harm reduction" and have spoken on the public’s frustration about safe injection sites.
Since taking office, Premier Ford cut funding for three safe injection sites, Premier Kenney froze funding for new safe injection facilities and Premier Pallister announced his intention to support law enforcement over harm reduction.
First, the activist narrative on harm reduction—that it saves lives without collateral costs—cannot be maintained. Safe injection sites have an extremely poor record of moving drug users into treatment and recovery, with some referral rates as low as 1%. As a result, neighborhoods that host safe injection sites, like the Downtown Eastside in Vancouver, often devolve into open-air drug markets, with hundreds of homeless addicts sleeping in the streets. This, of course, only compounds the problem and externalizes the social costs onto neighbors and small businesses.
Already, in some American cities that have come closest to implementing safe injection sites, there are echoes of the Canadian uprising. In 2017, five cities surrounding Seattle quickly passed local ordinances banning safe injection sites; U.S. Attorney Brian Mora warned Seattle lawmakers that any attempt to create a safe injection site would immediately be shut down by the federal government. Earlier this year, Philadelphia announced it would open the nation's first safe injection site, then quickly reversed course after working-class residents in South Philadelphia rebelled against the plan.
Moving forward, opponents of "harm reduction" must build on these successes and develop a coordinated strategy to prevent the establishment of safe injection sites. We all can learn an important lesson from cities like Vancouver and Seattle: there is no such thing as safely using heroin, fentanyl and methamphetamine. If all else fails move the bridges and the site to a Location away from schools, daycares and old folks homes. Consider an industrial location with access to public transport!

Eva
My husband and I want you all to know that we are totally AGAINST these proposed sites that are almost NEXT DOOR to a public school AND a daycare!
WHAT ARE YOU PEOPLE THINKING?????

We are requesting that this email/letter (whatever you want to call it) (OUR VOICES) be added to the agenda for the council meeting scheduled on Tuesday March 30th.

Respectfully,
Sue Balfour and Gord Balfour
"Aspire to Inspire
before you Expire"
Dear Mayor

The thought of drug addicts, which would be drawn in concentrated numbers, as well as the gathering of drug dealers, so close to where I live, and a grocery store which I frequent disturbs me tremendously. I feel the city needs to pursue viable options to help addicts recover physically, mentally and emotionally. If instead the city goes ahead with safe injection sites then they need to be away from controversial areas. I fear the cost of the fall out of having these injection sites in the proposed areas will be greater than anyone anticipates. I strongly implore the city to not put any safe injection sites in Cambridge.

Thank you
Margie Lake
Good Morning,

I was astounded to see the news report that 8 Oxford St. is being considered as a consumption site. This location is in the centre of a residential area. The only way to get to the site without a vehicle is by foot through residential streets. The other option is through the wooded area where the city just erected fences to stop trespassers. Even though this is an area of century homes it is home to many young families and two daycare centres. In this time of crazy real estate prices, this is an area where a young family might actually afford a home with a backyard. This site seems like someone has put a pin in a map to avoid visibility in the core but not considered any other factors. If we really cared about the people needing these services there are several empty buildings surrounding the main bus terminal. Look at the attached picture taken on Roseview Ave and please take this site off your list of possibilities.

Thank you

Don Cowan
I write this email concerning the issue of a Safe Injection Site in Cambridge. Thank you for the extensive study regarding the appropriate location of an SIS.

The gravity of the opiate crisis in our community has reached epidemic levels. In my work of 24 years at the Cambridge Self Help Food Bank I often met individuals that would benefit from such a site. I would encourage council to consider putting this site at 150 Main St. This has already proven to be most valuable in a location with other services used by this population. I believe to establish it outside of the core area of Galt would be a huge mistake.

I realize that there are some individuals in our community that do not agree with this suggestion. However, I believe the less vocal segment of our city would support this initiative proven to have worked for the benefit of those that need the service in a multitude of cities across Canada.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of this request.

Respectfully submitted.

June Anderson.
Good day Mrs McGarry,

I with my family have lived in Hespeler for 35 years. We moved from the Toronto area to provide a slower pace and safe environment for our children to grow up and go to school. I’m sending this email to voice my opposition to a safe injection site anywhere in the city of Cambridge. I believe in recent years the city of Cambridge has seen a dramatic increase in crime and I believe that an injection site anywhere in the city of Cambridge would only create more problems as well as lowering property values. Yourself and city council were elected by the citizens of Cambridge to serve and listen to the citizens of Cambridge.

This city is changing and not for the good. I urge you to please reconsider a safe injection site anywhere in the city of Cambridge.

Regards,

David Savoie
Hi,

My wife and I live at 60 Roseview ave, our back yard backs on to The Bridges shelter and my front lawn intersects with Oxford. When we moved into this area a few years ago we knew there would be some extra issues with being in such close proximity to the shelter. We have had our garage broken into as well as our car more then several times. Our backyard is frequently used as a short cut to the shelter. The wooded area that surrounds the lot has often been used for tents and it’s not an uncommon sight for drug users to be both on the street in the surrounding blocks as well in the wooded area. We have taken this all in stride and have been understanding with the homeless issue that our community is facing.

The proposal to put a safe injection site on Oxford street will only take an existing problem and increase it exponentially. This neighbourhood already has many issues with crime and to add another driving factor seems as the region is intentionally causing more issues for the residents in this area. There is a preschool and Montessori with in a block of this location and a school with in two. How is the location in the middle of such a dense residential area being considered? Would not a better location be the hospital? I believe they had been receptive to the idea but were not able to accommodate it while under construction.

I implore you and the other councillors to reconsider this as a potential site.

All the best,
Matthew Hayes
Hello it has come to my attention of the two CTS sites (8 Oxford St. and 15 Easton St.) . This is very concerning to me as a mother of 3 who lives right in the middle of both proposed sites . I’ve lived on Haddington Street for almost 30 years great memories on this street as a child now I’m raising my own children and let me tell you the past 4 plus years living on this street has been ridiculous I’m sure your well aware we had a drug house to which we finally as a neighbourhood came together to get rid of . My children seen far to much living a couple doors down from a drug house , my youngest was terrified to play outside . Just when I thought great we can have peace and quite and my children don’t have to witness drug addict behaviour I find we now may be close to a CTS site .... This worries me as a parent . Both my children’s schools will be close by these proposed sites (Manchester and G.C.I) . I do not agree with this and it’s not fair to the residents and children whom live near by . Please hear my voice !

