Corporation of the City of Cambridge
Special Council Meeting - Statutory Public Meeting
Agenda

Date: December 14, 2021, 10:00 a.m. (Statutory Public Meetings) and reconvening at 5:00 p.m. (Special Council)
Location: Virtual Meeting

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 be provided to the Mayor and Council prior to the meeting, and will form part of the public record.

1. Meeting Called to Order
2. Indigenous Territory Acknowledgement
3. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest
4. Public Meeting Notice
   If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or submit written submissions in respect to the by-law/plan of subdivision/official plan amendment to the City of Cambridge, before the by-law/plan of subdivision/official plan amendment is passed/adopted, the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal unless, in the opinion of the Tribunal, there are reasonable grounds to do so.

Members of the public who wish to participate virtually to provide comments on a Public Meeting are asked to contact (519) 740-4680 Extension 4799.

5. Public Meetings
   5.1. 21-316(CD) Public Meeting Report – 212 Queen Street West – Official
Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment – 2303623 Ontario Inc. (C/O IBI Group)

5.2. 21-313(CD) Additional Residential Units – City Initiated Zoning By-law Amendment and Official Plan Amendment – Public Meeting

5.3. 21-298(CD) 48 George St N – Condominium Conversion – Maison Canada

6. Delegations


6.2. Walter Aguirre re: 21-296(CD) Recommendation Report: Zoning By-law Amendment, 355 Guelph Avenue & 11 Fletcher Circle, IBI Group (c/o Dave Galbraith)

7. Presentations

8. 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.

8.1. Special Council Minutes - November 23, 2021

8.2. Special Council Budget Meeting Minutes - December 2, 2021
   Note: This item will be distributed on the addendum.

8.3. 21-326(CRE) Request to Amend Development Covenants and Restrictions for the Time for Development-Boxwood Business Campus

8.4. 21-318(CD) Building Permit Statistics – Third Quarter 2021

8.5. 21-312(CD) Special Event Strategy Status Update

8.6. 21-328 (CRS) 2021 Annual Review Emergency Management Program

8.7. 21-324 (CRS) Township of North Dumfries Fire Protection Agreement

8.8. 21-323 (CRS) Township of Puslinch Fire Protection Agreement

8.9. Cambridge Environmental Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes - October 27, 2021

8.10. Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes – October 21, 2021

8.11. Cambridge Cycling and Trails Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes – October 14, 2021

8.12. Committee of Adjustment Committee Meeting Minutes – October 6, 2021

9. Consideration of Reports

9.1. Community Development


9.1.2. 21-296(CD) Recommendation Report: Zoning By-law Amendment, 355 Guelph Avenue & 11 Fletcher Circle, IBI Group (c/o Dave Galbraith) 339 - 385

9.1.3. 21-301(CD) Request to Demolish a Part IV Designated Property, 4800 Fountain Street 386 - 423

9.2. Corporate Enterprise

9.2.1. 21-322(CRE) Core Areas Financial Incentives – December 14, 2021 Applications 424 - 431

9.3. Corporate Services


9.3.2. 21-331(CRS) Proposed Schedule for 2022 Meetings of Council 466 - 490

9.4. Infrastructure Services

9.4.1. 21–294 (IFS) Winter Level of Service and Update 491 - 503

9.5. Office of the City Manager

9.5.1. 21-332(OCM) Composition of the Mergeco Holding Company Board of Directors – Nominating Committee Recommendations 504 - 511

10. Unfinished Business

11. Correspondence

12. Motion to Receive Correspondence and Presentations

13. Introduction and Consideration of By-laws

THAT the following by-laws listed under the heading of Introduction and Consideration of By-laws be enacted and passed:

Being a by-law to amend Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended, with respect to land municipally known as 155 Equestrian Way (R02/21)

Being a by-law to amend Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended, with respect to land municipally known as 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle (R14/20)

Being a by-law to authorize the use of alternative voting methods and vote counting equipment for the 2022 Municipal and School Board Election

14. Confirmatory By-law

15. Adjournment
To: COUNCIL

Meeting Date: 12/14/21

Subject: Public Meeting Report – 212 Queen Street West – Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment – 2303623 Ontario Inc. (C/O IBI Group)

Submitted By: Lisa Prime, Chief Planner, MCIP, RPP

Prepared By: Michael Campos, Intermediate Planner

Report No.: 21-316(CD)

File No.: OR09/21

Recommendations

THAT report 21-316 (CD) - Public Meeting Report – 212 Queen Street West – Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment – 2303623 Ontario Inc. (C/O IBI Group) - be received;

AND THAT application OR09/21 for 212 Queen Street West be referred back to staff for a subsequent report and staff recommendation.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- This report has been prepared for the statutory public meeting required by the Planning Act to introduce the requested Official Plan and Zoning amendments to Council and the public.

- The applicant is proposing to construct a three-storey (12.89 metres) residential building consisting of 37 units (21 one-bedroom units and 16 two-bedroom units) on a vacant property that was previously occupied by a gas station. The proposal includes a total of 49 proposed parking spaces in an underground parking garage, where 10 spaces are proposed to be dedicated as visitor parking spaces. Two barrier-free spaces and one loading space is proposed at surface level.

- Access to the site is being proposed via Winston Boulevard, which bounds the subject property on its eastern side. The access is proposed to lead directly into
the underground parking garage and also provides access to the spaces located at grade (barrier-free and loading spaces).

- The proposal includes a green roof amenity area with a total area of 575 square metres (6,189 square feet), which will be accessible to residents and used as a common amenity space for the building. The proposed units are intended for rental purposes. The applicant has submitted an Official Plan Amendment application and a Zoning By-law Amendment application to facilitate the development of the residential building.

### Key Findings

- The proposed development provides an excellent opportunity to transform a vacant, underutilized, brownfield site along Queen Street West into a residential building that will introduce rental apartments within a Regeneration area of the City where intensification is promoted and encouraged. Regeneration areas are areas of the City where a transition of use from one use, such as commercial/industrial to another use, such as residential, is anticipated.

- The proposed development would contribute to the City’s objective of providing for a range and mix of housing options. The proposed intensification of the site will support the City’s objective of directing 45 percent of new development to the built-up area.

- One of the City’s objectives for residential lands is that it provides an adequate supply of both ownership and rental housing stock. The proposed development would support this objective by introducing 37 residential units for rental into the City’s housing stock.

- The proposed development represents an efficient use of the subject lands. The intensification of the lands for residential uses would use existing municipal services, and would provide additional support to local amenities in the nearby Hespeler Core Area. The site is in proximity to nearby transit services and community recreational areas. The proposed development supports the City’s objective of creating a complete community.

### Financial Implications

- Any costs of the application are borne by the applicant. The future recommendation report will provide additional financial implications.

### Background

The purpose of this report is to advise Council and the public of a proposed development for a three-storey residential building containing a total of 37 residential
units comprised of 21 one-bedroom units and 16 two-bedroom units. A total of 49 parking spaces are proposed within an underground parking garage, where 10 of those spaces are proposed to be dedicated for visitor parking. The total number of proposed parking spaces meet the minimum requirements of the City’s Zoning By-law No. 150-85.

The subject lands are currently vacant with existing trees and vegetation. The site was formally used as a gas station and has an approximate area of 2,219.26 square metres. The gas station use was decommissioned in 1997. As part of the proposed development of the subject lands, the applicant will be remediating and removing any environmental impairment currently present on the lands. Upon remediation being undertaken, a Record of Site Condition (“RSC”) is to be filed with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks prior to the issuance of a building permit, should the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment be eventually approved by Council.

The proposed development includes a rooftop green roof which will be accessible to future residents of the building. This space will provide residents with an area for leisure activities and gatherings, while improving the energy efficiency of the building. The rooftop will also provide residents with wide ranging views of the nearby natural heritage features across the road.

In order to facilitate the development of the three-storey residential building, an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment is required. An Official Plan Amendment is required to facilitate the proposed increase in allowable density on the subject lands. The proposed Amendment will retain the existing “Low/Medium Density Residential” designation, but requests an increase in the maximum allowable density from 75 units per hectare to 167 units per hectare.

A Zoning By-law Amendment application is also necessary to rezone the subject lands from the current “Residential – R4” and “Commercial-C5” zones to a “Multi-Residential – RM2” zone, which permits the development of apartment houses containing four or more dwelling units. The proposed zoning amendment will also seek to establish a site-specific exception pertaining to density. The RM2 zone that is proposed for the lands permits a maximum density of 150 units per hectare, whereas the proposed development is pursuing a maximum density of 167 units per hectare. All other provisions of the RM2 zone are being complied with as part of this submission.

**Location:**

The subject lands are municipally addressed as 212 Queen Street West and are legally described as Lot 44, Municipal plan 832, City of Cambridge, Regional Municipality of Waterloo. The subject lands contain a site area of approximately 2,219.26 square metres and have a lot frontage of approximately 30.83 metres along Winston Boulevard, along the site’s eastern side. The site is also bounded by Weaver Street to the west and Queen Street West to the north. The subject lands are also located in proximity to the
Hespeler Core Area, being situated approximately 600 metres from the Core from the west.

The subject lands are shown in the aerial below:

![Aerial Map of the Subject Lands (212 Queen Street West)](image)

**Figure 1 – Aerial Map of the Subject Lands (212 Queen Street West)**

**Existing/Surrounding Land Uses:**

The subject lands are located just outside of the Hespeler Core Area to the west. The surrounding land uses are mixed and consist of existing residential, commercial and industrial uses with emerging intensification of land uses. Lands located directly to the north of the subject lands are currently the subject of proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications (OR01/21) to covert current industrial uses into proposed commercial and residential uses for future development. In addition, an existing CN Rail line and the Chilligo Conservation Area, Mill Pond and Mill Run Trail are all located north of the subject lands. Lands located to the east comprise of existing low-density residential dwellings including single and semi-detached dwellings. To the south of the subject lands is an existing residential subdivision with Centennial School nearby and commercial uses located along Holiday Inn Drive. Finally, lands to the west consist of existing residential uses including single-detached dwellings.

The surrounding land use context is in keeping with the character of a mixed-use area.
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 2.1 Provide a wide range of ways that people can become involved in city decision making.

A statutory public meeting is a requirement of the Planning Act, which provides Council and members of the community an opportunity to review the proposed application and to provide input on the proposal. Any input received at the public meeting will be considered as part of the review of the application.

Comments

The proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications are currently under review by City staff and applicable commenting agencies. Considerations for the review of this application include (but are not limited to) the following:

- Consistency with the policies of the Provincial Policy Statement (2020);
- Conformity with the A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2020); Region of Waterloo Official Plan; City of Cambridge Official Plan; and, the City of Cambridge Zoning By-law No. 150-85;
- Land use compatibility with surrounding existing development and overall character of the existing neighbourhood;
- Appropriateness of the proposed site-specific zoning request associated with the proposed development; and,
- Comments received from members of Council, public, City staff and agency circulation.

In accordance with Planning Act requirements, the City is required to process complete planning applications which includes circulation, review of issues, and consideration of all input, along with making a future recommendation to Council. For this report, staff is providing the standard recommendation to refer the application back to staff to continue the processing of the planning application. Generally, if Council were to decide not to accept this recommendation, the applicant could appeal their application to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) after the timeline for processing the application set out in the
Planning Act has passed. If Council were to decide to refuse this application at this stage, in advance of receiving a future recommendation report from staff, then the City would issue notice of refusal which would include an appeal period. If appeals are filed under either of these scenarios then that would then leave the decision about this planning application to the outcome of the OLT process.

Existing Policy/By-Law

City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012)

The City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012) designates the subject lands as “Built-Up Area” on Map 1A and “Low/Medium Density Residential” on Map 2 (included in this report as Appendix No.3). In addition, the lands have been identified on Map 6 of the Official Plan as being within a “Regeneration Area”.

The Built-Up Area encourages the intensification of lands as part of the City’s growth management strategy and directs that “infill, intensification, and redevelopment within existing neighbourhoods will be minor in nature and will be designed to respect existing character and provide connections and linkages where possible”. Regeneration Areas in the City of Cambridge are considered transitional areas where changes to land uses are anticipated. The Official Plan outlines that compatible higher density residential development will be permitted in Regeneration Areas to support and ensure viability of existing and planned transit service levels. Lands identified as being within the Regeneration Areas are permitted to develop to a maximum height of 8 storeys and provide for a density of between 0.5 FSI and 2.0 FSI. The proposed development provides an FSI of 1.17. Notwithstanding said density permissions, the Official Plan’s “Low/Medium Density Residential” designation within a Regeneration Area permits a maximum of 75 units per hectare.

As a result, in order to facilitate the development of the proposed development, an Official plan Amendment will be required to permit an increased density of approximately 167 units per hectare.

City of Cambridge Zoning By-law No. 150-85 (as amended)

The subject lands are currently split zoned “Residential-R4” and “Commercial – C5” by the City’s Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended. The zoning currently applied to the lands does not permit the proposed development. The R4 zone only permits single-detached dwellings with respect to residential permissions. As a result, an application for a Zoning By-law Amendment is required to rezone the lands to the “Multi-Residential – RM2” zone, along with a site-specific provision to permit a density of 167 units per hectare, whereas the RM2 zone only permits a maximum density of 150 units per hectare.
A zoning map representing the current zoning of the subject lands has been included as Appendix No. 4 of this report.

**Financial Impact**

- Any costs of the application are borne by the applicant. The future recommendation report will provide additional financial implications.

**Public Input**

The statutory public meeting being held under the Planning Act is being held December 14th, 2021 and official notification was provided in the Cambridge Times. In addition, notice was provided to all assessed property owners within a 120 metre (393.7 feet) radius of the subject lands and anyone else requesting notice. Any interested parties and members of the public will be provided with an opportunity to speak to this proposal at the December 14th, 2021 public meeting. The supporting studies provided in support of the applications are available on the City of Cambridge Current Development website found here:


All public comments received will be considered as part of the review of the application and will be included in the future recommendation report to Council.

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

**Internal/External Consultation**

The application has been circulated to the departments and commenting agencies listed in Appendix No. 5. Any comments received will be included in a future planning recommendation report.

**Conclusion**

Staff will provide further comments and analysis regarding this application as part of the future recommendation report to the Planning and Development Committee. A statutory public meeting is required by the Planning Act to provide an opportunity for the public and Councillors to give input on the proposal.
Signature

Division Approval

Reviewed by the CFO

Reviewed by Legal Services

Name: Lisa Prime
Title: Chief Planner MCIP, RPP

Departmental Approval

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

City Manager Approval

Name: David Calder
Title: City Manager

Attachments

- Appendix No. 1 – Proposed Site Plan
- Appendix No. 2 – Proposed Elevations
- Appendix No. 3 – Existing Official Plan Map
- Appendix No. 4 – Existing Zoning Map
- Appendix No. 5 – Internal/External Consultation & List of Supporting Studies
Light green areas represent private patios. Darker green is common landscaped areas.
Appendix No. 2 – Proposed Elevations

NORTH ELEVATION

SOUTH ELEVATION
Appendix No. 5 – Internal/External Consultation & List of Supporting Studies

This application has been circulated to the departments and agencies listed below. Their comments will be included in a future staff report to the Planning & Development Committee for consideration.

- Energy + Inc;
- Public & Catholic School Boards;
- City of Cambridge Engineering Division
- City of Cambridge Transportation Engineering Division;
- City of Cambridge Recreation and Cultural Division;
- City of Cambridge Fire Department;
- City of Cambridge Building Services Division;
- City of Cambridge Accessibility Coordinator;
- City of Cambridge Senior Planner Reurbanization;
- Regional Municipality of Waterloo;
- Grand River Conservation Authority;
- Canadian Pacific Rail; and,
- Canadian National Rail;

List of Supporting Studies:

- Planning Justification Report;
- Plan of Survey;
- Architectural Design Package including Site Plan, Site Statistics, Floor Plans and Elevations;
- Urban Design Brief;
- Arborist Report including a Tree Inventory and Protection/Removals Plan;
- Landscape Plan including a Tree preservation and Removal Plan and a Rooftop Amenity plan and Details;
- Civil Engineering Package including a Site Servicing Plan and Site Grading Plan, Cross Sections Plan, Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and Details;
- Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report;
- Photometric Analysis Plan;
- Noise Impact Study;
- Transportation Impact Study;
- Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment; and,
- Section 59 Notice;
To:   COUNCIL
Meeting Date:  12/14/21
Subject:  Additional Residential Units – City Initiated Zoning By-law Amendment and Official Plan Amendment – Public Meeting
Submitted By: Lisa Prime, Chief Planner
Prepared By: Lisa Chominiec, Planner/Secretary Treasurer to the Committee of Adjustment/Development Charges Coordinator
Report No.:  21-313(CD)
File No.:  OR10/21

Recommendations

THAT report 21-313(CD) City Initiated Additional Residential Units – Zoning By-law Amendment and Official Plan Amendment be received.

AND THAT the City initiated applications to amend the Official Plan and Zoning By-law be referred back to staff for a subsequent report and staff recommendation.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- In 2018 Council passed by-law 108-18 to allow secondary dwelling units on residential single detached, semi-detached and linear row house properties in the City of Cambridge with specific requirements for lot area, frontage and parking.

- In 2019 further changes to the Planning Act through Bill 108, More Homes, More Choice Act, 2019 were put in place requiring municipalities to revise additional dwelling unit regulations and allow for an additional dwelling unit in the principle building and an additional dwelling unit in an ancillary building for a total of three residential dwellings on one property.

- In October and November 2021 public consultation for Additional Residential Units (ARUs) was hosted by the City via a virtual Open House (two sessions) as well as a survey that was open on the Engage Cambridge webpage until November 12, 2021.
• This report is for a statutory public meeting required by the Planning Act to introduce the proposed policy and zoning changes to Council and the Public and to share the public feedback so far. No decision is being made at this time and the proposed amendments are subject to change based on public, Council, staff and agency input.

Key Findings

• Council passed by-law 108-18 in 2018 to implement regulations for additional residential units. Since the implementation of the by-law, 115 additional residential unit permits have been processed and approximately 50 minor variances. Evaluation of the additional residential unit regulations and the draft Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law amendment has been completed by Meridian Planning consultants and are attached to this report.

• Some barriers that were restricting property owners from building ARUs are being proposed to be removed from the Zoning By-law. Some of these barriers included minimum lot frontage requirements, minimum lot area requirements and ground floor area restrictions for basements. The proposed amendments help achieve Objective 1.4 in the City’s Strategic Plan to promote, facilitate and participate in the development of affordable, welcoming and vibrant neighbourhoods

Financial Implications

• Work associated with this review will be accommodated through the operating budget.

Background

• Recent changes to the Planning Act require municipalities to allow additional dwelling units in single detached, semi-detached and street townhouse dwelling units.

• In 2018 Council passed bylaw 108-18 to allow secondary dwelling units. In 2019 changes to the Planning Act, through Bill 108, More Homes, More Choice Act, 2019 were put in place requiring municipalities to permit up to two additional residential units on properties containing a detached, semi-detached or row house residential dwelling.

• The current by-law passed in 2018 only allows one additional unit either within the primary dwelling or in an accessory structure. The changes to the Planning Act in 2019 allow two additional residential units, one in the primary building and one in an accessory structure. The attached Official Plan Amendment (OPA) and Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBA) reflect these changes.
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 1.4 Promote, facilitate and participate in the development of affordable, welcoming and vibrant neighbourhoods.

This report is to formally introduce proposed amendments to the City’s Official Plan and Zoning By-law for the City-wide Additional Residential Units (ARUs) regulations. The amendments have been drafted following feedback received through a fulsome public consultation, internal consultation and best practice review. The public meeting offers an additional opportunity to receive public and Council input to assist in the preparation of final recommended amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law.

Comments

The provision of additional residential units is one measure to increase the affordable rental housing stock within the City. This type of housing is recognized in Provincial policy as well as the Regional and City Official Plans. In 2018, in response to Bill 139, Council passed city by-law 108-18 which allowed one second residential unit subject to specific criteria. The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing introduced Bill 108, More Homes, More Choice Act, in 2019 (Bill 108). The Bill proposed a number of amendments including amendments to the Planning Act. The intention of Bill 108 is to address the housing crisis in Ontario by providing additional residential units. One of the directions to municipalities through Bill 108 was to permit up to two additional residential units on properties. An update to the City by-law and Official Plan is required to accommodate this change and also to assess the effectiveness and impact of the regulations passed in 2018. The City is required to comply with the changes made by Bill 108 to the Planning Act but has some flexibility to include regulations to mitigate planning compatibility concerns.

The City retained Meridian Planning to compile a comparison of the regulations in adjacent municipalities and initiate a best practice review to help frame the updated regulations. A comparison of the proposed zoning approach to the current zoning can be found in Appendix 1 of this report.

