Corporation of the City of Cambridge
Special Council Meeting
Agenda

Date: Tuesday, April 20, 2021, 5:00 p.m.

COVID-19
Due to COVID-19 and recommendations by Waterloo Region Public Health to exercise social distancing, members of the public are invited to submit written comments or requests to delegate via telephone related to items on the agenda.

The public wishing to speak at Council may complete an online Delegation Request form no later than 12:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting for Special Council Meetings occurring at 5:00 p.m. and no later than 12:00 p.m. the day before the meeting for Special Council –Statutory Public Meetings occurring at 10:00 a.m.

All written delegation submissions will form part of the public record.

1. Meeting Called to Order
2. Indigenous Territory Acknowledgement
3. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest
4. Presentations
5. Delegations and Consideration of Related Reports
6. Consent Agenda
   The Consent Agenda groups reports together that are of a routine nature and provides opportunity to vote on one motion rather than separate motions. However, Staff may not be in attendance to respond to queries on items contained in the Consent Agenda. Council Members wishing to pull an item from Consent Procedure should notify the City Clerk. Members will also have the opportunity to pull the item at the Meeting.
   6.1. Special Council Minutes- April 6, 2021
   6.2. Striking Committee Minutes- April 12, 2021
   6.3. 21-080(CD) Request to Alter a Part V Designated Property – 12 Joan Lane
   6.4. 21-072 (CRE) Industrial Land Sale Price
7. **Consideration of Reports**

7.1. Corporate Services

7.1.1. 21-107 (CRS) Fire Apparatus Replacement Report 41 - 53

7.2. Corporate Enterprise

7.2.1. 21-066(CRE) Smart Waterloo Region Partnership Update 54 - 63

7.3. Community Development

7.3.1. 21-083(CD) 2021 Speed Management Action Plan 64 - 73

7.3.2. 21-052(CD) 2020 Growth and Staging of Development 74 - 102

7.3.3. 21-070(CD) Request to Designate a Property of Cultural Heritage Value Under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and to Relocate Heritage House – 1395 Main Street 103 - 167

7.4. Infrastructure Services

8. **Other Business**

9. **Closed Session**

10. **Motions**

11. **Motion to Receive and File**

12. **Consideration of By-laws**

13. **Confirmatory By-law**

13.1. 21-029 168 - 169

Being a by-law to confirm the proceedings of the Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge

14. **Adjournment**
Council Members in Attendance: Councillors Reid (Ward 1); Devine (Ward 2); Mann (Ward 3); Liggett (Ward 4); Wolf (Ward 5); Adshade (Ward 6); Hamilton (Ward 7); Ermeta (Ward 8) with Mayor McGarry in the chair.

Staff Members in Attendance: David Calder, City Manager; Dave Bush, Deputy City Manager – Corporate Services; Yogesh Shah, Deputy City Manager – Infrastructure Services; Hardy Bromberg, Deputy City Manager – Community Development; Cheryl Zahnleiter, Deputy City Manager – Corporate Enterprise; Lisa Shields, City Solicitor; Sheryl Ayres, Chief Financial Officer; Elaine Brunn Shaw, Chief Planner; Kathy Padgett, Senior Planner- Environment; James Goodram, Director of Economic Development; Paul Kan, Manager of Realty Services; Malcolm Duncan, Planner 1; Danielle Manton, City Clerk; Jennifer Shaw, Deputy City Clerk; Briar Allison, Council Committee Services Coordinator; Ayesh Lokumalage, Network Administrator.

Others in Attendance: Brenna MacKinnon, Region of Waterloo; Delis Lus, 140 Old Mill Road Limited Partnership; and members of the general public are participating via Live Stream.

Meeting Called to Order

The meeting of the Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge is held virtually via Microsoft Zoom and live streamed to the City of Cambridge website. Mayor McGarry welcomes everyone present and calls the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m. and the meeting adjourns at 11:40 p.m.

Indigenous Territory Acknowledgement

Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest

There are no disclosures of pecuniary interest.

Presentations
1. Elaine Brunn Shaw, Chief Planner re: 21-106(CD) Minister’s Zoning Order – 0, 128, 134, 140, and 228 Old Mill Rd

See item #8

2. Kathy Padgett, Senior Planner - Environment re: 21-081(CD) ROP Review – Major Transit

See item #10

Delegations

1. Chris Pidgeon, GSP Group Inc. re: 21-106(CD) Minister’s Zoning Order – 0, 128, 134, 140, and 228 Old Mill Rd

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Chris Pidgeon is in attendance virtually to speak to item #8


Correspondence

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

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

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

4. Brett Goddard re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

5. Omar Kaake re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
6. Jimbo D re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
   Community Consultation and Site Identification

7. Mekcada A. Rodie re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
   Community Consultation and Site Identification

8. Robin Thomas re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
   Community Consultation and Site Identification

9. Kevin Nixon re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
   Community Consultation and Site Identification

10. Cinnamon Cantwell re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
    Community Consultation and Site Identification

11. Rachel Doiron re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
    Community Consultation and Site Identification

12. Hung Tran re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
    Community Consultation and Site Identification

13. Adam Braun re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
    Community Consultation and Site Identification

14. Nancy Arrojado re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
    Community Consultation and Site Identification

15. Theresa Dejmek re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
    Community Consultation and Site Identification

16. Darlene Baird re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
    Community Consultation and Site Identification

17. Linda Albright-Thiel re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
    Community Consultation and Site Identification

18. Eric Silveira re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
    Community Consultation and Site Identification

19. Natey Pranky re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
    Community Consultation and Site Identification

20. Stevie Tribble re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
    Community Consultation and Site Identification
21. Kenneth Lin re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

22. Michael J. Mullen re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

23. Mary Law re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

24. L. Vernon re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

25. Rick Costello re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

26. Kristine Dearlove re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

27. Shane Murphy re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

28. Adrienne Crowder re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

29. Lynn Woeller re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

30. Jenn Boyd re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

31. Kathy Moreland re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

32. Darren Schlueter re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

33. Mary Ann Costa re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

34. Kevin Hiebert re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

35. Lily Hiebert Rempel re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
36. Medeiros Family re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

37. Joy re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

38. Stephanie De Wit re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

39. Crystal Harvey-Robertson re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

40. Tonya Hampton re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

41. Keith Rivers re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

42. Terry Polyak re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

43. Laura McKenna, Pamela Mangos and Joanne Malone re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

44. Ron and Barbara Rogers re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

45. Melissa Bowman re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

46. Anne Lloyd Cook re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

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

48. Joanne Malone re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

49. Citizens for Cambridge re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

50. Kevin White re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
51. Jordan Thielman re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
   Community Consultation and Site Identification

52. Carla Johnson re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
   Community Consultation and Site Identification

53. Stacey Bauer re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
   Community Consultation and Site Identification

54. Marieta Raszga re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
   Community Consultation and Site Identification

55. Joyce Chapman re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
   Community Consultation and Site Identification

56. Lee Taggart re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
   Community Consultation and Site Identification

   and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

58. HIP Developments re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
   Community Consultation and Site Identification

59. Nicole Moxey re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
   Community Consultation and Site Identification

60. Megan Bailey re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
   Community Consultation and Site Identification

61. Shalon Armstrong re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
   Community Consultation and Site Identification

62. Anita Stefanovic re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
   Community Consultation and Site Identification

63. Sharon Livingstone re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
   Community Consultation and Site Identification

64. Cheryl Opolko re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
   Community Consultation and Site Identification

65. Becky Verdun re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
   Community Consultation and Site Identification
66. Janet Simms-Baldwin re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

67. Joan re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

68. Christina Hughes re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

69. Michelle Goodridge re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

70. Sue Johnson re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

71. Mark Schuiling re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

72. Mrs. I. Vestenicky re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

73. Angela re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

74. Mary Foulger re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

75. Amar Bhuee re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

76. James Presseau and Donna Presseau re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

77. Ted Kewley re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

78. Jim Boni re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

79. Gary Staveley re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

80. Christine Carey re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
81. Byron Holmes re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

82. Kayleigh Cadenhead re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

83. Geoff Smith re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

84. The Gaspar family re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

85. Sarah Bird, Pinewood Heating & Air Conditioning re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

86. Tyler Laycock & Lisa Hilborn-Laycock, Hilborn Pottery Design re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

87. Jesse Burt re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

88. Brian Johnson re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

89. David C. Bennett re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

90. Carol Thorman re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

91. Valerie Johnston re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

92. Craig Robertson re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

93. Angela Galley re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

94. Brandon Lee re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

95. Ron McKnight re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
96. Tammy Palfreyman re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
Community Consultation and Site Identification

97. Gord Fleet re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
Community Consultation and Site Identification

98. Joyce E Meissner re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
Community Consultation and Site Identification

99. Abigail Willms re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
Community Consultation and Site Identification

100. Robin Thomas re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
Community Consultation and Site Identification

101. Tammy Palfreyman re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
Community Consultation and Site Identification

102. Meredith Berrouard re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
Community Consultation and Site Identification

103. Ruth Cameron re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
Community Consultation and Site Identification

104. Kayleigh Cadenhead re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
Community Consultation and Site Identification

105. Sherry re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
Community Consultation and Site Identification

106. Christine Carey re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
Community Consultation and Site Identification

107. Ms. Symara Cyr re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
Community Consultation and Site Identification

108. Prateek Kumar re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
Community Consultation and Site Identification

109. Gary Staveley re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services
Community Consultation and Site Identification
110. Shane Outridge re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

**Consent Procedure**

THAT all items listed under the heading of Consent Agenda for Tuesday, April 6, 2021 Council Agenda be adopted as recommended.

Resolution: 21-080

Moved by: Councillor Wolf

Seconded by: Councillor Mann

Items #

1. Special Council Minutes - March 16, 2021
2. Council Information Package - March 19, 2021
3. Cambridge Cycling Trails Advisory Committee Minutes – January 14, 2021
4. Committee of Adjustment Minutes – February 3, 2021
5. 21-062(CD) Noise Exemption – Wesley Boulevard Moffat Creek Crossing Construction
6. 21-076 (CD) Request for Revision of Loan Agreement – Kinbridge Community Association
7. 21-091 (CRS) Appointment of Municipal Officers and Servants

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 9-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Liggett, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: None

**Consideration of Matters in Closed Session**

**Motion: Waive Notice Requirements**
Resolution: 21-081
Moved by: Councillor Mann
Seconded by: Councillor Hamilton

THAT the notice requirements of the procedure by-law be waived to consider a matter in closed session.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 9-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Liggett, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor

McGarry

Resolution: 21-082
Moved by: Councillor Devine
Seconded by: Councillor Liggett

THAT in accordance with Section s.239 (2)(f) of the Municipal Act, 2001, Council convene in Closed Session at 7:54 p.m. to consider the following subject matter:

Advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose (legal advice)

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 9-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Liggett, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor

McGarry

Council to Rise from Closed Session

Resolution: 21-083
Moved by: Councillor Mann
Seconded by: Councillor Adshade

That Council rise from Closed Session and reconvene in Open Session at 8:07 p.m.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 9-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Liggett, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor

McGarry

Opposed: None

Consideration of Reports

Community Development

8. 21-106(CD) Minister’s Zoning Order – 0, 128, 134, 140, and 228 Old Mill Rd

Resolution: 21-084

Moved by: Councillor Reid

Seconded by: Councillor Hamilton

THAT Report 20-106(CD) Broccolini Real Estate Group’s Request for a Minister’s Zoning Order for 0, 128, 134, 140 and 228 Old Mill Road, Cambridge be received;

AND THAT the application of a Minister’s Zoning Order as requested by Broccolini Real Estate Group for an industrial development on the lands located at 0, 128, 134, 140 and 228 Old Mill Road be supported;

AND FURTHER THAT City Staff be directed to work with Broccolini Real Estate Group to implement the Minister’s Zoning Order through future Planning Act applications, including Site Plan approval as generally depicted on the concept plans and renderings attached to Report 21-106(CD).

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 9-0

**Main Motion**

Moved by: Councillor Ermeta

Seconded by: Councillor Liggett


AND THAT Cambridge Council endorse the draft Regional Employment Area boundary;

AND THAT Cambridge Council endorse the employment land conversions recommended by Regional staff;

AND FURTHER THAT Report 21-065(CD) and its resulting resolution be provided to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo.

**Motion: Amendment**

Resolution: 21-085

Moved by: Councillor Wolf

Seconded by: Councillor Hamilton

AND THAT Council request the Region to remove 1140 Main Street from the employment area boundary to permit consideration of these lands for future commercial uses.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 5-4

In Favour: Councillor’s Ermeta, Hamilton, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Liggett and Mann
Motion: Amendment

Resolution: 21-086

Moved by: Councillor Liggett

Seconded by: Councillor Hamilton

AND THAT Council request the Region to remove the southern half of the Elgin Street property from the employment area boundary as set out in Report 21-065(CD).

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 9-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Liggett, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: None

Motion: Amendment

Resolution: 21-086

Moved by: Councillor Hamilton

Seconded by: Councillor Mann

THAT Council requests that the Region remove the lands at 4050 and 4070 Fountain Street North identified as Item 17, Attachment 5 in Report 21-065 (CD) from consideration in the Employment Area Boundary until notification of the conclusion of legal proceedings is received.

DEFEATED, on a recorded vote 7-2

In Favour: Councillor Hamilton and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Liggett, Mann, Reid and Wolf

Main Motion, as amended.
Resolution: 21-087

Moved by: Councillor Ermeta
Seconded by: Councillor Liggett


AND THAT Council request the Region to remove 1140 Main Street from the employment area boundary to permit consideration of these lands for future commercial uses.

AND THAT Council request the Region to remove the southern half of the Elgin Street property from the employment area boundary as set out in Report 21-065(CD);

AND THAT Cambridge Council endorse the draft Regional Employment Area boundary, as amended;

AND THAT Cambridge Council endorse the employment land conversions recommended by Regional staff, as amended;

AND FURTHER THAT Report 21-065(CD) and its resulting resolution be provided to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 9-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Liggett, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: None

10. 21-081(CD) ROP Review – Major Transit Station Areas – City of Cambridge Opportunity to Respond

Resolution: 21-088

Moved by: Councillor Mann

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.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 9-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Liggett, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: None

11. 21-123(CD) 2021 Spring / Summer Programs and Services Update

Resolution: 21-088

Moved by: Councillor Mann

Seconded by: Councillor Adshade

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 Report 21-123(CD) 2021 Spring / Summer Programs and Services Update 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 Report 21-123(CD) 2021 Spring / Summer Programs and Services Update.
CARRIED, on a recorded vote 9-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Liggett, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: None

Corporate Services

12. 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

Resolution: 21-089

Moved by: Councillor Hamilton

Seconded by: Councillor Adshade

THAT Cambridge Council receive Report 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification – for information;

AND THAT Council direct City staff to complete community consultation based on the site identification as described in Report Number 21-121(CRS) – Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification;

AND THAT Council direct staff to report back with a summary report of the feedback collected in the Community Consultation;

AND FURTHER THAT prior to a potential future operator (s) moving forward with applications to the Federal and Provincial governments for a Consumption and Treatment Services site in Cambridge that Council receive a comprehensive workplan and provide endorsement of the site.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 7-2

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Hamilton, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: Councillor’s Ermeta and Liggett
Motion to Extend

Moved by: Councillor Wolf

Seconded by: Councillor Reid

THAT the time limitations on the proceedings of Council set out in Section 16.27 of the Procedural By-law be waived to extend past the hour of 11:00 p.m. to 12:00 a.m.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 9-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Liggett, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: None

Infrastructure Services

Notice of Motion - Councillor Hamilton

Note: This Item will be brought forward to the April 13 Special Council Meeting for Consideration.

WHEREAS there have been ongoing problems for more than nine years concerning safe pedestrian crossings at Holy Spirit school, and insufficient parking spaces provided for parents and their children at Moffat Creek Public School on Myers Road;

WHEREAS, despite more than 80 cars now parking on Myers Road twice daily to get their children to school, the Region of Waterloo is planning to rebuild Myers Road with no parking spaces whatsoever, resulting in, twice a day, cars parking on distant residential streets, and making parents with young children walk in potentially adverse conditions;

WHEREAS Cambridge and Waterloo Region face an acute need for parking on this road at this specific location and a general and increasing need for parking as this area of the city, Southeast Galt, grows and intensifies substantially;

THERE IT BE RESOLVED that Cambridge Council request Regional Council to direct Region staff to work in consultation with parents and residents of Cambridge, to evaluate
options for parking spaces on Myer's Road at Moffat Creek Public School, and that correspondence be sent on behalf of Cambridge Council requesting Regional Council to consider that parking on Myers Road is essential for the overall safety and wellbeing of its parents, children, and residents of today, and the future.

Unfinished Business

Motion to Receive and File

Resolution: 21-090

Moved by: Councillor Wolf
Seconded by: Councillor Mann

THAT Council receive all presentations and correspondence at the Special Council Meeting held on April 6, 2021 for information.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 9-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Liggett, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: None

Introduction and Consideration of By-laws

Resolution: 21-091

Moved by: Councillor Liggett
Seconded by: Councillor Reid

21-023 Being a by-law to amend By-law No. 119-08 providing for the appointment of Officers and Servants of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 9-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Liggett, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: None
Confirmatory By-law

Resolution: 21-092
Moved by: Councillor Devine
Seconded by: Councillor Mann

21-027 Being a by-law to confirm the proceedings of the Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 9-0

In Favour: Councillors Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Liggett, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: None

Close of Meeting

Resolution: 21-093
Moved by: Councillor Ermeta
Seconded by: Councillor Adshade

THAT the Council meeting does now adjourn at 11:40 p.m.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 9-0

In Favour: Councillors Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Liggett, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: None
MINUTES
Corporation of the City of Cambridge
Striking Committee
No. 10-21

April 12, 2021
Virtual Meeting
6:00 p.m.
MINUTES

In Attendance: Mayor McGarry (joined at 6:09 p.m.), Councillors Reid, Wolf, Liggett, Mann with Councillor Ermeta in the Chair.

Staff: Danielle Manton, City Clerk, Jennifer Shaw, Deputy City Clerk and Briar Allison, Council Committee Services Coordinator.

Meeting Called to Order
The meeting of the Striking Committee of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge was held virtually via Zoom. Chair Ermeta welcomed everyone present and called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. and the meeting adjourned at 6:18 p.m.

Declarations of Pecuniary Interest
There are no declarations of pecuniary interest.