Amanda Field
Hello,

My name is Erin Dej and I am a resident of Cambridge, and East Galt specifically. I am writing to City Councillors to voice my whole hearted support for a Consumption and Treatment Site in Cambridge.

Criminal justice efforts to address substance use have failed miserably. This is because drug use is a health issue, not a criminal justice issue. People who use drugs are not bad people. They are not inherently dangerous or criminal. They are people; people who happen to use drugs. Their lives are as valuable as mine, or yours, or anyone else, and they deserve access to life saving care as all Canadians should expect in this country. People are dying because the drug supply is unsafe and because people are forced to hide and often use alone for fear of criminal charges. The overdose crisis is concomitant with the pandemic. There is expected to be a 50% increase in the number of deaths this year in Ontario. In the first three months of the pandemic 695 people in Ontario died from an opioid-related death. That's 695 people - actual human beings in our province who mattered and who had loved ones who cared about them. The devaluation of life that has penetrated our social systems and policies for decades has become increasingly visible throughout this pandemic. The lives of the elderly, of low-wage workers, and yes, of people who use drugs, have been positioned as 'less than' others. This is not ok. We cannot allow this to continue.

So many Canadians are proud of our universal health care system, as they should be. But how universal is that care if we know a way we can save people's lives and choose not to because we don't like it? It is un-Canadian and it is inhumane to deny access to a CTS in this community. Not only should there absolutely be a CTS in Cambridge, but it also needs to be located in a place where people will actually use it. It must be located in the urban core where people can walk to access it and it should be located somewhere where people do not feel judged or stigmatized for using drugs.

I implore City Council to do the right thing - to say yes to a CTS and to find a location that works for people who use drugs. You will not be able to find a location that is NIMBY-free so if the NIMBY comments are going to come regardless, it might as well be a site that Councillors can be proud of, knowing it will work best for its users and save people's lives.

Thank you for your consideration,

Erin Dej
New sites are not the solution to our problem in the Cambridge region. Let’s invest public money in rehabilitation centres. CTS is not working. This is encouraging use. Let’s promote a better lifestyle.

Dan
Hello,

I believe we need to proceed with a CTS in Cambridge. Guelph and Kitchener CTS have produced very positive results.

I believe that implementing a Cambridge CTS with wraparound services is an important action for Cambridge to take.

Thanks,
Patti Toporowski
Council of Cambridge,

My family has received a letter with the information that on March 30th Cambridge City Council will consider a city staff report on possible locations for a Consumption Treatment Site (CTS) for citizens-in-need in our community.

I have several points to make. Although the letter presumes that "results refute any negative arguments" and implies that there is no other way to prevent overdose deaths. But YES, there are many other ways to avoid ODs. Preventing kids from using drugs in the first place can be simple and cheap. Instead of investing in Consumption Treatment Sites (CTS) we would rather invest that budget in sports and many other community driven activities, keeping our kids busy and away from a lifestyle that would bring them to harm's way.

We are all aware that drugs don't affect its user alone, it affects their family and our entire community for sure. The first time it is always a choice and if we don't show our kids that there are other ways to deal with their problems they will also end in this terrible situation. Some might say that addiction is not a choice, but read carefully my sentence "first time it is always a choice".

I definitely don't want to raise my family in a city with this kind of program, I chose Cambridge just to stay away from it (common in big centres) and grow my family in a safer place. I already have suffered several incidents in life because of drugs (robbery, guns to my head, etc), and I don't want my kids to go through the same issues I went through.

I want to remind you all about the known law of supply and demand: where there are customers there will be sellers (drug dealers). This fact will not change just because we are creating a "Safe" site for drug use. As a matter of fact it will happen exactly the other way around.

Another point is that whoever is under influence does NOT think straight and they can no longer decide what to do in a proper way even when they want out after being chemically hooked. No one can prevent them from committing crimes as bluglaries, roberies or even rape.

I would not think twice about moving away from Cambridge if this bad idea moves forward, I would be taking my investments and taxes far away from here.

Sincerely
Joana Borges
I think the current galt shelter is a mess an putting the local children in harms way.

Bruce Deighan
Dear Council
I know you folks are probably tired of hearing from me but I worry so much that the voices you do hear
don't not fairly represent many if not most of us who love our community.
I would hope that the council will be supportive of the recommendations that staff come up with. We
have had the advantage of time since the Guelph and then the Kitchener started operating and so many
of the myths put forward by those opposed to a CTS have proven to be incorrect.
Cambridge is certainly as caring for its citizens as either of our neighbours.
Thank you for all the time and effort you all contribute to making Cambridge a better place to live and
work.
Take care

Bob Howison
Dear Council,

I wanted to pass in my thoughts regarding a CTS here in our city.

As an 18 year resident of this city I am more worried about our fellow citizens than ever before. The opioid crisis has taken a bad problem and made it catastrophic. We are losing people day in and day out. A safe place to be able to deal with their daily troubles and better connection to the services available is essential. To just simply leave people to live and use on the streets is giving up our humanity.

Please move forward with the next steps in bringing a CTS to Cambridge. Let's not give up and allow our humanity to erode further.

Mike Shanks
I live on Rich Ave and have participated in meetings, in person and virtually, where this matter has been discussed.

I find myself torn as the need for these facilities is real and urgent but the location - 150 Main Street - seems to present a real risk that the merchants in the area between there and the river will be adversely affected. If that should happen then we face the risk that that section will not be viable as a commercial centre. Additionally the residents in adjacent streets have been subjected to disturbing interactions with ‘homeless’ people.

If an alternative locale could be found I would wholeheartedly support the establishment of a CTS.

Gordon Divitt
Council of Cambridge,

My family and I OPPOSE to the CST in Cambridge.

Firstly there is nothing positive about (if you ever went to Kitchener downtown when it is dark you would understand how bad it is) and I am stunned by the patronizing paragraph “Unfortunately, Councillors are still hearing loud messages from a small group of Cambridge citizens who continue to argue that a CTS will increase drug use and cause harm to local residents and business owners alike. They want CTS banned from ever coming to our community. We have carefully observed the implementation of a Guelph CTS and a Kitchener CTS. Both have produced very positive results that refute negative arguments.” Absolutely NO ONE is in favor of it, at least no one I know who lives in the entire Cambridge / Waterloo / Kitchener is ok with it.