Based on the best practices review and public feedback received to date, Meridian Planning has prepared the draft Zoning By-law Amendment (Appendix 2) and draft Official Plan Amendment (Appendix 3).
Since 2018, the City has processed 115 building permits for secondary residential units and approximately 50 minor variances. The number of building permits illustrates community interest in establishing additional residential units and the number of minor variances indicates that revisions are needed to the regulations in place.

A summary of some of the proposed changes is noted below:

**Terminology:** Currently referred to as ‘Secondary Dwelling Units’ within the City’s Zoning by-law and Official Plan, the definition will be amended to ‘Additional Residential Unit’ in short ARUs.

*Reasoning:* This is in line with the Provincial terminology. There was no feedback received regarding this change.

**Number of Units and Location:** The new by-law will permit 2 ARUs on a property; either 2 within the primary home, or 1 within the primary and 1 within an accessory structure. The City’s current bylaw 108-18 permits 1 Additional Residential Unit, within the primary home or within an accessory structure, but not in both.

*Reasoning:* This change is to comply with the changes made by Bill 108 to the Planning Act. Most reasons for not supporting ARUs from the public were surrounding parking and congested neighbourhoods. Parking and lot areas have been considered in the proposed changes, and Staff are proposing that two ARUs per property will only be permitted in the RR1, RR2, R1, R2, R3 and R4 zone. These lots generally have minimum lot areas between 450 m² – 4,000 m². The smaller lots will only be permitted to have one ARU. These zones include R5, R6, RS1, RD3, RD4, RD5, RM1, RM2, RM3 and RM4 zones, which generally have lot areas under 360 m². Staff believe that limiting the number of ARUs in the smaller lot zones will help alleviate concerns from the public and will keep these units subordinate within the neighbourhood.

**Size and Bedrooms:** The maximum floor area will continue to have a cap of 40% of the total area of the primary dwelling, however, if the unit is in the basement, the 40% does not apply. The maximum number of bedrooms will remain at two.

*Reasoning:* Most ARUs coming through building permit are basement units. This existing provision limits many homes from implementing ARUs and requires additional costs and time for residents to go through the minor variance process. This provision also limits any owner of a one storey home like a bungalow from adding an ARU. The 40% and two bedroom maximum will continue to stay in the new by-law to keep the ARUs subordinate to the main home, but remove the restriction for bungalows.

**Key Zone Standards:** Removing the 450m² lot area requirement, removing the 11m-15m lot frontage requirement.

*Reasoning:* The lot area and lot frontage requirements were causing most applicants to seek relief from the Zoning By-law through a minor variance. The cost of a minor
variance application is $1,200 and a number of these applications were being refused by the Committee of Adjustment, appealed, just to be approved by the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT). The whole process from application to approval by the OLT could take upwards of eight months to receive a decision, which once received the applicant would still need to go through the Building Permit process. These restrictions are not common in other municipalities, caused excessive time and money for residents and made it difficult for people to add ARUs when the City’s and Province’s policies all point to encouraging more housing choice.

Parking: The current by-law requires one parking space per bedroom. The proposed amendment will require one parking space per unit. A two-bedroom ARU in a basement would require two parking spaces in our current by-law, whereas in the new by-law a two-bedroom unit would only require one parking space. The new bylaw also contemplates no parking requirements for an ARU within certain parts of the City. The exact area for parking exemptions is still under review.

Reasoning: The current parking requirement the City imposed in bylaw 108-18 is high compared to other municipalities. All cities part of the best practice review only require one parking space per unit, not per bedroom. Changing this provision makes the requirements more in line with other municipalities. The Planning Act also provides regulations regarding parking for ARUs such as:

- Each unit shall have a parking space except where a pre-approved zoning by-law amendment doesn’t require parking; and,
- Any additional required parking may be in tandem;

Encouraging transit ridership is key for the success of LRT in Cambridge. Although this project is close to 10 years out, Staff are proposing a phased approach to parking exemptions that make use of the City’s current infrastructure. The proposals are still under review and are as follows:

Option 1: Follow the existing by-law regarding parking exemptions in the core areas.

This would permit the core areas to not require parking for ARUs. This is in line with the current by-laws for core area parking.

Option 2: Option 1 + 800m distance around Ainslie St Terminal and Cambridge Centre transit station.

The proposed LRT stations are within close proximity to these already existing transit stations. Adding a buffer around these stations would exempt areas that are already near existing stations.

Option 3: Option 2 + 800m buffer around the core areas.
The core areas are intended to be walkable neighbourhoods. Adding an additional buffer around the core reduces the reliance of a vehicle and therefore a vehicle may not be necessary.

The phased approach will require some more review. Staff are proposing to amend the provisions once the LRT is closer to being implemented.

**Existing Policy/By-Law**

**Provincial Policy Statement (2020)**

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) supports intensification through a range of housing options and an appropriate range and mix of housing types and densities.

**Planning Act**

Consistent with the PPS the Planning Act guides planning in the Province of Ontario. Bill 108 to the Planning Act requires that Official Plans have policies to allow additional residential units and permit a maximum of one additional residential unit in a single detached, semi-detached or street fronting townhouse primary dwelling and one additional residential unit in an accessory structure. The Planning Act also provides regulations for additional residential units for:

- Each unit shall have a parking space except where pre-approved zoning by-law amendment doesn’t require parking;
- Any additional required parking may be in tandem;
- Additional residential units do not need to be owner-occupied;
- Additional residential units can be located either in new or existing buildings; and,
- Tenants cannot be regulated on the basis of relationship.
- Section 34 Subsection 19.1 of the Planning Act indicates that there are no appeal rights in respect of a by-law that gives effect to the policies, requirement or standard for creating secondary residential units.

**Regional Official Plan**

- The Regional Official Plan encourages area municipalities “to permit, wherever appropriate, individual lot intensification, such as secondary apartments and garden suites in residential neighbourhoods, where health, safety, servicing and other reasonable standards or criteria can be met”.


City of Cambridge 2012 Official Plan

- The 2012 Cambridge Official Plan indicates that the City will permit the establishment of a secondary residential unit within or attached to the existing residential buildings in all zones, where residential uses are permitted, without an amendment to the City’s Zoning By-law. Secondary residential units would be subject to certain criteria: parking; no separate road access; the secondary unit is subordinate to the main dwelling unit; adequate servicing; neighbourhood compatibility; and compliance with minimum standards of maintenance and occupancy. The draft Official Plan Amendment can be found in Appendix 3.

Zoning By-law 150-85, as amended

- The City of Cambridge Zoning By-law came into effect on October 27, 1986. Secondary units were not a permitted in the original by-law. In 2018 Council passed by-law 108-18 to allow a second residential unit in single detached, semi-detached and street fronting townhouses subject to specific regulations for lot area, frontage and parking. Since the passing of this by-law new requirements are necessary due to the Provincial direction. In addition, a review of the 2018 regulations was also necessary to assess their impact, effectiveness and appropriateness in comparison with other municipalities. The Zoning by-law Amendment can be found in Appendix 2.

Financial Impact

The review of the existing additional residential unit regulations and the associated by-law amendment and Official Plan amendment to implement the Planning Act requirements is being completed by internal staff with the assistance of a planning consultant funded though existing operating budget. Therefore, there are no additional financial implications are anticipated.

Public Input

Engagement tactics for the study included a newspaper ad, organic Facebook and Twitter posts on October 15, 20, 29, November 4 and 10, Cambridge.ca community event listing, a mailing list and Facebook boosted event and posts.

To date there have been three opportunities for public input for the updated regulations:

- On October 21, 2021 the City hosted two virtual public open house meetings via Zoom to introduce the project to the community. One session was held from 2pm-4pm, while another was held from 6pm-8pm. The City had 85 participants registered between both sessions. A presentation was delivered by Meridian Planning Consultants followed by a live Question and Answer period. Attendees were able to type questions into the chat box to be read out loud by staff, or
virtually raise their hands. The questions and comments were captured and summarized into a document (Appendix No. 4). Overall there appeared to be a positive response and support for the proposed regulations.

- On October 28, 2021 the City launched the Engage Cambridge webpage with a survey. The engage page was sent to all registrants as well as past applicants that applied for secondary dwelling units through the minor variance process. As of November 11, 2021 the page had 152 page visits and 36 completed surveys. The full survey results can be viewed in Appendix No. 5.

Survey Results

Overall the survey responses were fairly split in terms of support for ARUs. Those who supported ARUs did so for reasons such as: to offset mortgage costs, for added income, to help with homelessness, for elderly parents, income/investment, more affordable housing options, underutilized space, and options for extended family. Reasons for generally not supporting ARUs included population density, not enough parking, cost of major renovations on homeowners, congestion, removing community feel and altering the neighbourhood. Staff also heard from a number of residents who previously tried to apply for ARUs and were refused due to restrictive zoning. The new provisions will make it easier to qualify for ARUs.

Internal/External Consultation

Staff received comments from a number of departments to help formulate the amendments. Departments that were circulated included Economic Development, Transportation, Engineering, Building and Fire Services. Internal comments have been applied to the draft OPA/ZBA where necessary.

Conclusion

Recent changes to the Planning Act now require the municipality to amend the Zoning by-law and Official Plan to allow for two additional residential units. Planning staff are requesting that Council refer staff to bring back a subsequent report and staff recommendation.

This report summarizes the review and consultation completed to date for Additional Residential Units and introduces the draft Official Plan amendment and Zoning By-law amendment for the City. The draft amendments are under review. Any further comments received from the public or Council will be considered through a future staff recommendation report.

Section 34 Subsection 19.1 of the Planning Act indicates that there are no appeal rights in respect of a by-law that gives effect to the policies, requirement or standard for creating secondary residential units.
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CAMBRIDGE ADDITIONAL RESIDENTIAL UNIT PROPOSED ZONING APPROACH

Recommended modifications shown in red.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZBL Regs</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning Approach for Additional Residential Units</th>
<th>Current ZBL Regulations for Secondary Dwelling Units (Provided for Reference Purposes Only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Terminology** | o Use same terminology as the Province in the amended Planning Act:  
- Additional Residential Unit  
- Additional Residential Unit in an accessory structure | Secondary Dwelling Unit  
Secondary Dwelling Unit in an Accessory Structure |
| **Definitions** | o Adopt the following definition:  
\[\text{"Additional Residential Unit means a dwelling unit that is subordinate to the primary dwelling unit on a lot."}\]  
Note: The proposed definition works in conjunction with the updated definition of a ‘dwelling unit’ as per Cambridge ZBL 20-017:  
[\text{\"Dwelling unit means a suite operated as a housekeeping unit, used or intended to be used by one or more persons and usually containing cooking, eating, living, sleeping and sanitary facilities.\"}]  
o Add a definition for a primary dwelling unit:  
\[\text{\"Primary Dwelling Unit means the largest dwelling unit in which the primary residential use of the lot is conducted.\"}\] | Means a separate dwelling unit containing bathroom and kitchen facilities that is subordinate to a legally existing residential structure. (ZBL 108-18) |
| **Number of Units** | o Number of Additional Residential Units Permitted – 2 per lot  
(i) Within the primary dwelling unit; and/or  
(ii) Within an accessory structure. | Number of Secondary Units Permitted – 1 per lot  
(i) Within a primary dwelling unit; or  
(ii) Within an accessory structure. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZBL Regs</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning Approach for Additional Residential Units</th>
<th>Current ZBL Regulations for Secondary Dwelling Units (Provided for Reference Purposes Only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Number of Units Continued | However not more than 1 Additional Residential Unit may be permitted in an accessory structure on a lot.  
- Include a zoning provision that a primary dwelling unit with one or two Additional Residential Units shall not constitute any other type of dwelling otherwise defined in the ZBL (ie. duplex, triplex etc.)  
- Delete Section 3(b) of ZBL 108-18 which states that “...no secondary dwelling unit shall be permitted where b) a secondary dwelling unit already exists on the lot;” | Note Section 3(b) of ZBL 108-18 which states that “…no secondary dwelling unit shall be permitted where b) a secondary dwelling unit already exists on the lot;”  
As per Planning Act, 2 Additional Residential Units are now permitted on a single lot. |

| Location | - Permit within a detached, semi-detached, and linear row house dwelling  
- Permit an Additional Residential Unit in an accessory structure in the interior side yard, exterior side yard or rear yard  
- Permit 2 Additional Residential Units in the following residential zones –RR1, RR2, R1, R2, R3, and R4  
- Permit only 1 Additional Residential Unit in the following Residential Zones R5, R6, RS1, RD3, RD4, RD5, RM1, RM2, RM3 and RM4 Zones  
- Not permitted in a flood plain or areas identified as hazard lands  
- Not permitted in an accessory structure intended for required parking | - Permitted within a detached, semi-detached, and row house dwelling  
- Permitted in a variety of residential zones (RR1, RR2, R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, RS1, RD4, RD5, RM1, RM2, RM3, RM4)  
- Not permitted in a flood plain  
- Not permitted in an accessory structure intended for required parking |

<p>| Size | - <strong>Max Floor Area for an Additional Residential Unit in a Primary Dwelling</strong> - The maximum floor area for an Additional Residential Unit shall be 40% of the total | Max Floor Area - The maximum floor area for a Secondary Dwelling Unit shall be 40% of the total area of the primary dwelling unit including the basement. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZBL Regs</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning Approach for Additional Residential Units</th>
<th>Current ZBL Regulations for Secondary Dwelling Units (Provided for Reference Purposes Only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size Continued</strong></td>
<td>gross floor area of the primary dwelling unit including the basement. Notwithstanding, if the Additional Residential Unit is located in the basement, such Additional Residential Unit may occupy the entire basement.</td>
<td>Max Coverage - An accessory structure with a Secondary Dwelling Unit may not exceed 10% of the lot area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o <strong>Max Floor Area for an Additional Residential Unit in an Accessory Structure</strong> – The maximum floor area for an Additional Residential Unit in an accessory structure shall not exceed the lesser of 40% of the gross floor area for the primary dwelling unit or 80 m².</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o <strong>Max Coverage</strong> – An accessory structure with a Secondary Dwelling Unit may not exceed 10% of the lot area. Recommend delete – this clause is not needed as the 10% coverage cap applies to all accessory buildings and structures (see ZBL 150-85 Section 2.1.11.1(d))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Zone Standards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o <strong>Min Lot Area</strong> 450 m² - Delete minimum lot area requirement</td>
<td>Min Lot Area 450 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o <strong>Min Frontage</strong> 11 m or 15 m for a corner lot - Delete minimum frontage requirement</td>
<td>Min Frontage 11 m or 15 m for a corner lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o <strong>Max # Bedrooms in any Single Additional Residential Unit</strong>: 2</td>
<td>Max # Bedrooms: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o <strong>Min Interior Side Yard Setback for Additional Residential Units in an Accessory Structure</strong>: the zone standard for the zone in which the accessory structure with the Additional Residential Unit is located, as measured from interior side lot line to Additional Residential Unit entrance or external stairs</td>
<td>Min Interior Side Yard Setback: 1.2 m measured from interior side lot line to secondary unit entrance or external stairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o <strong>Max External Side Yard Setback</strong>: 6.0 m measured from exterior side lot line to secondary unit entrance or external stairs</td>
<td>Max Height for Secondary Unit in an accessory structure – accessory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZBL Regs</td>
<td>Proposed Zoning Approach for Additional Residential Units</td>
<td>Current ZBL Regulations for Secondary Dwelling Units (Provided for Reference Purposes Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Zone Standards Continued</strong></td>
<td>o <strong>Min External Side Yard Setback for Additional Residential Units in an Accessory Structure:</strong> the zone standard for the zone in which the accessory structure with the Additional Residential Unit is located, as measured from exterior side lot line to Additional Residential Unit entrance or external stairs</td>
<td>structure may not exceed 4.5 metres in height and does not exceed one storey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o <strong>Min Rear Yard Setback for an Additional Residential Unit in an Accessory Structure:</strong> 1.2 metres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o <strong>Separation Distance Between Primary Dwelling and Additional Residential Unit in an Accessory Structure</strong> - No separation distance proposed between primary dwelling unit and accessory structure with Additional Residential Unit on the same lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o <strong>Max Height for an Accessory Structure with an Additional Residential Unit</strong> – accessory structure may not exceed 4.5 metres in height and does not exceed one storey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td>A direct or shared entrance to the Secondary Unit may be permitted. Recommend delete and rely instead on the requirements of the Ontario Building Code and Fire Codes. Modify: No separate vehicular access to a municipal road is permitted. Add provision for pedestrian access across the lot: a <strong>1.2 metre wide unobstructed walkway shall be provided from a street or lane to the entrance of a Additional Residential Unit in an accessory structure. The walkway shall not be located within a required parking space.</strong></td>
<td>A direct or shared entrance to the Secondary Unit may be permitted. No separate access to a municipal road is permitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Parking

- 1 parking space per bachelor or one bedroom Secondary Dwelling Unit – or – 2 parking spaces per 2 bedroom Secondary Dwelling Unit in addition to the parking for the principal dwelling unit. Recommend modifying to: (i) 1 parking space per Additional Residential Unit; and (ii) 0 (zero) parking spaces where the lot with the Additional Residential Unit is located within 800 metres of a light rail transit station.

- Tandem parking permitted.

- Parking may be provided between the regulatory building line or the established building line and the street line.

- No separate vehicular access to a municipal road is permitted.

### Connection to Services

Retain existing zoning provision:

The primary dwelling and the Additional Residential Unit on the same lot must be connected to municipal water and sewer services of adequate size where municipal services are available. Where municipal services are not available, proof must be provided, to the satisfaction of the City, that private water and sewer service is capable of accommodating the main dwelling unit and the Additional Residential Unit.

The principal dwelling and the Secondary Dwelling Unit on the same lot must be connected to municipal water and sewer services of adequate size where municipal services are available. Where municipal services are not available, proof must be provided, to the satisfaction of the City, that private water and sewer service is capable of accommodating the main dwelling unit and the Secondary Dwelling Unit.

### Restricted Uses

- An Additional Residential Unit is not permitted on a lot containing a garden suite, or a boarding, lodging or rooming house.
- An Additional Residential Unit is not permitted on lot where the primary dwelling is used for a home occupation.

A secondary dwelling unit is not permitted on a lot with a garden suite.

A secondary dwelling unit is not permitted on lot where the principal dwelling is used for a home occupation.
| Non-Severance Clause | An Additional Residential Unit in an accessory structure may not be severed from the primary dwelling unit on the same lot. |
BY-LAW ___-21

of the

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Being a By-law of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge
to amend Comprehensive Zoning By-law No.150-85, as
amended with respect to permitting Additional Residential Units.

WHEREAS the Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge has the authority pursuant to
Section 34 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P. 13, as amended to pass this By-law;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge has initiated an application
to amend By-Law No.150-85, otherwise known as the Comprehensive Zoning By-Law, insofar as is
necessary to establish provisions to permit Additional Residential Units within the City;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge deems it advisable to
amend Zoning By-law 150-85, as otherwise amended, and therefore implement the Official Plan of
the City of Cambridge;

AND WHEREAS this By-law conforms to the Official Plan of the City of Cambridge;

AND WHEREAS Council deems that adequate public notice of the public meeting was provided and
adequate information regarding this Amendment was presented at the public meeting held on
______, and that a further public meeting is not considered necessary in order to proceed with this
amendment;

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

1. THAT this By-law applies to all residentially zoned lands with the City of Cambridge, Regional
   Municipality of Waterloo;

2. THAT Section 2.1.11.1(f) of the City of Cambridge Zoning Comprehensive Zoning By-law 150-85, is
   hereby amended by adding the phase “unless otherwise permitted by this By-law after the words
   “human habitation” as follows:

   “additional residential unit means a dwelling unit that is subordinate to the primary dwelling
   unit on a lot.”

   “dwelling unit, primary means the largest dwelling unit in which the residential use of the lot
   is conducted.”