Consideration of Matters in Closed Session
Resolution: 21-094
Moved by: Councillor Wolf
Seconded by: Councillor Liggett

In accordance with Section s.239 (2) (b) of the Municipal Act, 2001, Council to convene in Closed Session at 6:06 p.m. to consider the following subject matters:

1. Personal matters about an identifiable individual, including municipal Employees

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 5-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Ermeta, Liggett, Mann, Reid, and Wolf
Opposed: None
Appointments to Boards and Committees

Committee of Adjustment

Resolution: 21-094

Moved by: Councillor Wolf

Seconded by: Councillor Liggett

THAT the Clerk be Directed to release the names of the appointed members of Committee Adjustment after the April 13, Special Council Meeting.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 6-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Ermeta, Liggett, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: None

Committee to Rise from Closed Session

Motion: 21-095

Moved by: Councillor Reid

Seconded by: Councillor Wolf

THAT Council rise from closed session at 6:16 p.m. and reconvene in open session.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 6-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Ermeta, Liggett, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: None

Close of Meeting

Motion: 21-096

Moved By: Councillor Mann

Seconded By: Mayor McGarry

THAT the Striking Committee meeting does now adjourn at 6:18 p.m.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 6-0
In Favour:  Councillor’s Ermeta, Liggett, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed:  None

__________________________
CHAIR

__________________________
CLERK
Recommendations

THAT staff report 21-080(CD) – Request to Alter a Part V Designated Property – 12 Joan Lane be received;

AND THAT Council approve the proposed alteration at 12 Joan Lane for the chimney modification on the approved timber-frame gazebo in the back yard, substantially in accordance with the information appended to Report 21-080(CD).

Executive Summary

Purpose

- To seek updated Council approval for a modified chimney height on a new structure within a Heritage Conservation District

Key Findings

- Council granted approval in November 2020 to install a new detached “gazebo” building in the back yard of the subject property.

- An amended design specifying chimney height requires a minor variance and another Council approval relative to the heritage considerations.

- The property owner is requesting approval for a modified chimney design

- The proposed alterations are consistent with the recommendations and guidelines in the Blair Village HCD Plan.

Financial Implications

None
Background

The Blair Village Heritage Conservation District became effective in early 2002. The District Plan had been written in 1999 after much consultation with neighbours and staff.

Joan Lane was included in a new subdivision filed in 2006, south of Old Mill Road. This and other new subdivisions were reviewed to establish that their designs conformed to the Blair Village HCD. The owners in this subdivision were advised of the requirements.

The contemporary style residence at 12 Joan Lane was constructed about 2011. Its primary wall material is a mix of brown brick, with stone veneer sections. Its high-pitched roof is punctuated with multiple gables and dormers for windows from the upper half-storey.

12 Joan Lane

Council approved the construction of a timber framed gazebo on the property on November 11, 2020, after review by MHAC on October 15, 2020 (Report 20-025 (MHAC)).

It consists of an L-shaped building with enclosed rooms under one side, and large open areas (similar to large picnic shelters) plus a large stone chimney at one end. Many details show exposed curved timbering. Drawings are included as Attachment 1.
After Council approved the proposed design, the applicant determined further specifications regarding the dimensions of the stone chimney for the wood burning fireplace on the west end of the new detached structure that required a minor variance (File #A02/21). The proposed chimney will be 18 ft (5.5 m) tall. Dimensions are shown on Attachment 2.

Due to the change in specifications from the approved plans, additional Council approval is requested for the proposed modification in chimney height to the approved plans.

MHAC recommended approval of the previously-approved plans on December 17, 2021 Report 20-04(MHAC).

The Committee of Adjustment approved the minor variance on 3 February 2021 (File A02/21).
Analysis

Strategic Alignment

PLACE: To take care of, celebrate and share the great features in Cambridge that we love and mean the most to us.

Goal #3 - Arts, Culture, Heritage and Architecture

Objective 3.2 Conserve and make positive contributions to our heritage districts and buildings throughout the community.

This request provides for the owner to enhance the use of the property in the heritage conservation district.

Comments

Council previously approved a design for the construction of a timber framed gazebo as outlined in the attached plans. The previously submitted plans did not specify height for the proposed chimney.

The design under consideration now is identical to previously approved plans with the exception of chimney height being specified at 15 ft (5.5m). Council approval is required for this minor modification to the approved plans.

The scale of the proposed work and its location on the property will have a minor effect upon this property. The work will be minimally visible to the street. The resubmitted plans requiring a minor variance do not impact heritage attributes.

The proposal is in conformity with the HCD design policies and received MHAC endorsement on 17 December 2020.

If Council does not approve the proposed alteration then the chimney would be altered in accordance with previously approved plans which did not specify chimney height.

Existing Policy/By-Law

Ontario Heritage Act

Part V (Sections 39-46) of the Ontario Heritage Act provides for municipalities to establish and maintain heritage conservation districts.

Section 42. (2.1) “The owner of property situated in a designated heritage conservation district may apply to the municipality for a permit to alter any part of the property …”
Cambridge Official Plan

Section 4.1 of the Official Plan includes Objective a) to “support the conservation, restoration and prominence of the city’s built heritage as a key identifying feature of the community”.

Section 4.2 of the Official Plan discusses the priorities for cultural heritage resources in the City. Section 4.2.1 states:

1. When development is proposed, the City will encourage the conservation of cultural heritage resources in the following order of preference:

   a) incorporation of cultural heritage resources and their surrounding context into development applications in a manner which does not conflict with the cultural heritage resource;

Section 4.10 of the Official Plan includes 1. “A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment shall be required for a development proposal or Community Plan that includes or is adjacent to a designated property …”

Section 4.10 also includes 5. (in part) “…A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment may be scoped or waived by either Council or MHAC.”

The property is designated as part of the Blair Village HCD.

Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan

Pages 28 and 29 contain the policies for Building Additions. The main emphasis is upon visible additions to very historic buildings. Items that may apply for this proposal are “Design – Contemporary design for additions is acceptable when it is complementary in terms of scale, mass and texture …” and “Verandahs – New verandahs should be incorporated … to complement the existing building.”

Financial Impact

The owner has assumed all costs associated with the proposal.

Public Input

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

Internal/External Consultation

Planning staff consulted with Building Design and Construction staff and the owner.
Conclusion

The proposal provides for the owner to enhance the use of the property in the heritage conservation district. It is staff's opinion that the proposed changes would have a limited effect on the heritage of the property or the view from the street in the heritage conservation district. Staff recommends that Council approve the proposed alteration as outlined in Report 21-080(CD).

Signature

Division Approval

Reviewed by the CFO
Reviewed by Legal Services

Name: Elaine Brunn Shaw
Title: Chief Planner

Departmental Approval

Name: Hardy Bromberg
Title: Deputy City Manager, Community Development

City Manager Approval

Name: David Calder
Title: City Manager

Attachments

Attachment 1  Drawings for timber frame gazebo for 12 Joan Lane, prepared by Tobler's Woodland, July 2020.

Attachment 2  Elevations marked with chimney dimensions, submitted by owner, December 2020.
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To: COUNCIL

Meeting Date: 04/20/2021

Subject: Industrial Land Sale Price

Submitted By: James Goodram, Director Economic Development

Prepared By: Laura Pearce, Senior Economic Development Officer

Report No.: 21-072(CRE)

File No.: C1101

Recommendation(s)

THAT Report 21-072 (CRE), re: Industrial Land Sale Price be received;

AND THAT the sale price of City-owned serviced industrial land be adjusted from $350,000 to $625,000 per acre effective May 1, 2021 as outlined in Report #21-072(CRE).

Executive Summary

Purpose

- The City adjusts its land prices regularly based on fair market value. In order to keep land prices up-to-date, it is being proposed that the sale price for serviced industrial land be adjusted to $625,000 per acre.

Key Findings

- The City of Cambridge has recently reacquired lands in the Boxwood Business Campus for future sale. In order to ensure fair market value, it is recommended that the sale price of serviced industrial land be increased to $625,000 per acre.

Financial Implications

- The resulting revenue from the land sale price increase will be to the benefit of the Economic Development Reserve Fund. There will be no impact on the operating budget.
Background

Industry in Waterloo Region has grown over the last several years and has remained strong during the pandemic. The industrial market conditions and trends remain unchanged. Given this particular economic climate, there has been a significant increase in industrial land values since the last appraisal was completed in 2018. Accordingly, staff retained Antec Appraisal Group to conduct an updated appraisal on the Boxwood Business Campus lands as the City has recently reacquired a parcel which will be subsequently sold. Antec gathered recent sales of comparable vacant industrial land and analyzed using the comparative rate per acre method, which is most commonly relied upon in the market.

The City of Cambridge has policies in place with regards to the pricing of industrial land made available for sale. Policy ECO-30.070 requires that an appraisal be done annually. The sale price of City-owned industrial park land was most recently updated to a price of $350,000 per acre effective January 1, 2020. This report recommends the price of industrial land for sale by the City be adjusted to $625,000 effective May 1, 2021.

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 #6 - Economic Development and Tourism

Objective 6.1 Support the creation and retention of high quality and diverse employment opportunities by becoming the destination of choice for business and entrepreneurship, including helping existing firms thrive and grow.

Continuing to provide serviced land at fair market value that is ready for immediate construction will allow for business investment and job growth. Regular appraisal of the value of industrial land for sale by the City ensures that land is being sold at fair market value as per Policy ECO-30-070. These outcomes align with the goals and objectives of the City’s strategic plan.

Comments

The City of Cambridge Policy ECO-30.070 states that “a) The selling price of City-owned industrial land will vary from time to time to reflect fair market values, and competitive rates with surrounding municipalities, with prices subject to negotiation for larger lots, and b) An appraisal of current industrial land values will be undertaken at least once a year and reported to City Council for information”.

A narrative appraisal report was received on February 3, 2021, which resulted in the opinion that the current market value of vacant serviced industrial land in the Boxwood Business Campus is $625,000 per acre. This is a significant increase in price per acre that is being driven by demand for employment lands along the Hwy 401 corridor and in Waterloo Region given its proximity to the GTA as well as limited supply of employment lands. The price is reflective of recent sales of similar properties in the Region. Due to recent land activities, the City has recently reacquired lands as per Motion 21-002, Report 21-011(CRE) in the Boxwood Business Campus for future sale, therefore it is recommended that the price increase to better reflect current market value.

The appraisal report was developed in accordance with the Canadian Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice. A copy of the appraisal is available in the Economic Development Division for review.

**Existing Policy/By-Law**


**Financial Impact**

The resulting revenue from the land sale price increase will be to the benefit of the Economic Development Reserve Fund. There will be no impact on the operating budget.

**Public Input**

No public input was solicited on the recommended changes to the land price policy.

**Internal/External Consultation**

Internal discussions were held with Economic Development and Realty Services Staff. An external appraiser was commissioned to provide an updated valuation. A copy of the appraisal is available for review in the Economic Development Division office.

**Conclusion**

Staff recommends the sale price of City-owned serviced industrial land be adjusted from $350,000 to $625,000 per acre effective May 1, 2021.
Name: James Goodram  
Title: Director of Economic Development

Departmental Approval

Name: Cheryl Zahnleiter  
Title: Deputy City Manager Corporate Enterprise

City Manager Approval

Name: David Calder  
Title: City Manager

Attachments

- n/a
To: COUNCIL  
Meeting Date: 04/20/21  
Subject: Fire Apparatus Replacement Report  
Submitted By: Brian Arnold, Fire Chief  
Prepared By: Brian Arnold, Fire Chief  
Report No.: 21-107 (CRS)  
File No.: 2021-FIR-01

Recommendation(s)

THAT Report No. 21-107 (CRS) Fire Apparatus Replacement Report be received as information.

Executive Summary

Purpose

• On September 22, 2020 Council requested a staff report exploring the possibility of keeping fire apparatus in service longer than 20 years. This report details the feasibility of maintaining fire apparatus within the fleet for upwards of 25 years.

• Staff also developed a policy to replace or refurbish, as appropriate, fire apparatus. The policy balances industry-wide best practices with financial realities to create a flexible replacement schedule which adapts to vehicle condition assessments to reliable provision of emergency services.

• A formalized policy will provide a framework of consistent capital budget planning, improved funding predictability, regular service level reviews, and standardized condition assessment reports with which to make recommendations to Council.

Key Findings

• Cambridge Fire Department public safety assets are replaced through the 10-year capital planning process and a 20-year life-cycle replacement program.

• The plan is reviewed annually to verify replacement requirements based on vehicle condition and reliability while balancing prudent fiscal practices and functional requirements of the department.
• An unreliable fire apparatus compromises the mission of the department. It can imperil the safety of firefighters relying on that apparatus, jeopardize emergency operations, or endanger the public.

Financial Implications

• Planning for apparatus replacement is reviewed annually to consider funding levels in capital reserves, annual contributions to reserves, avoidance of more than one apparatus purchase in any given year so as to not deplete reserve funds, and anticipated lifespan based on industry practices and vehicle condition assessments.

Background

This report is in response to discussions during the Special Council Meeting of September 22, 2020 pertaining to apparatus replacement practices for the Cambridge Fire Department.

Increased budgetary concerns and stewardship of taxpayers’ money requires review of past practices and exploration of innovative trends to find efficiencies. Expectations are that fire protection services are provided at a high level while costs are contained.

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 #2 - Governance and Leadership

Objective 2.5  Focus on the responsible management of financial resources, ensuring transparency and accountability.

The policy aligns with the strategic plan by ensuring reliable provision of fire protection services to the community.

Responsible management of financial resources is achieved through a planning approach which provides for sustainable funding and balances operational requirements with flexibility for actual and anticipated apparatus condition.

Comments

The Cambridge Fire Department Apparatus Policy has several benefits to the department and the public:

• Capital planning which smooths the fiscal impact by not purchasing more than
one apparatus in a given year;

- Flexibility to move the purchase of a vehicle ahead or back by a year or more, depending its condition assessment;
- Timely replacement of aging fleet maintains availability with decreased frequency of maintenance;
- Adoption in principle of industry best practices as a guide to long range and capital planning;
- Reliable and safe apparatus maintains fire protection services to the public; and
- Greater responsiveness to adapt type of apparatus purchase in response to community risk and alignment with most recent Master Fire Plans.

A jurisdictional scan of comparable, smaller and larger fire services found that some departments are replacing their apparatus as early as 12 years up to a maximum of 20 years after placing into reserve status. None of the fire departments contacted had formalized apparatus replacement policies. The municipalities contacted included Toronto, Kitchener, Woodstock, Sarnia, London, Waterloo, and Guelph.

The challenge is the provision of sustainable funding, particularly over the next 5 years. Staff are currently pursuing options which would relieve pressure on the corporation’s equipment reserves account.

The Fire Chief supports this operational policy as it ensures reliable service levels while being fiscally responsible. The policy provides a decision-making framework which is consistent, based on industry best practices and takes into consideration realistic life-cycle planning in the capital planning process.

Current practice is to attempt to maintain the service life of all fire apparatus to 20 years or longer. The obvious benefit is deferral of capital expenditures to a later date. This could mean setting the replacement date to 20 years from date of purchase and planning for draws on reserves at set, predictable timelines.

Despite excellent preventative maintenance and repairs completed by the Mechanical division, the present reality is that the fire department is not able to keep most vehicles in service for 20 years due to reliability, service and safety issues. Notable exceptions include the Rescue and Hazmat trucks and the Technical Support unit, however, these vehicles do not have fire pumps or aerial devices.

There are a number of risks associated with extending the service life upwards of 25 years, including but not limited to:

- Increased maintenance costs as the vehicles age and deteriorate;
- Decreased availability and reliability as the vehicle is taken out of service at increasing frequency;
- Unpredictable and unscheduled breakdowns responding to or operating at emergency scenes affecting operations and safety of firefighters or the public;
- Sooner than scheduled apparatus replacement due to safety or functional
problems which are not budgeted for in the year required; and

- Refurbishment of vehicles to keep in service has significant expense, but aged vehicle components remain.

The Fire Chief does not support this approach as fire apparatus, particularly those with fire pumps and aerial devices, are not similar to other trucks. They are required to reliably perform at emergency events without fail. The ability of the fire department to meet the service expectations of the public and Council diminishes as the age of the fleet increases and deteriorates. The risk to firefighter and public safety in such a scenario cannot be endorsed if there is an alternative, prudent solution available.

**Existing Policy/By-Law**

Cambridge Fire Department Apparatus Replacement Policy F-30.010

Purchasing By-Law No.19-187

**Financial Impact**

**Life Cycle & Capital Planning**

A life-cycle plan of 20+ years has been established. This plan maps out long term replacement schedules for apparatus based on estimated service life. The apparatus replacement frequency illustrated in Table 1 incorporates industry practices and serves as a placeholder. The timelines are flexible and subject to change from year to year, based on the condition of the apparatus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>Frontline Years</th>
<th>Reserve Years</th>
<th>Total Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pumper</td>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerial</td>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform</td>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanker</td>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Vehicle Replacement Schedule

The 10-year capital plan is informed by the Vehicle Replacement Schedule, but the planning becomes more accurate within the 5 to 7-year range. This is due to changes in service requirements in the community, maintenance, age and annual condition assessment of the entire fleet.

Current day replacement costs of pumper and aerial apparatus range from $1 million to $1.4 million CDN, respectively. With $329,000 of additional contributions to reserves in 2021 and annual contribution increases throughout the 10-year capital plan, the reserve for replacement of Fire vehicles and equipment is expected to transition from a deficit balance to a favourable position by 2027.

**Public Input**
Internal/External Consultation

Extensive consultation was held with the Finance division to develop a sustainable plan which balanced fiscal constraints with operational requirements.

Additionally, the Manager of Fleet Services was engaged to confirm that proposed timelines were reasonably prudent to maintain operational readiness.

Conclusion

It is difficult to maintain a reliable fleet of fire apparatus to 20 years.

The apparatus replacement policy provides for financial flexibility and broadly considers all salient factors; this is a prudent approach to decision-making.

The formalized policy provides a framework which balances industry best practices and fiscal constraints in order to continue the provision of reliable and proficient fire protection services to the public.

Signature

Division Approval

Reviewed by the CFO
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Departmental Approval
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Title: City Manager
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POLICY STATEMENT

Life cycle planning for public safety assets is a core component of the CFD fleet standardization strategy and shall be reviewed annually.

PURPOSE

A fire apparatus is an emergency vehicle that must be relied upon to transport firefighters safely to and from an incident and to operate reliably and properly to support the mission of the fire department. A fire apparatus which breaks down at any time during an emergency operation not only compromises the success of the operation but might imperil the safety of firefighters relying on that apparatus, jeopardize emergency operations, or endanger the public. Thus, planning for apparatus replacement shall be reviewed annually with considerations for apparatus condition, maintenance, operating and capital funding.

DEFINITIONS

N/A

AUTHORITY

The Mechanical division facility and personnel complies with Ministry of Transportation regulations pertaining to commercial motor vehicles.
Industry standards and best practices are established by various independent bodies. While not mandatory, they serve to inform CFD Management of an apparatus replacement or refurbishment framework which is responsible, plausible and defensible:

**National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)**

The following NFPA standards for fire apparatus are adhered to as much as practicable:
- NFPA 1901 Standard for Automotive Fire Apparatus
- NFPA 1911 Standard for the Inspection, Maintenance, Testing, and Retirement of In-Service Emergency Vehicles
- NFPA 1912 Standard for Fire Apparatus Refurbishing

NFPA 1901 recommends replacement of frontline apparatus at 15 years. It is recommended that apparatus more than 15 years old that have been properly maintained and that are still in serviceable condition be upgraded in accordance with NFPA 1912 and incorporate as many features as possible of the current fire apparatus standard.