Secondly we came from Vancouver, a city completely changed to worse due to those “progressive” policies that filled many great spots of the city with drug dealers and its “customers” (victims). We left Vancouver for Ontario due to that as well. We can’t raise kids in a place like that and we won’t think twice about moving away from here if we ever see any of this in our city. Consequently taking our Tax Payment away from this Community.

Thirdly you should be focusing on eliminating the drug dealing in our city, not validating / normalizing its consumption. REFUND OUR POLICE AND ALLOW THEM TO WORK! Only then treat the population / victims from this hideous crime, by providing them the detox needed for them to think clearly. They cannot think straight under effect and reviving them from OD is not the way.

Lastly although Canadian Citizens my family and I came from Latin America, from a place that still suffers from Drug Cartels and the “collateral” violence. ALL of this is a consequence of several things allowed by the Government. It is all good until authorities lose control and the cartels take charge. We saw that once and it hurts us a lot to see that Canada might be going in the same path.

Sincerely,

Michel L. Chagas
Just to be clear I do not support the CTS-sites anywhere in the City of Cambridge specifically near the Bridges. We already have tremendous problems there. Furthermore I think the Bridges should relocate to a more suitable location and convert that building for only homeless families in need.

Celia Chaplin
I would approve this for Cambridge however would qualify it by saying it should not be located in the three major downtown areas.

This site needs transportation facilities and room to be surrounded by supporting infrastructure. Gord Chaplin Sent from my iPhone
Hello,

In light of an upcoming city council meeting that will be addressing a CTS in Cambridge, I wanted to share that I strongly support a CTS in Cambridge.

It’s time to recognize how much a CTS location is needed to target overdose deaths. Folks who are suffering from drug addictions need support and access to safe drugs — in order for them to stay alive to hopefully one day receive help they need to overcome their addictions.

There’s a loud voice from a small group of folks in Cambridge that are against CTS— please don’t let their loud voice convince you that the majority of the folks in Cambridge feel this way. I’d also encourage each city councillor to look at the research conducted around CTS’ and also to look to other city’s, who have already implemented this type of support. Please use this information make a decision on how we are going to help citizens of Cambridge who are suffering from addiction. Their lives are important and we have a responsibility to help.

Kind regards,

Karin Devries
Mayor McGarry, Council, Clerks and to whom it may concern:

I am a concerned citizen of Cambridge and I have recently become aware of the possibility of a "Harm Reduction" site being considered here in Cambridge - again! In no way do I, and many of the constituents of Cambridge, agree on having a "harm reduction" site in Cambridge.

People promoting these "harm reduction" sites claim they save lives and yet a person using the site can leave while they are still high and OD just down the street. A pregnant woman can use the site with no questions asked. This is not safe at all.

People promoting these sites claim there are wrap-around services available knowing full well there are none available. These sites are not open 24/7. A person struggling with addiction isn't going to wait until business hours to use the site. A person struggling with addiction isn't even going to go out of their way to use the site. They will use when and where it is convenient for them. Continued drug use will eventually damage the brain and internal organs not to mention damaging the families involved.

Suggestion: The funding used to hand out free drug paraphernalia (that gets tossed all over the streets and parks) and the funding going towards "harm reduction" sites could be used towards funding something that will work - Treatment Centres.

When promoting saving lives - please consider Treatment over Enabling. Long term treatment with supports in place, once the person leaves the treatment centre, should be considered.

I truly believe a lot more lives will be saved with Treatment Centres not the "harm reduction" sites.

Karen Houston
To: COUNCIL

Meeting Date: 03/30/2021

Subject: 2021 Spring / Summer Program and Service Update

Submitted By: Hardy Bromberg, DCM – Community Development
Yogesh Shaw, DCM – Infrastructure Services

Prepared By: Lesley Head, Director, Recreation & Culture
Mike Hausser, Director of Operations

Report No.: 21-123(CD)

File No.: C1101

Recommendations

THAT Report 21-123(CD) – 2021 Spring / Summer Program and Service Update – be received;

AND THAT Council endorse the modified program and service delivery as outlined in this report to provide sports, recreation trails and outdoor services under pandemic conditions, including additional by-law enforcement and operational needs;

AND FURTHER THAT Council approve a transfer from the Rate Stabilization Reserve of up to $862,000 from provincial 2021 COVID-19 Recovery Funding for Municipalities, for modified program and service delivery to meet COVID-19 operational and programming requirements as outlined this report.

Executive Summary

Purpose

• To inform Council of the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the planned program and service delivery in a number of priority areas for the 2021 spring/summer season.

• To recommend program and service levels which have been informed by, and will be guided by, the following:
  o Provincial regulations;
  o Public health orders;
  o Health and safety considerations;
• Input and feedback provided by the public;
• Council-approved 2021 Budget, including cost-containment measures; and
• Alignment with proposed Regional service levels.

• To seek approval from Council for anticipated expenditures related to COVID-19 mitigation measures to enable the delivery of sports, recreation, trails and outdoor services, to the extent permitted under Provincial Legislation and Public Health Regulations.

Key Findings

• The majority of recreation services can be offered by the City under the current Provincial Legislation and Public Health Regulations. Most, if not all, sports and recreation facilities and bookable spaces are planned to be provided, however, some at reduced levels of operation.

• Staff are preparing to service all public outdoor facilities and sports fields in anticipation of strong demand and usage by the public. The delivery of sports and recreation programs will be dependent on the City’s colour placement within the Provincial Response Framework. At present the City remains in the Red – Control level.

• Staff are preparing all bookable facilities and sports fields to accommodate groups and activities permissible under Provincial Regulations and under Public Health Regulations, with City-approved service levels.

• 2021 approved budgets are providing regular staffing levels and expenses to deliver these programs and services, however, there are additional expenses related to COVID-19 that are required to support the plan to offer the services outlined in this report.

• The Government of Ontario has provided 2021 COVID-19 Recovery Funding for Municipalities for the purposes of supporting COVID-19 operating costs and pressures.