3. THAT Section 2.1.11.1(f) is hereby amended by adding the phase “unless otherwise permitted
   by this By-law after the words “human habitation” as follows:
“Subject to the following regulations, nothing in this by-law shall apply to prevent the use of land or the erection, location or use of a building or structure accessory to a use permitted in a residential use class zone:

(f) no accessory building or structure shall be used for human habitation unless otherwise permitted by this by-law, or for the purposes of a home occupation as specified in Section 2.1.17”

4. THAT Section 2.1.17.2 is hereby amended by adding a new subsection (c) and consequently renumbering the remaining subsections as follows:

“(c) a home occupation shall not be permitted on a lot containing an additional residential unit;”

5. THAT Section 2.1.20 is hereby amended by adding a new subsection (8) as follows:

“Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of this by-law, a detached dwelling which is occupied and continues to be occupied as the principal residence of the proprietor, may be used for the purpose of a bed-and-breakfast hostel in accordance with the following regulations:

8. Notwithstanding any other provision of this by-law, a bed and breakfast hostel is not permitted on a lot containing an additional residential unit;”

6. THAT Section 2.2.1.1(i) is hereby amended by deleting the existing parking standard for a secondary dwelling unit and replacing it with the following parking requirement for an additional residential unit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Building or Use</td>
<td>Required Number of Parking Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) an additional residential unit</td>
<td>1 parking space per additional residential unit. Notwithstanding, no parking space is required on lands delineated on ‘Map _____ - Parking Exemption Overlay’ attached to and forming part of this Zoning By-law.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. THAT Section 2.2.2 is hereby amended by adding a new subsection (15) as follows:

“15. Additional Residential Units

Notwithstanding any other provision of this by-law, parking for an additional residential unit may be:

(i) provided as a tandem parking space; and,
(ii) located between the established building line and the street line.
Further notwithstanding any other provision of this by-law, no new driveway or vehicular access from a residential lot to a municipal street or road shall be permitted in order to provide access or required parking for an additional residential unit."

8. THAT Section 3.1.1.7 is hereby amended by adding a new subsection (c) as follows:

“A boarding, lodging or rooming house shall not be permitted on a lot containing an additional residential unit.”

9. THAT Section 3.1.1 is hereby amended by adding a new subsection (11) as follows:

“3.1.1.11 Additional Residential Units

Where an additional residential unit is permitted by this By-law, the following provisions shall apply:

a) An additional residential unit shall only be permitted on a lot containing a detached dwelling unit, semi-detached dwelling unit, rowhouse or townhouse dwelling unit;

b) Where permitted, a maximum of two (2) additional residential units may be permitted on a lot in accordance with the uses permitted in Section 3.1.2.1(s).

c) Where only one (1) additional residential unit is permitted, such unit shall only be located within the same principal building as the primary dwelling unit on the lot;

d) Where two (2) additional residential units may be permitted on a lot, such additional residential units may be located as follows:

i) one (1) additional residential unit within the same principal building as the primary dwelling unit on the lot and one (1) additional residential unit in a detached accessory building located on the same lot as the primary dwelling unit; or,

ii) two (2) additional residential units within the same principal building as the primary dwelling unit in which case, an additional residential unit in a detached accessory building shall not be permitted.

In no case, shall two (2) additional residential units be permitted in a detached accessory building.

e) A principal building on a residential lot that is divided into a primary dwelling unit and an additional residential unit(s) shall not constitute any other type of dwelling unit otherwise defined in this By-law;

f) A maximum of two (2) bedrooms shall be permitted in an additional residential unit;

g) An additional residential unit shall only be permitted on a lot fronting on an open and municipally maintained street or road;

h) Where municipal services are available, both the primary dwelling unit and the additional residential unit(s) on the same lot must be connected to municipal water and
sewer services of adequate size. Where municipal services are not available, proof must be provided, to the satisfaction of the City, that private water and sewer service is capable of accommodating both the primary dwelling unit and the additional residential unit(s);

i) An additional residential unit shall not be permitted:

i) on lands identified as hazard lands or as being within the flood plain; and,

ii) on a lot containing a garden suite, bed and breakfast, home occupation or a boarding, lodging or rooming house;

j) Parking for an additional residential unit(s) shall be provided in accordance with the requirements of Section 2.2 of this By-law;

k) Required off-street parking spaces may be arranged in tandem. A tandem parking space may be located on a driveway that is within the front yard;

l) Both the primary dwelling unit and the additional residential unit(s) shall be in compliance with the Ontario Building Code and the Ontario Fire Code; and,

3.1.11.1 Additional Residential Units in a Principal Building on a Residential Lot

Where an additional residential unit(s) is permitted within the principal building on a residential lot the following provisions shall apply:

a) The additional residential unit(s) is located entirely within the same building as the primary dwelling unit;

b) The maximum gross floor area of the additional residential unit(s) may not singularly or cumulatively exceed 40% of the gross floor area of the primary dwelling unit. Notwithstanding, if an additional residential unit is located in the basement, such additional residential unit may occupy the entire basement. In no case shall more than one (1) additional residential unit be located in a basement;

c) Where direct access to the additional residential unit is provided from the interior side yard, the entrance to the additional residential unit is required to be a minimum of 1.2 metres from the interior side lot line. and no stairs accessing the additional residential unit are permitted within 1.2 metres from the interior side lot line.

3.1.11.2 Additional Residential Units in a Detached Accessory Building

Where an additional residential unit is permitted in a detached accessory building to a primary dwelling unit the following provisions shall apply:

a) The accessory building with the additional residential unit may be located in the interior side yard, exterior side yard, or rear yard. In the case of an accessory building located on a through lot and accessed by a laneway, such accessory building shall be located in the yard adjacent to the rear wall of the principal building on the lot;
b) The maximum gross floor area of the additional residential unit may not exceed 40% of the gross floor area of the primary dwelling unit but in no case may be larger than 80 m²;

c) Notwithstanding Section 3.1.1.11.2(b) above, the detached accessory building containing the additional residential unit shall not exceed 10% of the lot area of the lot on which it is located;

d) An additional residential unit in an accessory building is not permitted to have a basement or other habitable living space below grade;

e) An accessory building containing an additional residential unit shall have a maximum height of 4.5 metres;

f) A clear and maintained pedestrian path with a minimum width of 1.2 metres shall be provided from the street line to the entrance of an additional residential unit that is contained within a detached accessory building;

g) Notwithstanding any other provision of this By-law, the accessory building containing the additional residential unit shall be located:

i) consistent with the applicable exterior side yard setback for zone in which it is located;

ii) consistent with the applicable interior side yard setback for zone in which it is located; and,

iii) a minimum of 1.2 metres from the rear lot line, or in the case of an accessory building located on a through lot and accessed by a laneway, a minimum of 3.0 metres from the lot line adjacent and parallel to the laneway;

h) An additional residential unit in an accessory building shall not be severed from the lot containing the principal dwelling unit."

10. THAT Section 3.1.2.1(s) is hereby amended by deleting the words “Secondary Dwelling Unit” and adding the words “Additional Residential Unit”.

Further, a notation (*1) shall be added to the RR1, RR2, R1, R2, R3, and R4 Zones in the permitted use table in Section 3.1.2.1(s). A notation (*2) shall be added to the R5, R6, RS1, RD3, RD4, RD5, RM1, RM2, RM3 and RM4 Zones in the permitted use table in Section 3.1.2.1(s). Notations (*1) and (*2) shall be added below the permitted use table in Section 3.1.2.1 and shall constitute part of such permitted use table as follows:
### List of Notations:

- **Notation *1** - Two (2) additional residential units may be permitted on a lot.
- **Notation *2** - Only one (1) additional residential unit may be permitted on a lot.

#### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Permitted</th>
<th>In Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(s) Additional Residential Unit</td>
<td>RR1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*)</td>
<td>(*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. THAT Section 3.1.2.8 is deleted in its entirety.

12. THAT this by-law shall come into force and effect on the date it is enacted and passed by the Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge, subject to notice hereof being circulated in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P. 13.

Read a first, second, and third time and finally passed this _____ day of _______, 2021.

__________________________
Kathryn McGarry, Mayor

__________________________
Danielle Manton, Clerk

Corporate Seal
AMENDMENT NO. ____
TO THE
OFFICIAL PLAN OF THE
CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Additional Residential Units

Prepared For:
The Corporation of the City of Cambridge

Prepared By:
Meridian Planning Consultants

Drafted: November 4, 2021 v1
Being a By-law passed pursuant to the provisions of Sections 17, 21 and 22 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, as amended.

The Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge, in accordance with the provisions of Sections 17, 21 and 22 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, as amended, hereby enacts as follows:

1. Amendment No. ___ to the Official Plan of the City of Cambridge, consisting of the attached explanatory text is hereby adopted.

2. That the Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to make application to the Region of Waterloo for approval of Amendment No. ____ to the Official Plan of the City of Cambridge.

3. That the Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to proceed with the giving of notice under Section 17(23) of the Planning Act.

4. This By-law shall come into force and take effect on the day of final passing thereof.

Enacted and passed this ____ day of ______, 2021.

Signed: _____________________________  
Kathryn McGarry, Mayor

CORPORATE SEAL OF  
MUNICIPALITY

Signed: _____________________________  
Danielle Manton, Clerk

Certified that the above is a true copy of By-law No. _____-2021, as enacted and passed by the Council of the City of Cambridge on the _____ day of _____, 2021.

Signed: _____________________________  
Danielle Manton, Clerk
AMENDMENT NO. ____
OFFICIAL PLAN OF
THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

The attached explanatory text constituting Amendment No. ____ to the Official Plan of the City of Cambridge, was prepared by the Council of the City of Cambridge and was adopted by the Council of the City of Cambridge by By-law No. ____ in accordance with the provisions of Sections 17, 21 and 22 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, on the ____ day of _____, 2021.

Signed: ____________________________
Kathryn McGarry, Mayor

CORPORATE SEAL OF
MUNICIPALITY

Signed: ____________________________
Danielle Manton, Clerk

Signed: ____________________________
David Calder, City Manager

This amendment to the Official Plan of the City of Cambridge, which has been adopted by the Council of the City of Cambridge, is hereby approved in accordance with the provisions of Sections 17, 21 and 22 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990 as Amendment No. ____ to the Official Plan of the City of Cambridge.

____________________________
Date

____________________________
Region of Waterloo
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AMENDMENT NO. ____
TO THE
OFFICIAL PLAN OF
THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

INTRODUCTION

STATEMENT OF COMPONENTS

PART “A”  THE PREAMBLE does not constitute part of this Amendment.

PART “B”  THE AMENDMENT, consisting of the following text constitutes Amendment No. ____ to the Official Plan of the City of Cambridge.

PART “C”  THE APPENDICES do not constitute part of Amendment No. ____ to the Official Plan of the City of Cambridge, and contain planning reports, background information and public and agency comments pertaining to the Amendment.
PART “A” -- THE PREAMBLE

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE AMENDMENT

In 2019, the Province of Ontario expanded the requirements for municipalities to permit ‘Additional Residential Units’ in their Official Plans and Zoning By-laws. As such, an amendment to the Official Plan is required to update the City’s existing ‘Secondary Residential Unit’ terminology, definitions, and policies in the Official Plan and to bring the local policy framework into conformity with the updated Provincial requirements for Additional Residential Units, as required by the Planning Act. Therefore, the purpose of Official Plan Amendment _____ to the City of Cambridge Official Plan is to:

1. Revise Section 2.8.2.7 (Range and Mix of Housing Types) to reflect and incorporate updated Provincial terminology;

2. To delete and replace Section 2.8.2.8 (Secondary Residential Units) to incorporate the new Provincial requirements for Additional Residential Units and to provide criteria for the siting of such units;

3. To add a policy to Section 2.8.2.9 (Garden Suites) to clarify the locational criteria for a garden suite in relation to an Additional Residential Unit;

4. To add a policy to Section 8.6.4 (Home Occupations) to clarify that a home occupation shall not be permitted on a lot that contains an Additional Residential Unit;

5. To delete the definition of a ‘Secondary Residential Unit’ and add new definitions for ‘Additional Residential Unit’ and ‘Primary Dwelling Unit’ to the Official Plan.

These amendments apply to the entirety of the City of Cambridge.

3.0 BASIS OF THE AMENDMENT

Through the 2019 More Homes, More Choices Act (Bill 108), the Province of Ontario expanded the requirements for municipalities to permit ‘Additional Residential Units’ in their Official Plans and Zoning By-laws. More particularly, municipalities are now required to permit Additional Residential Units in detached, semi-detached and row house or townhouse dwellings, and in an accessory building or structure, totalling a potential three (3) dwelling units on a residential lot.

The Province also released implementing regulations (Ontario Regulation 299/19) which includes:
- A stated Provincial policy directive that an Additional Residential Unit may be occupied by any person, regardless of whether the primary dwelling unit is occupied by the owner of the property;

- A provision that an Additional Residential Unit is permitted without regard to the date of construction of the primary residential unit;

- A requirement that each Additional Residential Unit shall have one (1) parking space that is provided and maintained for the sole use of the occupant of the Additional Residential Unit and that such parking may be provided as a tandem parking space;

- A provision that in a case where a municipal Zoning By-law requires no parking spaces for the primary residential unit, that correspondingly, no parking spaces would be required for the Additional Residential Unit(s); and,

- Where a municipal Zoning By-law establishes a parking standard that is lower than a standard of one parking space for each of the additional residential units, the municipal Zoning By-law parking standard would prevail.

The basis for the policy amendments proposed by Official Plan Amendment ____ is established by the provisions of the Planning Act and implementing regulations for Additional Residential Units.

PART “B” -- THE AMENDMENT

1.0 INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

All of this part of the document entitled PART “B” -- THE AMENDMENT, consisting of the following text, constitutes Amendment No. ____ to the Official Plan of the City of Cambridge.

2.0 DETAILS OF THE AMENDMENT

The Official Plan of the City of Cambridge is hereby amended as follows:

1. Section 2.8.2.7 ‘Residential Lands – Range and Mix of Housing Types’ is hereby amended by deleting the words ‘secondary residential unit’ and adding the words ‘additional residential unit’ as follows:

   “7. The City will encourage individual lot intensification, through the creation of additional residential units or garden suites throughout the Urban Area where appropriate, subject to compatibility criteria in Section 8.4.2.”
2. Section 2.8.2.8 ‘Residential Lands – Secondary Residential Unit’ is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

“Additional Residential Units

8. *Additional residential unit(s)* are permitted as-of-right on lands designated for residential uses by this Official Plan in accordance with the criteria below.

a) A maximum of two (2) *additional residential unit(s)* are permitted on a residential lot containing a detached dwelling, semi-detached dwelling, or rowhouse dwelling. Such *additional residential unit(s)* may be located:
   i) within the main residential building on the lot within which the *primary dwelling unit* is located; and/or
   ii) within a detached accessory building that is ancillary to the *primary dwelling unit* on the lot.

Only one (1) *additional dwelling unit* may be permitted in a detached accessory building.

b) The *additional residential unit(s)* must be located on the same lot as the *primary dwelling unit* and must be subordinate in scale and function to the *primary dwelling unit*.

c) The *additional residential unit(s)* must be *compatible* in design and scale with the built form on the lot and with neighbouring residential properties in terms of massing, height, and visual appearance.

d) Any exterior alterations to accommodate an *additional residential unit(s)* within a Heritage Conservation District must have consideration and regard for the policies of the Heritage Conservation District Plan and/or Guidelines. Heritage Alteration Permit approval may be required for alterations to designated properties, including properties located in a Heritage Conservation District.

e) *Additional residential unit(s)* shall be prohibited:
   i) on *hazardous lands* or lots within a *flood plain*; and,
   ii) on lots containing a boarding, lodging or rooming house, *garden suite*, home occupation, or bed and breakfast.

f) Adequate potable water and wastewater treatment must be available to accommodate the *additional residential unit(s)*.
g) No new separate access to a municipal road will be permitted in order to accommodate or provide access to a proposed *additional residential unit(s)*.

h) Parking shall be provided in accordance with the minimum parking standards of the City’s Zoning By-law.

i) Both the *primary dwelling unit* and the *additional residential unit(s)* shall be in compliance with the following:
   i) Building Code;
   ii) Fire Code;
   iii) City of Cambridge minimum standards for maintenance and occupancy; and,
   iv) any other applicable legislation.

j) *Additional residential unit(s)*, shall not be subject to Site Plan Approval.

k) A detached accessory building containing an *additional dwelling unit* shall not be severed from the lot containing the *primary dwelling unit*.

3. Section 2.8.2.9 ‘Residential Lands – Garden Suites’ is hereby amended by adding a new subsection j) as follows:

   “j) A *garden suite* shall not be permitted on a lot with an *additional residential unit* in a detached accessory building.”

4. Section 8.6.4 ‘Home Occupations’ is hereby amended by adding a new subsection g) as follows:

   “g) A home occupation shall not be permitted on a lot with an *additional residential unit*.”

5. Chapter 13 (Definitions) shall be amended by deleting the definition for ‘secondary residential unit’ and adding the following new definitions:

   “*additional residential unit* means a dwelling unit that is subordinate to the primary dwelling unit on a lot.”
“primary dwelling unit means the largest dwelling unit in which the primary residential use of the lot is conducted.”

3.0 IMPLEMENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

The implementation and interpretation of Official Plan Amendment No. ____ shall be in accordance with the respective policies of the Official Plan of the City of Cambridge.

PART “C” -- THE APPENDICES

The following appendices do not constitute part of Official Plan Amendment No. ____ , but are included as information supporting the Amendment.

- Appendix No. 1 - Zoning By-law Amendment
- Appendix No. 2 – Public Comments
FAQ’s from the October 21, 2021 Virtual Open House

Access to ARU’s

Why can’t the proposed 1.2 m (3.94 ft) walkway requirement be part of the driveway?
The primary concern for this requirement is that the existing parking spaces remain. We want to ensure that people aren’t removing their parking in order to create a walkway. On the other end, we also want to ensure that the walkway is not being used to park on. The intent of the walkway is to ensure that there is a clear unobstructed path for emergencies and for safety.

If I am putting in an entrance on the side of my house, will it need to be 1.2 m (3.94 ft) from property line?
Yes, you will need to fit in the required 1.2 m (3.94 ft) walkway. The minimum 1.2 m (3.94 ft) setback is a standard zoning requirement that most residential homes are built to. Also note that an addition of below grade stairs or a landing pad/step at the door may no longer put you in compliance with the 1.2 m (3.94 ft) setback and a minor variance may be required.

Setbacks

Does a detached ARU need to meet a minimum setback of 7.5 m (24.61 ft)?
No. In the proposed by-law detached ARU’s would need to meet a minimum side yard and rear yard setback of 1.2 m (3.94 ft). This is different than the City’s by-law for accessory structures (non-ARU’s), which requires 0.6 m (1.97 ft) setbacks.

Contractors have been allowed to build with less than 1.2 m (3.94 ft) between house and property line, will home owners need to apply for a minor variance if they have less than a 1.2 m (3.94 ft) walkway?
Yes you must meet the 1.2 m (3.94 ft) walkway criteria whether its to a side door, back door or detached ARU in the yard. The homes that are built on smaller lots would not be eligible for a second ARU and may require minor variance applications to meet the walkway requirements in the side yard.

Timelines & Process

When is the City going to approve the bylaws and when can we start applying for building permits?
We are aiming to go to Council in early 2022, targeting January. Since there is no right of appeal on this, once it is adopted by Council, it should take effect right away. There also needs to be an amendment to the Official Plan, which the approval authority is the Region of Waterloo. That puts us at early Spring 2022 for all approvals. If you would like to be notified when the by-law is approved, please email chominiecl@cambridge.ca to be added to the mailing list.

I currently have permit being held up because I don’t meet the current requirements. I would like to wait for new by-law to come into effect so the new regulations apply.
If you’d like to put your building permit application on hold, please contact building@cambridge.ca

I am wondering if I should wait until Spring 2022 when new bylaws come into effect before applying.
The City’s current bylaw does not allow 2 ARU’s on one property. If you applied today, your application would be rejected because it would not comply with the City’s zoning by-law. However, the City’s existing bylaw does allow for 1 ARU on residential properties, subject to specific criteria. If you can meet the criteria today, you can apply for a building permit for 1 ARU. If you do not meet the criteria for 1 ARU or would like 2 ARU’s, it is recommended to wait for the new by-law to take effect.

Once the new regulations are in place, what will be the process for applying for an ARU?
If you meet all the zoning regulations, then you just go straight to building permit. If you do not comply with the regulations, you will need to change your design or go through the minor variance process.

Size of Units

Can you utilize the entire square footage of a bungalow basement? Yes, the 40% will still be a requirement except when it is for a basement. ARU’s can occupy the entire basement, permitting homes like bungalows to have ARU’s. This is an improvement from the current by-law which limited all ARU’s to 40%, making it difficult for bungalows to add ARU’s.

If I use the basement of my home for the first ARU and build the second ARU in my yard as a detached structure, how big can the separate structure be?
It would be calculated as the ground floor area (GFA) of the primary dwelling (excluding the basement). So if the bungalow (without the basement) was 1,000 ft², the ARU in the yard could be a maximum of 40% of 1,000 = 400 ft².

Will lot size will have any impact on the size of a detached ARU in the yard?
Lot size is not a specific requirement in the size of ARU’s, but the ARU need to stay subordinate or secondary to the primary resident, hence the 40% requirement. The maximum floor area for an ARU in an accessory structure shall not exceed the lesser of 40% of the gross floor area for the primary dwelling unit or 80 m² (861 ft²).