Complete or partial refurbishments per NFPA 1912 may be followed, particularly for apparatus without fire pumps or aerial devices, if the cost benefit analysis makes it a viable candidate for such upgrades.

**Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS)**

By establishing a regular vehicle replacement schedule, the City is demonstrating due diligence towards ensuring a dependable response fleet for the fire department and the community it serves.

A regular vehicle replacement schedule contributes to the FUS fire protection grading for a community. A high fire protection grading reflects positively on commercial and residential insurance rates for the public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apparatus Age</th>
<th>Major Cities²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-15 years</td>
<td>First Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25 years¹</td>
<td>No Credit in Grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-29 years¹</td>
<td>No Credit in Grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 years¹</td>
<td>No Credit in Grading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ All listed fire apparatus 20 years of age and older are required to be service tested by a recognized testing agency on an annual basis to be eligible for grading recognition (NFPA 1071)
Major cities are defined as an incorporated or unincorporated community that has:
a) a populated area (or multiple areas) with a density of at least 400 ppl / km$^2$; AND
b) a total population of 100,000 or greater.

**SCOPE**

**Frontline and Reserve Fleet**

Cambridge Fire Department (CFD) currently operates with eight (8) frontline fire apparatus;
- four (4) Pumpers,
- two (2) Aerial / ladder / platform trucks with fire pumps,
- one (1) Tanker with a fire pump, and
- one (1) Rescue without a fire pump.

CFD maintains three other apparatus with fire pumps in reserve as well as a Command vehicle and two support units, each without fire pumps. Reserve apparatus are put into service when maintenance or unexpected repairs occur on a primary or frontline apparatus. Having reserve apparatus and a strong preventative maintenance program allows for uninterrupted service delivery to the community.

**Maintenance**

The Mechanical Division adopts the practices identified in NFPA 1911. The Mechanical division maintains an effective fleet maintenance and replacement program following industry guidelines and standards, including retirement criteria for fire apparatus.

Preventative maintenance and unscheduled repairs ensure the availability and reliability of apparatus for emergency response. As apparatus age and vehicle and component condition deteriorate, reliability issues increase. Further, as these vehicles are taken out of service on increasing frequency and longer duration due to unplanned maintenance, availability for emergency response further diminishes.

In addition to maintaining an appropriate frontline fleet of emergency response apparatus, the Mechanical division maintains the complement of reserve apparatus to ensure the day-to-day emergency operations of the department are sustained.

Emergency Vehicle Technicians (EVT) conduct annual performance testing, such as:
- Aerial device service test
- Fire pump service test
- Foam system test and calibration

Emergency Vehicle Technicians (EVT) ensure Underwriters Laboratories of Canada (ULC) standards are met:
• Acceptance test certification (all components must meet safety criteria at time of build)
• Non-destructive aerial device testing (every 5 years). All functions and capabilities must be tested. All structural components tested for fatigue and wear.

A Preventative Maintenance (PM) program, scheduled and unscheduled repairs are conducted daily by the two EVT-certified mechanics and documentation retained of all maintenance. Vehicle condition and anticipated major repairs are identified and communicated to the appropriate CFD Management.

Vehicle downtime, the duration that a unit is out of service and not available for emergency response, is tracked and reported to Platoon Chiefs and CFD Management. The percentage of time that a unit is in service and available for emergency response is a reliability metric. This metric is inversely proportional to the age of the vehicle.

Considerations for Age & Condition

The following metrics are utilized to assist with decisions on apparatus replacement:
• no. of emergency responses;
• kilometers driven;
• engine hours;
• pump hours;
• ladder hours, (as applicable);
• age of vehicle;
• frame condition;
• custom vs. commercial chassis;
• body condition;
• functionality of components:
  o steering and braking systems;
  o electrical and emergency lighting systems;
  o pump operations;
  o ladder operations (as applicable);
  o transmission, drive shaft, axels and wheels;
  o starting and engine operations;
• availability of replacement parts or components;
• reliability ratio (in-service to out-of-service time); and
• occupant safety and current technological improvements.

POLICY

Life cycle planning for public safety assets is a core component of the CFD fleet standardization strategy. CFD public safety assets are replaced through a ten-year
capital plan and a 20+ year life-cycle replacement program. This involves a detailed analysis on the age and expected useful lifespan of the various apparatus. Based on this, a replacement program is developed to ensure that necessary funding is available through corporate reserves. The plan is reviewed annually to verify yearly replacement requirements based on vehicle condition and reliability while balancing prudent fiscal practices and functional requirements of the department.

POLICY COMMUNICATION

This policy is shared with internal stakeholders.

RELATED PROCEDURES

Life Cycle Planning & Funding

Life cycle planning includes a 20-year lifespan of fleet vehicles, including anticipated year of reassignment from frontline service to reserve status, if appropriate. The 10-year capital plan uses these estimates for capital budget planning. Capital funding for fire apparatus comes out of the corporate equipment reserves account.

Planning for apparatus replacement shall be reviewed annually to consider funding levels in capital reserves, annual contributions to reserves, avoidance of more than one apparatus purchase in any given year so as to flatten depletion of reserves, and anticipated lifespan based on industry practices and vehicle condition assessments.

Procurement

Local Authority Services (LAS) is the business services arm of the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO). LAS offers a Municipal Group Buying Program which includes fire apparatus, PPE and equipment. All offerings have undergone a formal competitive bid process on behalf of Ontario’s municipalities, ensuring compliance with purchasing bylaws and trade agreements. Acquiring apparatus through the Municipal Group Buying Program can result in savings between 12-17%, ensuring the apparatus comes fully equipped and on/under budget. CFD Management will endeavor to utilize the Municipal Group Buying Program where possible.

The following schedule depicts a frequency range for life-cycle planning purposes which is acceptable to CFD Management:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>Frontline Years</th>
<th>Reserve Years</th>
<th>Total Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pumper</td>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerial</td>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>17 ³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform</td>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>17 ³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 As long as aerial or platform apparatus are utilized in the same way as pumper apparatus as first-due “frontline” vehicles, a 12 to 14-year replacement schedule (similar to pumper apparatus) is warranted. Such aerial/platform trucks function as pumper trucks, running similar frequency and type of emergency calls from their respective stations. An aerial apparatus, however, experiences a greater rate of wear per call caused by additional vehicle weight and ladder movement (bounce) while driving.

Part of the annual review of apparatus replacement must include consideration of the functional requirements of apparatus based on community risk and current and future service levels. Relevant recommendations within the current Fire Master Plan can be used to assist the review process.

**RELATED DOCUMENTS/LEGISLATION**

There are no related documents or legislation.
Schedule ‘A’
To: COUNCIL

Meeting Date: 04/20/2021

Subject: Smart Waterloo Region Partnership Update

Submitted By: Cheryl Zahnleiter, Deputy City Manager – Corporate Enterprise

Prepared By: Brooke Lambert, Director Corporate Strategy

Report No.: 21-066(CRE)

File No.: N/A

Recommendation(s)

THAT staff report 21-066(CRE) – Smart Waterloo Region Partnership Update – be received;

AND THAT Council approve the City’s financial commitment to the Smart Waterloo Region Initiative of $135,296;

AND FURTHER THAT Council authorize the financial contributions of $33,824 for four years.

Executive Summary

Purpose

• To provide an overview of the revised Smart Waterloo Region Initiative, a community-based initiative that leverages technology and data solutions to address challenges faced by children and youth.

• To outline the proposed governance, timeline and partner contributions, including financial contributions of this revised framework.

Key Findings

• The Smart Waterloo Region initiative generated significant momentum through the creation of an innovative partnership model that included all areas of the community, including not-for-profit, private sector and municipal stakeholders – for the purposes of improving youth wellbeing in Waterloo Region.
• This partnership has been revised to reflect a more limited scope of work and evolving context (including the COVID 19 pandemic) while still allowing for an innovative, “made in Waterloo Region” approach to solving complex challenges faced by today’s youth.

Financial Implications

• Core funding for the Smart Waterloo Region initiative is being supported by the Lyle S. Hallman Foundation, the Region and Area Municipalities. The current funding is based on a four-year time frame.

• The City of Cambridge contribution is anticipated to be $33,824 per year for four years – for a total contribution of $135,296.

• Municipal contributions are being matched dollar for dollar by the Lyle S. Hallman Foundation.

Background

In 2018 and 2019, the Region of Waterloo, the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener, and Waterloo, and the Townships of Wilmot, Woolwich, North Dumfries, and Wellesley collectively responded to the Government of Canada’s Smart Cities Challenge to municipalities. The Smart Cities Challenge encourages communities to leverage technology and data solutions to help overcome their most pressing challenges. Through the multi-phased application process, Waterloo Region selected Healthy Children and Youth as its community challenge area.

While the partnership was disappointed not to be awarded the grand prize (big city category, $50 million dollars), the substantial work done to develop a collaborative, innovative and youth focused approach was recognized to be of significant value for ongoing discussions. Further, given the local interest in supporting this work financially from the Lyle Hallman Foundation, a new partnership model has been developed.

As a result, the Region of Waterloo, and partner municipalities (including the City of Cambridge) are relaunching the Smart Waterloo Region initiative. The Smart Waterloo Region initiative is a community-based initiative that leverages technology and data solutions to address challenges faced by children and youth.

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.

The Smart Waterloo Region proposal is an example of how the community has begun working together to address some of the wider challenges around youth engagement and wellbeing. The City of Cambridge has been an active participant in this process and has worked hard to ensure that the youth and tech industry in Cambridge have been a key part of this important discussion.

This revised proposal aligns well with the new Strategic Plan goal related to “People”, including the objectives to improve wellbeing, belonging, inclusion and vibrant neighbourhoods.

Comments

Working with the technology sector, the social services sector, and Waterloo Region youth, the Smart Waterloo Region initiative aims to develop technology-based solutions that enhance the programs and services offered to youth, ultimately to increase their overall wellbeing.

The Smart Waterloo Region initiative is governed by the eight municipal corporations in Waterloo region, including a Steering Committee and Community Advisory Committee. A core team of three Smart Waterloo Region staff will be based out of the Economic Development Department at the Region of Waterloo.

The previous SWR Priorities included; early childhood development, mental & emotional Health, and sense of belonging.

With the onset of Covid-19 the implementation was delayed, however a new timeline has been developed that would see this work move forward. More information can be found in the Region of Waterloo Report included as Attachment 1.

Highlights include:

**Project Period – April 2021 – April 2025**

- Public Relaunch – April 2021

**Public Consultation & Project Development**

- Partner Engagement Underway
- Re-establish Project Committees (Steering, Community Advisory, Data & Privacy, Youth)
- Public Engagement (Early Summer 2021)
Project Development 2021

- 3 Technology-Based Projects/Pilots (e.g. Youth Mental Health Services Program Pilot, Newcomer Youth App, Library Programming – Connected Community Spaces, Fibre)
- 1 Data Project/Pilot (e.g. Data Collaborative, Covid Impacts)

Innovation Lab

Innovation Lab Timing contingent on reopening

- Lab Services provided by Communitech

Staffing

- 3 positions – SWR Innovation Lab Manager, Data/Social Planning Specialist, Connected Community Space Coordinator (Libraries/Community Centres)
- SWR Innovation Lab Manager – Grayson Bass
- Remaining Positions – April/May 2021

SWR Priorities

- Early Childhood Development
- Mental & Emotional Health
- Sense of Belonging
- Responding to Covid-19

Measurement

- Community-Based Measurement Framework to UNICEF Index

Existing Policy/By-Law

There is no existing policy/by-law.

Financial Impact

A new cost sharing agreement has been established by the Steering Committee (including all Chief Administrative Officers of the local municipalities).

Annual Region & Area Municipal Cost Share ($)

- Townships $5,882 each (2.5% of total cost)
- Cities $33,824 each (13.5% of total cost)
- Region $125,000 (50% of total cost)

The annual total project cost for the area municipalities together is $250,000 ($1,000,000 over four years) – these contributions will be matched by the Lyle S. Hallman foundation each year. This leverages municipal financial contributions 1:1.

For the City of Cambridge, this equals a contribution of $135,296 over four years. The 2020 and 2021 contributions were identified and approved as part of the 2020/21 budget processes. Staff is requesting Council approval for the remaining annual commitments of $33,824 for 2022, 2023, subject to approval of the annual operating budget.¹

**Public Input**

There was extensive public consultation and engagement throughout the region as part of the development of the original Smart Cities proposal. Engagement will continue to be a part of this initiative with a focus on youth.

**Internal/External Consultation**

Throughout the development of the original proposal staff from several divisions participated – this includes: Corporate Strategy, Parks and Recreation, Project Management, Clerks (Accessibility and Inclusion) and Communications. There was also been active involvement by our local neighbourhood associations and other interested community agencies.

The Steering Committee is comprised of each of the CAOs from the local municipalities which will assist further coordination within each partner organization and across the various functional areas as required.

**Conclusion**

The Smart Waterloo Region initiative continues to be an exciting opportunity to build on the significant momentum generated through the federal government’s Smart Cities challenge of 2018/19. This includes an innovative partnership model that brings together all areas of the community, including not-for-profit, private sector and municipal stakeholders – for the purposes of improving youth wellbeing in Waterloo Region.

This partnership has been revised to reflect a more limited scope of work and evolving context (including the COVID 19 pandemic) while still allowing for an innovative, “made in Waterloo Region” approach to solving complex challenges faced by today’s youth.

¹ The 2022 and 2023 amounts have been identified in the approved operating budget forecast (as such, they will not required any additional increases to the current forecasted future tax levies).
It is recommended that this partnership be one of the ways the City of Cambridge works with others to achieve the goals and objectives of its new strategic plan, specifically related to the goal of “people” where the objectives include focusing on wellbeing, belonging, inclusion and vibrant neighbourhoods.

Signature

Division Approval

Reviewed by the CFO

Reviewed by Legal Services

Name: Brooke Lambert
Title: Director of Corporate Strategy

Departmental Approval

Name: Cheryl Zahnleiter
Title: Deputy City Manager Corporate Enterprise

City Manager Approval

Name: David Calder
Title: City Manager

Attachments

- Regional Report
1. **Recommendation:**

For Information.

2. **Purpose / Issue:**

To provide an update to Regional Council on the relaunch of the Smart Waterloo Region initiative for child and youth well-being.

3. **Key Considerations:**

   a) In 2018, the Region of Waterloo, the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener, and Waterloo, and the Townships of Wilmot, Woolwich, North Dumfries, and Wellesley collectively responded to the Government of Canada’s Smart Cities Challenge to municipalities. The challenge asked communities across Canada to leverage technology and data solutions to overcome their most pressing issues. Through an extensive community consultation process, Waterloo Region selected Healthy Children and Youth as its community challenge area under the “Smart Waterloo Region” brand. In 2019, the Smart Waterloo Region (SWR) proposal finished the challenge as 1 of 5 finalist communities in the large cities category. The Region’s Economic Development Division provided core administrative and project support for SWR in partnership with the Children and Youth Planning Table of Waterloo Region (CYPT).

   b) A key success of SWR was the ability to bring together technology companies with social service providers and young people to develop technology and data-enabled solutions for children and youth in Waterloo Region. The Government of Canada also recognized SWR as having one of the best engagement processes that ensured proposed solutions reflected community need. Community stakeholders have been advocating to keep SWR active and for it to continue its work with smart technology, data, and children and
youth. In early 2020, the Lyle S. Hallman Foundation approved a $1 million grant to support the relaunch SWR in partnership with the Region and Area Municipalities.

c) In October 2019, Regional Council approved the relaunch of SWR in partnership with the Area Municipalities and the Lyle S. Hallman Foundation as per Report PDL-ECD-19-02. The relaunch, which was scheduled for the spring of 2020, was delayed due to Covid. Staff from Economic Development as well as CYPT have continued to consult with social services providers, researchers, technology and data companies, and youth about the focus areas for SWR and partnership opportunities. This feedback has continued to shape SWR priorities moving forward. Staff have been able to leverage SWR during the pandemic by supporting various interim projects such as internet connectivity to support e-learning.

d) The revised implementation plan for the SWR launch will begin in spring 2021 and run until spring 2025. The 2021 approved operating budget includes the Region’s annual portion of $125,000.

4) Background:

Through an extensive community engagement process, Waterloo Region established the following challenge statement for the SWR proposal:

“We will become the benchmark community in Canada for child and youth well-being by using early intervention, youth engagement and a connected-community framework to create adaptive, data-driven programs and scalable learning technologies that improve early child development, mental health and high school graduation rates.”

Since the end of the Government of Canada’s Smart Cities Challenge, community partners have been asking to relaunch SWR as a way to achieve this goal. One of the project partners, the Lyle S. Hallman Foundation, has contributed $1 million over four years towards the relaunch of SWR. The funding will support project staffing, community engagement, communications, pilot projects, technology, and data-enabled programming for children and youth across the four townships and three cities. A condition of the Hallman Foundation funding is a matching contribution from the Region and area municipalities. Administration of SWR, including staffing, will continue from the Economic Development team at the Region of Waterloo with support from the CYPT. The SWR relaunch was initially planned for spring 2020 but was delayed due to Covid. The project’s duration would now begin in the spring of 2021 and end in the spring of 2025.

Similar to the proposal phase, SWR will receive guidance from the following committees:

- Steering Committee – Chief Administrative Officers from the Region of Waterloo
and area municipalities.

- Advisory Committee - Representatives from industry associations as well as education, health, and children and youth service providers.
- Youth Advisory Committee – Youth representatives from across Waterloo Region.
- Data, Privacy, and Security Working Group – Data representatives from private sector technology companies, children and youth service providers, and area municipalities.
- Staff representatives from the Region and area municipalities will also provide support on a project-by-project basis.

Despite being delayed, SWR was able to lead interim projects for children and youth during Covid. In the summer of 2020, schools, families, and kids were adjusting to the initial impacts of Covid on the education system. While devices such as laptops and tablets were made available for e-learning, many kids did not have access to the internet to connect those devices. With the generous support of SWR partners and local organizations, SWR was able to work with telecoms and the local school boards to provide internet access to 1500 households across Waterloo Region.

SWR will continue to focus on the priority areas resulting from the extensive community consultation during the proposal phase – early childhood development, youth mental health, sense of belonging, and child and youth well-being data. However, future projects will also be shaped by data and ongoing engagement with the community and youth. In the first year, SWR will collaborate with the local tech, the CYPT, and young people to develop three technology-based projects for children and youth in Waterloo Region. Staff will also begin developing a data platform to measure child and youth well-being and the impact of SWR.