Financial Implications

• 2021 budget supports staff and expenses for normal operations of core services, facilities, sports fields, trails, and open spaces/parks. This will provide the City with the ability to receive revenue for community use of facilities and services.
• However, in order to deliver services to the extent possible under pandemic conditions, additional funding is required as outlined in this report and summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Category</th>
<th>Expense details</th>
<th>Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Costs</td>
<td>By-law enforcement</td>
<td>$311,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary staffing for additional washroom cleaning</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shelter/covered space for physical distancing</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Costs:</td>
<td>Additional vehicle leases</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioning off-season vehicles</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extended use of fleet vehicles (deferred surplus)</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mileage reimbursement for personal vehicle use</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal protective equipment for additional staff:</td>
<td>Masks, face shields, googles, gloves, gowns, etc.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage:</td>
<td>For 10 city splashpads and other facilities</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access control:</td>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Costs:</td>
<td>Additional parking spaces required at Bishop Operations Centre</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Value</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$862,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• It is anticipated that by-law enforcement demands will continue to be very high to respond to concerns raised by the public regarding provincial regulations related to congregate limits, masking, and physical distancing. As Cambridge is operating and supporting most programs and facilities, it is likely that there is an additional need for by-law enforcement to respond to issues observed by staff at our facilities and public spaces. Estimated cost is $311,000.

• Public Health has expressed the need for municipalities to open public washrooms and provide portable washroom units. The 2021 budget supports the provision and operation of washrooms and portable units; however, Public Health is recommending the implementation of additional sanitation requirements which is beyond the capacity of existing staffing and operating budgets. The cost to provide enhanced sanitation requirements at Public Health-recommended levels (twice daily) is estimated at $140,000 for the season for students and temporary staffing.

• Physical distancing and occupancy limits have created a need to provide some form of additional sheltered/covered space for operations staff in areas such as horticulture, parks & trails maintenance, sports fields and sport facility support and maintenance. It is proposed that, where space permits, event tents are provided to accommodate space for staff. The estimated cost is $18,000 for approximately ten (10) units.
• A reduction in occupancy of staff within vehicles to a maximum of two (2) individuals has introduced a need for use of additional vehicles to transport staff to/from job sites instead of having up to four (4) occupants under normal operating conditions. Estimated costs are outlined as follows:

  o Additional (7) leased vehicles to support summer programs and construction season at a cost of $40,000 including leasing, fuel, and cleaning costs.

  o Use of existing vehicles within the fleet normally used to transport equipment and materials through winter months but not normally in the summer (i.e. single axle dump trucks to transport staff). This is estimated at $30,000 in vehicle utilization costs including fuel and cleaning supplies.

  o Use of surplus vehicles that would normally be auctioned off after a replacement unit has been commissioned. This will provide up to (14) units for use by staff over and above normal fleet compliment and is estimated to cost $140,000 including internal equipment monthly recovery costs, fuel, and cleaning costs.

  o If all required vehicles are not available through lease, other vehicles, or surplus vehicles, staff may be asked to use their own vehicles to transport themselves to the job site and expense mileage as per normal Corporate Policy. The cost is estimated to be $10,000.

• PPE supplies are an additional expense and affect almost all services in Cambridge. These costs are anticipated to be an additional $25,000 for seasonal operations.

• Many of the programs offered at City Facilities have participant limits as per Provincial Regulations. Public access to open programs offered at our recreation facilities including outdoor pools will need to continue to be monitored by “COVID Entry Greeters”. In response to the City’s current placement within the Provincial Framework recreation programs at our various facilities have been reduced or adapted to meet the public health regulations for safe operation. There is no additional cost impact related to program service delivery anticipated at this time.

• Staff have been working in collaboration with our regional partners to deliver a consistent service for Splashpad operations. At the time in consultation with Public Health staff plan to open (10) of the City’s splashpads, with signage and social distancing markers. Signage costs are estimated at $5,000.
• Additional fencing is required for controlled access at select City facilities to support crowd control and physical distancing. Fencing costs are estimated to be $18,000.

• Additional parking spaces are required Bishop Street Operations Centre (BOC) to support the additional vehicle need required to meet Covid-19 requirements this is at an estimated cost of $125,000.

• The Government of Ontario will be providing the City of Cambridge $2,491,652 in 2021 COVID-19 Recovery Funding for Municipalities through two equal installments – one instalment on or before May 1, 2021 and the other on or before November 1, 2021.

• This funding is provided to assist municipalities recover from COVID-19 by providing funds to safely reopen and deliver programs, services and capital projects and to help ensure the City does not carry operating deficits in 2021.

**Background**

The COVID-19 pandemic has been disruptive in all sectors of business, industry, education, commerce, and municipal services. Cambridge Sports, Recreation, Events, and Public Spaces were no exception in that disruption as it resulted in cancellation of facility rentals, wedding ceremonies, sports events, and significant reduction in maintenance of all public spaces. Staff have worked hard to balance the demand for services and the need to contain costs in anticipation of general revenue shortfalls.

The City is currently in the Red Level of the Provincial Reopening Framework and as we move towards the 2021 spring and summer season in pandemic conditions, the demand and public expectations to return to use of public parks, trails, sports fields, play spaces and equipment, and other recreation facilities remains very strong.

Working closely with our regional partners we continue to operate under Emergency Orders with Provincial Regulations and Public Health directives. Cambridge continues to re-instate service levels for recreation services to the extent possible abiding by physical distancing, occupancy limits, public health guidelines.

Staff have prepared the 2021 budget in anticipation of returning to full service capacity to the extent permitted by both Provincial Legislation and Public Health Guidelines. Various protocols have been implemented through our Emergency Management Division to support the reinstatement of various programs and services across the corporation which includes the return of full compliment of seasonal staff, contracted services, supplies, and equipment supported by the approved 2021 budget.

The Province of Ontario has recognized the need for additional funding in many sectors to continue operating and supporting economic activity. The City of Cambridge will
receive 2021 COVID-19 Recovery Funding for Municipalities to provide funding to offset additional operating expenses due to COVID-19 impacts while continuing to provide public services.

Decision-making in spring/summer 2020 was necessarily reactive in the face of the global health pandemic. Program and service delivery decisions were made in response to rapidly changing direction from the federal, provincial and regional governments and were prioritized to protect health and life safety. 2021 provides an opportunity for a more proactive, coordinated and intentional planning, coordination and budgeting.