Bedroom limitations

Why isn’t the City considering more than 2 bedrooms? Many people need office space now or a 3rd bedroom.
The existing standard in Cambridge right now for ARU’s is 2 bedrooms and it seems to be working, so we weren’t looking to change this requirement. The intent of ARU’s are to be subordinate to the main home. Limiting them to 2 bedrooms will keep most units in line with this criterion.
Parking

Have case studies been looked into regarding bylaw infractions in terms of parking on lawns, parking on the street etc.
The intent of this update is to provide more housing choice. The direction for parking requirements comes straight from the Province. In this update we are hoping to manage some of the parking issues by proposing that the areas around the City with smaller lots (such as the R6 zones, typically new subdivisions) are restricted to only 1 ARU, specifically in response to parking concerns. We looked at a number of cities across the Province and Cambridge has one of the highest parking requirements for ARU’s in its current bylaw. The new proposed parking requirements are now more in line with other municipalities. It is also important to not assume that every person owns a vehicle. The City supports a wide range of sustainable transportation options such as walking, cycling and transit and we cannot always assume that every person owns and operates a vehicle. Less restrictive parking requirements helps support the City’s sustainable transportation goals.

Second storeys on detached ARU’s

Can I add a small loft on top of an existing structure in my yard?
The City still has a height limit of 4.5 m (14.76 ft) on accessory units and does not permit more than 1 storey. A loft on an existing structure would not comply with the Zoning requirements and would likely require a minor variance application.

Design

Any specifications for materials and design when building new units?
The City is not imposing any specific design criteria for ARU’s. As long as the building meets the bylaw and Ontario Building Code.

Can I put a basement in a detached ARU for additional storage?
No, basements are not permitted for ARU’s.

Would a tiny home that is moveable, on wheels and plugs into the primary unit’s heat hydro and water, meet the zoning criteria?
No, tiny mobile homes were not specifically contemplated in this update. A requirement of ARU’s is that they need to connect to municipal services on their own and are intended to be permanent structures. A tiny home, or mobile home, would not meet the zoning criteria for an ARU. More research into these types of homes is underway, but will not be part of this update.

If you have any other questions, please use the ‘Questions’ tab at the bottom of the engage page or email Lisa at chominiecl@cambridge.ca
Additional Residential Unit (ARU) - Survey

SURVEY RESPONSE REPORT
15 August 2018  10 November 2021

PROJECT NAME:
Additional Residential Unit Regulations
SURVEY QUESTIONS
Q1 | Do you currently own or rent an Additional Residential Unit?

**Question options**
- Yes, I OWN an Additional Residential Unit
- No
- Yes, I RENT an Additional Residential Unit

*Mandatory Question (36 response(s))
Question type: Radio Button Question*
Q2 Would you consider building an Additional Residential Unit on your property?

- **Yes**: 15 (46.9%)
- **No**: 17 (53.1%)

**Question options**
- Yes
- No

*Mandatory Question (32 response(s))
Question type: Radio Button Question*
### Q3 Please explain why:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>srl1</td>
<td>Homelessness is endemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munajj Ahamed</td>
<td>For added income to offset the huge increase in mortgage amount in recent years due to severely inflated house prices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OffTheRecord</td>
<td>Because I moved to a single family subdivision so that it wouldn't be congested like a townhouse or condo subdivision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Schueler</td>
<td>For income/investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dbaverstock</td>
<td>possibly an inlaw suite in my basement for elderly parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CourtneyWilson</td>
<td>It depends on how bad the economy gets, but probably not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Schito</td>
<td>Not enough parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annmarie</td>
<td>More affordable housing is needed in Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qdppjyKz2ZiBBkVFc9Vj</td>
<td>I have underutilizes space and could use the extra income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alida</td>
<td>I currently use my entire household. However, I would consider it if I had unused space in my house or on my property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul9119</td>
<td>Additional income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dellis</td>
<td>Extra income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nubelia</td>
<td>With the market as it is I absolutely would, not for lucre but out of need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastsider</td>
<td>Older area and unable to access driveway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAi</td>
<td>To put one small drop into the sea of rental accommodation that is reasonably priced and comfortable to live in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Long</td>
<td>More options for extended family or for extra income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andre H</td>
<td>I own a condominium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricketont</td>
<td>lack of affordable housing!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rz</td>
<td>I do not own property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grechfam</td>
<td>Often times the cities info structures in existing single family home developments can not accommodate multi unit dwellings. creating problems surround refuse storage and disposal, vehicle traffic and parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cdn counsel</td>
<td>Would materially alter the neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td>Housing for aging parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie FF</td>
<td>Great solution for parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser</td>
<td>(1) To contribute to the rental housing stock in Cambridge so there is more decent housing for decent tenants at reasonable rent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Residential Unit (ARU) - Survey: Survey Report for 15 August 2018 to 10 November 2021

amounts and; (2) to lessen the burden of the mortgage, property taxes, insurance, etc, on the property.

Nerina
10/31/2021 07:54 PM

Own a small property

KS17
11/02/2021 12:05 PM

I don't want additional people living on my property or within my home. It adds to more congestion in the neighbourhood and it removes the community feeling.

FFJeff
11/03/2021 12:33 PM

My lot shape is not conducive for such a dwelling. My basement is unfinished and would require major renovations to create a safe living space. Unless financial compensation would be offered by the governments, it's not feasible.

Shawn S
11/03/2021 04:41 PM

There are not enough parking spots for more people to live in residential unit

MattJ
11/04/2021 09:02 PM

The neighborhood is already dense enough; houses are close together and the road is narrow. Population density is an on-going issue for neighborhoods which were not designed with this in mind.

Smartypants
11/04/2021 10:15 PM

For my Mother

Tcrutcher
11/07/2021 04:27 PM

I purchased a single family home in a single family residential area.

Mandatory Question (32 response(s))

Question type: Essay Question
Q4  The proposed change will permit a third ARU within any single, semi-detached and row homes, or in an accessory building on the lot, as long as zones have minimum frontages of 15 metres or greater. Do you agree with this proposed change?

Question options

- Yes
- No

Mandatory Question (36 response(s))

Question type: Radio Button Question
Q5  Please provide reasons for your answer above:

srl1  
10/28/2021 03:41 PM  
We don't need more space

Munajj Ahamed  
10/28/2021 04:20 PM  
15 meter requirement is excessively high. Kitchener, Guelph and Waterloo has a requirement of 9m frontage only. Where is the requirement for 15m coming from?

OffTheRecord  
10/28/2021 04:31 PM  
I am seeing homes on my street already being converted to duplexes and basement suites. It's causing congestion on the streets because the renters are parking 2 and 3 vehicles. There is more noise with the increased people, dogs barking and cars. Home frontage green space is being reduced to accommodate an extra parking spot. Garbage is being left at the front of the home along with dog poop with increased vermin in the neighbourhood. No bylaw to be seen when complaints have been made.

Gavin  
10/28/2021 06:22 PM  
I believe the city needs more affordable housing and I think this is a step in the right direction in making that happen

LA Schueler  
10/28/2021 06:34 PM  
If it makes sense to give people more affordable housing

dbaverstock  
10/29/2021 09:22 AM  
I feel it would reduce the possibility of increased high density

CourtneyWilson  
10/29/2021 09:59 AM  
There's a very limited amount of low income housing available - this may be an option for finding low income housing and may be necessary

Andrew Schito  
10/29/2021 10:40 AM  
If it has adequate space in the front and parking.

Lori  
10/29/2021 10:56 AM  
Two units per property is enough. You would create a traffic nightmare and safety concerns on the residential roads. Also who would monitor the safety of these units. Is the infrastructure able to
cope? Would the extra vehicles block access for emergency vehicles and snow removal???

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Username</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annmarie</td>
<td>10/29/2021 11:06 AM</td>
<td>Shouldn't be a restriction on frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qdpqjKz2ZiBBkVFc9Vj</td>
<td>10/29/2021 11:08 AM</td>
<td>Too dense to be supported by current services, schools, parks, recreation facilities, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alida</td>
<td>10/29/2021 11:28 AM</td>
<td>Housing is an issue and this is one way to create more housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul9119</td>
<td>10/29/2021 11:53 AM</td>
<td>We are lacking a medium density housing in many areas across Canada. I support any initiative to address this seriously and provide housing for folks across Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dellis</td>
<td>10/29/2021 12:09 PM</td>
<td>Provides affordable housing and extra income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nubelia</td>
<td>10/29/2021 01:05 PM</td>
<td>I agree with the additional units, however I have no use for the so called frontage malarky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastsider</td>
<td>10/29/2021 04:21 PM</td>
<td>Parking and density. Too many cars parked on the street now and we'll be like rats attacking each other with super high density.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAi</td>
<td>10/29/2021 05:59 PM</td>
<td>Then there can be 2 drops into the sea of rental accommodation that are reasonable priced and comfortable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Long</td>
<td>10/29/2021 06:11 PM</td>
<td>we need more housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andre H</td>
<td>10/29/2021 07:25 PM</td>
<td>Parking is a major concern. Three units on these small lots is too many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricketont</td>
<td>10/29/2021 09:35 PM</td>
<td>The amount of frontage your property has should not matter if there is enough room to place a unit in your back yard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a strong need for affordable housing. Having more units available should increase supply and hopefully approach meeting demand. As a student at the UW School of Architecture in Galt, I know that there is a need for more rental units to support the undergraduate and graduate student populations.

Current infrastructure does not support for these changes as it will perpetuate issues surrounding increased refuse storage and disposal concerns, increased vehicle traffic and parking concerns in residential neighbourhoods. Additionally, it encourages the installation of unregistered or something legal units with pose both a health and safety risk to all residents in the neighbourhood.

Proper multi unit buildings should be constructed rather than jamming people into single family homes.

With the current housing crisis, and long waiting lists at seniors residences, we need to have viable alternatives to keep our elderly in a safe, affordable environment.

Great alternative

I think a minimum frontage of 12 metres is sufficient.

It is important to have options to leverage your property.

Homes and houses should not be used as a business entity which many homes are currently illegally. It adds to further congestion in a small neighbourhood with additional parking of vehicles. It makes neighbourhood less community and family friendly because we don't know our neighbours. It makes neighbourhoods overly dense.

Usually parking is an issue.

I'm not entirely sure of the question but if there is ample room around each structure then it should work. Overcrowding would be
the biggest issue as would be access to alley’s. Basement units should be allowed.

Shawn S 11/03/2021 04:41 PM

Answer provided on previous question. I invite you to come around newer sub divisions that only have one driveway for residential unit. You can see all the people parking on the roads. This create safety issues with site lines for driving. It also makes it harder for emergency services to navigate streets.

Donna S 11/04/2021 01:41 PM

We desperately need affordable housing and home owners need help affording their bills to maintain home ownership so this is a win-win situation.

MattJ 11/04/2021 09:02 PM

New areas should be zoned with growth in mind; most home owners purchase their houses because they like the area. Having additional families move in and adding to noise, parking, etc., is not something that existing home owners can do anything about.

Smartypants 11/04/2021 10:15 PM

Affordable housing situation is desperate

Tcrutcher 11/07/2021 04:27 PM

I purchased a single family dwelling in a residential area of single family homes that already has traffic problems. The area would not support with infrastructure with extra traffic

MikeF 11/10/2021 02:26 PM

It is important to provide safe and affordable housing.

Mandatory Question (36 response(s))

Question type: Essay Question
Q6 | The proposed change will require an accessory building used for an ARU to be set back the same distance from the interior and exterior side lot lines as the primary home. Currently, buildings must be set back a minimum of 1.2 metres from the interior...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Please provide reasons for your answer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sr11</td>
<td>Its logical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/2021 03:41 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OffTheRecord</td>
<td>Build more apartments along Hespeler road instead of congesting single family neighbourhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/2021 04:31 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Schueler</td>
<td>I don't even understand what that question means. You need a diagram.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/2021 06:34 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dbaverstock</td>
<td>I don't want to see properties look congested or junkie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/2021 09:22 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CourtneyWilson</td>
<td>It makes sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/2021 09:59 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Schito</td>
<td>As long as the size of the lot is large enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/2021 10:40 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annmarie</td>
<td>Seems reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/2021 11:06 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qdppjyKz2ziBBkVFc9Vj</td>
<td>Individual site locations should determine, not a blanket statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/2021 11:08 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul9119</td>
<td>Minimum set backs are unnecessary and are an antiquated way of thinking with a car focused society. We should abolish any minimum set back in Cambridge, including for ARUs and increase density to make the community more walkable, bikeable, and livable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/2021 11:53 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dellis</td>
<td>Should be less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/2021 12:09 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nubelia</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I don't agree with higher density

The setbacks allow for a recognized amount of privacy/sight lines

we need to make it easy to do this

don't think all that distance is really necessary

6 metres is excessive

This seems reasonable

I think the exterior lot line setback can be 4.5 metres.

Seems reasonable.

Lots are getting smaller in Cambridge.

Each lot or potential is unique. Is there a back alley? Houses can be built closer to the alley than a front or side street. However if no back alley then the homeowner behind the potential site needs to have a say and financial compensation if a home is built closer to the rear or side of their property.

Same as previous answers

I believe that is enough space for a setback allowance
MattJ
11/04/2021 09:02 PM

It is an attempt to make sure structures are not right on top of neighboring property lines.

Optional question (24 response(s), 12 skipped)

Question type: Essay Question
Q8 The Province requires that 2 ARU’s be permitted on a lot with a single, semi-detached or row home. The City is considering two possible configurations to accommodate this. Please indicate which of the options below you feel would be most appropriate.

Question options
- Main home + 1 ARU within (i.e. basement), + 1 ARU within an accessory building.
- Main home + 2 ARU’s within. No ARU’s permitted in accessory buildings.
- I have no preference as to how the three units are configured between the main home and any accessory building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Username</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>srl1</td>
<td>10/28/2021 03:41 PM</td>
<td>Need flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munajj Ahamed</td>
<td>10/28/2021 04:20 PM</td>
<td>Complete irrelevant as long as long the facade of a particular property is unaffected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OffTheRecord</td>
<td>10/28/2021 04:31 PM</td>
<td>I don't agree with congesting single family home subdivisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin</td>
<td>10/28/2021 06:22 PM</td>
<td>Think it's a good idea to make better use of the outside spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Schueler</td>
<td>10/28/2021 06:34 PM</td>
<td>I don't think it matters. Depends on the house and property capacities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dbaverstock</td>
<td>10/29/2021 09:22 AM</td>
<td>I don't want properties to look junkie or congested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CourtneyWilson</td>
<td>10/29/2021 09:59 AM</td>
<td>I don't know why this is a required answer seeing as I said I have no preference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Schito</td>
<td>10/29/2021 10:40 AM</td>
<td>I think there should really be one ARU in a house. The third should be in an accessory building. Again parking needs to be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>10/29/2021 10:56 AM</td>
<td>I do not choose any of these answers as I'm opposed to it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annmarie</td>
<td>10/29/2021 11:06 AM</td>
<td>More affordable housing is needed in Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qdpjjyKz2ZiBBkVFc9Vj</td>
<td>10/29/2021 11:08 AM</td>
<td>This provision only applies if other requirements are met. Better control over density.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Timestamp</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alida</td>
<td>10/29/2021 11:28 AM</td>
<td>Each household/property is different and it may make more sense for one option than the other per household/property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul9119</td>
<td>10/29/2021 11:53 AM</td>
<td>Again, we need to increase density by any means necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dellis</td>
<td>10/29/2021 12:09 PM</td>
<td>The more options the better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nubelia</td>
<td>10/29/2021 01:05 PM</td>
<td>Third solution will do fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastsider</td>
<td>10/29/2021 04:21 PM</td>
<td>I do NOT agree with the Province on this mandate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAi</td>
<td>10/29/2021 05:59 PM</td>
<td>Lot size and configuration vary so much that either option could be the most appropriate, depending on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Long</td>
<td>10/29/2021 06:11 PM</td>
<td>Give people choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andre H</td>
<td>10/29/2021 07:25 PM</td>
<td>The lots are already small and not large enough for additional units within accessory structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricketont</td>
<td>10/29/2021 09:35 PM</td>
<td>I think one backyard living unit per house would be enough. example tiny house plus two sheds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rz</td>
<td>10/29/2021 10:07 PM</td>
<td>-2 additional ARU's in a single home could result in small, cramped, unsafe spaces, however, if there is regulation and oversight to ensure safety, this is less of a concern. ARU's in accessory buildings are my preference because it allows for more configurations of dwelling units and has a lot of potential for taking advantage of Cambridge's laneways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grechfam</td>
<td>10/29/2021 11:25 PM</td>
<td>Aru’s permitted in accessory buildings would more negatively impact neighbourhoods and their environment. Reduced green space, and increased travel around the exterior of homes could negatively impact surround neighbours in single family dwellings. Additional structures could also have a negative impact on drainage on as well as adjacent properties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clarke 10/30/2021 04:08 PM
Most homes can't accommodate (or want) 2 ARU's within. We need to be able to have a separate unit in an accessory building.

Connie FF 10/30/2021 04:41 PM
I don't have a preference

Laser 10/30/2021 05:57 PM
I like that there can be flexibility in the configuration so that ARUs may be approved in more eligible properties and structures.

Nerina 10/31/2021 07:54 PM
I think we don't want to have many small units in a property.

KS17 11/02/2021 12:05 PM
I prefer that there are no ARUs allowed at all.

Lucilia Schito 11/02/2021 06:54 PM
I strongly disagree with adding any ARU on these small lots.

FFJeff 11/03/2021 12:33 PM
Each situation is unique. I'm unclear as to how the mandate works but how can they mandate an ARU within a private home? I must be reading that incorrectly however the way the question reads "The Province requires that 2 ARU's be permitted on a lot with a single..home" so does that mean that each property can now have 2 ARU's?

Shawn S 11/03/2021 04:41 PM
No comment

Donna S 11/04/2021 01:41 PM
If there is space to add an accessory building, I think it should be permitted and owners should be able to make the choice between 2 ARU's within the home or 1 with an accessory building.

MattJ 11/04/2021 09:02 PM
Ultimately whether the internal or external, the population density in areas not designed for the increase is the issue.
Smartypants
11/04/2021 10:15 PM

Each property would be unique and flexibility is essential

Tcrutcher
11/07/2021 04:27 PM

It’s the least impact to our traffic congestion and strain on infrastructure

MikeF
11/10/2021 02:26 PM

More options to create more units is important

Mandatory Question (36 response(s))

Question type: Essay Question
Q10  At the present time, an ARU is permitted in an accessory building provided it has a lot coverage that does not exceed 10%. Smaller lots would permit only a very small ARU. The proposed change would permit an ARU with a maximum gross floor area that...

```
  18 (50.0%)
  18 (50.0%)
```

**Question options**

- Yes
- No

*Optional question (36 response(s), 0 skipped)*

*Question type: Radio Button Question*
**Q11** If no, what would be an appropriate size for an ARU in an accessory structure and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Username</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>srl1</td>
<td>Tiny home size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munajj Ahamed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OffTheRecord</td>
<td>I don’t agree with congestion in single family neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin</td>
<td>I think the bigger home possible for someone to live in the better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Schueler</td>
<td>I agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dbaverstock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CourtneyWilson</td>
<td>Again, with a lack of low-income housing options available, I think we need to be able to accommodate this. It makes sense to make the available maximum gross floor area larger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Schito</td>
<td>I think the size now is sufficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>I disagree with this proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annmarie</td>
<td>I think it could be 20-30% of the floor area of the primary home, because more affordable housing is needed in Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qdpjzyKz2ZBBBVFc9Vj</td>
<td>I didn’t say no!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Username</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul9119</td>
<td>A good first step but the ARU should have no maximum gross floor area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dellis</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nubelia</td>
<td>Nitpicking but it will do and considering the Cambridge I grew up in it is at least a considerable step forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastsider</td>
<td>consider present zoning. It's there for a reason.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAi</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Long</td>
<td>We don't wan the ARU too large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andre H</td>
<td>I live in a condominium that is 700 square feet. The proposed size is too large for an ARU in an accessory structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricketont</td>
<td>must not exceed over 50% of backyard green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rz</td>
<td>I support this change. More development on already developed land is advantageous for livening our city through densification, and will hopefully slow sprawling developments--which are detrimental to the environment and to the walk-ability/accessibility of the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grechfam</td>
<td>Loss of green space, drainage on property. And number of residents in the ARU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cdnounsel</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NA

Yes

50% or 90 square metres

Makes sense the aru to be smaller.

There shouldn't be any ARUs in Cambridge

Small homes don't have room to have multiple families living together.