5) Public / Area Municipality / Stakeholder Engagement:

To ensure that the proposal was informed by input from community partners, youth, and the public, the Smart Waterloo Region team undertook a number of engagement activities during the development period. Engagement activities included: web-based engagement through smartwr.ca and social media; stakeholder labs; stakeholder pop-ups; conversation toolkits, street teams, youth forums, and hackathons. In total, over 35 events occurred across Waterloo Region. Special focus was given to reaching out to underrepresented youth (e.g. newcomers, rural youth, LGBTQ2+). Attached to the Smart Waterloo Region proposal was a letter of support with over 2000 signatures from youth across the Region.

As part of the Lyle S. Hallman Foundation funding, ongoing engagement with the community and specifically youth is required to shape projects. Staff will develop an annual engagement framework, which will use online and in-person formats.
6) Strategic Plan:

The relaunch of SWR supports Strategic Action 1.1.3 to develop a broader Smart Waterloo Region strategy and implementation plan in partnership with area municipalities and the technology sector. It also supports Strategic Action 4.1.2 to support the collective efforts of the CYPT, including the Smart Waterloo Region initiative for children and youth.

7) Financial Implications:

A funding model has been developed to support approximately $500,000 per year in operating costs for this initiative: $125,000 from the Region, a combined $125,000 from area municipalities, and a matching $250,000 from the Lyle S. Hallman Foundation. The 2021 operating budget includes the Region’s contribution of $125,000.

8) Conclusion / Next Steps:

Staff will work towards a relaunch of the Smart Waterloo Region in the spring of 2021 and will report back to Council towards the end of Year 1 with an update on the first technology and data project developed through SWR.

9) Attachments / Links:

None.

Prepared By: Matthew Chandy, Director, Economic Development and Smart Waterloo Region

Approved By: Rod Regier, Commissioner of Planning, Development and Legislative Services
To: COUNCIL

Meeting Date: 04/13/21

Subject: 2021 Speed Management Action Plan

Submitted By: Kevin De Leebeeck, Director of Engineering

Prepared By: Shannon Noonan, Manager of Transportation

Report No.: 21-083(CD)

File No.: C1101

Recommendation

THAT Report 21-083(CD), 2021 Speed Management Action Plan be received for information.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- To provide an overview of the 2021 Speed Management Action Plan and update Council on other speed management and road safety initiatives.

Key Findings

- In 2019, Council approved the Speed Management Program. The Speed Management Program ensures resources are being allocated where they are actually needed and that the most appropriate tools are being used.

- Based on the Council approved Speed Management Program, staff have developed the 2021 Speed Management Action Plan. Seventeen (17) locations where speeding was raised as a concern in 2020 were reviewed and prioritized.

- In addition, five (5) locations were carried over from 2020 that were delayed due to COVID-19, required studies, or additional monitoring and review.

- Locations within Categories 2 and 3 have been assessed further to determine potential remedial measures and identify which program or tool would be most appropriate for the specific situation. These locations can be found in Table 1.0.
In addition to the 2021 Speed Management Action Plan, seasonal traffic calming locations from 2020 will be reinstalled, and the Radar Message Board and Tommy & Friends programs will begin in April.

Recognizing that speeding on residential streets is the most common complaint or concern that is received by Transportation Engineering, staff are continually considering new programs and initiatives as outlined within this report.

Financial Implications

- The estimated cost for all works within the 2021 Speed Management Action Plan and other programs/initiatives for 2021 is approximately $95,000.

- Speed management initiatives planned for 2021 can be funded in part by the 2021 Operating Budget and the 2020 Capital Budget for Traffic Calming Implementation initiatives.

Background

Each year, the City receives numerous complaints or concerns from residents regarding speeding on various roads throughout the City. These complaints or concerns are primarily associated with residential areas and often lead to requests for traffic calming or some form of traffic control.

Transportation Engineering responds by investigating the need for speed mitigation. Through studies, it is frequently found that speeding is perceived and not necessarily real. Often sensitivity to speeding is based on how residents think drivers should behave on a particular street not how they are actually behaving.

In 2019, through Report 19-131(CD), Council approved the Speed Management Program, which provides a methodology for assessing these locations to ensure resources are being allocated where they are actually needed and that the most appropriate tools are being used when addressing speeding complaints.

Using the approved Speed Management Program, staff have developed the 2021 Speed Management Action Plan.

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 #7 - Transportation and Infrastructure
Objective 7.3 Provide innovative leadership in the management of city assets to help plan, fund and maintain city assets in a sustainable way.

Development of an annual Speed Management Action Plan while also working on other speed management and road safety initiatives demonstrates innovative leadership while dedicating resources responsibly and in a sustainable manner.

**Comments**

Speeding on residential streets is the most common complaint or concern that is received by Transportation Engineering. Addressing these issues requires a significant amount of resources including staff time and funding.

Often times residents request interventions that are not intended to control speed or are ineffective such as: traffic signals, all-way stops, or isolated reduced speed limits. Using the wrong tools to address a traffic issue not only doesn't solve the problem, but may create additional safety issues.

To ensure resources are being allocated where they are actually needed and that the most appropriate tools are being used, staff have developed a 2021 Speed Management Action Plan.

**2021 Speed Management Action Plan**

Seventeen (17) locations where speeding was raised as a concern in 2020 were reviewed and prioritized. As per the Speed Management Program, these locations were categorized according to the degree of speeding that may be occurring based on the 85th percentile speed (the speed at which 85% of drivers are travelling at or below). The locations were grouped into three (3) categories:

- Category 1 - 85th percentile speed less than 5 km/h over the posted speed limit
- Category 2 – 85th percentile speed 5-10 km/h over the posted speed limit
- Category 3 – 85th percentile speed greater than 10 km/h over the posted speed limit.

Of the seventeen (17) locations, seven (7) fell into Category 1, with one (1) in Category 2 and nine (9) in Category 3.

For locations within Category 1, generally no further action has been taken as speeding is not considered to be problematic. However, it should be noted that one location, namely, Northview Heights Drive, is within one of the Neighbourhood 40 km/h Pilot areas. Other locations within Category 1 include:

- Old Mill Road
- Linnwood Drive
- Sunnyhill Road
- Taylor Avenue
- Lilywood Drive
- Bloomington Drive
For all Category 1 locations, residents have been notified of the outcome of the review.

The locations within Categories 2 and 3 have been assessed further to determine potential remedial measures and identify which program or tool would be most appropriate for the specific situation. These locations have been included in the 2021 Speed Management Action Plan and are noted Table 1.0 below with proposed actions:

**Table 1.0 - 2021 Speed Management Action Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millcreek Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Scheduled for Radar Message Board program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue Road (Hespeler Road to Elgin Street N)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Install seasonal traffic calming with painted lane lines and painted median at the St. Peter’s school. Location included in Neighbourhood 40 km/h Speed Limit pilot and is under consideration for an “Enhance School Zone”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue Road (Franklin Boulevard to Cowan Boulevard)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Install seasonal traffic calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaverdale Road (Fisher Mills to Mohawk Road)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Install seasonal traffic calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheese Factory Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Install seasonal traffic calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Street N (Glamis Road to Munch Avenue)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Install two painted islands with seasonal traffic calming. Location included in Neighbourhood 40 km/h Speed Limit pilot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Boulevard (Edward Street to Winston Boulevard)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Additional police enforcement and schedule for Radar Message Board program. Speed limit was reduced to 40 km/h in 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Street (Bishop Street to Dolph Street)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Location included in Neighbourhood 40 km/h Speed Limit pilot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardcastle Drive (Sim Park Zone)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Modify on-street parking regulations to alternate sides of the street with lane lines and painted medians as well as seasonal traffic calming at the park and in the curve area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northview Heights</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Location included in Neighbourhood 40 km/h Speed Limit pilot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive (Frobisher Court to Ardoch Mews)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speed Limit pilot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2020 Carryover Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Boulevard (Elgin Street to Christopher Drive)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Install seasonal traffic calming with pavement marking modifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West River Road (at access to Tait Street Public School)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Install painted island with seasonal traffic calming signs and add new School Area signs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper Street (Lewis to McMaster)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Install seasonal traffic calming signs, but requires on-street parking modifications. A separate report will be presented to Council related to the parking modifications. Seasonal traffic calming signs cannot be installed without parking modifications, as such, this work will be scheduled for 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Create a visually narrow roadway using painted parking lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph Avenue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Permanent radar message boards were installed in 2020. For 2021, painted pedestrian refuge islands will be installed with seasonal traffic calming. Location will also have automated speed enforcement installed in school zone and is part of the Neighbourhood 40km/h Speed Limit pilot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Speed Management Initiatives

In 2020, seasonal traffic calming signs were installed at ten (10) locations. Two (2) of these locations were only temporary for 2020, as such eight (8) locations will be reinstalled for the 2021 season in addition to any new locations for 2021. The locations from 2020 include:

- Avenue Road
- Samuelson Street
- River Road
- Salisbury Avenue
- McCormick Drive
- Queen Street W
- Black Bridge Road
- Beaverdale Road

The two (2) temporary seasonal traffic calming locations included Duke Street, to address speeding concerns related to the King Street Streetscaping project and Dunbar Road as an interim measure while the design work for the Dunbar Road Multi-Use Trail...
The final design for Dunbar Road is now complete and includes permanent traffic calming elements that are planned to be constructed this year.

In addition, the Radar Message Board and Tommy & Friends programs will also be in full operation for 2021 with six (6) radar message boards and eight (8) Tommy & Friends silhouettes being rotated around the City on a 2-week rotation.

Recognizing that speeding on residential streets is the most common complaint or concern that is received by Transportation Engineering, staff are continually considering new programs and initiatives to add to our suite of options to address speeding and road safety on residential streets and in school zones. Some new programs/initiatives for 2021 include:

**Enhanced School Zones**

Transportation staff have collaborated with Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region (STSWR) to secure grant funding in the amount of $30,000 through the Ontario Active School Travel Fund to be invested in Cambridge for an “Enhanced School Zone” project. The project involves implementing “Enhanced School Zones” at 2-3 schools across the City that includes infrastructure improvements such as new larger brighter signs, colourful and custom pavement markings. Celebration events will also be part of the project.

STSWR aims to increase safety for children while also helping parents make the connection between driving behaviours and safety within school zones. The project is intended to build the case for wider application of “Enhanced School Zones” across the Region through observations and data collection pre and post installations. Although STSWR is the primary applicant of the grant funding, as a major stakeholder in the project, the City will be providing the following support:

- Transportation personnel hours for project planning, criteria development, school assessment and selection, and data collection;
- $3,000 towards materials and installation;
- Participation in a launch event for all or each school as determined in planning;
- Data collection during the project for storytelling and reporting purposes, and;
- Participation in storytelling development.

**Automated Speed Enforcement Program**

At the July 28, 2020 Council meeting, through Report 20-176(CD), Council authorized the execution of all necessary agreements and renewals with the Region of Waterloo for the administration and operation of Automated Speed Enforcement (ASE) on City roads, and approved four sites for the implementation of ASE. Guelph Avenue (at St. Gabriel Elementary School) was selected as the first location in Cambridge for installation this spring and Elgin Street North (at Elgin Street Public School) has been
selected as the second location for installation later this year provided it meets all of the vendor location criteria.

**Neighbourhood 40km/h Speed Limit Pilot**

On March 2, 2021 Council approved a 40km/h neighbourhood speed limit pilot to be conducted in four neighbourhoods across the City, described as: Central Cambridge, Lower Preston, North Hespeler and Southwest Galt. The pilot project will be in place over a 2-year period beginning this spring.

**Slow Streets Pilot**

In late 2020, through staff report 20-274 (CD), Council approved a Slow Streets pilot initiative. While this is an active transportation initiative to create better space for cyclists and vehicles to share the road, it also provides added benefits by potentially reducing cut-thru traffic, which can decrease overall traffic volumes and vehicle speeds.

**Website Improvements**

The City’s road safety page is being updated with a Speed Management Dashboard that will be launched later this spring. The dashboard will provide information about speed management initiatives undertaken since 2018 and will allow dashboard visitors to select a specific street for more details. The dashboard will also display information using simplistic graphs for a quick glance and yearly comparison. A sample of the map and graphs that will be available on the dashboard can be found in Appendix A.

**Street Design Guidelines**

As part of the update to the City’s Engineering Design Standards and Guidelines currently underway, design guidelines that provide for calmer traffic speeds and balance the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, transit users and motorists are being considered.

Other programs/initiatives under consideration for the future include:

- Lawn Sign Program
- Temporary traffic calming curbs
- Pop-up traffic calming – focused on school areas
- Keep Calm Program showcase locations
- Council Policy for unwarranted All Way Stop Control

Although staff is continuing to work on the items listed above the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic has delayed the implementation of a number of these items.

It is also important to note that outside of the above programs and tools, speeding can also be managed through enforcement and ensuring that posted speed limits are set appropriately based on roadway classification, function, and physical characteristics. Credible posted speed limits enhance road safety by matching driver expectations for a
roadway and its surrounding area. The City uses the Transportation Association of Canada Guidelines for Establishing Posted Speed Limits.

**Existing Policy/By-Law**

The Council approved Speed Management Program was used for developing the 2021 Speed Management Action Plan.

**Financial Impact**

- The estimated cost for all works within the 2021 Speed Management Action Plan and new programs/initiatives for 2021 is approximately $95,000.

- Speed management initiatives planned for 2021 can be funded in part by the 2021 Operating Budget and the 2020 Capital Budget for Traffic Calming Implementation initiatives.

**Public Input**

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

**Internal/External Consultation**

There was no internal/external consultation undertaken.

**Conclusion**

The 2021 Speed Management Action Plan has been developed in accordance with the Council approved Speed Management Program and will be implemented as noted in this report. Development of an annual Speed Management Action Plan while also working on other speed management initiatives demonstrates innovative leadership while dedicating resources responsibly and in a sustainable manner.
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Signature

Division Approval

Reviewed by the CFO

Reviewed by Legal Services

Name: Kevin De Leebeeck
Title: Director of Engineer

Departmental Approval

Name: Hardy Bromberg
Title: Deputy City Manager, Community Development

City Manager Approval

Name: David Calder
Title: City Manager

Attachments

- Appendix A – Speed Management Dashboard Samples
Recommendations

THAT Report 21-052(CD) – 2020 Growth and Staging of Development be received for information;

AND FURTHER THAT Council approve the 2020 Growth and Staging of Development Report – which aligns with the approved Capital Budget, to be used for growth-related capital projects associated with infrastructure, secondary plans, subwatershed plans, and development charge reviews.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- To report if Cambridge is meeting the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) requirement of having a sufficient supply of land to meet anticipated demand for residential units over the next three and fifteen years.

- To report if Cambridge has enough residential land to accommodate the 2031 population target set by the Province for the Region and allocated by the Region to the area municipalities.

- To report if Cambridge has met the target set by the Region for the proportion of new residential units constructed within the Built Boundary in 2020.

Key Findings

- Cambridge has a sufficient inventory of serviced and suitably zoned lands to meet the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) requirement of being able to provide at least a three-year supply of residential units.
Cambridge has a sufficient inventory of residentially designated lands to meet the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) requirement of being able to accommodate forecasted housing demand to 2035.

Section 3 in Attachment 1 includes the estimated timing of development based upon developer input.

Cambridge has enough residential land to accommodate the 2031 population targets that are adopted in the Regional Official Plan and the Cambridge Official Plan.

The Provincial Growth Plan was revised in 2020 and provides updated population and employment targets for the Region to 2051. The 2051 population and employment targets for Cambridge are expected to be provided to the City by the Region later in 2021.

The Regional Official Plan requires a minimum of 45% of new residential development occurring annually within the region as a whole to be constructed within the Built Boundary. In 2020, 58% of building permits for residential units in Cambridge were within the Built Boundary.

The 2020 Growth Plan increases the minimum percentage of new residential development occurring annually within the Built Boundary to 50% for the Region as a whole, starting when the current update to the Regional Official Plan is approved and in effect.

This report will provide background for the preparation of a future Community Benefits Charge and By-law for the City.

Financial Implications

The forecasted scope, timing, and location of residential and employment development assist in allocating financial resources for infrastructure investment.

Background

The purpose of the 2020 Growth and Staging of Development Report (Attachment 1) is to:

a. Monitor past and potential residential growth to evaluate compliance with the Provincial Policy Statement 2020 (PPS) and the Provincial Growth Plan 2019 (Section 2);

b. Evaluate if future residential land supply is sufficient to meet the population growth forecasted for Cambridge (Section 2);
c. Explore a method of forecasting future Development Charge revenue by estimating the timing of building permits for new residential development (Section 3);

d. Evaluate if the percentage of residential units built in 2020 within the Built Boundary has met the 45% target adopted in the Regional Official Plan (Policy 2.C.2) and the Cambridge Official Plan (2.6.1.1) (Section 4);

e. Summarize the addition of any new residential units in the City’s three Core Areas (Section 5);

f. List any new or upgrades to infrastructure planned for the City in three Community Plan/Secondary Plan areas (Section 6);

g. Provide growth and staging information based on projected timing for the delivery of infrastructure to assist the development industry (Section 6);

h. Summarize the industrial land inventory available to accommodate demand for employment uses (Section 7); and

i. List any new or upgrades to infrastructure planned for the City by the Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Section 8).

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 #7 - Transportation and Infrastructure

Objective 1.4 Promote, facilitate and participate in the development of affordable, welcoming and vibrant neighbourhoods.

The 2020 Growth and Staging of Development Report monitors the City’s ability to meet the forecasted demand for residential and employment land over the next fifteen years.

The Report is an important tool for signalling if adjustments in development activities may be appropriate to meet targets for balanced city-building and smart growth.

The City is well-positioned to meet or exceed the Provincial residential supply and dwelling unit targets. Pending updated population and employment forecasts will inform and guide future work. Intensification rates vary somewhat, and are anticipated to increase with the on-lining of more mass transit.
Comments

- The number of units in serviced and suitably zoned registered plans, draft plans, and, intensification and redevelopment plans represent a 9.4-year supply based upon a pure mathematical calculation, which exceeds the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) requirement of a three-year residential supply. It should be noted that the pace of development can vary, and can be influenced by developers and builders deciding when and what to build. If the rate of growth increases, the years of supply would be reduced.

- Approximately 65,200 units would be needed to accommodate the forecasted population for Cambridge in 2031 of 176,000. The number of existing dwelling units at the end of 2020 added with the total number of potential residential units equals 68,367 units, exceeding the number of dwellings needed by 2031. The City has adequately planned for residential growth until 2031 and beyond.

- The Development Charges Act requires development charges be reviewed every five years or sooner. The monitoring of past and potential development activity through the Growth and Staging of Development Report helps inform whether a review of development charges should occur more frequently.

- Some assumptions and figures in the Growth and Staging of Development Report are different from the Development Charges Background Study due to changes to development proposals that have occurred since the Study was completed. City staff will continue to monitor this information.

- The 2019 Growth Plan establishes an updated population and employment forecast to 2051 for the Region, which has yet to be allocated to the City through the Regional Official Plan Review. This work is scheduled to be finalized in 2021. Ongoing communication with the Region about the updated population and employments forecast for Cambridge will occur.