It is noted that not all the City’s programs and services are captured in this report. Those programs and services which will be run in ways similar to 2019 levels or with modified approaches as approved by Waterloo Regional Public Health, and / or have financial implications already captured in the Council-approved 2021 budget are not included.

Analysis

Strategic Alignment

PEOPLE To actively engage, inform and create opportunities for people to participate in community building – making Cambridge a better place to live, work, play and learn for all.

Goal #1 - Community Wellbeing

Objective 1.1 Work with partners to create a safe, inclusive and accessible city.

Objective 1.2 Support and facilitate community access to services related to health, wellness and personal development.

Public health and safety remain the City’s top priority during COVID-19. The City is committed to deliver program and services to residents in a way that is responsible and responsive to community needs.

The City also recognizes the importance of public programs and services for the overall health of the City, including its residents, our health and wellness, and our economy.

Delivering public services in modified formats, and resourcing them appropriately, demonstrates the City’s commitment to residents needs, desires, health, safety and well-being.

Goal #5 - Parks and Recreation
Objective 5.3 Develop a strategic approach to programs and services that tie investments/resources to community outcomes.

By developing a strategic and collaborative approach to the return of pre-pandemic service levels, the City is able to better identify and properly resource to address community need. Working closely with our regional public health we have identified opportunities to ensure the safe and cost-effective ways to provides safe work places for both staff and the community.

Comments

Services Offered and Impacted

The following lists parks and recreation services planned to be provided for the spring and summer of 2021, subject to approval of COVID-19 related costs noted in this report. All service levels are subject to change based on Provincial Emergency Orders and Public Health Directives.

Normal Service Levels:

- Parks, trails, open spaces, play structures, flower beds and plantings, forestry.
- Public Washrooms
- Portable washrooms
- Funeral Services and Cemetery maintenance
- Cambridge Famers Market
- BMX Bike Park
- Skateboard Parks
- Tennis/Pickleball Courts
- Basketball Courts

Services with Reduced Operating Hours:

- Outdoor Pools
- Indoor Pools

*Ongoing review of aquatic operations for all (5) facilities will take place to evaluate program suitability and service levels

Services with Occupancy/Gathering Impacts:
• Indoor spaces limited to established long-term rental agreements
• Sports fields and arena spaces bookings limited to guidelines for City placement within the Provincial Framework- current is Red-Control Level
• Day Camp Participant Levels
• Beach Volleyball
• Outdoor Weddings
• Splashpads
• Picnic Shelters

Special Event Impacts:

• As per current Public Health special event guidelines, special events will be permitted to a maximum of (100) individuals in the Green through Orange Framework restrictions. If Waterloo Region moves out of the Red-Control level of the Framework, the events division is implementing two dedicated Special Events sites (Forbes Park for the month of July and Central Park for the month of August) to enable City and community groups to plan an event safely and reduce the variables, expenses and resources often experienced with outdoor events. The creation of the dedicated special event spaces will be covered under the current 2021 budget.

Services that remain Unavailable:

• Short-term rentals for indoor spaces
• Specific recreation programs/services – due to structural implications and requirements for shared use of equipment, programs such as pottery, cards, board games and billiards are not being offered at this time

Logistics of Planned Service Delivery under Pandemic Conditions

Space for Staff:

• Physical distancing for staff is planned to be accommodated by organizing smaller crew deployments, installation of tents as start/end shift mustering points and for breaks/lunches out of sun/weather where possible.

• Use of spaces not used (i.e. change rooms in arenas or other unallocated/unbooked spaces).
• Ad-hoc use of other spaces not frequently used by the public (i.e. the Chapel in Mount Hope Cemetery).

• Additional vehicles to transport crews (max 2 per vehicle) that otherwise would be travelling 3-4 per vehicle will be provided by use of off-season vehicles (i.e. dump-trucks not used for hauling materials), use of surplus vehicles, additional leased vehicles as outlined in the financial section of this report.

• Higher expectation of staff to have breaks/lunches at the job site – physically distanced.

Space for Vehicles:

• Additional vehicles will be accommodated by re-arranging existing yard spaces including moving off-season items to other city-owned spaces in the city (i.e. snow dump off Bishop St).

• Expansion of parking lot to make use of space at the Magnotta site will need to be expedited in the next few months.

Additional Pandemic Constraints Impact:

Should the Province or Public Health Unit direct higher levels of restrictions (i.e. reduced occupancy and/or gathering limits). City facilities, spaces, bookings will be reduced accordingly. Associated seasonal staff to support those locations will either be re-deployed to other service needs within Cambridge, or, if no other options, be laid off.

Pandemic Constraint Reduction Impact:

Should the Province or Public Health Unit direct lower levels of restrictions (i.e. increased occupancy and/or gathering limits). City facilities, spaces, bookings may be increased accordingly and is anticipated to be accommodated by the compliment of staff available at current budget levels. Some COVID-19 costs such as additional costs for vehicles will also be reduced accordingly.

Existing Policy/By-Law

Staff have been guided by the current Cost Containment Strategy in the development of this report.

Financial Impact

This plan is oriented towards providing as many services as possible within limits of the current Provincial Legislation and Public Health Regulations under the 2021 operating budgets. The additional costs associated with the return to pre-pandemic service levels are estimated to be at an upset limit of $426,000, plus $125,000 for parking needs, plus
$311,000 for by-law enforcement and funded from the Rate Stabilization Reserve Fund through the 2021 COVID-19 Recovery Funding for Municipalities.

**Public Input**

There has been a great deal of public feedback in the form of comments regarding service availability and service levels – specifically, the lack of, in 2020 when Cambridge reduced staffing levels and corresponding service levels in public spaces, sports facilities, recreation spaces. This plan has been developed based on what the public feedback was in 2020 and what staff and other municipalities have been hearing from various sports and recreation groups with respect to the demand for these services to be available along with keeping inline with our regional partners and their current service levels.

**Internal/External Consultation**

This report has been developed with significant consultation from the following:

- External: Region of Waterloo; municipalities and Region of Waterloo Public Health

**Conclusion**

With the community eager to access a pre-pandemic lifestyle, staff are ready to initiate the return of many service levels in order to safely serve and maintain our parks, facilities and programs. Following both Provincial Legislation and current Public Health Regulations staff are confident in our ability to provide safe, fun and enjoyable places and spaces for our community to recreate this season. The desire to access facilities such as fields, playgrounds and splashpads will be high for residents who will be eager to access outdoor amenities this summer.