If the proposed ARU is separate from the main structure, then the size of the proposed ARU should have no relevance to the min structure. People need a little bit of space for a single bed possibly, a table for two, a table for a computer/tv, some cupboards and counter space for a kitchen. Then a separate small bathroom with shower stall, toilet and vanity. Whatever size that takes is what a bare minimum.

see previous answers

I do think there needs to be a limit as to how much land the ARU is permitted to cover on a lot so that it leaves room for greenspace which creates enjoyment of outdoor areas

n/a

No idea

It has nothing to do with the size of the property but the traffic
11/07/2021 04:27 PM  congestion in the area

MikeF  11/10/2021 02:26 PM  The typically property used for ARU's in other cities are bungalows that are roughly 1000sq ft, 40% is a max of 400sqft. I find this to be a very small space. Perhaps a percentage of the lot size to be allowed ??

Mandatory Question (36 response(s))

Question type: Essay Question
Q12 At the present time, one parking space is required per bedroom. This parking standard will be changed to one parking space per unit to comply with Provincial requirements. However, the City proposes to not require parking for the second or third A...

Question options
- Yes
- No

Mandatory Question (36 response(s))
Question type: Radio Button Question
Q13  Please provide reasons for your answer:

sr11  10/28/2021 03:41 PM
Most people who need this housing will be cycling or busing

Munajj Ahamed  10/28/2021 04:20 PM
N/A

OffTheRecord  10/28/2021 04:31 PM
Providing 2 spots per unit is essential. A home down my street just added a one bedroom unit where a couple live. Both have a car. Only one spot provided. Now they park on the street infront of neighbours houses, along with their friends, preventing other home owners from having guest parking.

Gavin  10/28/2021 06:22 PM
Not everybody who needs somewhere to live has a car and needs somewhere to park, I don’t believe a parking space should be a requirement but if the person does have a car then they should look for somewhere with appropriate parking

LA Schueler  10/28/2021 06:34 PM
Makes sense

dbaverstock  10/29/2021 09:22 AM
not everyone is going to use the LRT, people will still have cars

CourtneyWilson  10/29/2021 09:59 AM
When the transit situation in the city improves (with LRT), then people would be able to get through the city without a car.

Andrew Schito  10/29/2021 10:40 AM
This will be the biggest problem with these changes. As much as I love to see more people in Cambridge take transit, the reality is Cambridge is a car city. It's very sprawled out which means travelling around the city by car is the easiest. The light rail transit in Cambridge is still far off. Allowing ARU's without parking is a disaster waiting to happen. Smaller subdivisions will be clogged with cars on the streets.

Lori  10/28/2021 04:11 PM
This is ludicrous to propose and everyone knows there will be an
overflow of vehicles on city streets. City council is making yet another mistake for this city

If the unit did not have parking, the rental price could reflect that. Not all renters have a vehicle(s). Again, there needs to be more affordable housing for Cambridge residents.

The LRT is still many years away if built at all but residents will be putting up with the problems immediately. It now takes two incomes to afford rent so relaxed parking restrictions just exacerbate the problems.

Not everybody has a vehicle.

If places are walkable, they do not need additional parking spaces.

I agree as not everyone has a car

Its fine, not to nitpick but is there any reason why are own bus lines do not inspire such an exemption? I am all for the light rail and cannot wait for it but we are not all going to live adjacent.

City Hall needs to reconsider the decisions being made here. Do the planners live in Cambridge? If not then they seem to feel free to make decisions that do NOT affect them. Shame!

Parking shouldn't determine if a residence is an option since some people won't have cars.

again, make it easy

Multiple families require multiple vehicles. This change will create a mess with vehicles parking on the streets and on the boulevard. This is not a good idea.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Username</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cricketont</td>
<td>10/29/2021 09:35 PM</td>
<td>light rail?? what about the city bus? As of now there are rental units that charge for parking or have no parking at all it should be left to the home owner to decide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rz</td>
<td>10/29/2021 10:07 PM</td>
<td>This change will encourage the use and development of robust public transit, which is good for the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grechfam</td>
<td>10/29/2021 11:25 PM</td>
<td>Parking will continue to become a problem as more ppl reside at the residence. Homeowners with ARU's will proceed to widen there driveways illegally making them oversized often into the properties setback causing more green space loss and water drainage issues. Street scapes would deteriorate as multiple cars would be parked across the fronts of these homes often times causing concerns regarding fire safety as access to the front of the homes become obstructed with vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cdcounsel</td>
<td>10/30/2021 01:19 AM</td>
<td>Will lead to an overwhelming amount of street parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td>10/30/2021 04:08 PM</td>
<td>Street parking would become a nightmare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie FF</td>
<td>10/30/2021 04:41 PM</td>
<td>Make more eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser</td>
<td>10/30/2021 05:57 PM</td>
<td>Makes sense to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nerina</td>
<td>10/31/2021 07:54 PM</td>
<td>There should be a parking allowance regardless of where the property is located.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS17</td>
<td>11/02/2021 12:05 PM</td>
<td>There should be limit of parking of 2-3 vehicles per home not per unit or bedroom. There are many Cambridge neighbourhood streets that are filled with more cars than houses. It adds to congestion to streets that are trying to encourage physical activity. There have been children hit by vehicles on Cambridge streets because the streets look like parking lots for cars. How does it promote physical activity and community building when we live in a parking lot and it becomes unsafe for children?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lucilia Schito  
11/02/2021 06:54 PM 
Parking is always an issue and will be unsafe for children in the area.. with more traffic.

FFJeff  
11/03/2021 12:33 PM 
People need cars. Period. Regardless of living, working on or near a LRT, GO station or public transit, people still need cars. They need to park them somewhere when they take the LRT to work. To not understand that and to continuously push a no car mentality is not helping the situation at all. What of those people who have family and friends nowhere near LRT, GO or public transit or who work out of the region and require a car to get to work?

Shawn S  
11/03/2021 04:41 PM 
Previous answers. There already is not enough parking

Donna S  
11/04/2021 01:41 PM 
I agree with this suggestion.

MattJ  
11/04/2021 09:02 PM 
As long as parking enforcement is proactive, this could be a benefit / incentive to have residents use public transit.

Smartypants  
11/04/2021 10:15 PM 
Many units are eliminating parking availability

Tcrutcher  
11/07/2021 04:27 PM 
The extra parking space will be the road regardless and when visitors come it addes to the problems. Unless there are constant bylaw patrolled it will not matter how many parking spots are approved

MikeF  
11/10/2021 02:26 PM 
Creating parking is always a challenge especially when there is landscape area requirements.

Mandatory Question (36 response(s))
Question type: Essay Question

Q14 Is there anything else you’d like to share?

Munajj Ahamed  
10/28/2021 04:20 PM 
The current requirement of having a lot area of 450 sqm and 11m frontage is not acceptable given all of our neighboring cities in the greater horseshoes area have significantly lower ceiling for getting
a secondary unit established. Also, it is highly suggested to investigate further training for the committee of adjustment members on what the definition of a minor variance is as they are extremely ill trained have very little knowledge about what the 4 tests entails. They are costing residences a lot of money for appealing their decisions to LPAT where it is eventually getting overruled and dismissed. The entire ordeal also takes a painstakingly long time due to backlogs. This can be just avoided if the committee of adjustment members are properly trained and does not make decisions based on their own personal preferences of what should constitute a legal secondary unit and what they think is minor. The definition of a minor variance has been defined several times previously in provincial court.

OffTheRecord 10/28/2021 04:31 PM

Nope

Gavin 10/28/2021 06:22 PM

I’m not sure if you are also changing the lot size requirement for allowing aru’s but think the 450 m2 currently is too big and smaller lots should be allowed also without having to go thru the committee of adjustments because that whole process is a waste of time and money, also don’t think a aru in a basement for example should have to be less than 40% of main home, if it’s able to be bigger then why not let it be bigger, more space the better for people, thanks

LA Schueler 10/28/2021 06:34 PM

No

dbaverstock 10/29/2021 09:22 AM

no

CourtneyWilson 10/29/2021 09:59 AM

No

Andrew Schito 10/29/2021 10:40 AM

I understand the need for more housing in the region but I do believe that this won’t ultimately solve our housing problem. In my opinion, we will be incentivising investors to buy up more properties in order to convert them into multi-units to make more profit. Allowing more ARU's will only drive the price of homes up further making it harder for my generation to purchase their first home. Furthermore, the smaller sub-divisions where lots are very close together and space is limited will have constant issues with cars. I
currently live in a new subdivision and we already struggle with parking. There is already one applicant who filed a minor variance to have a basement apartment installed in his house. He didn't meet the lot size requirements. In his application, he specified that he has the required tandem parking to install a unit. In reality, he has multiple cars and ends up parking on his lawn or illegally on the street. So the question becomes, how are we going to enforce parking to allow these ARU's? Currently, the by-law department is inundated with complaints that they simply can't keep up. Thank you.

Lori
10/29/2021 10:56 AM

The mayor wants to make Cambridge into something that no one else wants. She should have run for mayor in a larger city, after all, apparently you don't have yo live where you are the mayor.

Annmarie
10/29/2021 11:06 AM

I'd love to see this go ahead so that more lower income people in Cambridge would have access to affordable housing.

qdppjyKz2ZiBBkVFc9Vj
10/29/2021 11:08 AM

Tighter provisions for property standards need to be enforced for absentee landlords so slums aren’t created.

Alida
10/29/2021 11:28 AM

I really hope that Council listens and takes into consideration what the community wants versus implementing their own agenda based on their recent actions.

Paul9119
10/29/2021 11:53 AM

Cambridge should focus on medium density housing with walkable areas and mixed uses (retail, housing, office space, etc).

Dellis
10/29/2021 12:09 PM

This is great progress.

nubelia
10/29/2021 01:05 PM

Nimby is the biggest problem with this city and hit always has been, these changes are welcome.

CAi
10/29/2021 05:59 PM

1. It wasn't made clear concerning services: will additional water and sewer connections from the street be an option? 2. It wasn't made clear what the landscaping requirements would be.

Kathy Long
We need more options for homes and our parents would like to
stay home longer - make it easy to have options

Yes tiny homes should be allowed in Cambridge. With the price of housing no wonder why we have so many homeless people

As ARU’s grow in popularity so do many of the issues that follow such as; home overcrowding, illegal units, parking issues, loss of green space, and permeable landscape, noise violations, snow removal increased pedestrian and vehicular traffic just to name a few. Refuse often becomes a major issue as Regional or Municipal garbage collections do not make additional accommodations for homes with ARU’s

Build more appropriate multi unit structures instead.

We need to utilize useable spaces to accommodate our growing population. To be able to ensure our elderly are taken care of. To assist our children in transitioning out of our home, recognizing the prohibitive costs of homes in this region.

No

It's important the city enforces property care. With so many rentals, property conditions tend to deteriorate bringing down the look of the entire neighborhood.

There are too many illegal rooming houses posing as “family” members living in one home to get around being called a rooming house. It is suspicious when there are multiple single people, sometimes up to 6-8 people living in single family, single car driveway homes with 6-8 cars in the driveway, on the boulevard, on the road (taking up all the shared street parking). ARUs are not the solution/strategy to create more affordable housing, it is about landlords jam packing people into homes as a business and making large sums of money while it changes the neighbourhood to being less community and family friendly. ARUs become a loop hole for landlords that come in from Toronto and GTA to make money for themselves and not have to care about the neighbourhood because they don't live in Cambridge. The street
parking in these neighbourhoods have become a problem, because there is nothing available for anyone as these rental homes keep cars parked on the road 24/7 and claim the street parking as if it is for them only. There is no consideration that it is shared space and everyone should be parking their vehicles in their own driveway. This is becoming a problem that people in my neighbourhood can’t have family get togethers because there is never anywhere to park. It is not fair that single families live and follow the rules while multiple renters can take advantage and have their rights protected. I often wonder what it will be like for first responders who have to respond in an emergency but are held up by the parking of so many vehicles in an overly dense home.

Lucilia Schito
11/02/2021 06:54 PM
I totally disagree with Additional Residential Units being put in homes where the parking is an issue and small lots.

FFJeff
11/03/2021 12:33 PM
ARU's can work in some places for sure and won't in others. Each property is unique. In order for this project to improve there has to be financial incentives for current property owners to update, renovate their homes, and property. A major change has to occur in the Landlord/Tenant Act in order to hep with disputes especially if a basement ARU is being created.

Shawn S
11/03/2021 04:41 PM
With the amount of money homes are going for, it is not realistic that there will only be one car in a driveway. It should be a bylaw to have a minimum two parking spots per house hold. If adding ARU, should have parking spots as set out previously.

Donna S
11/04/2021 01:41 PM
Nothing at this time.

MattJ
11/04/2021 09:02 PM
Many Cambridge neighborhoods are already overpopulated. Houses are oversized compared to the lots, and as density goes up, we see more issues, such as pedestrians being struck by vehicles. Additionally, making changes to existing neighborhoods is unfair to people who purchased their homes under the premise that they would only have single neighbors on either side. Higher density residential zones also leads to parking issues.

MikeF
11/10/2021 02:26 PM
Its great to see Cambridge more welcoming of creating more units. The current and previous requirements are a bit challenging from an investor point of view. Essentially a path of least resistance to
create these units will be successful in attracting investors to create them. At the moment it tends to deter some investors. Thank you!

Optional question (29 response(s), 7 skipped)

Question type: Essay Question
Recommendation

THAT City staff continue with the review of application 30CDM-21101 and preparation of conditions of draft approval for the reasons set out in report 21-298 (CD).

Executive Summary

Purpose

- The purpose of this report is to advise Council and the tenants of the receipt of an application for a condominium conversion.

- The applicant has applied to the Region of Waterloo (approval authority for this type of application) for a condominium conversion of a three storey, 20-unit rental apartment building located at 48 George St N.

- The proposed development was reviewed and approved through the site plan process (SP17/15).

- In accordance with the Official Plan, a public meeting is required to be held where the owner and all tenants of the subject building are invited.

Key Findings

- The built form, number of units, permitted uses, parking, etc. already has approval through previous applications.

- The condominium conversion is for the tenure (ownership) of the development only, to allow each apartment unit to be sold with exclusive use parking spaces, while common areas (driveway, outdoor landscaping, lobby, mechanical and
electrical rooms, corridors and elevator) are owned and maintained by a future condominium corporation.

Financial Implications

- The subject property is located in a Core Area and fees ($8,700 for a condominium application fee) are waived in accordance with the Community Improvement Plan
- Any costs of the application are borne by the applicant.

Background

The applicant has applied to the Region of Waterloo (the approval authority for this type of application) for a Plan of Condominium (condominium conversion) located at 48 George St N. The development was previously approved through a site plan application (SP17/15). The applicant is not proposing any exterior alterations to the building or site.

The purpose of this report is to advise Council and the tenants of the receipt of an application for a condominium conversion. In accordance with Official Plan Policy 8.4.4.2 c) prior to the Region of Waterloo making a decision on the application, a public meeting is required to be held to which the owner and all tenants of the subject building are invited. The application has also been circulated for comment/draft conditions to City departments.

Existing and Surrounding Land Uses:

The subject property is located on the west side of George St N, north of Crescent Pl. and south of Blair Rd. The property is 1,550.6 m² (0.38 ac) in size, with access from George St N.

The uses surrounding the subject property consist of office/commercial to the north and south, single detached/converted office dwellings to the east, and multiple residential to the west.
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 2.1 Provide a wide range of ways that people can become involved in city decision making.

This report is for a public meeting required by the Official Plan to inform the tenants of the intended form of ownership for the current rental apartment building.

Comments

The Region of Waterloo is the Approval Authority for plans of condominium. The Planning Act does not require a public meeting for a condominium conversion (standard plan of condominium); however, the City’s Official Plan requires a public meeting be held on the proposed conversion, to which the owner and the tenants of the subject building are invited.

The development was approved through site plan application SP17/15 which was reviewed by staff and external agencies. The built form, number of units, permitted uses, parking, etc. are in conformity with the City' Official Plan and Zoning By-law. The
building is comprised of bachelor, one-bedroom and two-bedroom units each with their own private balcony.

The condominium conversion is for the tenure (ownership) of the development only, to allow each dwelling unit to be sold separately. The proposed draft plan of condominium includes the following:

- Three-storey multiple-residential building with 20 dwelling units
- 20 residential parking spaces (exclusive use units)
- Residential entrance, lobby, vestibule, stairwells, and elevators (common element)
- Bike Storage (common element)
- Office Space (common element)
- Outdoor landscapes area (common element)
- Garbage facilities (common element)
- Mechanical and electrical rooms (common element)

The public meeting is to provide information to the public and Council regarding the intended form of ownership of the units as the development itself (built form, number of units, permitted uses, parking, etc.) already has approval through previous applications.

**Existing Policy/By-Law**

City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012)

The 2012 City of Cambridge Official Plan designates the subject lands as ‘Galt City Centre Core Area’ which permits a range of uses including multiple-residential.

The City’s Official Plan includes policies on condominium conversions in section 8.4.4 which contains criteria that may permit the conversion of affordable rental multi-residential developments where such conversion will not have a significant impact on the supply of affordable housing for rent in Cambridge.

The Official Plan defines ‘affordable’ rental housing as the least expensive of:

i. a unit for which the rent does not exceed 30% of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households; or

ii. a unit for which the rent is at or below the average market rent of a unit in the regional market area. (PPS)
The subject building was intended to be condominium tenure but the building was occupied prior to the plan of condominium application being submitted to the Region which resulted in the need for a condominium conversion application. The units were not built for rental nor were they built/marketed for affordable rental housing.

The applicant has provided a Planning Justification Report in support of the application indicating the current rent is not considered affordable. The Region of Waterloo has reviewed the rent roll and determined the rental units are not affordable according to the Regional Official Plan which shares the same definition as affordable in the City’s Official Plan. Therefore, the proposed conversion would not have adverse impacts on the supply of affordable housing for rent in Cambridge in conformity with the Official Plan.

Subsection 2 of the policy requires the following conditions to be satisfied:

a) a detailed inspection report on the physical condition of the property by a qualified architect or engineer

b) cash-in-lieu of parkland dedication

c) a public meeting has been held on the proposed conversion, to which the owner and all tenants of the building were invited

d) tenants have the option to continue to lease their units in accordance with the provisions of the Residential Tenancies Act; and

e) tenants are given the right of first refusal to purchase a condominium unit

This public meeting satisfies item c) and the other items will be addressed through conditions of draft approval.

City of Cambridge Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended

The subject lands are zoned C1RM1 (Commercial and Multiple Residential) in Zoning By-law No. 150-85 which permits a wide range of residential uses including an apartment building. The development is consistent with the current zoning classification.

**Financial Impact**

- The subject property is located in a Core Area and fees ($8,700 for a condominium application fee) are waived in accordance with the Community Improvement Plan

- Any costs of the application are borne by the applicant.
Public Input

In accordance with policy 8.4.4.2 (d) of the Official Plan, notice of this public meeting has been provided to all tenants of the project, based on the current tenant list provided by the applicant. Any interested parties and members of the public will be provided with an opportunity to speak to this proposal at the December 14, 2021 public meeting.

Internal/External Consultation

This application and supporting studies have been circulated to the departments and agencies outlined in Appendix 3.

Conclusion

Formal comments from city staff and external agencies are required in order to complete a comprehensive analysis of this application and to form conditions of draft approval for the condominium. A recommendation letter to the Region of Waterloo with draft conditions will be prepared for the review and approval of the Chief Planner in accordance with Delegation By-law no. 42-01. No further staff report on this matter will be prepared.

Signature

Division Approval

Reviewed by the CFO
Reviewed by Legal Services

Name: Lisa Prime, MCIP, RPP
Title: Chief Planner

Departmental Approval

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

Name: David Calder
Title: City Manager

Attachments

- Appendix No. 1 – Draft Plan of Condominium
- Appendix No. 2 – Existing Zoning Map
- Appendix No. 3 – Internal/External Circulation
Appendix No. 3 – Internal/External Circulation

This application has been circulated to the departments listed below. The Region of Waterloo is the approval authority for plans of condominium and, as such, circulated external agencies for comment.

- City of Cambridge Engineering and Transportation Services Division
- City of Cambridge Planning Services Division
- City of Cambridge Fire Department
- City of Cambridge Building Division
1. **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 10:04 a.m.
2. Indigenous Territory Acknowledgement

3. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest


Due to a recent lease he signed.

4. Public Meeting Notice

5. Public Meetings

5.1 21-218(CRS) Development Charges Background Study & By-law Amendment Public Meeting

Motion: 21-243

Moved by Councillor Devine
Seconded by Councillor Mann

THAT report 21-218(CRS) re: Development Charges Background Study & By-law Amendment Public Meeting be received;

AND THAT the development charges background study and draft by-law be referred back to staff for subsequent review and recommendation.