- In 2019, the Provincial Growth Plan increased the intensification target to 50% and this target will come into effect following the next update to the Regional Official Plan which is currently underway. The intensification rate was 44% on average between 2006 and 2019, and was 58% in 2020. Significant intensification may be challenging until an inter-modal mass transit network can be accessed conveniently from anywhere in the city.

Existing Policy/By-Law

2012 Cambridge Official Plan (OP):

Section 2.8.1 “Residential Land Supply”
• Maintain a 10-year supply of land for residential development including intensification and redevelopment;

• maintain servicing capacity sufficient to provide at least a three-year supply of residential units through lands suitably zoned to facilitate residential intensification and redevelopment, and land in draft approved and registered plans; and

• prepare a Staging of Development Plan with input from key stakeholders including the Region to address the capital works necessary to allow the planned residential and employment growth to occur.

Section 2.6.1.1 “Intensification within the Built-up Area”

• By the year 2015 and for each year thereafter, a minimum of 45% of all residential development will occur within the built-up area of the region as a whole. The City in collaboration with the Region will monitor development within the built-up area.

The Regional Official Plan (ROP) policy 2.B.3j describes the addition of approximately 115 ha (284 acres) of land to be added to the Cambridge urban boundary. These lands are in northwest Cambridge. The ROP Amendment to add these lands has been appealed to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal. Once the appeal is resolved and the exact location of the 115 ha (284 acres) is known, City staff will work with the Region, affected property owners and the public to develop a detailed Secondary Plan for this additional area.

Financial Impact

• The forecasted scope, timing, and location of residential and employment development assist in allocating financial resources for infrastructure investment.

• The Development Charges Act requires development charges be reviewed every five years or sooner. The monitoring of past and potential development activity through the Growth and Staging of Development Report helps inform whether a review of development charges should occur more frequently.

• Some assumptions and figures in the Growth and Staging of Development Report are different from the Development Charges Background Study due to changes to development proposals that have occurred since the Study was completed. City staff will continue to monitor this information.

Public Input

Posted publicly as part of the report process.
Internal/External Consultation

Extensive consultation amongst various City departments, including Engineering and the Economic Development Divisions, was undertaken in the preparation of this report. A draft of this document has also been circulated to Region of Waterloo Community Planning Division staff for their input. Section 2.8.1.3 of the Official Plan requires that the Capital Works necessary for the planned residential and employment growth be addressed with input from key stakeholders including the Region.

This report has also been shared with the Waterloo Region Homebuilders’ Association for their information.

Conclusion

Cambridge is meeting the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) requirement of having a sufficient supply of land to meet anticipated demand for residential units over the next three and fifteen years. Cambridge also has enough planned residential dwelling units to accommodate the 2031 forecasted population. Cambridge has met the target set by the Region for the proportion of new residential units constructed within the Built Boundary in 2020.
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Introduction

This document fulfills the City’s obligations specified by the Province.

First, it satisfies a Provincial Policy Statement requirement that municipalities have sufficient residential land to accommodate anticipated growth for the next three to fifteen years.

Second, it verifies that enough residential land is available to accommodate population targets set by the Province for the Region and allocated by the Region to area municipalities.

Third, it reviews if the proportion of new residential units constructed within the Built Boundary has met the targets set by the Province (Provincial Growth Plan) and Region in 2020.

In addition, the report provides an overview of past, present and anticipated residential development activity. The inventory of industrial lands for employment uses is also reviewed.

Section 1: Provincial Policy Statement and Provincial Growth Plan Requirements

The 2020 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) requires that, “planning authorities shall maintain at all times the ability to accommodate residential growth for a minimum of 15 years through residential intensification and redevelopment and, if necessary, lands which are designated and available for residential development.” (Policy 1.4.1a). The 2020 PPS came into effect on May 1st, 2020. In addition, the PPS requires that, “planning authorities shall maintain at all times where new development is to occur, land with servicing capacity sufficient to provide at least a three-year supply of residential units available through lands suitably zoned to facilitate residential intensification and redevelopment, and land in draft approved and registered plans.” (Policy 1.4.1b).

The 2006 Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan) requires that a minimum of 40% of all residential development occurring annually within each upper- and single-tier municipality will be within the built-up area. (Policy 2.2.3.1) The “Built Boundary” was defined by the Province in June 2006, based on the limits of the development in place at the time (shown on Map 2). Based on local needs, the Regional Official Plan (ROP) requires that 45% of new residential development in the region as a whole be constructed in the Built-Up Area (ROP 2.C.2). Consequently, the City considers the 45% figure to be the target.

The 2020 Growth Plan came into effect on August 28, 2020. The 2020 Growth Plan increases the minimum percentage of new residential developments occurring annually within the Built Boundary to 50% for the Region as a whole, starting when the current update to the Regional Official Plan is approved and in effect.

Section 2: Residential Inventory

As illustrated in Table 1, the residential building permit activity between 2006 and 2020 has resulted in a three-year average construction of 686 units/year and a fifteen-year average construction of 558 units/year. Average construction rates by unit type over the three- and fifteen-year time frames are also shown. This information is used to determine demand for residential units (absorption rate).
Table 1: Residential Units Built 2006 -2020

Number of Residential Units for which Building Permits were Issued in the City of Cambridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Detached Units</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Semi-detached Units</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Town House Units</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Apartment Units</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 year average: 168 24.6% 12 1.8% 268 39.1% 237 34.6% 686 100.0%
15 year average: 216 36.6% 7 1.2% 154 27.6% 161 32.4% 558 100.0%

*Apartment figures include units in duplexes, stacked townhouses, rental apartment buildings, condo apartment buildings, and residential units in mixed use buildings. Source: City of Cambridge Community Development Department. Revised March 1, 2021.

Three-Year Supply Required by the 2020 PPS

The 2020 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) requires that planning authorities maintain at all times a supply of units in registered plans, draft approved plans, and intensification and redevelopment lands that have sufficient servicing capacity and are suitably zoned to accommodate three years of demand.

As of December 31st, 2020, there were 145 unbuilt residential units in registered plans, and 4,938 unbuilt residential units in draft approved plans. There were also an additional 1,363
unbuilt residential intensification and redevelopment units. The total number of units in draft approved and registered plans, and suitably zoned intensification and redevelopment plans were 6,446. Table 2 summarizes these figures and breaks down the totals by unit type.

- The most recent three-year average demand for residential units based on building permits was 686 units/year. Based on this, a three-year supply is 2,058 units. As the current supply is 6,446 units within registered and draft approved plans, and intensification and redevelopment plans, the City of Cambridge is exceeding the requirement of the PPS for a three-year supply of units. These 6,446 potential residential units have sufficient servicing capacity and are suitably zoned, and could be provided within the three-year time frame established in the 2020 PPS. However, based on the three-year average demand observed from building permits of 686 units/year, it would take 9.4 years for the 6,446 units to be absorbed based upon a pure mathematical calculation. It should be noted that the pace of development can vary, and can be influenced by developers and builders deciding when and what to build. If the rate of growth increases, the years of supply would be reduced.

The locations of the registered plans, draft approved plans, and intensification and redevelopment plans (vacant multiple residential sites) are shown on Map 1. This map is based on data as of December 31st 2020 and is compiled in early 2021.

Table 2: Three Year Residential Unit Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Type</th>
<th>Low Density (1) (Single and semi-detached)</th>
<th>Medium Density (Townhouse)</th>
<th>High Density (Apartment)</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registered Plans</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Approved Plans</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>4,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensification and Redevelopment (suitably zoned) (2)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>1,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for 3 Year Supply</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>2,486</td>
<td>2,873</td>
<td>6,446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Development Monitoring Tables (as of Dec.31, 2020) City of Cambridge Community Development Department.

(1) The density is determined by the land area taken up by the unit design. Density refers to the number of units that can exist on a hectare or acre. Single and semi-detached units take up more land area than townhouses or apartment units.
(2) Include site plan applications (approved plans and plans under review), residual blocks from older plans of subdivision, and other vacant residually zoned parcels which are not included in the subdivision counts above.
Map 1: Locations of Development

Source: City of Cambridge Community Development Department, Development Monitoring Tables (Dec. 31, 2020)
Additional Residential Development Applications

In addition to the units in registered plans, draft approved plans, and suitably zoned intensification and redevelopment plans that form the three-year supply, there is an upcoming supply of residential units through rezoning applications and preliminary plans (subdivision plans under review, pending draft approval). As of December 31st, 2020, there were 3,862 units under rezoning applications (includes official plan amendment applications) and 932 units in preliminary plans for a total of 4,794 units. Table 3 summarizes these figures and breaks down the totals by unit type. The locations of rezoning applications and preliminary plans can be seen on Map 1.

It should be noted that different rezoning applications and preliminary plans are at varying stages in the approval processes. There are rezoning applications and preliminary plans which may be approved within the next three years. For example, if any of these applications or plans are approved this year, then the approved units will be counted in the three-year supply in next year’s report.

Since these applications were not suitably zoned or draft approved as of December 31, 2020, they are not counted in the three-year supply (as defined by the 2020 PPS) in this year’s report. However, these additional residential development applications accommodate the minimum 15 years of residential growth required by the 2020 PPS.

Table 3: Units in Additional Residential Development Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Type</th>
<th>Low Density (Single and semi-detached)</th>
<th>Medium Density (Townhouse)</th>
<th>High Density (Apartment)</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning (1)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>3,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Plans (2)</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>1,664</td>
<td>2,616</td>
<td>4,794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Development Monitoring Tables (as of Dec.31, 2020) City of Cambridge Community Development Department.

(1) Rezoning applications or Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning applications.

(2) Preliminary Plans are plans for which an application for subdivision has been received and are under review but have not been “Draft Approved” as of Dec.31, 2020.
Fifteen Year Residential Inventory

The 2020 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) requires that planning authorities maintain at all times the ability to accommodate residential growth for a minimum of 15 years through residential intensification and redevelopment, and lands which are designated and available for residential development.

In addition to development applications, lands are also designated and available for residential development through approved Community Plans/Secondary Plans. The Southeast Galt Community Plan is currently the only approved Community Plan with some remaining vacant lands not under any development applications, but are designated and available for future residential development. Map 1 shows the boundary of the Southeast Galt Community, the locations of the existing subdivision plans in Southeast Galt, and the remaining lands available for future development.

There are three existing subdivision plans within the Southeast Galt Community. Two plans are draft approved and one plan is under review. The approved and proposed units in these three subdivision applications have been deducted from the initial total number of units approved under the Southeast Galt Community Plan, since these units have already been accounted for in earlier sections of this report. Table 4 displays the remaining total number of residential units that could be developed in Southeast Galt and the potential number of units by type. There remain 4,440 residential units available for future development in Southeast Galt.

Table 4: Units Not Under Application in Community Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Plans</th>
<th>Low Density (Single and semi-detached)</th>
<th>Medium Density (Townhouse)</th>
<th>High Density (Apartment)</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Galt Community Plan (1)</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>4,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>4,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Development Monitoring Tables (as of Dec.31, 2020) City of Cambridge Community Development Department.

(1) Unit Types on Community Plans and Areas are typically unspecified. The quantity of units by type was estimated for the lands not under application by applying the same proportion of unit types from the existing applications in the Southeast Galt Community Plan area (26.5% Single & Semi Detached, 42% Rowhouses, 31.5% Apartments). This unit apportioning may not reflect the unit mix when eventually approved.
Table 5: Summary of Units to Accommodate Residential Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Type</th>
<th>Low Density (1)</th>
<th>Medium Density (2)</th>
<th>High Density (3)</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registered Plans</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Approved Plans</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>4,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensification and Redevelopment (suitably zoned) (4)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>1,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of 3 Year Supply Units</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>2,486</td>
<td>2,873</td>
<td>6,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Year Average Construction Rate</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years to Absorb 3 Year Supply (Supply/3 yr Average Construction)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning (5)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>3,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Plans (6)</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units in All Applications</td>
<td>1,601</td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td>5,489</td>
<td>11,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units on Community Plans not Under Application</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>4,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total (7)</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units (Applications &amp; Community Plans)</td>
<td>2,775</td>
<td>6,017</td>
<td>6,888</td>
<td>15,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifteen Year Average Construction Rate</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years to Absorb All Units (Supply/15 yr Average Construction)</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Development Monitoring Tables (as of Dec.31, 2020) City of Cambridge Community Development Department.

(1) Single and Semi-detached units.
(2) Row and Cluster Townhouse units.
(3) Apartment units (include duplex, stacked townhouse, rental apartment building, condo apartment building, residential in mixed-use building).
(4) Include site plan applications (approved plans and plans under review), residual blocks from older plans of subdivision, and other vacant residentially zoned parcels which are not included in the subdivision counts above.

(5) Rezoning applications or Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning applications.

(6) Preliminary Plans are plans for which an application for subdivision has been received and are under review but have not been “Draft Approved” as of Dec.31, 2020.

(7) Unit Types on Community Plans and Areas are typically unspecified. The quantity of units by type was estimated for the lands not under application by applying the same proportion of unit types from the lands with existing applications in a particular Community Plan area. This unit apportioning may not reflect the unit mix when eventually approved.

According to Regional Official Plan (ROP) Policy 2.B.3(J), a maximum of 115 hectares of Countryside land in northwest Cambridge may be added to the Urban Area. The Regional Official Plan Amendment (ROPA) to add these lands to the Urban Area is currently appealed to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal. Once the appeal is resolved, the City will undertake a detailed Secondary Plan for this area. The Secondary Plan will determine the land use policies and the maximum number of residential units supported for these lands.

Table 5 summarizes the total number of residential units that can accommodate future residential growth. There is a total of 15,680 residential units in all development applications and Community Plan lands not under application. Based on the current 15-year average construction rate of 558 units/year, 15,680 units will meet 28.1 years of residential demand, which exceeds the 2020 PPS requirement to accommodate a minimum of 15 years of residential growth.

It should be noted that this methodology uses past demand (measured by units on building permits) to predict future demand. However, using past absorption to predict future demand will not reflect unexpected shifts in demand due to fluctuations in the local, provincial, or national economy.

### Population Growth Targets

Another measure of residential growth is provided in the Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan) through population forecasts. As stated in the Growth Plan, it builds upon the policy foundation provided by the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and provides additional and more specific land use planning policies.

Implementing the 2006 Growth Plan, the Regional Official Plan (ROP) adopted the Growth Plan population forecasts and allocated population targets to area municipalities. The population target allocated to the City has been adopted in the Cambridge OP (Policy 2.3.1). Cambridge’s population is forecasted to increase to 176,000 people in 2031. Based on an overall Persons Per Unit (PPU) of 2.7 from the latest Census, approximately 65,200 residential units would be needed to accommodate the 2031 forecasted population.

The Census found that the City of Cambridge had 49,388 total private dwellings in 2016. Adding the residential building permits the City issued from January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2020, of 3,304 units (Table 1 shows the building permits issued each year), the total
number of existing dwellings at the end of 2020 was 52,692 units. As detailed in earlier sections and Table 5, the total number of units that can accommodate residential growth is 15,680 units. Adding together the number of existing units at the end of 2020 and the number of potential future residential units, there is a total of 68,372 units to accommodate long-term population growth. Since only about an estimated 65,200 units would be needed by 2031, the City has adequately planned for residential growth until 2031 and beyond.

The 2020 Growth Plan establishes an updated population forecast to 2051 for the Region, which has yet to be allocated to the City through the Regional Official Plan Review. This work is scheduled to be finalized in 2021. Ongoing communication with the Region about the updated population forecast for Cambridge will occur.

(1) It is assumed that the dwelling units that had building permits issued in 2016 would not have been built and occupied in time to be counted in the 2016 Census survey. Thus, the number of building permits issued in 2016 is also added.

**Section 3: Forecasting Revenue Implications of Future Residential Growth**

This section explores a method of forecasting future Development Charge revenue by estimating the timing of building permits. The estimated total number of units to have building permits issued is summarized in Table 6 by year and by unit type. These estimates are based on the status of development applications, development phasing plans, and communications with developers.

**Table 6: Potential Timing of Development Projects by Year and Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (1)</th>
<th>Single Detached</th>
<th>Semi-detached</th>
<th>Townhouse</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
<th>Total by Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>1,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>2,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>1,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>1,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026-2035*</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,152</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>7,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total by Unit Type</td>
<td>2,775</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,017</td>
<td>6,888</td>
<td>15,680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes an estimated 4,440 units on 116 hectares of vacant developable land currently not under plan in the Southeast Galt Community.

(1) These estimates are based on the status of development applications, development phasing plans, and communications with developers.

It should be noted that the forecasted annual supply of units is much higher than the historic average units per year for which building permits have been issued. As shown in Table 1, the average number of units built over the past three years was 686 units annually, and the average number of units built over the past ten years was 558 units annually. The potential
surplus of forecasted supply to expected demand (average annual building permits) is ideal because developers would be able to respond quickly to unexpected increases in demand.

The Development Charges Act requires development charges be reviewed every five years or sooner. The monitoring of past and potential development activity through the Growth and Staging of Development Report helps inform whether a review of development charges should occur more frequently.

Some assumptions and figures in the Growth and Staging of Development Report are different from the Development Charges Background Study due to changes to development proposals that have occurred since the Study was completed. City staff will continue to monitor this information.

**Section 4: Built Boundary Targets**

In 2006, the Province introduced the Growth Plan and established a Built Boundary for every municipality subject to the Plan, which is identified on Map 1. The 2006 Growth Plan then set an annual target of 40% of new units to be built within the Built Boundary, starting in 2015. The Regional Official Plan increases this target to 45% for all new residential development occurring annually within the region as a whole.

On a year-to-year basis, the proportion of units built within the Cambridge Built Boundary can vary significantly. The percent of units built within the Built Boundary was only 13% in 2015 and soared to 64% in 2019. Since the introduction of the Growth Plan in 2006, and up until the end of 2019, 44% of all residential building permits in Cambridge have been for units within the Built Boundary, as shown in Table 7. In 2020, the percent of units built within the Built Boundary was 58%, as shown in Table 8.

The 2020 Growth Plan increases the minimum percentage of new residential developments occurring annually within the Built Boundary to 50% for the Region as a whole, starting when the update to the Regional Official Plan is approved and in effect. In June 2018, an amendment to the City’s Zoning By-law was passed to facilitate the development of legal secondary apartment units in singles, semis and townhouses, which should further increase the supply of units within the Built Boundary. The City in collaboration with the Region will continue to monitor development within the built-up area.
Table 7: Location and Type of Units Built Relative to the Built Boundary between 2006 and 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year to 2019</th>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Single Detached Dwelling</th>
<th>Semi-Detached Dwelling</th>
<th>Townhouse</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
<th>Total by Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside Built Boundary</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2207</td>
<td>3321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Built Boundary</td>
<td>2548</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>4174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total by Unit Type</td>
<td>2919</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2528</td>
<td>7495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Cambridge Community Development Department

Table 8: Location and Type of Units Built Relative to the Built Boundary in 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Single Detached Dwelling</th>
<th>Semi-Detached Dwelling</th>
<th>Townhouse</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
<th>Total by Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Inside Built Boundary</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside Built Boundary</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total by Unit Type</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Cambridge Community Development Department

Section 5: Core Area Residential Growth in 2020

In 2020, building permits for 6 new residential units were issued in two of the three Community Core Areas:

**Galt Core Area**

- 1 secondary unit in a single-detached dwelling at 43 Park Hill Road;
- 2 new semi-detached units at 45 Blair Road;
• 1 apartment unit in a fourplex at 99 Walnut Lane; and
• 1 apartment unit in a new 3-storey mixed-use building.