Although costs for service are allocated as part of the 2021 operating budgets, additional costs and modifications to our service levels remain as we continue to navigate the current status of the pandemic. These costs and services levels are outlined in this report and financial implications can be accommodated through the funds received through the Provincial Pandemic Relief Fund allocation that the City of Cambridge has received.
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Recommendations

THAT Report 21-089(CD) – Additional Building Division Staff – be received;

AND THAT the Building Division increases its staffing complement of Municipal Building Officials by 2 FTE to manage increased volume of permit activity.

Executive Summary

Purpose

The City of Cambridge has seen a significant increase in construction activity with growth forecasts suggesting it will continue into the foreseeable future.

As a result, the workload of the Building Division has also substantially increased with a higher volume of permit applications and heightened demands for permit issuance and inspections. It has been challenging for the Division to manage all the demands being made of it.

This report will provide justification for the hiring of 2 additional staff in the Building Division.

Key Findings

- The City of Cambridge has seen a significant increase in construction activity with growth forecasts suggesting it will continue into the foreseeable future.

- Current Building Stabilization Reserve Fund is $3,131,469.
• StatsCan has identified Kitchener-Waterloo and Cambridge as communities with the third highest population growth rate in the country. StatsCan shows an estimated increase of 33.6% increase by 2031.

• In 2019, $76,687 was paid to RSM Consultants to assist the Building Division to meet the legislated service levels during peak demand times.

Financial Implications

• The addition of two FTE’s to the Building Services Division would add approximately $170,000 to the operating costs per year.

• The Building Division’s operating budget is funded through permit revenue, and therefore there is no impact to the City’s overall tax base.

• In 2019, $20,761 was paid in overtime.

• In 2019, $76,687 was paid to RSM Consultants for assistance during peak demand times.

• In 2020, $12,272 was paid in overtime.

• In 2019, $2,411,390 was budgeted for operating costs. Permit revenue was $3,495,576.

• In 2020, operating costs amounted to $2,666,019. Permit revenue was $2,308,685. The decrease in permit revenue was largely due to COVID-19 impacts. $357,334 was drawn from the Building Permit Stabilization Reserve.

• Building Stabilization Reserve Fund permits a maximum of 150% of operating expenditures, which is $4,215,600. The current balance of the reserve fund is $3,131,469.

• The financial data bears out that the Building Division is in a position to support the addition of two FTE’s to its staffing complement.

Background

Cambridge has evolved into a thriving mid-sized city. Interest in Cambridge from developers, builders, homeowners and the business community continues to grow and keeps pressure on building officials and the Division to adapt and deliver effective and timely services. The current complement of building officials has been working overtime to keep up with demand and ensure plans review and inspections are completed in the mandated timeframes. With developments such as the Limerick Road and Mattamy subdivisions where construction of hundreds of homes are being constructed in less than a 6 month time frame, and other high profile projects such as the hospital and the
Gaslight District, building officials are struggling to keep up with mandated timeframes set out by the code and the increasing demands of our clients. As a short-term measure, during specific peak demand periods through the year, RSM Consultants, a registered code agency, was hired to help the Building Division.

In 2019 a total of 1642 permits, at a construction value of $455,980,194 were issued, an increase from 2018, where a total of 1051 permits were issued with a construction value of $370,997,292. In 2018 the number of residential units constructed was 578 and nearly doubled in 2019 to 1049 residential units constructed.

In 2020 a total of 1251 permits at a construction value of $258,443,157 were issued. The number of residential units constructed was down to 385. These decreases were due to the impacts of COVID-19.

Analysis

Strategic Alignment

PROSPERITY: To support and encourage the growth of a highly competitive local economy where there is opportunity for everyone to contribute and succeed.

Goal #2 - Governance and Leadership

Objective 2.3 Encourage a culture of innovation and engagement that allows all staff to contribute to the ongoing renewal of city

The addition of 2 FTE’s will contribute towards keeping the Building Division responsive, agile and a leader in helping the public navigate the approvals process, get permits issued faster and help support the economic development and growth of the City.

Comments

StatsCan has identified Kitchener-Waterloo and Cambridge as communities with the third highest population growth rate in the country. StatsCan shows an estimated increase of 33.6% increase by 2031, for a predicted population of 176,000, for the City of Cambridge.
The graphs show a general upward trend in overall construction, with 2019 having the highest construction value in the past 10 years, while 2020 was impacted by Covid-19. All indicators (StatsCan data and the staging of development report in Appendix) predict that 2021 -2023, at the least, will be back on track for increased overall development.

It should be noted that residential alteration permits show a steady climb year after year and has significantly spiked during the pandemic. While these permits generally do not generate much overall revenue, it is a significant contributor to the volume of permits that still require processing and often requires significantly more time to review plans and inspect construction as building officials help homeowners through a process they are generally not familiar with.

Our Economic Development Division anticipates in excess of a million square feet of new industrial space will be built in the City over the next year.

Cambridge Memorial Hospital continues with its next phase of construction and has almost reached a stage where assigning a building official exclusively to the hospital to manage the volume of inspections will be required to meet schedules. This will create a ripple effect for the rest of the inspection team.

In addition to the steady increase of overall development the Building Division has 4448 permit files open currently.

Of those:

- 3673 are more than 1 year old, and
- 775 had been started (permit submitted) within the last year and would be considered current applications
Taken from previous WRCBOC Stats - the ratio of permits issued per year/per site inspector is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019 Issued Permits</th>
<th>Number of Site Inspection Staff</th>
<th>Aggregate permits per inspector</th>
<th>Notes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>2975</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Kitchener is seeing a surge in development and their ratio is still lower than ours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Number of inspectors was previously 8 - not sure if they had temporary vacancies that impacted 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

200 – 250 is generally the capacity of a site inspector (on average). This gives an idea of the scope of taking on clean-up of the inactive open permits. It will take additional staff and at least a few years to work through these.

With the last of green field development happening in the City, infill and redevelopment is on the rise and with it, more diverse and complex projects that require a shift in focus, approach and skillset. Further, there is increased interest and investment in Cambridge’s core areas, including the repurposing of existing heritage structures, which will have its challenges with approvals. The addition of these two FTE’s will help keep the Division responsive, agile and a leader in helping the public navigate the approvals process.