In Favour (8): Councillor Reid, Councillor Devine, Councillor Mann, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Adshade, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Absent (1): Councillor Liggett

Carried (8 to 0)

5.1.1 Consultant Presentation - Watson and Associates Economists Ltd.

5.2 21-226 (CD) Public Meeting Report – 40 Albert Street, Zoning By-law Amendment – Kelly Dacosta (c/o Ron Rogan)

Motion: 21-244

Moved by Councillor Adshade
Seconded by Councillor Wolf
THAT report 21-226 (CD) - Public Meeting Report – 40 Albert Street, Zoning By-law Amendment – Kelly Dacosta (c/o Ron Rogan) - be received;

AND THAT application R04/21 for 40 Albert Street be referred back to staff for a subsequent report and staff recommendation.

In Favour (8): Councillor Reid, Councillor Devine, Councillor Mann, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Adshade, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Absent (1): Councillor Liggett

Carried (8 to 0)

5.2.1 Staff Presentation - Michael Campos, Intermediate Planner – Development

5.3 21-251(CD) Public Meeting Report – IP Park Phase 1 – Intermarket CAM Limited

Motion: 21-245

Moved by Councillor Reid
Seconded by Councillor Devine

THAT report No. 21-251(CD) - Public Meeting Report – IP Park Phase 1 – Intermarket CAM Limited - be received;

AND FURTHER THAT application OR08/21 for IP Park Phase 1 – Intermarket CAM Limited be referred back to staff for a subsequent report and recommendation.

In Favour (8): Councillor Reid, Councillor Devine, Councillor Mann, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Adshade, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Absent (1): Councillor Liggett

Carried (8 to 0)

5.3.1 Staff Presentation - Kathy Padgett, Senior Planner - Environment

5.3.2 Applicant Presentation - Intermarket Properties

Note: This item was discussed at 7 p.m. in accordance with the statutory notification circulated to the area surrounding the subject lands

6. Delegations
6.1 Tracy Bartlett re: Councillor Wolf Motion regarding Objection to proposed CBM Aggregate Expansion of Dance Pit

7. Presentations
7.1 Draft 2022 Budget and Business Plan, Sheryl Ayres, Chief Financial Officer

8. Consent Agenda
Motion: 21-247
Moved by Councillor Ermeta
Seconded by Councillor Wolf

THAT all items listed under the heading of Consent Agenda for November 23, 2021 Council Agenda be adopted as recommended.

8.1 Special Council Minutes - November 9, 2021
8.2 Special Council - Workshop Minutes - November 2, 2021
8.3 Council Information Package - November 12, 2021
8.4 Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee Minutes - July 15 and Septembers 16, 2021
8.5 Youth Advisory Committee Minutes - October 14, 2021
8.6 21-281(CD) 51 Sparrow Ave., Exemption to Part Lot Control, Cambridge Main Street Development Limited Partnership
8.7 21-284(CD) By-law to Designate 1261 Dundas Street South under the Ontario Heritage Act
8.8 21-300(CD) 64, 66, 68 and 70 Hilldale Dr. – Extension to Part Lot Control By-law, Norrich West Inc
8.9 21-317 (CRS) A/00924-40 for Microsoft Office 365 Migration
8.10 21-306(CRS) Supply and Delivery of Two Battery Electric Ice Resurfacers

8.11 21-315(CD) December 1, 2021 – Indexing of Development Charges

In Favour (8): Councillor Reid, Councillor Devine, Councillor Mann, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Adshade, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Absent (1): Councillor Liggett

Carried (8 to 0)

9. Consideration of Reports

9.1 Corporate Services

9.1.1 21-325(CRS) FPO21-96 Pumper Fire Trucks

Motion: 21-248

Moved by Councillor Mann
Seconded by Councillor Adshade

THAT Report 21-325(CRS) FPO21-96 Pumper Fire Trucks be received;

AND THAT OPTION B be adopted, as outlined in the Financial Impact section of report 21-325(CRS);

AND THAT a 2022 capital project budget of $1,050,655 to be funded from the Equipment Reserve Fund – Fire, be pre-approved;

AND THAT a 2023 capital project budget of $1,050,655 to be funded from the Equipment Reserve Fund – Fire, be pre-approved;

AND THAT the transfers to/from Reserve Funds as outlined in the Financial Impact section of report 21-325(CRS), be approved;

AND FURTHER THAT Option B as outlined in report 21-325(CRS) for the award of Hybrid Pumper Fire Trucks to Commercial Truck Equipment Company of Delta, BC for the total cost of $1,543,996 in U.S. Funds, this being part of a Co-operative Purchasing program, be approved.
9.2 Corporate Enterprise

None.

9.3 Community Development

9.3.1 21-285(CD) By-law to Designate 22-24 Shade Street under the Ontario Heritage Act

Motion: 21-249

Moved by Councillor Wolf
Seconded by Councillor Hamilton

THAT Report 21-285(CD) - By-law to Designate 22-24 Shade Street under the Ontario Heritage Act - be received;

AND THAT the by-law attached as Appendix “A” to Report 21-285(CD) be passed.

In Favour (8): Councillor Reid, Councillor Devine, Councillor Mann, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Adshade, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Absent (1): Councillor Liggett

Carried (8 to 0)

9.3.2 21-311(CD) Request to Waive Community Holding Fee and Introduction of Community Rental Room Rate

Motion: 21-250

Moved by Councillor Ermeta
Seconded by Councillor Reid

THAT Report 21-311(CD) Request to Waive Community Holding Fees and Approval of Community Group Rental Rate be received;
AND THAT as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic impacts, waiving the Community Holding Fee on all applicable rentals until 2022, as outlined in report 21-311(CD), be approved;

AND THAT any Community Holding Fees already received during the 2020-2021 rental period be returned to those applicable community groups;

AND FURTHER THAT the implementation of a new Community Group Rental Rate and approval criteria as part of the Municipal Fees & Charges By-Law, be approved.

In Favour (8): Councillor Reid, Councillor Devine, Councillor Mann, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Adshade, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Absent (1): Councillor Liggett

Carried (8 to 0)

At this time, being 6:05 p.m., Councillor Liggett joined the meeting.

9.4 Infrastructure Services
None.

10. Unfinished Business
None.

11. Correspondence
11.1 John De Freitas re: Councillor Wolf Motion regarding Objection to proposed CBM Aggregate Expansion of Dance Pit

11.2 Clare Dejong re: Councillor Wolf Motion regarding Objection to proposed CBM Aggregate Expansion of Dance Pit

11.3 Irene Dejong re: Councillor Wolf Motion regarding Objection to proposed CBM Aggregate Expansion of Dance Pit

11.4 Linda Martin re: Councillor Wolf Motion regarding Objection to proposed CBM Aggregate Expansion of Dance Pit

11.5 Rick Gavel re: Councillor Wolf Motion regarding Objection to proposed CBM Aggregate Expansion of Dance Pit
12. Motion

12.1 Councillor Wolf Motion regarding Objection to proposed CBM Aggregate Expansion of Dance Pit

Motion: 21-251

Moved by Councillor Wolf
Seconded by Councillor Mann

Whereas CBM Aggregates has applied for an expansion of the Dance Pit located on the south side of Cedar Creek Road (Regional Road 97) in close proximity to the City of Cambridge and Township of North Dumfries boundary, under the Aggregate Resources Act to the Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry; and

Whereas the existing pit which boarders Cambridge and North Dumfries is controlled by CBM Aggregates and is approximately 74 hectares (182 acres) in area. The westerly portion, being approximately 45 hectares (111 acres) in area, is currently zoned and licensed for aggregate extraction. It is within the remaining 29 hectares (71 acres) along the easterly portion of the landholding that CBM seeks to secure the approvals to modify their license and expand the aggregate operation at the Dance Pit location; and

Whereas the expansion lands adjacent to the Cambridge and North Dumfries boundary are presently under active agricultural cultivation and to the east of the CBM landholding is the City of Cambridge and a long-established residential neighbourhood; and

Whereas the health and wellness of the Cambridge residents that back onto the proposed expansion for the Dance pit are of concern to area residents. Currently, the noise, dust, dirt particles, vibration, hinder the residents from being able to enjoy their backyards Monday to Friday, 7:00 am to 6:00 pm. The stress and anxiety that these factors bring to them is widespread and mounting. The residents are woken up at 7:00 am on the dot, often earlier, by the noise from the pit area. Folks that work shift work cannot sleep during the day. This community believes this expansion and the constant noise, dust and dirt that each property suffers will decrease their property values; and

Whereas there are more than 15 operational gravel pits within 3 miles to the West-to-Northwest of residences in the St. Andrew’s neighbourhood. Emissions of fine dust from these pits and from the heavily travelled and dusty regional roads accumulate in the air as the predominant West-to-
Northwest winds blow toward the City of Cambridge. A 2021 Health Canada report concluded that exposure to elevated concentrations of fine dust is associated with short term health impacts on asthmatics, young children and the elderly, and that long-term exposure can shorten life expectancy; and

Whereas there is a Deed to the Land dated September 23, 1993, and an amendment to that Deed dated December 15, 1999, stating that the lands that are contained in the Dance Pit proposed expansion area shall be used for agricultural use only; and

Whereas the Township of North Dumfries is not in receipt of a planning application to facilitate the proposed aggregate extraction land use activity and has requested staff to send correspondence requesting additional time to complete a review of the supporting technical studies to properly inform any planning, environmental and economic/social matters or concerns; and

Whereas the deadline for an objection or the filing of comments on the ARA Application with the MNRF is December 14, 2021; and

Therefore, be it resolved that the City Clerk be directed to send correspondence on behalf of the City of Cambridge Council to the Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry objecting to the Aggregate Resource Act application for the expansion, and in support of the residents and requesting that CBM Aggregates honour the Deed to that parcel of land and keep it agricultural use only, and not grant CBM’s Application for License;

And that this correspondence also be sent to the Council of North Dumfries and Regional Council of Waterloo.

In Favour (9): Councillor Reid, Councillor Devine, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Adshade, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Carried (9 to 0)
At this time, being 7 p.m. a Public Meeting was held for Item 5.4.

5. Public Meetings (continued)


Motion: 21-246

Moved by Councillor Hamilton
Seconded by Councillor Adshade


In Favour (8): Councillor Reid, Councillor Devine, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Adshade, Councillor Hamilton, and Mayor McGarry

Conflict of Interest (1): Councillor Ermeta

Carried (8 to 0)

5.4.2 Staff Presentation - Jacqueline Hannemann, Planner 1 Site Development/Zoning

5.4.3 Applicant Presentation - Schout Vision Limited

13. Motion to Receive Correspondence and Presentations

Motion: 21-252

Moved by Councillor Adshade
Seconded by Councillor Liggett

THAT all presentations and correspondence from the November 23rd, 2021 Special Council meeting be received.
14. **Introduction and Consideration of By-laws**

Motion: 21-253

Moved by Councillor Liggett
Seconded by Councillor Devine

THAT the following by-laws listed under the heading of Introduction and Consideration of By-laws be enacted and passed:

- **21-081** Being a by-law to exempt certain lots or blocks pursuant to subsection 50(5) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended (Part Lot Control Exemption) – 51 Sparrow Ave

- **21-082** Being a by-law of the City of Cambridge to designate the property at 1261 Dundas Street South, Cambridge, Ontario as being a property of cultural heritage value or interest

- **21-083** Being a by-law to designate the property at 22-24 Shade Street as being a property of cultural heritage value or interest

- **21-084** Being a by-law to exempt certain lots or blocks pursuant to subsection 50(5) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended (Part Lot Control Exemption) – 64, 66, 68 & 70 Hilldale Drive

In Favour (9): Councillor Reid, Councillor Devine, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Adshade, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Carried (9 to 0)

15. **Confirmatory By-law**

Motion: 21-254

Moved by Councillor Devine
Seconded by Councillor Reid

21-085 Being a by-law to confirm the proceedings of the Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge
In Favour (9): Councillor Reid, Councillor Devine, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Adshade, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Carried (9 to 0)

16.  **Adjournment**

Motion: 21-255

Moved by Councillor Reid
Seconded by Councillor Ermeta

THAT the Council meeting does now adjourn at 7:40 p.m.

In Favour (9): Councillor Reid, Councillor Devine, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Adshade, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Carried (9 to 0)

_________________________
Mayor

_________________________
Clerk
To: COUNCIL

Meeting Date: 12/14/2021

Subject: Request to Amend Development Covenants and Restrictions for the Time for Development – Boxwood Business Campus

Submitted By: James Goodram, Director Economic Development

Prepared By: Laura Pearce, Senior Economic Development Officer

Report No.: 21-326(CRE)

File No.: C1101

Recommendation(s)

THAT report 21-326(CRE), re: Request to Amend Development Covenants and Restrictions for the Time for Development - Boxwood Business Campus be received;

AND THAT Council authorize the Mayor and Clerk to execute documentation to amend the Development Covenants and Restrictions to allow for a one (1) year extension to the construction start date AND a one (1) year extension to the substantial completion date, without penalties, to be granted to businesses/developers noted in Attachment 1 to this report, subject to the satisfaction of the City Solicitor.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- A request for Council to approve an additional extension to the start of construction dates and substantial completion dates for the remaining eligible developments within the Boxwood Business Campus. The existing dates and new proposed dates are included in Attachment 1 to this report.

Key Findings

- Under the Agreement of Purchase and Sale for properties purchased within the Boxwood Business Campus, the owner is required to commence construction and be substantially complete within the times specified in the Agreement.

- Based on Clause 3d of the Development Covenants and Restrictions in the Agreement, if an extension of time is granted that the owner is required to pay liquidated damages to the City which are calculated based on the amount of
municipal taxes which the owner would have been required to pay had a building or buildings been constructed and any difference in land value. Under this current recommendation, no penalties would be issued or collected on the subject properties noted in Attachment 1 of this report.

- In September 2020, Council approved an extension to the start of construction dates and substantial completion dates for the remaining eligible developments within the Boxwood Business Campus by one year respectively due to the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic.

- Due to the ongoing various economic impacts and material shortages due to COVID-19, industrial development has been delayed within the prescribed timelines for several properties within Boxwood.

- As part of the City of Cambridge’s Economic Response Plan, Staff is proposing an additional one (1) year extension as noted above to allow eligible businesses time to procure materials while continuing on with their respective developments in Boxwood.

**Financial Implications**

Registration costs to amend the development covenants will be incurred per file in the amount of $78.79 inclusive of tax for an anticipated total of $787.90 inclusive of tax. This cost will be funded by the City from the Economic Development budget.

**Background**

Council will recall that in September 2020, Council approved an extension to the start of construction dates and substantial completion dates for the remaining eligible developments within the Boxwood Business Campus by one year respectively due to the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. Regrettably, further impacts from the pandemic have now been reported. Developers in the Boxwood Business Campus, and other areas of the City, have noted to staff that they are experiencing severe delays in development due to construction material shortages.

Given the challenges noted above, many developers are still unable to fulfil their timeline obligations noted in the Development Covenants and Restrictions at no fault of their own. Accordingly, Staff are respectfully requesting Council to approve an additional extension to the timelines for development within the Boxwood Business Campus.

Currently, all agreements of purchase and sale for properties in the Boxwood Business Campus contain Development Covenants and Restrictions requiring the owner to start construction within one (1) year of acquisition and then be substantially complete within one (1) year from said start of construction. For several, these covenants were amended in September 2020 to allow for a further 1-year extension. Failure to meet
these timelines causes liquidated damages to be assessed against the owner pursuant to the Agreement of Purchase and Sale and amending covenants.

This report is requesting to allow for an additional one (1) year extension to the start of construction date AND an additional one (1) year extension to the substantial completion date, without penalties, to be granted to the businesses/developers listed in Attachment 1 to this report.

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.

The development of the Boxwood Business Campus supported the City’s objective to assist with the creation of high quality and diverse employment opportunities. Providing latitude with an additional one-year extension for the time of development will now assist businesses in these economically challenging times and provide additional time for them to receive the outstanding materials required to complete their building.

Comments

The COVID-19 pandemic has created economic uncertainty and a financial strain on the City, its residents, and its businesses. Additionally, developers have experienced delays in the development process due to the previous mandated Provincial shutdown and more recently the material shortage. These delays have lengthened the time necessary for the development of the industrial facilities in Boxwood.

In consideration of these noted delays, the City is proposing to assist the remaining developing businesses within the Boxwood Business Campus through the request of an additional one (1) year extension for the time of development. No liquidated damages would apply during that additional period.

For clarity, Staff has prepared the chart found in Attachment 1 to this report that details the existing dates and the new proposed dates for the start of construction and completion.
Eligibility

For Council’s information, any property that has currently been granted an extension would also be eligible for this further extension, provided that any and all associated penalties are not outstanding.

In addition, at the time of this report, the property noted as 50 Goddard Crescent has not yet been conveyed and is still in the City’s ownership. The scheduled closing date is December 6, 2021 and staff have included this development in this report as it is anticipated that material shortages will be ongoing for some time.

Existing Policy/By-Law

Timing of development and penalties are regulated as per the respective Development Covenants and Restrictions registered on title on the subject properties.

Financial Impact

As the developers are required to pay liquidated damages to the City (which are calculated based on the amount of municipal taxes which the owner would have been required to pay had a building or buildings been constructed and any difference in land value), approval of the recommendations contained in this report will defer the collection of municipal property taxes on the subject sites noted in Attachment 1.

Registration costs to amend the development covenants will be incurred per file in the amount of $78.79 inclusive of tax, for a total of $787.90 inclusive of tax. This cost will be funded by the City from the Economic Development budget.

Public Input

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

Internal/External Consultation

Legal and Financial Services has been consulted on this report.

Conclusion

Staff recommends that an additional one (1) year extension to the construction start date and substantial completion date be granted without penalties to businesses/developers noted in Attachment 1, as outlined in this report.
Attachment 1 – List of Properties Eligible by the One (1) Year Extension
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Date of Transfer</th>
<th>Current required building permit date</th>
<th>Current original completion date</th>
<th>New required permit date</th>
<th>New required completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>110 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>16 Goddard Developments Corp. (Albertino Domingues)</td>
<td>23-Jul-2019</td>
<td>January 24, 2022</td>
<td>January 24, 2023</td>
<td>January 24, 2023</td>
<td>January 24, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>100 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>17 Goddard Developments Corp. (Albertino Domingues)</td>
<td>23-Jul-2019</td>
<td>January 24, 2022</td>
<td>January 24, 2023</td>
<td>January 24, 2023</td>
<td>January 24, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>65 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>42 Goddard Developments Corp. (Albertino Domingues)</td>
<td>23-Jul-2019</td>
<td>January 24, 2022</td>
<td>January 24, 2023</td>
<td>January 24, 2023</td>
<td>January 24, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>45 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>43 Goddard Developments Corp. (Albertino Domingues)</td>
<td>23-Jul-2019</td>
<td>January 24, 2022</td>
<td>January 24, 2023</td>
<td>January 24, 2023</td>
<td>January 24, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>115 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>PPDS Canada Inc.</td>
<td>12-Apr-2019</td>
<td>April 12, 2021</td>
<td>April 12, 2022</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>April 12, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>85 Heroux Devtek Dr</td>
<td>VFD Solutions</td>
<td>20-Nov-2020</td>
<td>November 20, 2021</td>
<td>November 20, 2022</td>
<td>November 20, 2022</td>
<td>November 20, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>Blendtech Inc.</td>
<td>20-Jul-2018</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>July 20, 2022</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>July 20, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>Leo Altberg, in trust</td>
<td>6-Dec-2021</td>
<td>December 6, 2022</td>
<td>December 6, 2023</td>
<td>December 6, 2023</td>
<td>December 6, 2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation

THAT Report 21-318(CD) Building Permit Statistics – Third Quarter 2021 be received as information.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- This report provides building permit information, including:
  - The number of permits issued, broken down into detailed categories in accordance with the classifications in the Ontario Building Code;
  - The construction value of permits issued;
  - The number of new residential units between January 1, 2021 and September 30, 2021; and
  - A comparison of this information to previous years.

Key Findings

- The total number of building permits issued between January 1 and September 30, 2021 is 1300, compared to 856 building permits issued by the end of Q3 of 2020, and compared to the five-year average of 1068.

- The construction value of permits issued between January 1 and September 30, 2021 is $386,586,552 while the construction value of permits issued by the end of Q3 of 2020 was $144,658,126 and the five-year average construction value of permits issued in the first three quarters of the year is $229,334,971.
• The number of permits issued for new residential units between January 1 and September 30, 2021 is 647 compared to 182 new residential units by the end of Q3 2020 and the five year average of 442.

• Construction activity in the first three quarters of 2021 is greater than average. Comparisons have been provided to both construction activity 2020, and the five-year average of construction activity between 2016 and 2020.

Financial Implications

• As of September 30, 2021, $3,203,483 has been collected in permit revenue. This is an increase of 64% increase over the average revenue collected of $1,954,310 during this time frame in the years 2016 – 2020.