Preston Core Area

• 1 secondary unit in a single-detached dwelling at 806 Duke Street.

There is currently a total of 1,407 proposed units on applications at various stages of approval in two of the three Community Core Areas. There are 1,343 units between five site plan applications and three rezoning applications in the Galt Core, and there are 64 units in one site plan in the Hespeler Core.

Section 6: Planned Growth-Related Capital Projects with Forecasted Timing

The following Maps 2, 3, and 4 provide details of the planned capital infrastructure projects in the three Community Plan/Secondary Plan areas designated for future development. The maps were provided by the Engineering Division of the Community Development Department and display planned infrastructure improvements and construction years approved in the Capital Budget for the period 2020-2029.
Map 2: Cambridge West/Westwood Village Secondary Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCTION YEAR (Estimated)</th>
<th>PROJECTID</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>A00679-40</td>
<td>Cambridge West - Blenheim Rd Realignment</td>
<td>Sewer, Watermain loop, storm extensions + road upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>A00485-40</td>
<td>Cambridge West - Watermain Blenheim Rd to Freure Dr</td>
<td>Watermain Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>A00484-40</td>
<td>Cambridge West - Storm Outlet at Princess and Park Street Storm Sewer</td>
<td>Storm Outlet between Central SWM and SWM facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>A00713-40</td>
<td>Cambridge West - Devils Creek SWM</td>
<td>Devil’s Creek SWM Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>A00483-40</td>
<td>Cambridge West - Central SWM Facility</td>
<td>Central SWM Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>A00712-40</td>
<td>Cambridge West - West SWM Facility</td>
<td>West SWM Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>A00482-40</td>
<td>Cambridge West - Future Bismark Dr Sanitary Trunk</td>
<td>Sewer, Watermain loop, storm extensions + road upgrades</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Source: City of Cambridge Capital Budget 2020-2029.
Map 3: Southeast Galt Community Plan

Source: City of Cambridge Capital Budget 2020-2029.
Map 4: North Cambridge Employment Lands

Source: City of Cambridge Capital Budget 2020-2029
Section 7: Industrial Land Inventory

The City of Cambridge has been immensely successful in the sale of city-owned industrial land since the early 2000s. As of 2019, a majority of these lands have been sold.

The City has an inventory of four privately-owned Greenfield vacant industrial subdivisions totaling approximately 186 hectares. Three of the subdivisions are located within the North Cambridge Business Park (North Cambridge) that are part of the Stage 1 East Side Lands. The fourth is the Millgate subdivision in Blair. The locations of industrial subdivisions are marked with stars on Map 1.

North Cambridge Business Park

In North Cambridge, as of December 31, 2020, there is one draft approved plan of industrial subdivision and two plans of industrial subdivision under review pending draft approval. The subdivision that has already been draft approved is Phase 1 of the Intermarket IP Park Industrial Campus (31.1 ha). The first subdivision under review is Phase 2 of the Intermarket IP Park (21.9 ha). The second subdivision under review is the HOOPP iPort Cambridge industrial campus (107.4 ha). These three industrial subdivisions will satisfy short to medium term demand for industrial and employment uses. These projects are the result of a long-term City strategy to provide “shovel-ready” employment lands by pre-designating and pre-zoning employment lands in North Cambridge.

Additional Lands for Future Development

Over the longer term, there are also an additional 19.18 hectares of privately-owned land and 22.22 hectares of provincially owned land in North Cambridge that have been pre-designated and pre-zoned for industrial uses. Additionally, there remains an additional 236.9 hectares of Greenfield lands in North Cambridge that are part of the Stage 1 East Side Lands. These lands will also be pre-designated and pre-zoned in the future to provide “shovel-ready” employment lands. A significant portion of these lands is currently owned by the Province. The draft-approved Millgate subdivision (25.6 ha) in Blair is also expected to be developed in the near future.

Conformity with Planning Policy

The industrial lands in North Cambridge have been identified as a Provincially Significant Employment Zone, which receives enhanced protection from conversion to non-employment uses under the 2020 Growth Plan. The limited supply of industrial lands results in a need to protect these lands for employment uses, as required by the Growth Plan, the Regional Official Plan (ROP), and the Cambridge Official Plan (OP).

The Cambridge OP also requires that the necessary infrastructure is provided to support current and forecasted employment needs. Map 4 in Section 6 shows the planned growth-related capital projects for North Cambridge.
Section 8: Infrastructure Growth and Upgrades planned by the Regional Municipality in the City of Cambridge

The Region’s website summarizes current and future road construction projects. The time frame shown is the planned construction phase but it is subject to change. The current construction projects and schedules are based on the program approved by Regional Council. The Future Construction projects are based on the 10-Year Capital Program approved by Regional Council. These works may change or may not occur at all. Tables 10 and 11 that follow briefly describe these projects.

Table 9: Current Road Construction Projects in Cambridge by The Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type of Work</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dundas Street (Reg.Rd.8), Shade Street to Briercrest Ave.</td>
<td>Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>Greg Proctor 519-575-4729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain Street (Reg. Rd. 17), King Street (Reg. Rd. 8) to Highway 401</td>
<td>Road reconstruction</td>
<td>Jason Lane 519-575-4757 x3752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Boulevard (Reg. Rd. 36), Avenue to Clyde</td>
<td>Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>Jeff Nyenhuis 519-575-4735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street (Reg. Rd. 8), Eagle Street to Bishop Street</td>
<td>Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>Dave Brown 519-575-4757 x3686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Grove Road (Reg. Rd. 38) at Compass Trail</td>
<td>Installation of left turn lane</td>
<td>William Gilbert 519-575-4603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McQueen Shaver Boulevard, Water Street (Reg. Rd. 24) to Franklin Boulevard (Reg. Rd. 36) and Franklin Boulevard extension (Reg. Rd. 36), Myers Road (Reg. Rd. 43) to Cambridge south east boundary Road</td>
<td>New construction with multi use trail and sidewalk installation</td>
<td>Andrew Doman 519-575-4757 x3183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Street (Reg. Rd. 24), Main Street to 200m south</td>
<td>Pedestrian crossing at the Idea Exchange (Library)</td>
<td>William Gilbert 519-575-4603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10: Future Road Construction Projects in Cambridge by the Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Type of Work</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ainslie Street and Park Hill Road</td>
<td>Ainslie Street and Park Hill Road improvements will be addressing infrastructure that has reached the end of its service life, requiring replacement. This project will be replacing underground sanitary and storm sewers, transmission and distribution watermains, traffic signals, streetlighting, roadway base and asphalt, concrete curb and gutter and sidewalks.</td>
<td>Andrew Doman 519-575-4757 x3183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Boundary Road, City of Cambridge, Township of North Dumfries, Township of Puslinch</td>
<td>The Region Municipality of Waterloo is undertaking a study to address a potential new transportation network facility in the southeast area of the City of Cambridge, Township of North Dumfries and a portion in the Township of Puslinch. This study is being carried out under Schedule 'C' of the Class Environmental Assessment process and will look to various alternatives for transportation facilities including potential new roadway route alignments. The need for a future &quot;East Boundary&quot; road has been documented in several previous transportation studies. Study completed May 2020.</td>
<td>Justin Armstrong 519-575-4757 x 3164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain Street, Maple Grove Road to Fairway Road</td>
<td>The Region of Waterloo is currently undertaking a planning study to consider proposed improvements to Fountain Street from Cherry Blossom Road to Kossuth Road / Fairway Road by widening the road to 4 lanes and enhance pedestrian/cyclists' facilities. Timing: Completion in 2020</td>
<td>John Stephenson 519-575-4757 x4096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Grove Road (Hespeler to Vondrau)</td>
<td>The Region of Waterloo is undertaking a Schedule &quot;C&quot; Class Environmental Assessment to consider improvements to Maple Grove Road from Hespeler Road to Vondrau Drive in the City of Cambridge. Improvements being considered include widening from two (2) to four (4) lanes, intersection improvements, cycling and pedestrian facilities, drainage improvements, bridge widening and culvert extensions, storm sewers, sanitary sewers, watermain looping, streetlights and landscaping/streetscaping.</td>
<td>Delton Zehr 519-575-4757 x 3637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers Road, Water Street to Branchton Road</td>
<td>Road reconstruction including replacement of roadway, watermains, storm sewers, curbs, multi-use trails and boulevard landscaping.</td>
<td>Skylar Van Kruistum 519-575-4757 x3182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

THAT Report 21-070(CD) – Request to Designate a Property of Cultural Heritage Value Under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and to Relocate Heritage House – 1395 Main Street – be received;

AND THAT Council authorizes the Clerk to publish a Notice of Intention to Designate the main house of the property municipally known as 1395 Main Street because of its cultural heritage significance, in accordance with Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act;

AND THAT Council Authorize the City Clerk to present the designating by-law to Council after the house has been relocated provided there is no objection to the Notice of Intention to Designate within 30 days of it being published;

AND THAT Council authorize the City Clerk to take necessary actions in the event that there is an objection to the Notice of Intention to Designate;

AND THAT Council approves the request to demolish all the buildings and structures on the property of 1395 Main Street except for the main house;

AND THAT Council approve the request to relocate the house onto a new foundation on a new a site within the current property where it continues to face to the south, to facilitate the construction of a residential subdivision as depicted in the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) Addendum submitted by MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC), Revised October 23, 2020;

AND THAT this work must be subject to and in accordance with a Conservation Plan prepared by a qualified heritage consultant to the satisfaction of the Senior Planner –
Heritage that is consistent with the conservation strategy set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) Addendum submitted by MHBC, Revised October 23, 2020;

AND THAT Council approve alterations to the heritage property after relocation, and construction of an addition to the west substantially as depicted in the HIA Addendum submitted by MHBC, revised October 23, 2020 at the developer’s cost;

AND FURTHER THAT Council direct staff to update the Heritage Properties Register listing to identify that the designation applies only to the main house at 1395 Main Street after the designation is registered on title.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- Council approval is required to:
  - Initiate the heritage designation of the main house under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act for the property municipally known as 1395 Main Street;
  - To relocate the main house on site;
  - Demolish the remaining structures on the property

Key Findings

- The property at 1395 Main Street, with a c.1855 stone farmhouse, has been on the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register since the 1990s as a listed property of interest.

- The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) received a Heritage Impact Assessment in 2012 and recommended designation of the main house and provisions for demolition of the barn. No further designation action was taken; the barn was demolished in early 2020 after documentation was received. An addendum was submitted by MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC), Revised October 23, 2020 outlining heritage impacts of the current proposal. Selections of this document are included as (Appendix 1). The full document is available upon request. The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee reviewed this document and has recommended approval of recommendations.

- The current proposal is to relocate the house within the property, facing the same direction to the south on a corner parcel, rehabilitate it and construct an addition.
• The subject property meets Provincial criteria for designation under the Ontario Heritage Act and should be designated after the main house is relocated. The owner is supportive of its designation.

Financial Implications

• There is no fee for designating a property in Cambridge. The City will pay for publishing the Notice of Intention to Designate in the Cambridge Times and for sending the notice to the owner. The City does provide and pay for the installation of a heritage landmark plaque if the owner desires one, at a cost of approximately $500.

• All costs for relocating the existing building would be the responsibility of the property owner.

Background

The subject property is an approximately 48.5ha (120 acre) parcel containing a 1 1/2 - storey fieldstone farmhouse with Gothic Revival design features. The structure was constructed in about 1855.

The property was added to the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register as a listed property of interest in the 1990s.

In preparation for a Draft Plan of Subdivision Application, in 2012, the owner had a preliminary Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) prepared by Stantec for the subject property including the main house and barn.
The HIA recommended designation of the main house due to its cultural heritage value or interest and future documentation of the barn prior to demolition. The executive summary from the HIA are included within (Attachment 1) to this report, as Appendix C of the 2020 report. A complete copy of the HIA materials are available upon request.

The HIA was submitted to the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) in May 2012 and deferred to June 2012. The Committee’s resolution on June 21, 2012 was:

“THAT the Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommends to Cambridge City Council that the Clerk be authorized to publish a Notice of Intention to Designate the stone farmhouse on the property municipally known as 1395 Main Street because of its cultural heritage significance;

THAT prior to the issuance of a demolition permit for the existing barn, measured drawings, a land use history, photographs and other available documentation of the existing barn in its surrounding context be provided to the satisfaction of Cambridge Planning Services Department;

AND THAT the barn be retained until the application receives draft plan approval is obtained.”

No record has been found of Council action following MHAC’s motion in 2012. The MHAC meeting minutes of June 2012 were accepted by Council on July 11, 2012. No additional MHAC reviews have occurred.

On February 11, 2020, the City received a demolition permit request for the barn. Planning staff recommended approval the demolition based upon an earlier version of the current HIA supplement, which included the documentation of the barn as requested by MHAC and approved by Council adopting the meeting minutes in 2012. The barn has been demolished.

The property owner has submitted a draft plan of subdivision application for this property that has been appealed to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal. A settlement hearing is scheduled for June 25, 2021. The current proposal is to relocate and rehabilitate the main house as part of the proposed subdivision. The owner is supportive of the designation of the main house but is requesting that the passing of the designation by-law be delayed until the house has been relocated to a different lot within the proposed subdivision.

An addendum to the 2012 HIA has been produced by MacNaughton Hermsen Britten Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC). The addendum concluded that relocating the house would have minimal negative heritage impacts (Attachment 1).

On 21 January 2021 the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee passed the following resolutions:
THAT Report 21-001 (MHAC) – Request to Designate a Property of Cultural Heritage Value Under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and to Relocate Heritage House – 1395 Main Street – be received;

AND THAT the Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommends to Cambridge City Council that the Clerk be authorized to publish a Notice of Intention to Designate the main house of the property municipally known as 1395 Main Street because of its cultural heritage significance, in accordance with Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act;

AND THAT the MHAC recommends that Council approve the demolition of all the buildings and structures on the property of 1395 Main Street except for the main house;

AND THAT the MHAC recommends that Council approve the request to relocate the house to a site within the current property where it continues to face to the south, as depicted in the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) Addendum submitted by MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC), Revised October 23, 2020;

AND THAT the MHAC recommends that Council provide for mutual agreement between the City and the owner for delaying passage of the designation by-law for 1395 Main Street until the house is relocated;

AND THAT the MHAC recommends that Council approve the rehabilitation of the original house on the property after relocation, and construction of an addition to the west as depicted in the HIA Addendum submitted by MHBC, revised October 23, 2020 at the developer's cost;

AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC recommends that Council direct staff to update the Heritage Properties Register listing for the remainder of the property at 1395 Main Street after the designation for the main house on the property is registered on title.

**Analysis**

**Strategic Alignment**

PLACE: To take care of, celebrate and share the great features in Cambridge that we love and mean the most to us.

Goal #3 - Arts, Culture, Heritage and Architecture

Objective 3.2 Conserve and make positive contributions to our heritage districts and buildings throughout the community.
Retaining the historic farmhouse within a new residential development and rehabilitating for residential use would help to conserve the house for future generations and would be a positive outcome for the City of Cambridge.

**Comments**

**Designation:**

In order to be eligible for designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act a property needs to meet at least one prescribed criterion laid out in Ontario Regulation 9/06 showing either design or physical, associative or historical, or contextual value.

The Heritage Impact Assessment produced by Stantec and dated April 23, 2012 identifies that the subject property has design or physical value as a representative example of local architectural design and materials. It is staff’s opinion that the property also has historical value connecting to the theme of the City of Cambridge’s agricultural past, and contextual value due to its historical link to the surrounding farmland.

Staff is satisfied that the main house located at 1395 Main Street meets at least one provincial criterion for designation and so should be designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. No other remaining structures on the subject property have been identified as having heritage significance.

Council is requested to issue a Notice of Intention to Designate the main house only. If Council agrees a notice will be published in the Cambridge Times, and if no objection is submitted in 30 days a designation by-law will be submitted to Council after the house has been relocated using an accurate description of the house parcel.

Council has the option of declining to support a heritage designation, either by not issuing a notice of intention to designate, or by turning down the designation by-law in the future. A minor amendment to the subdivision plan could delete the designation requirement, as stated in a recommended condition of the draft approval. Council could decide to keep the house listed on the Heritage Properties Register within its individual parcel instead of including the entire farm on the Register.

**Relocation of Existing House and Delaying Passage of Designation By-law**

The property owner is proposing to relocate the main house from its current location to a new location on the existing lot approximately 180 metres north west of the current location in order to better integrate the house into the proposed subdivision.

The relocation of the house is proposed in order that it may occupy a more prominent position at the entrance to the subdivision immediately to the east of the Wesley Boulevard roundabout rather than be buried within the subdivision.
Existing and Proposed Location of the Main House

The owner is proposing to restore the existing house in its new location, fitting it with new doors, windows, and chimneys, and constructing an addition, including a garage, on the west elevation as depicted in schematics prepared by Martin Simmons Architects, 2019 (Attachment 1, Appendix D)

Schematics, Martin Simmons Architects 2019 in (Attachment 1, Appendix D)
The owner has submitted an engineering report prepared by Tacoma Engineers and dated December 2019 identifying that the condition of the existing house makes it a good candidate for relocation and that the building could be moved without being adversely affected.

Development Planning and Heritage Planning staff have concurred with the developer that relocation of the house is preferred over keeping it in place. Significant grade changes have been designed for the new subdivision and the existing house location would require raising it above the current grade.

It is staff’s opinion that relocating the farmhouse on the same property will not materially impact its cultural heritage value. It is recommended that Council delay passing the by-law to designate the property until the house has been re-located in order that the legal description in the designating by-law may be accurate following the subdivision of the land.

If Council does not agree to the relocation of the house, Council has the option to prevent the relocation by designating the property immediately. The house would remain in the centre of the subdivision, would require a new foundation, and the property would require extensive grading work to accommodate it. Under the Ontario Heritage Act, the owner may appeal the designation to the Conservation Review Board resulting in legal and planning staff being required to attend a hearing.

**Existing Policy/By-Law**

**Ontario Heritage Act**

Part IV Section 29 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act provides municipalities in Ontario the ability to designate individual properties that are shown to have cultural heritage value to a community.

Section 30 (1) provides that permits for altering the property become void when a Notice of Intention to Designate is served. (They may be issued after heritage approvals.)