If Council does not approve the addition of 2 FTE’s for the Building Division, the division would be required to retain the services of a private registered code agency during peak demand periods to ensure we meet the minimum legislated service levels.

It should be noted that 3 current building officials are eligible to retire in 2021 and will put additional demands on the Division. Should construction activity slow down as a result of future imposed restrictions due to the pandemic in the future there will be the flexibility to not immediately backfill the positions.

**Existing Policy/By-Law**

- Building bylaw
- Section 3.(2) of the *Building Code Act*, whereby the Council of a municipality shall appoint a chief building official and such inspectors as are necessary for the enforcement of the Act in the areas in which the municipality has jurisdiction

**Financial Impact**

Permit revenues from 2016 through 2019 have exceeded operational costs by approximately $500,000 per year. It is anticipated that these permit revenues will continue to exceed operational costs into 2023.
The addition of two FTE to the Building Services Division would add approximately $170,000 to the operating costs of the division per year. This dollar figure includes salary, benefits and impact to the indirect costs.

Operating costs of the building division are fully funded from users through permit fees, and therefore changes to staff levels do not impact the tax base funding.

Public Input

While public input is neither mandated, nor is there required legislated consultation for this request, informal suggestions have been made from the industry, including member builders of the Waterloo Region Homebuilders’ Association, to hire additional staff to manage the increased workload that has burdened the approvals process.

This report is posted publicly as part of the report process.

Internal/External Consultation

Financial Services has been consulted in regards to:

- Future growth projections for the City of Cambridge
- Operating budget
- Costs associated with increased staff complement
- Permit revenue
- Building Stabilization Reserve
- Direct and indirect costs of the Building Division

Conclusion

Cambridge is a mid-sized city that is experiencing momentous growth and development with a substantial upsurge in construction and building activity. GTA builders are migrating west in search of other development opportunities and find Cambridge to be a desirable location. There is a proliferation of business and industry locating facilities and operations in Cambridge due to its location along the 401 corridor and its relative proximity to the GTA and the American border. This is translating into a steady increase in the volume of permit applications that are being applied for and processed in the Building Division. Adding to the staff complement will aid in dealing with increased permit activity, improve turnaround times on permit review and the timely issuance of building permits.
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Attachments