• The balance of the Building Permit Stabilization Reserve Fund at October 31, 2021 is $3,155,896.

Background

This building permit report is provided to show construction activity in the municipality. The building permit statistics report provides a detailed breakdown of the permits issued using the classification of buildings in accordance with the Ontario Building Code and includes a bar graph for a visual representation of that data.

Analysis

Strategic Alignment

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

Goal #2 - Governance and Leadership

Objective 2.2  Communicate often and make sure messages are clear, timely and delivered in a variety of ways.

The permit statistics for the first three quarters of 2021 show an increase in construction activity in relation to the average permit activity in the first three quarters of the previous five year period from 2016 - 2020. Incoming permit applications and development planning information indicate construction activity will continue at an increase for the remainder of the year.

This level of construction activity is expected as in 2006, downtown Cambridge was identified as an Urban Growth Centre by Ontario’s Places to Grow, and the Regional Official Plan. As the City plans for an additional 65,000 people living in our community
over the next 30 years, construction related to housing and employment is on the rise, bringing more people to Cambridge to live, work and play.

Comments

The statistics for the first three quarters of 2021 show an increase in construction activity in comparison to the average construction activity over the same time period in the previous five years.

Regulations implemented under the Reopening Ontario Act (O. Reg. 82/20) have had impact on construction activity in 2021. Restrictions were placed on some construction projects beginning January 12, 2021, ending for residential construction projects February 10, 2021, and restrictions lifted on all construction projects on February 16, 2021.

The Building Division provided full service for permit processing, including answering customer questions, intake of permit applications, processing permit fees and issuing building permits for all permit types during this timeframe. The building division provided inspection services for all construction projects and have conducted investigations when required during the third quarter.

A comparison of the number of permits issued in the first three quarters of 2021 against the average number of permits issued over the previous 5 years is as follows:

Housing and Minor Permits (Category 1:10 Day mandated turn-around time) were above average in every month from January to September.
Industrial, Commercial, Institutional projects (Categories 2, 3 and 4: 15, 20 & 30 Day Turn-Around times) were below average in January, February, May and August and above average in March, April, June, July and September.

Residential alteration permits continue to increase, with 245 alteration permits issued in the first three quarters of 2021 in comparison to the average of 160 permits issued over the same period in the previous five years.

Since Zoning By-Law Amendment 108-18 was enacted on June 12 2018, there has been an increase in permits submitted and issued for the addition of a secondary suite, both within existing houses and in detached accessory structures. In the first three
quarters of 2021, 39 permits have been issued for the creation of an additional dwelling unit.

**Existing Policy/By-Law**

Building By-law 44-12 Being a Bylaw under the *Building Code Act* respecting submission requirements for construction, demolition, change of use, request requirements for occupancy, transfer of permits and notice of inspections, and payment of and refund provisions for permit fees.

**Financial Impact**

As of September 30, 2021, the Building Division collected $3,203,483 in permit revenue. This is an increase of 64% over the average revenue collected of $1,954,310 during this time frame in the years 2016 – 2020.

Permit revenue collection can vary significantly over the course of each year and revenues for large projects can impact the numbers in different months and quarters.

The Building Division is self-funded and permit revenues fund operating costs. Any shortfall in revenue or excess cost is to be funded from the Building Permit Stabilization Reserve which currently has a balance of $3.13 million.

**Public Input**

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

**Internal/External Consultation**

There was no internal/external consultation undertaken.

**Conclusion**

The Building Permit Statistics Report is provided for information on construction activity occurring within the City of Cambridge.

The statistics show there is a significant increase in construction activity in the first 3 quarters of 2021 in comparison to both the same timeframe in 2020 and the average over the previous 5 years. Providing this report to Council and making it publicly available supports the City’s strategic objective of timely, accurate information sharing with a range of audiences.
Signature

Division Approval

Reviewed by the CFO
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Name: Tanya Gies
Title: Chief Building Official

Departmental Approval

Name: Hardy Bromberg
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City Manager Approval

Name: David Calder
Title: City Manager
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- Appendix A - Building Permit Statistics Report – Q3 of 2021
Building Permits Statistics
September 2021

1,300 Permits Issued Year to Date
Total Construction Value of $419,711,298

Construction Value by Month and Year

- September 2021 - 76 Units Started
## PERMITS ISSUED JANUARY TO SEPTEMBER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Permit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New House</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27,806,046</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13,812,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Townhouse</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>138,382,873</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>23,750,271,80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Rise, New-Add-Alt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>536,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Rise, New-Add-Alt</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13,943,900</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House - Alteration *</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>14,267,579</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>6,783,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deck/Porch</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1,932,769</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2,018,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessory Structure</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1,874,992</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,462,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foundation Only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>885,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>916</td>
<td>199,629,159</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>48,083,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alteration</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58,880,533</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5,472,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New/Addition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>288,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Portable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alteration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,700,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>238,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New/Addition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9,500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office/Personal Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alteration</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6,683,650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5,417,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New/Addition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16,710,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alteration</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4,954,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4,403,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New/Addition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,226,125</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alteration</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12,154,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12,810,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New/Addition</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71,599,294</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18,559,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>195,759,202</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>57,311,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>Agricultural Building</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change of Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conditional Permits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,443,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,979,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12,417,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designated Structures</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,016,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>316,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foundation - Non Res</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10,798,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,515,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous Permits</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4,952,311</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2,516,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent Signs</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>798,232</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5,284,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plumbing Only</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3,982,964</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1,690,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary Tent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45,330</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>259</td>
<td>24,322,937</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>39,263,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>419,711,298</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>144,658,126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* New units created through a House Alteration permit includes:
  - Secondary suites
  - Division of single detached to duplex

The new unit # indicated the number of newly created units.
To: COUNCIL

Meeting Date: 12/14/2021

Subject: Special Event Strategy Status Update

Submitted By: Lesley Head, Director of Recreation & Culture

Prepared By: Rachel Fraser, Manager of Recreation, Sport and Culture

Report No.: 21-312(CD)

File No.: C1101

Recommendations

THAT Report 21-312(CD) - Special Event Strategy Status Update - be received as information;

AND THAT capital project A/00193-20 Special Events Strategy be closed and the remaining funds of $10,019 be returned to the Economic Development Reserve Fund.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- The purpose of this report is to advise Council that the outcome of the Special Event Strategy will form part of the upcoming Arts and Culture Master Plan proposed in the 2022 capital budget.

Key Findings

- The Arts and Culture Master Plan is proposed as part of the 2022 capital budget and will provide an opportunity to embed the proposed Special Event Strategy as part of an overall Arts and Culture Master Plan and more closely align with the Strategic Plan passed by Council on May 25, 2021.

- The Request for Proposal for the Arts and Culture Master Plan will include the following as part of the project scope:
  - Requirement of transparency in decision making with equal opportunities for all community groups to access resources
  - Streamlining of City special event resources
Development of a training incubator to assist independent event organizers to maximize event effectiveness
Review of community organizations/events and associated criteria for inclusion under the City of Cambridge insurance program or otherwise known as Schedule “A”.

- Inclusion of the Special Events Strategy with the update to the Arts and Culture Master Plan offers an opportune time to confirm the direction of the proposed recommendations with the over 170 individuals/organizations/committees that were consulted during the previously completed review/consultation period of 2016/2017.

- Larger community development initiatives including the Community Group Registry Program are being developed during 2022 which will address wider issues surrounding in-kind and space concerns that were noted in the draft Special Event Strategy report completed in 2017.

**Financial Implications**

- The Arts and Culture Master Plan is allocated as part of the 2022 capital budget, pending Council approval.

- The current open Special Events Strategy capital project A/00193-20 has remaining funds in the amount of $10,019. These will be allocated back to the Economic Development Reserve Fund.

**Background**

In 2009, the City of Cambridge completed an Arts and Culture Master Plan. The plan identified the need for a review of how the City of Cambridge supports special events ensuring that the City’s cultural objectives related to capacity building and economic development are being achieved.

An increase in event requests signalled that a review of the current event policies was required. Issues of capacity, transparency and equity of funding were identified along with further review on insurance provisions for event delivery.

In 2016, Council supported moving forward with a Special Events Strategy. The purpose of the Strategy was to provide a sustainable and structured approach in the growth and development of events for the City of Cambridge.
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 #3 - Arts, Culture, Heritage and Architecture

Objective 3.3 Facilitate, support and provide a diverse range of events and festivals that bring all people together from across the city, region and beyond.

The Special Events Strategy will create a sustainable framework for the delivery of special events. By including this Strategy as part of the proposed Arts and Culture Master Plan it will help to align any proposed recommendations. The intended outcome will touch each of the updated Strategic Plan objectives (People: Wellbeing, Belonging, Inclusion and Vibrant Neighbourhoods; Place: Placemaking and Planning for Growth; Prosperity: Strong Cores and Economic Inclusion and Support). This will allow the City to take full advantage of the opportunities for quality of life and economic development that a robust arts and culture sector can bring.

Comments

In 2017, a consultant drafted a Special Events Strategy for the City’s consideration. The strategy included a proposed vision for events, outlined gaps in services and identified an uneven delivery model to events based on city insurance requirements and city resources. Using the content of the draft report, staff were directed to re-evaluate and review the existing events delivery model; including the process for compliance meeting necessary insurance requirements and ensure equitable access to city resources. Strategic Actions also to be further reviewed for implementation including consistent framework for event delivery, establishment of sustainable toolkit for event support and review innovative ways for event delivery i.e. incubator model.

The City recently launched a new online insurance portal which will further support and review external requests for insurance provision. This process will aid in the ability for more of our event organizers to access a more centralized, low cost insurance provider. This will aid event organizers who may not be aware of how or when to access insurance. The introduction of a portal or “one stop shop” will provide better access and information to our community.

The effect of the pandemic on event organization, launch of the City’s new Strategic Plan and the introduction of a new Insurance Portal requires the review and confirmation that the recommendations proposed by the consultant are complete, relevant and accurate for the upcoming planning period.
Existing Policy/By-Law

CSD - Special Event Policy C.80-040

This policy provides definitions of Special Event Categories including directly sanctioned special events and City affiliated events. In addition, it outlines criteria for establishment of new affiliated events, risk management, roles & responsibilities and accountability measures.

Financial Impact

No additional costs are required to support adding the Special Event Strategy to the 2022 Arts and Culture Master Plan capital project.

The current capital project A/00193-20 – Special Events Strategy has remaining funds in the amount of $10,019 that will be allocated back to the Economic Development Reserve Fund with the approval of the 2022 capital project for an Arts and Culture Master Plan.

Public Input

The initial draft Events Strategy was created based on the input of over 170 individuals/organizations/committees that were consulted during the 2016-2017 review. These included 4 public meetings, consultation with city affiliated event organizers and the Arts & Culture Advisory Committee.

Those organizations and committees support embedding the recommendations and outcomes of the Event Strategy within the Arts and Culture Master Plan.

This report has been publicly posted as part of the report process.

Internal/External Consultation

Consultation was conducted with the Recreation and Culture Department, Chief Risk Officer; and Finance Department.

Conclusion

Special events have had a positive impact on the lives of people in Cambridge as well as on the community’s economic development. The increase in the number and size of events coupled with limited City resources has resulted in a need for a formal special events strategy.

Inclusion of the Special Events Strategy within the proposed Arts and Culture Master Plan for 2022 will ensure that there is alignment of priorities as this strategic city document will outline the Culture Division’s vision, mission, strategic priorities and
recommendations for developing and enhancing Culture services for the next ten years and beyond.

**Signature**

**Division Approval**

Reviewed by the CFO

Reviewed by Legal Services

Name: Lesley Head  
Title: Director of Recreation & Culture

**Departmental Approval**

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

**City Manager Approval**

Name: David Calder  
Title: City Manager

**Attachments**

- Appendix A - CSD- Special event policy C.80-040
POLICY TITLE Master Plan for Leisure Services/Facilities – Special Events Policy
CATEGORY Corporate
POLICY NUMBER CSD-80.040
DEPARTMENT Community Services
DIVISION CSD Operations
AUTHORITY Corporate
APPROVED BY Not Listed
EFFECTIVE DATE 02/10/2014
REVIEW DATE Not Listed

POLICY STATEMENT
Not Listed

PURPOSE
Not Listed

DEFINITIONS
N/A

AUTHORITY
CSD Administration

SCOPE
Community Services Department, Cambridge Residents
POLICY

DEFINITION OF SPECIAL EVENT CATEGORIES

1) Directly Sanctioned Special Events (2013 Events)


Advisory Committees affiliated with the City of Cambridge may be involved with a special event, either ongoing or one-time events. City staff may also, from time to time, be requested to directly organize a special event, e.g. grand opening of a new facility, park.

Characteristics of This Type of Event

• Budget for the event is included in the Operating Budget.
• City staff are primarily responsible for the event, but may work with a volunteer committee.
• The City of Cambridge is acknowledged in all advertising and other publications for their support.

Municipal Supports Provided

• Free use of city meeting rooms for committee meetings and event.
• Staff liaison (Recreation Co-ordinator) for committee development issues/training.
• Staff liaison (Special Events Liaison) for Special Event Policies and procedures compliance.
• Photocopying, postage, equipment provided.
• Liability insurance for volunteers.

2) City Affiliated Events (2013 Events)


Youth Events.

A volunteer committee organizes a City-wide special event, with support from a City of Cambridge Recreation Co-ordinator. The event may be free of charge or there may be a participation fee.
Characteristics of This Model

- A formal committee/board is established/Terms of Reference are developed.
- Minutes of meetings are completed and circulated.
- Bank account/financial statements are established.
- Annual budget presented to city staff for approval/financial assistance in Operating Budget.
- Risk Management Plan presented to city staff for approval.
- The City of Cambridge is acknowledged in all advertising and other publications for their support.

The Establishment of a New City Affiliated Event

The following criteria must be met in order for staff to recommend that an event receive City Affiliated Event status and become eligible for event funding.

The new event committee will be asked to prepare and present a report that provides evidence that the following criteria has been met. The presenting of this information can take place over a period of time, but all criteria must be met to proceed. For an event to take place the following calendar year, this information must be presented by September 1st at the latest so the proposal can be addressed in the budget process and the group can present to the budget task force in January.

- A formal committee/board is established/Terms of Reference are developed
- Minutes of meetings are completed and circulated
- Bank account/financial statements are established
- Annual budget presented
- Grant request cannot exceed 30% of total budget
- Event details presented
- Sponsorship package in place
- Sponsorship or other sources of funding secured
- Marketing plan developed and funding in place
Municipal Supports Provided

- Free use of city meeting rooms for committee meetings, parks, arenas.
- Staff liaison (Recreation Co-ordinator) for committee development issues/training.
- Staff liaison (Special Events Liaison) for Special Event Manual Policies and Procedures Compliance, day of the event.
- Liability insurance for volunteers
- Eligible for Annual Special Event Grant Process
- Photocopying, mailings (to a maximum of $1,000 for events with budgets under $50,000 and to a maximum of $1,400 for events with budgets in excess of $50,000)
- Electrical Inspection
- Use of City’s Special Event Equipment
- Events Promotion – Pamphlet Assistance, City’s Activities Guide, City’s Website, City’s Communication Division
- Volunteer training

3) Special Interest/Fundraising Events

Examples: Kin Carnival, Fall Fair, District Senior Games, Reunions, Downtown Sidewalk Sales, and other miscellaneous events.

Individuals and groups approach the City of Cambridge to book space at our facilities/park for special events (over 200 events per year). These events are for a specific interest group and/or are a fundraising venture for a group or organization.

Characteristics of this model

- Group has purchased special liability insurance for the events.
- Group is aware of the special events procedures, special licenses, requirements from other departments.
- Group may apply through the Grants to Groups process.

Municipal Supports Provided

- None, although not for profit groups may be eligible for a grants to groups.
- Eligible to attend city training events
Any new groups will be added into the appropriate category.

B. RISK MANAGEMENT

Any special event committee is required to obtain a copy of the “Special Events Manual” that, among other topics, details the risk management policies and procedures with which the events are required to comply. The Special Events Manual is also available on the City of Cambridge website.

The Manual includes detailed information on the following:

1. Critical Path & Timeline
2. Special Events Policy
3. Planning
4. Promotion
5. Volunteers
6. Grants, Sponsorship & Fundraisers
7. Site
8. Insurance
9. Street Closures
10. Alcohol Licensing
11. Vendor Licensing
12. Music Licensing
13. Amusement Rides
14. Bingo, Raffles & Fundraisers
15. First Aid Services
16. Security
17. Noise Policy
18. Portable Toilets
19. Fireworks
20. Tents
21. Electrical Set-Up & Inspection
22. Inclusion & Access
23. On-site Meeting
24. Special Event Evaluation
25. References
26. Critical Path & Timeline
27. Special Events Policy
28. Planning
29. Promotion
30. Volunteers
31. Grants, Sponsorship & Fundraisers
32. Site
33. Insurance
34. Street Closures
35. Alcohol Licensing
36. Vendor Licensing
37. Music Licensing
38. Amusement Rides
39. Bingo, Raffles & Fundraisers
40. First Aid Services
41. Security
42. Noise Policy
43. Portable Toilets
44. Fireworks
C. ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS/MEASURES

The following accountability measures are incorporated into the Grants - Special Events annual application process.

• To provide the municipality with an annual evaluation, including volunteer hours, attendance, programming, marketing, and other data as deemed appropriate.

• To provide annually to the municipality, financial statements for the previous year of operation, including a balance sheet (outside audit preferred)

• Financial Statements: For each City Affiliated event, a peer financial review should be performed by an individual who is not a board member of the organization. This financial review report should be included with their Special Event Grant application.

• Reserve Funds: Groups should establish a reserve account and annually set aside funds with the goal of, within a period of 5 years, having 25% of their total budget amount available to cover any unanticipated budget shortfalls e.g. inclement weather

D. FUNDING FOR THE POLICY

City staff will prepare annual operating budgets in accordance with the “Special Events Policy” for consideration by Cambridge City Council through the annual operating budget approval process – Grants – Special Events. Any additional requests for funding support will be considered as not in accordance with city policy and would require more specific direction from Cambridge City Council.

E. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The responsibility for a safe, well managed special event is the responsibility of the organizing committee. The role of the municipality is to support the special events volunteers in their venture through a variety of means. City staff will have the final approval for the financial and risk management issues related to the event. Within the parameters of this policy, the volunteers have autonomy to determine the details of the event planning.
City staff are not members of the special event committee and do not take a direct role in the event planning (e.g. committee), nor the implementation of the event. City staff will be present at the event to ensure that risk management issues are addressed.

Role of Recreation Co-ordinator

• Primary liaison to the committee; facilitator of committee development (attending meetings as required)
• Assists the committee with Special Event grants application
• Assists in co-ordination with other city departments
• Assists in recruitment of volunteers
• Provides special events manual
• Assistance on day of event in regards to risk management

Role of Special Events Liaison Co-op Student

• Attends committee meetings pertaining to site planning
• Responsible for completion and distribution of Critical Paths for Special Events
• Manages event site meetings
• Issues event approval once specifications are met
• Assistance on day of event with regard to risk management

POLICY COMMUNICATION

Not Listed
To: COUNCIL

Meeting Date: 12/14/2021

Subject: 2021 Annual Review Emergency Management Program

Submitted By: Dave Bush, Deputy City Manager Corporate Services

Prepared By: Gina Cliffe, Manager of Emergency Management and Business Continuity

Report No.: 21-328 (CRS)

File No.: C-1101

Recommendation(s)

THAT report 21-328 (CSR) 2021 Annual Review Emergency Management Program be received as information.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- This report is to provide Council with an update on the status of the City of Cambridge’s Emergency Management Program for 2021.

Key Findings

- Each year, the Office of the Fire Marshal and Emergency Management perform an annual year-end audit of all municipal emergency management programs in Ontario.
- To provide Council with a summary of activities the City has undertaken to meet the annual requirements.
- The City has completed an Annual Statement of Completion form signed by the Community Emergency Management Coordinator (CEMC) and the Head of Council, declaring that the Municipality has completed the annual requirements.

Financial Implications

- There are no financial implications.
Background

All municipalities in Ontario are required to establish and maintain an emergency management program in accordance with the requirements under the Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act RSO 1990 and Ontario Regulation 380/04.

The purpose of this information report is to provide Council with an update on the status of the City of Cambridge’s Emergency Management Program for 2021.

Under the Act and Regulation, the City is required to establish an Emergency Management Program Committee. This committee designs, coordinates and implements a wide variety of initiatives and ongoing activities to ensure compliance with the provincial legislation and to strengthen the Corporation’s ability to prepare for, respond to, and recover from, major emergencies affecting the Corporation and the residents of Cambridge. Each year, the Office of the Fire Marshal and Emergency Management perform an annual year-end audit of all municipal emergency management programs in Ontario. The City completes an Annual Statement of Completion form signed by the CEMC and the Head of Council, declaring that the Municipality has completed the annual requirements.