**Ontario Regulation 9/06**

Ontario Regulation 9/06 lays out provincial criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest and are pursuant to Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act. In the regulation it is stated that a property may be designated under the Ontario Heritage Act if it meets one or more of the following criteria. The following is an abridged list of criteria that apply to the subject property.

1. The property has design value or physical value because it,
   
   i. is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method,
2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,
   i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community,
   ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or

3. The property has contextual value because it,
   ii. is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings.

**Cambridge Official Plan**

Section 4.1 of the Official Plan includes Objective a) to “support the conservation, restoration, and prominence of the city’s built heritage as a key identifying feature of the community”.

Section 4.2 of the Official Plan discusses the priorities for cultural heritage resources in the City. Section 4.2.1 states:

1. When development is proposed, the City will encourage the conservation of cultural heritage resources in the following order of preference:
   
   incorporation of cultural heritage resources and their surrounding context into development applications in a manner which does not conflict with the cultural heritage resource;

   promotion of the use of scale and design which blends harmoniously with existing cultural heritage resources when development occurs; and

   preservation and adaptive re-use of buildings of cultural heritage significance for compatible residential intensification and/or for other appropriate and compatible uses is encouraged.

Section 4.4 lays out criteria for evaluating heritage significance. This includes the following criteria that apply to the subject property:

   i) it dates from an early period in the development of the city’s communities;

   v) it is a representative example and illustration of the city’s social, cultural, political, economic or technological development history;

   vii) it is a representative example of its architectural style or period of building;

   viii) it is a representative example of architectural design;
Financial Impact

- There is no fee for designating a property in Cambridge. The City will pay for publishing the Notice of Intention to Designate in the Cambridge Times and for sending the notice to the owner. The City does provide and pay for the installation of a heritage landmark plaque if the owner desires one, at a cost of approximately $500.

- All costs for relocating the existing building would be the responsibility of the property owner.

Public Input

MHAC meetings are open to the public. The Council meeting agenda is posted publicly as part of the report process.

Internal/External Consultation

Planning staff have had correspondence with the owner and with their consultants.

Conclusion

The main house on the farm property at 1395 Main Street is a significant heritage resource and should be designated, following the processes of the Ontario Heritage Act. Staff is of the opinion that the house may be relocated within the development according to provisions submitted without adversely affecting the property’s cultural heritage value or interest. Based upon the above analysis it is recommended that Council approve the recommendations outlined in Report 21-070(CD). Retaining the historic farmhouse within a new residential development and rehabilitating for residential use would help to conserve the house for future generations and would be a positive outcome for the City of Cambridge.
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Glossary of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHIA</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHVI</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Value or Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRO</td>
<td>Land Registry of Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHBC</td>
<td>MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHSTCI</td>
<td>Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Cultural Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHA</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHTK</td>
<td>Ontario Heritage Toolkit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-REG 9/06</td>
<td>Ontario Regulation 9/06 for determining cultural heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>Statement of Significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.0 Introduction

1.1 Project Overview

MHBC was retained by LVH Developments (MC) Inc. in November of 2018 to undertake an addendum to a previous Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed development located at 1395 Main Street, City of Cambridge hereafter referred to as the ‘subject land’. The proposed development proposes to dismantle the barn on-site and salvage material where feasible and relocate, integrate and rehabilitate the farmhouse within the proposed Plan of Subdivision.

The building located on 1395 Main Street in the City of Cambridge is a “listed” (non-designated) property on the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties’ Register. The subject land is not located within a Heritage Conservation District designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act.

1.2 Background

A preliminary HIA was completed by Stantec Consulting Limited in 2012 (see Appendix ‘C’) and concluded that the farmhouse and barn should be identified as cultural heritage resources. It also recommended that the stone farmhouse be retained and barn be relocated or deconstructed. Attached as Appendix ‘A’ of the above mentioned report was a “Structural Investigation and Feasibility Study for an Existing Heritage Barn” which recommends that the barn be dismantled and materials sold or catalogued and stored for future projects.

In June 2012, the minutes from the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommended that the Clerk be authorized to publish a Notice of Intention to Designate the stone farmhouse on the property and permit the demolition of the existing barn based on conditions (see Appendix ‘H’).

1.3 Purpose

The purpose of this HIA Addendum is to explain how the design of the Plan of Subdivision will integrate the retention of the farmhouse as an identified cultural heritage resource. The Addendum also will address the retention of the house and proposed relocation within the proposed redevelopment of the site as requested by Heritage Planning Staff in June of 2012.
2.0 Methodology and Approach

2.1 Methodology

This addendum includes the following content:

- Brief description of site and review of previous assessments;
- Current Condition of farmhouse and barn;
- Description of proposed development;
- Impacts analysis;
- Alternative development options;
- Mitigation measures;
- Conservation recommendations;
- Conclusion and recommendations.

2.2 Approach

In April 2012, a preliminary Heritage Impact Assessment was completed by Stantec Consulting Limited which included an engineer’s investigation report on the associated barn structure and its feasibility in the development; this previous assessment and its corresponding appendices will be used as a basis for this report (see Appendix ‘C’).

A site visit was conducted by MHBC Staff on November 28, 2018 to assess and document the current condition of cultural heritage resource(s) on site. Additional site visits was performed by MHBC Staff on January 15, 2019 and June 11, 2019 (during MHAC site visit).

The previous professional studies completed for the identified cultural heritage resources on-site, as well as visits by MHBC Staff, will be used to establish an assessment of development approaches. This assessment will include actions required, positive and negative implications and mitigation measures that would be associated with each option.

Also, this report referenced the following documents in regards to approaching the protection and conservation of cultural heritage resources on the subject lands:

- The Planning Act (which includes the Provincial Policy Statement 2014);
- The Ontario Heritage Act;
- The Ontario Heritage Tool Kit which includes Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Built Heritage Properties (Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport);
- City of Cambridge Official Plan (2018);
- Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada (Second Edition);

This report utilizes guides published by the *International Council on Monuments and Site (ICOMOS)*, Council of UNESCO, from the World Heritage Convention of January of 2011. The grading of impact is based on “Guide to Assessing Magnitude of Impact” as a framework for this report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Grading</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Change to key historic building elements that contribute to the cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>heritage value or interest (CHVI) such that the resource is totally altered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive changes to the setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Change to many key historic building elements, such that the resource if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>significantly modified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Changes to the setting an historic building, such that it is significantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>modified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible/Potential</td>
<td>Change to key historic building elements, such that the asset is slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Change to setting of an historic building, such that it noticeably changed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 General Information

3.1 Brief Description of Subject Lands

The property is located at 1395 Main Street, City of Cambridge on a portion of the northern half of Lot 3 of Concession 10 in the south eastern corner of the City of Cambridge; this lot was formerly part of the Township of North Dumfries as per the Tremaine Map of 1861. The site is primarily agricultural fields and includes a wood frame barn with above grade fieldstone foundation and a one-and-a-half storey, Gothic Revival farmhouse. The farmhouse is situated on elevated lands overlooking agricultural fields. Moffat’s Creek crosses the project site east of the laneway and the property is 3.1 kilometres east of the Grand River.

The property is included on the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties’ Register; the property is ‘listed’ (non-designated).

Figure 1: Aerial view of the subject lands which are indicated by the blue line and surrounding area (Waterloo Region GIS Locator, 2018).
3.2 Overview of Property’s History

The land was originally owned by Honourable William Dickson and then transferred to Honourable Robert Dickson in 1848 and purchased by Thomas McKenzie purchased the property in 1855 (LRO). According to the Tremaine Map of 1861, the land continued to be owned by Thomas McKenzie.

Thomas McKenzie (born 1788) was a native of Scotland and was a relative¹ of John McKenzie of Scotland (born 1778) who was one of the original settlers in North Dumfries with a dated arrival in 1824 (Taylor 38). Thomas McKenzie is listed as a farmer in the census of 1851 and 1861. He was married to Rebecca Russel of Scotland and they had three (3) children: Christine (born 1820), Christina (born 1825) and John (born 1827) all of whom were born in Nova Scotia before immigrating to Ontario (Waterloo Generations, 2018).

The preliminary HIA by Stantec Limited Consulting (April 2012) suggests that the farmhouse was built sometime after Thomas McKenzie purchased the property in 1855 and 1860 as the house appears on the 1861 Tremaine Map.

The property was transferred to Thomas’ son, John R. McKenzie, in 1862 (Thomas was 74 years old). John R. McKenzie also owned part 2 of Concession 10 to the east of the subject property.

¹ Possibly his biological brother.
In 1867, the land was transferred to William Cooke (born 1827) of England who is listed as a Bank Agent in 1861 (Waterloo Generations, 2018). Six years after this purchase, the land was transferred to William McVicar in 1873. William McVicar (born 1816) was a native of Scotland and was listed as a labourer in the 1861 census. He was married to Agnes Mason (born 1819) and they had six (6) children: Margaret (born 1846), Agnes (born 1851), Catherine “Kate” (born 1853), Lucy (born 1855), Mary (born 1858) and Janet (born 1860); all the children were born in Scotland. On March 1879, William McVicar died of phthisis (Waterloo Generations, 2018).

3.3 Summary of Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Resources On-site

Farmhouse: The farmhouse is a one-and-a-half storey that was built between 1855 and 1860. The farmhouse is located on an inclined slope. The house is built of limestone which was popularly used in the 19th century by Scottish masons (in 1846, this was the most popular building materials in Galt) and is an example of an Ontario Cottage. The architecture of the house is of Gothic Revival style with its central, medium-pitched gable and lancet arch window on the front façade which was characteristic of farmhouses in Waterloo Region. Architectural elements include stone header above the main door frame, projecting verges, moulded frieze and returning gables and soffits.

Figure 3: View of farmhouse on the subject lands (MHBC, 2019)
The western elevation is particularly characteristic of this style. Some original windows remain although there have been several alterations over the years.

**Barn:** The L-shaped barn is a timber frame, wood cladding with a fieldstone foundation and aluminium-clad gabled roof. It is two storeys with lofts and is approximately 4,800 sqft. It has small rectangular windows located at the top of the stone foundation. On the southern elevation (east end) there is a cross cut into top of the façade below the open gable. This was used for ventilation and aesthetic purposes.

![Figure 4: View of barn on the subject lands (MHBC, 2019)](image)

3.4 Previous Assessments

3.4.1 Heritage Impact Assessment by Stantec Consulting Limited (April 2012)

In April of 2012, Stantec Consulting Limited completed a heritage impact assessment on the subject lands. In conclusion the report stated the following:

> Based on the criteria outlined under Ontario Regulation 9/06, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, under the Ontario Heritage Act (2006), the farmhouse and L-shaped barn at 1395 Main Street are considered by this assessment to be of cultural heritage value. Both structures are representative of local architectural style and use of material. In addition, the buildings both have contextual value as examples of rural architecture. As a result, the cultural heritage values of both structures should be considered in Project design (p. 11).
The recommendations from the assessment were as follows:

1. **The farmhouse should be retained and re-used in the project design in compliance with Parks Canada’s conservation principles;**

2. **Additional recommendations for proposed development to consider existing road patterns and topography when designing the layout and to consider streetscape design elements that are sensitive to cultural heritage;**

3. **The most feasible option for the barn is to relocate or deconstruct the barn. Deconstruction would include the re-use of foundation stones as an entrance feature to development; re-use barn board for benches, or use stone or wood from the barn for landscaping features.**

See Appendix ‘C’ for full report.

3.4.2 Structural Investigation and Feasibility Study for an Existing Heritage Barn by Stantec Consulting Limited (April 2012)

The structural investigation and feasibility study for the existing heritage barn on the subject lands was completed as Appendix ‘A’ of the HIA report by Stantec in April 2012. The engineer’s report concluded that the upgrades to allow the building to be occupied in accordance with the Ontario Building Code would be “somewhat impractical and prohibitively expensive” (4.1). This report recommends that the building be dismantled and the materials sold or catalogued and stored for future projects if feasible.

See Appendix ‘C’ for full report.

3.4.3 Architect’s Report of Existing Structure (Farmhouse) by Martin Simmons Architects (October 2019)

In October of 2019, an investigation and report was completed by Martin Simmons Architects on the farmhouse (see Appendix D). The report concluded “there seems to be no substantive reasons why this structure cannot be relocated…No major structural flaws were evident in the stone exterior walls” (p 1).

Architectural drawings were completed by Martin Simmons Architects providing drawings of the original farmhouse’s elevations and floor plan (see Figures 5 & 6).

See Appendix ‘D’ for full report.
Figure 5 & 6: (Above) Architectural drawings of current elevations; (Below) Architectural drawings of current floor plan (Martin Simmons Architects, 2019)
3.4.4 Engineer’s Structural Report House Relocation (Tacoma Engineers) (CAHP Qualified) (December 2019)

In December 2019, Tacoma Engineers completed a structural review of the farmhouse on-site to report on the feasibility of relocating the building. The report concluded the following, “we are of the opinion that the existing house is a good candidate for relocation.” It was stated that the foundation slab and chimney are structurally independent would have to be removed to permit the relocation and can be removed “without adversely affecting the original structure.”

See Appendix ‘E’ for full report.
4.0 Current Conditions

The following section will provide information as to the condition of the identified cultural heritage resources on the subject lands as described in the chart below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approx. date of Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmhouse</td>
<td>One-and-half storey limestone, Gothic Revival Ontario Cottage</td>
<td>Between 1855-1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn</td>
<td>Two storey timber frame, wood clad barn with fieldstone foundation</td>
<td>Between 1855-1860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Overview of Condition of Cultural Heritage Resources in April 2012

The farmhouse and barn were evaluated and confirmed to be cultural heritage resources within the preliminary heritage impact assessment by Stantec Limited Consulting in 2012. The following information describes the buildings condition in 2012:

**Farmhouse:** The farmhouse had undergone several alterations including repairs, addition of exterior windows, removal of windows on the first floor replaced with doors and possibility of previous existing porch or sunroom on the eastern elevation. A section of stone on the northern elevation had also been replaced.

**Barn:** Most of the fieldstone foundation was sound although there were several cracks in the mortar ranging in severity. The main interior structure appeared to be structurally sound (refer to engineer’s report Appendix ‘C’ of the HIA).

4.2 Current Condition of Cultural Heritage Resources (November 2018, January & June 2019)

A site visit was completed in November of 2018 and January 15th, 2019 by MHBC in order to document and assess the current condition of both identified cultural heritage resources on the subject lands.

The site visits conducted in 2018 and 2019 demonstrated that the stone farmhouse was in good condition. There were signs of some cracking in the masonry walls, however, overall appeared to retain its structural integrity. The porch addition to the house appearing in 2012 photographic documentation no longer existed. Refuse around the farmhouse has been cleaned up and removed.

Several barn boards had been removed from the barn; the interior of the barn is exposed to the elements in several locations along the elevations. The fieldstone foundation appears to be in good condition, however.
4.3.1 Exterior of Farmhouse

South (Front) Elevation

The south elevation includes two, 2x2, double hung windows with Scottish stone window headers and stone sills. The lancet arch window wood frame under the medium-pitched gable appears in poor condition. The front door no longer has a transom light or sidelights or decorative door frame panels and has been replaced with MDF boards. There are several minor to moderate vertical cracks in the masonry and the extended eaves of the gabled window and gabled roofline is in fair to poor condition including the soffits; the western corner of the eaves is becoming detached.

West Elevation

The western elevation consists of four (4) windows- 2, 2 x2, double hung windows on the first storey and two smaller, 2 x2 double-hung windows on the second storey. All windows have Scottish stone headers and stone lintels in good condition. All window openings, windows associative architectural details appear to be original. The wooden window frames are in poor condition. A later brick chimney shaft is central to the façade; the brick appears to be in good condition. The extended returning eaves are in poor condition including the pediment returning soffits. The limestone has several moderate vertical cracks. Overgrown vegetation, such as the invasive vines that tampered with the integrity of the building, has been removed.

Figure 9 & 10: (left) View of west elevation in November 2017 Source: Sigmund Soudack & Associates Inc., 2017 (right) View of west elevation in January 2019 (Source: MHBC, 2019)
East Elevation

There are two, single, double windows on the second storey which have replaced the original windows. The window openings are original with original stone header and stone sill. The two original window openings on the first storey have been replaced and enlarged for doorways and contain modern doors. The doorway to the north still has the original stone header, whereas, the doorway to the south on this elevation has had the original stone header removed. The infill wall on the majority of the first storey wall did not appear to tamper with the surrounding stone masonry. The iron fence that ran along the south edge of the elevation has been removed.

The extended open gable eaves are in poor condition including the pediment soffits. The limestone appears to have some discolouration and moderate cracks in the mortar which in some places has been parged with what appears to be a Portland mixture in place of a mixture more compatible to the type of stone and technique. The stonework of this façade is significantly deteriorating on the south side of the elevation. The chimney on this elevation appears to be in fair condition with no significant spalling that would require its removal.


![Figure 13:](View of cellar door on east elevation in January 2019 (Source: MHBC, 2019)
North (Rear) Elevation

The window openings, windows, window frames and architectural decorations appear to be original. There is discolouration under the windows sills and spalling of stone façade. There is one aluminium sill on the east side of the façade. The returning eaves and soffit are in fair condition. The entryway to the cellar also appears to be in good condition with rough fieldstone wall although the condition of the door is unknown, or if it remains, as it is boarded.

Figure 14: View of northern elevation looking south (Source: MHBC, 2019)
4.3.2 Exterior of Barn

The barn is L-shaped and composed of a main rectangular barn and eastern rectangular wing. For the purpose of this report, the main building will be called ‘Section A’ and the eastern wing will be called ‘Section B’. Since the assessment in 2012 by Stantec Limited Consulting, the barn has declined in its condition. Several barn boards have been removed from the building exposing the interior wood framing. Section ‘B’ has had most of its barn board cladding removed. The original beams and posts remain and are in fair to good condition.

![Aerial view of the barn indicating 'Section A' as the main barn building and 'Section B' as the eastern wing (Google Earth Pro, 2018).](image)

**Figure 15:** Aerial view of the barn indicating ‘Section A’ as the main barn building and ‘Section B’ as the eastern wing (Google Earth Pro, 2018).

**East Elevation**

Since 2012, the majority of the wood cladding has been removed from this elevation and windows have been boarded. Foundation, albeit some cracks, is in good condition.

![View of eastern elevation from west side including Section ‘A’ and Section ‘B’; View of eastern elevation including boarded rectangular window openings of ‘Section A & B’ (MHBC, 2019).](image)

**Figures 16 & 17:** *(Left)* View of eastern elevation from west side including Section ‘A’ and Section ‘B’; *(Right)* View of eastern elevation including boarded rectangular window openings of ‘Section A & B’ (MHBC, 2019).
West Elevation

There are minor to moderate cracks in the stone masonry. Most of the wood cladding on the west elevation of Section ‘B’ has been removed. The elevation on Section ‘A’, however, is in fair condition.