- Appendix A – Workload Planning
- Appendix B – 2020 Staging of Development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Name</th>
<th>Development Location</th>
<th>Estimated Number of Dwelling Units Created in 2021</th>
<th>Estimated Number of Dwelling Units to have Foundations in 2021</th>
<th>Estimated Number of Apartment Units to have Foundations in 2021</th>
<th>Estimated Number of Rowhouse Units to have Foundations in 2021</th>
<th>Estimated Number of Semi-Detached Units to have Foundations in 2021</th>
<th>Estimated Number of Single Detached Units to have Foundations in 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>River Mill West, Phase 3</td>
<td>770 Equestrian Way</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southpoint</td>
<td>201-225 Dundas St.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood</td>
<td>5-Dundas St.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw</td>
<td>249 Sagebrush Way &amp; 234 Rose Point Dr.</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison Creek Estates</td>
<td>288 Bismark Dr.</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windermere Village</td>
<td>212 Bloor Dr.</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southpoint</td>
<td>2-112 Fincher Ave.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>217 Egle St.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>33 Spurrier Ave.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>225 Hopewell Rd.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>225-228 Hopewell Rd.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>234 River Rd.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>212 Franklin Blvd.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Cambridge</td>
<td>140-300 River Road</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>2-16 Queen St.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>200 Gladsbrook Rd.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>747</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner on File</td>
<td>Construction Year - Estimated Internally</td>
<td>Construction Year - Estimated by Developer</td>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>Associated File(s)</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Date Approved or Applied YY MM DD</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>SP20-20 - this year</td>
<td></td>
<td>12104(2)</td>
<td>SP20-20 (Blk4)</td>
<td>Draft Approved</td>
<td>2016.05.12</td>
<td>N/E of Speedsvale Rd &amp; Hwy 401, 270 Equestrian Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Q3 2021 for towns, singles</td>
<td></td>
<td>13103</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Approved</td>
<td>2020.02.18</td>
<td>Dundas St (N.side, across from Branchton Rd.), 1261 &amp; 1265 Dundas St. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Q3/4 2021 for singles</td>
<td>registering stage 2 -spring, permits in summer</td>
<td>14102</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Approved, SP to be submitted for multi-blocks</td>
<td>2019.12.23</td>
<td>Dundas St (N.side) &amp; Vanier Drive, 0 Dundas St. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Not sure about stage 1 2022</td>
<td>servicing started. Register in spring.</td>
<td>16101</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Approved</td>
<td>2019.07.22</td>
<td>4045 Maple Grove Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Registering in next couple weeks. Permits in Feb. Spring/summer for site plan units.</td>
<td>16105</td>
<td>Draft Approved</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Cambridge West</td>
<td>Huron Creek Developments</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>2021. Registered this or next month. SP finalized then permits. BlockA-J submitted for permits in 2020, but not issued</td>
<td>17101 (6)</td>
<td>Draft Approved</td>
<td>0 &amp; 112 Pinebush Avenue</td>
<td>Branthaven Belmont Pinebush Inc.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>19101</td>
<td>SP07-18</td>
<td>Draft Approved</td>
<td>2020.10.09</td>
<td>51 Sparrow Ave</td>
<td>Greengate Village Ltd.</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanne</td>
<td>12102</td>
<td>No recent activity</td>
<td>12.08.27</td>
<td>90 &amp; 96 Branchton Rd</td>
<td>Manor Wood Homes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>2023, LPAT Settlement/Draft Approval expected Fall 2021</td>
<td>13101(3)</td>
<td>Ongoing, resubmission Dec 2020</td>
<td>1395 Main Street East, aka Moffat Creek, (former Hammersley Lands)</td>
<td>LVH (MC) Developments Inc</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanne</td>
<td>07102</td>
<td>No recent activity</td>
<td>07.04.19</td>
<td>S of Dundas St. E of Branchton Rd</td>
<td>Activia Holdings Inc/GSP Gro</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner on File</td>
<td>Construction Year - Estimated Internally</td>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>Associated File(s)</td>
<td>Date Approved or Applied YY.MM.DD</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Single Detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>20101</td>
<td>R03-20</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>20.05.08</td>
<td>215 Blenheim Rd.</td>
<td>Grand Ridge Estates Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Block 352, 30T-03102</td>
<td>Not submitted, pre-consultations in 2019 and 2020</td>
<td>1081 Dundas St S.</td>
<td>Green Gate Village Ltd.</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanne</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>SP40-04DDB</td>
<td>B23-20, B24-20, B25-20, B-26-20 R16/07EB</td>
<td>Seeking severances through COA</td>
<td>11 Bechtel St.</td>
<td>P.Romeo</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>SP17-14</td>
<td>SP27-15</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>3 Liberty Drive</td>
<td>Paderski</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>SP21-16</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Zoning Approved, but not active on SP submission</td>
<td>235 Lena Crescent</td>
<td>SWBC Lena Ltd.</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>SP31-16 (4)</td>
<td>R1351 BKA</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2019.09.12</td>
<td>350 Fishermills Rd.(4)</td>
<td>Bousfields Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>SP41-16</td>
<td>R09-15</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2016.10.24</td>
<td>264 Blair Rd</td>
<td>FAE Development &amp; Construction Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassigned</td>
<td></td>
<td>SP07-17</td>
<td>58M477, R02-17</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>415 Water St. S</td>
<td>Chrisview Custom Homes Ltp</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>SP28-17</td>
<td>R14-16</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>65 St.Andrews St.</td>
<td>Summerco Properties Inc.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>SP41-17</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2019.05.21</td>
<td>147 Elgin St.N</td>
<td>Cambridge Vineyard Christian Fellowship</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>SP13-18</td>
<td>OR02-18</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2019.08.30</td>
<td>195 Hespeler Rd</td>
<td>NHDG (Hespeler) Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>SP45-18</td>
<td>OR01-18</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>258 Hespeler Rd</td>
<td>2406461 Ont.Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>SP01-19</td>
<td>58M302 Blk7</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2019.11.27</td>
<td>1100 Fountain St. N</td>
<td>1100 Fountain St. Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>SP09-19</td>
<td>OR03-18</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>408 &amp; 416 Dundas St.S</td>
<td>2577917 Ont.Ltd.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>SP18-19</td>
<td>OR04-18</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>721 Franklin Blvd.</td>
<td>2415274 Ont. Ltd.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>SP23-19</td>
<td>58M604 Blk190</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2020.06.23</td>
<td>124 Compass Trail</td>
<td>Hunt Club Valley Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>SP28-19</td>
<td>RP1526, Block 23</td>
<td>Ongoing, 2nd submission</td>
<td>165 &amp; 185 Greenbrier Rd.</td>
<td>2546912 Ontario Inc.</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner on File</td>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>Associated File(s)</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Single Detached</td>
<td>Semi-detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>SP31-19</td>
<td>P12-18 (fmly R02-10YR)(2)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>25 Ishenwood Ave</td>
<td>Activa Holdings Inc.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>SP38-19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>220 Blaire Rd.</td>
<td>Doma Homes &amp; Realty Corp.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>SP02-20</td>
<td>R10-18</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>340-352-360 River Rd.</td>
<td>Reid's Heritage Homes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>SP04-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>2-16 Queen St. W.</td>
<td>Concept Development</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP06-20</td>
<td>30T17101 Blk2&amp;14</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>108 &amp; 110 Pinebush Rd.</td>
<td>Branthaven Belmont Pinebush</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline/Bryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>270 Equestrian Way</td>
<td>River Mill Development Corp.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>4 Branchton Rd.</td>
<td>Wil-I Homes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>288 Bismark Dr.</td>
<td>Cachet Developments (CamWest) Inc.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td></td>
<td>R12-17 Plan182</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>647 Coronation Blvd.</td>
<td>Holman Designs Ltd.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td></td>
<td>R12-18 Plan1803</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>155-171 Guelph Ave.</td>
<td>Polocorp Inc. c/o M.Poupolo</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>1701 King St E. 151 Main St.</td>
<td>Sribalaji Holdings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>442-448 River Rd.</td>
<td>KAH Group Inc.(Butternut Grove)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing, will need to undergo site plan</td>
<td>0 &amp; 55 Kerr St.</td>
<td>50 Shade St. Investments Inc.</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>15 Clover Ave</td>
<td>10184217 Canada Corp.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>61-69 Ainslie St. S.</td>
<td>2699380 Ontario Inc.</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner on File</td>
<td>Construction Year - Estimated Internally</td>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>Associated File(s)</td>
<td>Date Approved or Applied YY MM DD</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Single Detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Approval this year. Either this year or next construction.</td>
<td>OR04-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>61 Nottinghill Dr.</td>
<td>1370823 Ontario Inc.</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 2024</td>
<td>OR06-20</td>
<td>Applied for draft plan</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>1005 Main St</td>
<td>Greengate Village Ltd. &amp; LVH Developments (CW) Inc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Decision this year. Construction next year.</td>
<td>OR07-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>932 Eagle St. N.</td>
<td>BHR Properties</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan 2023</td>
<td>OR08-20 &amp; OR09-20</td>
<td>River Mill West (Phase 4) - applied for draft plan</td>
<td>Approval 2021-2022</td>
<td>1134 Hunt Club Rd., 1285 Speedsville Rd., 800 Briardean Rd.</td>
<td>River Mill Development Communities</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan 2021</td>
<td>R01-20</td>
<td>Will need to apply for site plan</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>405 Myers Rd</td>
<td>Estate of John Fraser c/o Granite Homes</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt late 2022</td>
<td>R07-20</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>285 Limerick Rd.</td>
<td>2404445 Ontario Inc.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin/Malcolm</td>
<td>R09-20</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>95 East Street</td>
<td>Azeez Bacchus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 2024</td>
<td>R10-20</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>436 Fountain St. S.</td>
<td>KIAH Group Inc (Vista Ridge) Inc.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm late 2021</td>
<td>R15-20</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>102 Spruce St.</td>
<td>2368122 Ontario Inc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt mid-late 2022</td>
<td>R14-20</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>355 Guelph Ave.</td>
<td>2753144 Ontario Inc.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>