Figures 18 & 19: (Above) View of west elevation looking north east of Section ‘B’ (Below) View of west elevation looking east of Section ‘A’ (Source: MHBC, 2018)
North Elevation

The northern elevation consists of only ‘Section A’ which is the main barn building. At least half of the elevation has had the wood cladding removed. The elevation is currently in poor condition.

Figures 20 & 21: (Left) View of north elevation with majority of wood cladding removed (Right) View of southern elevation from farmhouse (Source: MHBC, 2019)
South Elevation

The southern elevation consists of views of “Section A” and “Section B”. The elevation appears to be in poor condition in Section ‘A’ of the elevation; most of the wood cladding has been removed and has exposed the building to the elements. Contrary, the elevation on Section ‘B’ is in good condition with the exception of a few missing boards (the opening is for entering hay into the loft). The cross insignia for ventilation remains in good condition.

Figures 22: (left) View of southern elevation of Section ‘A’ of the barn (Source: MHBC, 2019)

Figures 23 & 24: (Left) View of southern elevation of Section ‘A’ of the barn; (Right) View of cross insignia on southern elevation for ventilation and blessing for protection (Source: MHBC, 2019)
5.0 Description of Proposed Development

5.1 Description of Development

The proposed development includes the removal of a farmhouse and barn identified as cultural heritage resources and the development of the land as a subdivision with multiple family residential, mixed terrace dwellings and townhouse dwellings with a total proposed number of 419 units within 23 blocks. See Appendix ‘A’ and ‘B’ of this report for the plan of subdivision and its formation on the subject lands.

Figures 25: Proposed Plan of Subdivision (Source: IBI, September 2020);
As part of the development, it is proposed that the barn will be dismantled and building material salvaged and sold and or donated, and the farmhouse relocated, integrated and rehabilitated in the new Plan of Subdivision. It is proposed that the farmhouse will be relocated within the proposed Plan of Subdivision on the northern corner lot at the intersection of Maple Bush Drive and Green Gate Boulevard (see Figure 26 & 27). The lot width is 16.81 metres, which is sufficient to accommodate the farmhouse. It is a corner lot which provides flexibility to accommodate an addition and results in the building being highly visible. The farmhouse is proposed to be used as a single family dwelling. The distance of the farmhouse from its current location is a distance of 190 metres.

![Figure 26: Identification or proposed relocation site for farmhouse in the Plan of Subdivision; Blue circle indicates proposed relocation site (Source: MHBC, 2020).](image-url)

A preliminary concept for the orientation of the building on site with proposed addition has been established (see Schematic Site Plan in Figure 28). The house is proposed to have a front yard setback along Greengate Boulevard that is consistent with adjacent properties. The two neighbouring lots to the north are both proposed as single detached lots to allow for a transition between the heritage building and the proposed townhouse lots (see Figure 27 and Appendix D).
Figures 27 & 28: (Above) Detailed view of relocation site and immediate neighbouring lots to the north and associated setbacks (MHBC, 2020) (Below) Schematic site plan option (Source: Martin Simmons Architects, 2019)
6.0 Assessment of Impacts of Proposed Development

The following sub-sections of this report will provide an analysis of impacts which are anticipated as a result of the proposed redevelopment of the subject land as they relate to the identified cultural heritage resources. This will include a description of the classification of the impact as beneficial, neutral, or adverse.

6.1 Assessment of Impacts of the Proposed Development at 1395 Main Street, Cambridge, ON

6.1.1 Removal of the Barn

**Adverse Impacts:** The removal of the fieldstone foundation and timber posts and beams associated with the design of the barn should be considered a *moderate impact of destruction* as these are key attributes associated with the cultural heritage resource.

6.1.2 Relocation, Integration and Rehabilitation of the Farmhouse

**Beneficial Impacts:** The rehabilitation of the farmhouse will allow for the building to continue to be used within the local community and within the vicinity of its original context and also increases its visibility from the public realm. A new foundation will eradicate issues of a flooding basement which is currently plaguing the house. The re-use and relocation of the farmhouse meets the objective of Chapter 4.1 (g), supporting the adaptive re-use and relocation of cultural heritage resources.

**Adverse Impacts:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2 Summary of Impacts

There is a moderate impact of destruction of the barn as it proposed to be removed.

There is a minor impact to the farmhouse as the original foundation and associative foundation sill (including two (2) window cells on current north and south elevations and cellar door opening on east elevation) will be removed.

There is a negligible impact of alteration as it is proposed that the window openings on the west elevation will be extended to facilitate an addition. The addition will improve the adaptive re-use and therein, viability of the building. It is possible that unintentional alterations may occur during the relocation of the house.
7.0 Assessment of Development Options and Mitigation Measures

7.1 Development Options

A range of development options have been identified for the farmhouse and the barn. This section of the report describes those options and provides recommendations for each one.

7.1.1 Alternative Options for the Barn

a. Do Nothing

The HIA report (2012) completed by Stantec Consulting Ltd recommended that the barn be dismantled. Since the time of that report, further deterioration has occurred. Pursuing the “Do Nothing” option would result in the eventual collapse of the barn which would be an issue of health and safety. As of December 12, 2019, the municipality issued a minimum standards order ordering that the “dilapidated barn” be demolished as it possesses a “fire and accident hazard, and is unsafe to the general public” (File no. 19 008294 000 00).

b. Integrate Barn In-situ

The retention, integration and adaptive re-use of the barn was evaluated by Stantec 2012. A structural assessment and cost analysis proved that this option is not economical or logical due to the cost to restore or rehabilitate, processes that would be required to permit an occupancy beyond agricultural and the feasibility of integration into the current Plan of Subdivision. This option is not recommended.

c. Retain and Relocate On-site or Off-site

The retention and relocation of the barn on-site or off-site is challenging as removing the original fieldstone foundation would remove an essential structural component of the exterior form and part of the cultural heritage value associated with the building. A great amount of the barn board has been removed from the barn. The combination of the removal of the fieldstone foundation and lack of original barn boards would remove the essential building parts that constitute it as a cultural heritage resource; therefore this alternative is not recommended.

The HIA completed in 2012 and associated structural report recommended that the barn be dismantled and materials salvaged where feasible. This report concurs with this recommendation in review of alternatives. It is recommended that building materials, including timber beams and posts be sold and/ or donated for re-use.
7.1.2 Alternative Options for the Farmhouse

a. Do Nothing

The farmhouse is stable but deteriorating; in its current condition it is not habitable. The “do nothing” option would result in the continued deterioration of the house. There is risk that the house would eventually deteriorate to the point where it could no longer be rehabilitated.

b. Retain and Integrate In-situ

The retention, integration and adaptive re-use of the farmhouse in-situ is an alternative option. The house is currently located in ‘Block 6’ which is designated for townhouse dwellings which proposes 74 units. There are several challenges as it relates to the integration of the building within the proposed development; issues include: the current orientation of the building, location for optimum visibility to the public realm and its current topography as the building is situated on an incline.

If the house were to be retained in-situ, there would be potential that the building could be isolated in the new context due to its current orientation and existing topography. If the house were to retained in its current location, it is highly likely it would have to be re-oriented to be integrated into the overall road circulation and lot arrangement. The building would be required to be temporarily lifted and a new basement constructed to meet the overall grading and drainage infrastructure for the subdivision. The building is located within the interior of the Plan of Subdivision and would have less visibility to the overall public realm in its current location in contrast to the proposed relocation site.

Figure 29: Existing location of farmhouse in relation to surrounding Plan of Subdivision (MHBC, 2020)
It is recommended that the farmhouse be retained and relocated as it more adequately integrates it into the Plan of Subdivision while being in close proximity of its original context. The proposed location for the farmhouse provides more visibility of the farmhouse and associated heritage attributes from the public realm as it serves as a gateway into the Greengate and Moffat Creek Subdivisions. The proposed development including the relocation, integration and restoration of the farmhouse in the Plan of Subdivision is in respect to objective 4.1 (g) of the Official Plan of the City of Cambridge.

7.2 Mitigation Measures

The impact of the removal of the barn can be mitigated by photographic documentation of the structure (Appendix G) and the salvage of timber beams and posts and incorporated into on-site landscaping and/ or parkland (see Appendix E) where feasible or sold/ donated to the public;

The impact of the destruction of the foundation of the farmhouse can be mitigated by the re-use of fieldstone in landscaping, if feasible. The foundation window sill frames will be salvaged if feasible.

The alteration to the original house by means of an addition can be mitigated by following minimizing intervention required to accommodate the new construction outlined in a Conservation Plan. Specifications from an engineer and architect (preferably a member of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals) will be required to mitigate potential alterations from relocation and requires hiring an experienced structural house moving contractor and including a full design engineering for the temporary bracing, shoring and lift beams.
8.0 Conservation Recommendations

It is recommended that a Conservation Plan be completed that will outline short, medium and long term conservation goals for the relocation and integration of the farmhouse into the new Plan of Subdivision. It would be recommended that the house follow the conservation approach of ‘rehabilitation’ in accordance with the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada in order to facilitate its adaptive re-use. It’s recommended that the following short-term conservation goals be completed prior to the move:

- Repointing of masonry addressing cracks in the northeast and southeast corners of exterior masonry walls;
- Periodic inspections to ensure boarding is adequate to protect the interior of the house.
9.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

A preliminary HIA was completed in 2012 by Stantec Consulting Limited which concluded that the farmhouse and barn located at 1395 Main Street, City of Cambridge have cultural heritage value or interest as per their evaluation under Ontario Regulation 9/06 prescribed under the Ontario Heritage Act. The property does not have significant historical/associative value. The former contextual value of the property stated in the HIA of 2012 by Stantec Consulting Ltd. will be removed with the proposed removal of the associated barn.

The development proposes to remove the barn and retain and relocate the Gothic Revival farmhouse north west from its original location within the proposed Plan of Subdivision on the northern corner lot at the intersection of Maple Bush Drive and Green Gate Boulevard (see Appendix A). The relocation is approximately 190 metres from the farmhouse’s original location.

This report has reviewed the various options for the retention of the farmhouse on the subject land. It is recommended that the relocation of the building be endorsed as after analysis, is the most viable option for integration for the building within the proposed Plan of Subdivision. The report recommends the proposed development including the relocation, integration and rehabilitation of the farmhouse in the proposed Plan of Subdivision in respect to objective 4.1 (g) of the Official Plan of the City of Cambridge.

Summary of Impacts:

This report has determined the following impacts:

- **Moderate impact of removal of barn**;
- **Minor impact of removal resulting from relocation** (removal of the foundation and foundation sill window openings);
- **Negligible alteration** to the farmhouse due to the extension of window openings on the west elevation (side) to facilitate an addition to the house for its re-use.

Mitigation Measures:

- The impact of the removal of the barn can be mitigated by photographic documentation of the structure (Appendix G) and the salvage of timber beams and posts and incorporated into on-site landscaping and/or parkland where feasible or sold/donated to the public;
- The impact of the destruction of the foundation of the farmhouse can be mitigated by the re-use of fieldstone in landscaping, if feasible;
- The impact of alteration to the original house by means of an addition can be mitigated by the completion of a Conservation Plan, minimizing intervention required to accommodate the new construction consistent with the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada (particularly Standards 3, 5, 9-12). Specifications from an engineer and architect (preferably a member of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals) will be required to mitigate unintentional alterations due to relocation by...
hiring an experienced structural house moving contractor and including a full design engineering for the temporary bracing, shoring and lift beams.

**Conservation Recommendations:**

It is recommended that a Conservation Plan be completed that will outline short, medium and long term conservation goals for the relocation and integration of the farmhouse into the new Plan of Subdivision. It would be recommended that the house follow the conservation approach of ‘rehabilitation’ in accordance with the *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* in order to facilitate its adaptive re-use. It recommended that the following short-term conservation goals be completed prior to the move:

- Repointing of masonry addressing cracks in the northeast and southeast corners of exterior masonry walls;
- Periodic inspections to ensure boarding is adequate to protect the interior of the house.

It is recommended that the photographic documentation within Appendix ‘G’ of this report serve as a photographic documentation of the barn on-site as required by the City in 2012. It is recommended that this report should be included as part of the Municipal Heritage Committee’s archival files for future reference.
10.0 Sources


Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport. InfoSheet#5 Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans, 2006


Waterloo Region, Waterloo Region GIS Locator, 2018.
Appendix A-Map of Subject Lands and Heritage Farmhouse Relocation Map
Appendix B-Plan of Subdivision
Appendix C - Preliminary Heritage Impact Assessment by Stantec Consulting Limited (2012)
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

LVH Developments (SoCa) Inc. has proposed to develop the property at 1395 Main Street East, Ontario. The stone farmhouse and barn located on the property are both included in the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Inventory, which has been endorsed by council and affords legal restrictions on the demolition or removal of the structures under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, Part IV, s. 27 (1.2). As a result, a Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared in order to: evaluate the cultural heritage values of the property and structures; identify Project constraints related to cultural heritage; and to recommend mitigation measures and feasible Project alternatives to best conserve the heritage values of the property.

Both the farmhouse and barn were evaluated for their cultural heritage value or interest based on the criteria outlined under *Ontario Regulation 9/06 Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, Under the Ontario Heritage Act, 2006*. The structures both meet the criteria of design or physical value and contextual value. Possible alternatives for the conservation of the cultural heritage value of the farmhouse and barn were identified and evaluated and recommendations have been made for the design of the development.

It is recommended that the stone farmhouse be retained and re-used in the Project design. Plans for renovation and rehabilitation of the building should consider the following principal:

(a) Conserve the *heritage value* and *character-defining elements* when creating any new additions to [a heritage resource] or any related new construction.

(b) Make the new work physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to, and distinguishable from the [heritage resource].

The following character-defining elements should be conserved:

- Exterior stone masonry;
- Symmetry of windows and doors on the southern and western elevations;
- Front door with ornate frame;
- Lancet arch window below the front gable;
- Moulding along the eaves and returning gables; and
- The central gable on the front elevation.

The following additional items should be considered in project design:

- Road patterns and grading should consider the existing topography of the property, the relationship between the lane-way and Moffatt’s Creek, and the orientation of the farmhouse; and
- Streetscaping features, such as lighting, should be sensitive to the cultural heritage nature of the farmhouse.
Three possible strategies exist for the conservation of the cultural heritage values of the barn, in order of preference:

- Adaptive re-use or re-purposing of the barn;
- Relocation of part or all of the barn; or
- Deconstruction and re-use of the materials.

Although the re-use of the barn structure is the most preferable alternative, it does not appear to be the most feasible option based on the constraints of this project (both financial and building-use constraints).

If adaptive re-use of the structure *in situ* is not possible, the barn should be moved and used as a barn at another location. There are a number of groups in the local area, particularly among the Mennonite community, that have a demonstrated interest and experience moving barns to new locations.

Deconstruction of the barn, while not the most preferred alternative, would allow for the commemoration of the history of the property. Possible re-use alternatives include, but are not limited to:

- the use of foundation stones as an entrance feature to the development;
- re-use of barn board for benches; or
- use of stone or wood from the barn for landscaping features.

It is recommended that this Preliminary Heritage Impact Assessment be submitted to the City of Cambridge Heritage Planner and Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) for review, comment and endorsement in principal.

Once a Project design has been determined, the Project design and a brief HIA identifying how the design adheres to the recommendations outlined in the Preliminary HIA must be submitted to the Heritage Planner and MHAC.

It is further recommended that this report and associated documentation (*i.e.*, photographic documentation, information about any possible relocation or re-use of the barn) be submitted to the MHAC for their records.
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Appendix D- Heritage Lot Context & Architect’s Report of Existing Structure (Farmhouse) and Schematic Site Plans by Martin Simmons (October 2019)
Appendix E - Structural Assessment Report for Relocation of Farmhouse by Tacoma Engineers (December 2019)
Tacoma Engineers has been retained to complete a structural review of the existing heritage residence at 1395 Main Street East, Cambridge and provide: a structural engineering assessment regarding the feasibility of relocating the structure; and if feasible, to provide a foundation design to support the existing structure in its new location.

Based on our review of the structure on December 5, 2019, we are of the opinion that the existing house is a good candidate for relocation. The existing structure is best described as a conventional wood framed house (wood load bearing walls supporting a wood floor and roof structure) with mass masonry exterior stone walls. This opinion is based on our visual review of the house without benefit of any destructive testing. The majority of the interior framing is covered with finishes and the stone masonry visible from the exterior.

The existing house includes the original heritage structure and a more modern addition, which has been demolished. The foundation slab of this addition remains in place. There is also a modern brick chimney that has been added to the exterior of the home. Both the foundation slab and chimney are structurally independent and will need to be demolished to permit relocation, which can easily be done without adversely affecting the original structure.

Note the house relocation work must be completed by an experienced structural house moving contractor and include full design engineering for the temporary bracing, shoring and lift beams. This work is outside of Tacoma Engineers scope of work. The contractor is to contact Tacoma Engineers to coordinate the structural move requirements with the design of the new foundation system.

Per

Nick Lawler, MASEc, PE, P.Eng, CAHP
Structural Engineer, Senior Associate
Tacoma Engineers Inc.

Encl.

none
Appendix F- Measured Drawings of the Farmhouse
BY-LAW 21-029

of the

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Being a by-law to confirm the proceedings of the Council of the
Corporation of the City of Cambridge

WHEREAS the Municipal Act, 2001 S.O. 2001, c.25, Section 5, provides that the powers of a
municipal corporation shall be exercised by its Council;

WHEREAS the Municipal Act, 2001 S.O. 2001, c.25, Section 9 and 11, provides that except where
otherwise provided the powers of any Council shall be exercised by by-law;

AND WHEREAS in many cases action which is taken or authorized to be taken by Council does not
lend itself to the passage of an individual by-law,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Corporation of the City of Cambridge enacts
as follows:

1. THAT the action of the Council at its meeting held on the 18th day of November, 2020, in
respect of each motion, resolution and other action taken by the Council, and its Committees,
at its said meeting is, except where the prior approval of the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal
or other authority is by law required, hereby adopted, ratified and confirmed as if all such
proceedings were expressly embodied in this by-law.

2. THAT where no individual by-law has been or is passed with respect to the taking of any
action authorized in or by the above mentioned Minutes or with respect to the exercise of any
powers by the Council in the above mentioned Minutes, then this by-law shall be deemed for
all purposes to be the by-law required for approving and authorizing and taking of any action
authorized therein or thereby, or required for the exercise of any powers therein by the
Council.
3.  **THAT** the Mayor and the proper officers of The Corporation of the City of Cambridge are hereby authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to the said action of the Council or to obtain approvals where required and, except where otherwise provided, the Mayor, the Clerk and the Treasurer are hereby directed to execute all documents necessary on behalf of The Corporation of the City Cambridge and to affix thereto the corporate seal.

4.  **AND THAT** this by-law shall come into full force on the day it is passed.

ENACTED AND PASSED this 20th day of April, 2021.

_________________________________
MAYOR

_________________________________
CLERK