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.

Working with key stakeholders and partners to ensure we have a safe community where people can live and work.

Comments

The City of Cambridge has undertaken many initiatives in 2021 to ensure compliance with the Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act and Ontario Regulation 380/04.
The following is a summary of the activities the City has taken to meet the annual requirements.

- **Community Emergency Management Coordinator CEMC (O. Reg. 380/04, section 10)**
  - All municipalities are required to designate an employee to perform the role of (CEMC). The Manager of Emergency Management and Business Continuity is the City’s designated CEMC.

- **CEMC is required to complete provincial training (O. Reg. 380/04)**
  - The CEMC has successfully completed the provincial CEMC course and other training requirements.

- **Community Emergency Management Program Committee (EMPC) (O. Reg. 380/04, Part II Section 11)**
  - The City of Cambridge’s EMPC is comprised of senior-level staff; the City Manager and CEMC co-chair the committee (Attachment A - EMPC Terms of Reference for the full membership list).
  - The City of Cambridge has created an Emergency Management Program Committee Working Group. This group is made up of internal and external representatives that provide input and make recommendations to the Emergency Management Program Committee on corporate emergency management initiatives. The CEMC chairs this committee (Attachment B - EMPC Working Group Terms of Reference for full membership).
  - The City’s EMPC and EMPC Working Group meet as required to continue efforts to strengthen and integrate the City’s Emergency Plan and supporting plans and documents.

- **By-law adopting the Emergency Management Program (EMCPA, Section 2.1 (1))**

- **Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment HIRA (EMCPA section 2.1)**
  - The EMPC reviewed the City’s HIRA and there were no changes made for 2021.

- **All municipalities are required to review their Emergency Response Plan and update it as required. (EMCPA section 3, O.Reg.380/04 Part II Section 13 (1) and (2))**
  - The EMPC reviewed the City’s Emergency Plan and there were no changes to the plan for 2021.
  - A copy is filed with the OFMEM and Provincial Emergency Operations Centre and posted on the City’s website.
• By-law to adopt the Emergency Response Plan (EMCPA Section 2.1 (1))
  o The current by-law 179-17 was approved by Cambridge City Council on December 12, 2017.

• Designated Emergency Operations Centre (EOC) with appropriate communications equipment (O. Reg. 380/04, part II section 13(1) and (2))
  o The City of Cambridge has a primary and alternate EOC.
  o The City’s EOCs are equipped with dedicated landlines, internet, dedicated email accounts, with the capability to bring in radio communications when needed.
  o Throughout 2020 and 2021 the Emergency Management and Business Continuity Team improved the virtual EOC capabilities to ensure the EOC is able to activate in a hybrid virtual model if required.

• Critical Infrastructure Identification (EMCPA s. 2.1 (3))
  o The EMPC reviewed and updated the critical infrastructure list including contact information.

• Annual training for Municipal Emergency Control Group (EMCPA section 2.1 (2) (b) section 3.4 O. Reg. 380/04 part II section 12 (3))
  o Throughout 2021 there were several training sessions offered:
    ▪ New hybrid EOC model training session to EOC Personnel.
    ▪ New employees designated as EOC personnel were provided training to understand the Incident Management System (IMS) and their EOC IMS role.
    ▪ IMS Policy Group support personnel received a refresher training session.
    ▪ EOC Command Support Scribe Personnel received a scribe training session specific to the EOC Command Scribe Support role.

• Annual Emergency Exercise (EMCPA Section 3 (5), O. Reg. 380/04 Part II Section 12 (6))
  o This year’s exercise was held on December 1, 2021. This hands-on exercise ensured the EOC personnel understood the new hybrid model applications and format.
  o Lessons learned from this exercise will be incorporated into future plans and initiatives.

• Designated Emergency Information Officer (O. Reg. 380/04 Section 14)
  o The City’s Director of Communications or alternate is the designated Emergency Information Officer responsible for coordinating emergency information whenever the City’s Emergency Plan and EOC are activated.
• Public Education and Awareness Program (EMCPA s. 2.1 (2) (c))
  o Annual public education activities are important ongoing components of the City’s Emergency Management Program. The CEMCs from all the municipalities in the Waterloo Region jointly updated emergency preparedness information and placed it on the Waterloo Region Emergency Management website http://www.wrem.ca/
  o During Emergency Preparedness Week 2021, the Emergency Management and Business Continuity Team ran social media and radio ad campaigns throughout the week. They also provided emergency preparedness messages on billboards throughout the City.
  o During the COVID-19 response, information was shared frequently and regularly with the public with regards to the pandemic and public safety measures.

• Annual Emergency Management Program Review O. Reg. 380/04 Part II Section 11(6)
  o The EMPC reviewed the City’s Emergency Management Program and verified the City’s Emergency Management Program met the annual requirements.
  o A signed copy of the 2021 Emergency Management Statement of Completion Form and online Emergency Management Program Annual Compliance tool will be submitted to OFMEM by December 31, 2021.

Existing Policy/By-Law

By-law 179-17

Financial Impact

The activities required to maintain compliance with legislation and the emergency management program are completed within the approved operating budget.

Public Input

Posted publicly as part of the reporting process.

Internal/External Consultation

Consultation with the Emergency Management Program Committee took place. CEMC participates on the Provincial Emergency Management Coordinating Committee (PEMCC) as a Golden Horseshoe Sector Representative and ensures that the most up-to-date information and guidance are applied to the City’s program.
Conclusion

Emergency Management staff will continue to work with a broad range of internal and external stakeholders to further our collective prevention, mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery abilities in support of enhancing the emergency management resiliency within the City of Cambridge. The City of Cambridge accomplished the Emergency Management Program requirements to achieve the annual compliance for 2021 as highlighted in this report, and will be submitting a signed copy of the Emergency Management Statement of Completion Form and completing the online Emergency Management Program Annual Compliance tool to OFMEM by December 31, 2021.

Signature

Division Approval

Reviewed by the CFO
Reviewed by Legal Services

Name: Gina Cliffe
Title: Manager of Emergency Management and Business Continuity

Departmental Approval

Name: Dave Bush
Title: Deputy City Manager, Corporate Services

City Manager Approval

Name: David Calder
Title: City Manager
Attachments

- Attachment A - EMPC Terms of Reference
- Attachment B - EMPC Working Group Terms of Reference
Recommendation(s)

THAT Report 21-324(CRS) Township of North Dumfries Fire Protection Agreement be received;

AND THAT the three-year extension to the Fire Protection Agreement with the Township of North Dumfries be approved as per Report 21-324(CRS);

AND FURTHER THAT the Mayor and Clerk be authorized to execute the Agreement, subject to the satisfaction of the City Solicitor.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- The City has an existing fire services agreement with the Township of North Dumfries that expires on December 31, 2021.

- North Dumfries Administration approached City staff to discuss a three-year continuation of the fire agreement beyond 2021.

- The Fire Protection and Prevention Act, 1997, S.O. 1997, c.4 provides the ability for municipalities to enter into fire protection agreements to provide specified fire protection services to lands or premises that are situated outside the territorial limits of the municipality and also receive such services as specified in an agreement.

- The intent of this report is to authorize the execution of a fire protection agreement with the Town of North Dumfries.
Key Findings

- There are no material changes to the fire protection services provided by the City of Cambridge Fire Department to the Township of North Dumfries.

- Response service levels and the fire protection coverage area as set out in Schedule ‘A’ remain unchanged.

Financial Implications

- The revenue formula is determined by using 100% of the Cambridge per capita cost for fire protection, less Fire Prevention and Public Education expenditures, multiplied by the North Dumfries population served, using figures from preceding years.

- The annual fee is discounted by the City, as agreed to with the Township. Annual increases of 1.5% are applied to the net annual fee over the course of the Agreement, as set out in Schedule ‘B’.

- Discounts in previous years approximated $120,000. The new methodology of calculating Indirect Costs adds an additional $100,000 to be discounted.

- Without the discounting, the percentage increase for the first year of the agreement would amount to 56.56%. A 6.9% increase to $430,000 would create a concern for sustainability and risk cancellation of services and loss of revenues to the City.

Background

The Fire Protection and Prevention Act, 1997, S.O. 1997, c.4 provides the ability for municipalities to enter into automatic aid/fire protection agreements to provide specified fire protection services to lands or premises that are situated outside the territorial limits of the municipality and also receive such services as specified in an agreement.

To enable such agreements, the City of Cambridge must enact a bylaw and/or provide delegated authority to staff to be able to proactively execute, bind, review and where appropriate modify the agreements in response to changing circumstances.

North Dumfries Administration approached City staff to discuss a three-year continuation of the fire agreement beyond 2021, as the current Township of North Dumfries Fire Protection Agreement expires on December 31, 2021.

Township of North Dumfries Council approved the agreement at their meeting of November 10, 2021. Two signed copies of the agreement have been provided by the Township of North Dumfries to the City of Cambridge.
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 2.4 Work collaboratively with other government agencies and partners to achieve common goals and ensure representation of community interests.

Entering into a shared services agreement showcases the City's collaborative efforts working with other municipal partners. By doing so, better use of service delivery and partnerships are formed at the municipal level.

Comments

There are no material changes to the fire protection services provided by the City of Cambridge Fire Department to the Township of North Dumfries. Response service levels and revenue formula calculations remain unchanged.

Existing Policy/By-Law

By-Law No. 214-03

Financial Impact

- The methodology for calculating Indirect Costs for the provision of fire protection services in the City of Cambridge has been changed to reflect service contributions by other City divisions. This is identical to the methodology used for the Township of Puslinch.

- The revenue formula is determined by using 100% of the Cambridge per capita cost for fire protection, less Fire Prevention and Public Education expenditures, multiplied by the North Dumfries population served, using figures from preceding years.

- The annual fee is discounted by the City, as agreed to with the Township. Annual increases of 1.5% are applied to the net annual fee over the course of the Agreement, as set out in Schedule 'B'.

- Without the discounting, the percentage increase for the first year of the agreement would amount to 56.56%. A 6.9% increase to $430,000 would create
a concern for sustainability and risk cancellation of services and loss of revenues to the City.

- The proposed Cambridge per capita cost will increase from $181.55 in 2021 to $199.45, $201.59 and $203.41 in 2022, 2023 and 2024, respectively.

- The North Dumfries population in the service area will increase to 3,157 and remain static for the three-year duration of the agreement.

- 2021 City revenue of $402,200 will see annual increases of 1.5%, resulting in revenue expectations of $408,233 in 2022, $414,356 in 2023 and $420,572 in 2024.

Public Input

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

Internal/External Consultation

This document and attachments were reviewed by Finance, the City Clerk’s office and Legal Services.

Conclusion

There are no material changes to the fire protection services provided by the City of Cambridge Fire Department to the Township of North Dumfries, as response service levels remain unchanged.

The methodology used to calculate Indirect Costs is aligned with the Puslinch methodology, reflecting the true cost of service provision and resulting increase in the amount discounted.

Staff are recommending an extension to the Fire Protection Agreement for an additional three-year period.

Signature

Division Approval

Reviewed by the CFO
Reviewed by Legal Services

Name: Brian Arnold
Title: Fire Chief
Departmental Approval

Name: Dave Bush
Title: Deputy City Manager

City Manager Approval

Name: David Calder
Title: City Manager

Attachments

Appendix 1: 2022-2024 Cambridge-North Dumfries Fire Protection Agreement

Appendix 2: Schedule ‘A’ 2022 CFD-North Dumfries Service Area

Appendix 3: Schedule ‘B’ 2022-2024 Fire Contract Fees North Dumfries
THIS AGREEMENT made this ___ day of __________, 2021

BETWEEN:

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

(hereinafter referred to as “the City”)

OF THE FIRST PART

AND

THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF NORTH DUMFRIES

(hereinafter called "the Township")

OF THE SECOND PART

WHEREAS the City provides a fire service for the benefit of the residents of the City of Cambridge

AND WHEREAS the Township has requested that the City provide fire services in the Township

AND WHEREAS subsection 2(5) of the Fire Protection and Prevention Act, 1997 permits municipalities to enter into agreements to provide, and to receive, fire services outside of their geographic boundaries

AND WHEREAS the City and the Township wish to define their respective responsibilities for the provisions of fire services in the Township

NOW WITNESSETH that in consideration of mutual covenants and agreements contained and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the parties hereby covenant and agree as follows:

RECITALS

1) The parties warrant that the above recitals are true and the same are hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference.

2) The schedules to this Agreement form an integral part of the Agreement.

DEFINITIONS

3) In this Agreement, the following words and phrases shall have the following meanings:

a) "Confidential Information" means information disclosed to or obtained by the Township in connection with the fulfillment of the terms of this Agreement and which has been identified by the City as information which should be treated as confidential,

b) "Schedule A" means the map of the Township of North Dumfries identifying various Serviced Areas attached and forming part of this Agreement,

c) "Schedule B" means the costs of the City's fire services to be paid by the Township to the City attached and forming part of this Agreement,

d) “Serviced Area” means that portion of the Township indicated as Part 1 in Schedule ‘A’ hereto annexed, including the properties located on both sides of Sideroad 10 South.

TERM

4) Except as otherwise provided in this Agreement, the term of this Agreement shall be three years, commencing on January 1, 2022 and expiring December 31, 2024.

TOWNSHIP RESPONSIBILITIES

5) The Township agrees as follows:

a) That the Township Fire Department shall provide assistance or relieve the Cambridge Fire Department from any further responsibility at the scene as soon as reasonably practical after the arrival of the City at the scene, should the estimated duration of the incident exceed one hour.

b) The Township will pay annually to the City, for the duration of this Agreement, a fee based on one hundred percent (100%) of the total Cambridge per capita direct and indirect costs for fire protection in the City (less Fire Prevention and Public Education expenditures); such fee to be calculated using the following formula:
i. The annual fee shall be calculated by multiplying the City of Cambridge per capita direct and indirect cost of fire protection in the City, as identified by the City for the applicable year, (less Fire Prevention and Public Education expenditures) by the population figure for the Serviced Area within the Township, located in Part 1 on Schedule ‘A’ in the preceding year, to be determined on an annual basis using population figures as agreed to by the Township and the City.

ii. The annual fee may be discounted by the City as agreed to by the Township and the City with 1.5% annual increases to the net annual fee over the course of the Agreement as set out in Schedule ‘B’.

c) Payment of the fee shall be made in four (4) instalments on the thirty-first day of March and the first of each of the months of June, September and December in each year.

d) The Township will identify all properties within the Serviced Area covered by this Agreement by civic addresses in accordance with the policy established by the Office of the Fire Marshal for rural areas.

e) This Agreement includes and is applicable to any and all fire or other emergency calls made to the City by a municipal officer of the Township or by a resident of the said Township or by any other person.

f) The Township will complete all fire reports to the Office of the Fire Marshal in accordance with the Fire Protection and Prevention Act, 1997 relating to all fires and emergencies originating in the Township.

g) That the level of service provided by the City, under this Agreement, is subject to the availability of resources not required to manage emergencies within the City.

CITY RESPONSIBILITIES

6) The City agrees as follows:

a) To respond immediately with its own equipment and personnel to all fire and other emergencies occurring in that portion of the Township of North Dumfries indicated described as Part 1 on Schedule "A".

b) To respond to the first alarm with a maximum of six (6) vehicles and sixteen (16) firefighting personnel; the type of vehicles and the number of personnel are at the present time as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VEHICLES</th>
<th>PERSONNEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Pumper or Quint</td>
<td>4 Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pumper/Tanker</td>
<td>1 Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pumper or Quint</td>
<td>4 Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pumper or Quint</td>
<td>4 Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Rescue</td>
<td>2 Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Supervisory Vehicle</td>
<td>1 Person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) The number of vehicles and persons, up to the above-mentioned maximum and the type of vehicle to be dispatched, shall be within the sole discretion of the City.

d) For reported structure fires, the area described as Part 1 on Schedule ‘A’ will receive the same response as provided within the City in accordance with City policies and practices subject to the provisions of this Agreement.

e) The Incident Commander (IC) of the fire or emergency shall, upon arrival at the fire or emergency scene and until such time as the Township Fire Department relieves the Cambridge Fire Department with the necessary fire vehicles, equipment and personnel, have the authority to call for assistance as may be required from the City in order to combat and care for the fire or emergency in accordance with City policies and practices.

f) The City shall notify the Township Fire Chief or Designate of any structure fires within Part 1 of Schedule ‘A’ as soon as reasonably practical and the estimated duration of attendance by the Cambridge Fire Department.

g) The City will supply all necessary information to the Township regarding fires and emergencies they attend within Part 1 of Schedule ‘A’.
h) The City will classify any response by Cambridge Fire Department to motor vehicle emergencies occurring on King's Highways or municipal rights-of-way within Part 1 on Schedule A as an emergency call under this Agreement and will claim costs from the Ministry of Transportation or any other applicable source i.e. insurance company. If both the Cambridge Fire Department and the North Dumfries Fire Department respond to such a motor vehicle emergency, then one of the Fire Departments will claim the costs on behalf of both Departments and the municipality which submits the claim and receives the fees will reimburse the other.

CITY’S LEVEL OF SERVICE
7) The City and the Township agree that:
   a) the City will provide fire services in the area described as Part 1 on Schedule ‘A’.
   b) the level of service provided by the City, under this Agreement, is subject to the availability of resources that are not required first to manage fire services including emergencies within the City of Cambridge, solely determined by the City in its discretion.

INDEMNIFICATION
8) The Township shall both during and after the term of this Agreement, shall at all times, and at its own cost, expense and risk, defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City, its elected officials, officers, employees, volunteers, agents, contractors, and all respective heirs, administrators, executors, successors and assigns from any and all losses, damages (including, but not limited to, incidental, indirect, special and consequential damages, or any loss of use, revenue or profit by any person, organization or entity), fines, penalties and surcharges, liabilities (including, but not limited to, any and all liability for damage to property and injury to persons, including death), judgments, claims, demands, causes of action, contracts, suits, actions or other proceedings of any kind (including, but not limited to proceedings of a criminal, administrative or quasi criminal nature) and expenses (including, but not limited to, legal fees on a substantial indemnity basis), which the indemnified person or persons may suffer or incur, howsoever caused, arising out of or in consequence of or directly or indirectly attributable to the activities contemplated by this Agreement and/or required to be performed by the Township, its agents, employees and sub-contractors on behalf of the City, whether such losses, damages, fines, penalties and surcharges, liabilities, judgments, claims, demands, causes of action, contracts, suits, actions or other proceedings of any kind and expenses as defined above are due or claimed to be due to the negligence, breach of contract, and/or breach of law of the Township, its agents, employees or sub-contractors, or the City, its agents or employees.

9) The City shall both during and after the term of this Agreement, shall at all times, and at its own cost, expense and risk, defend, indemnify and hold harmless the Township, its elected officials, officers, employees, volunteers, agents, contractors, and all respective heirs, administrators, executors, successors and assigns from any and all losses, damages (including, but not limited to, incidental, indirect, special and consequential damages, or any loss of use, revenue or profit by any person, organization or entity), fines, penalties and surcharges, liabilities (including, but not limited to, any and all liability for damage to property and injury to persons, including death), judgments, claims, demands, causes of action, contracts, suits, actions or other proceedings of any kind (including, but not limited to proceedings of a criminal, administrative or quasi criminal nature) and expenses (including, but not limited to, legal fees on a substantial indemnity basis), which the indemnified person or persons may suffer or incur, howsoever caused, attributable to the activities contemplated by this Agreement and/or required to be performed by the City, its agents, employees and sub-contractors on behalf of the Township, whether such losses, damages, fines, penalties and surcharges, liabilities, judgments, claims, demands, causes of action, contracts, suits, actions or other proceedings of any kind and expenses as defined above are due or claimed to be due to the negligence, breach of contract, and/or breach of law of the City, its agents, employees or sub-contractors, or the Township, its agents or employees.

INSURANCE
10) The parties shall insure themselves under the following minimal coverages so as to protect and indemnify and save harmless the other party:
a) **General Liability Insurance:** The Parties shall maintain liability insurance acceptable to each other throughout the term of this Agreement. Coverage shall consist of a comprehensive policy of public liability and property damage insurance in an amount of not less than $5,000,000 per occurrence. **Such insurance shall name the other party as an additional insured** thereunder and shall be endorsed to include a Cross-Liability Endorsement with a Severability of Interests Clause, Blanket Contractual Liability, if required and Non-Owned Automobile Liability. The policy SIR/deductible shall not exceed $100,000 per claim and if the policy has an aggregate limit, the amount of the aggregate shall be double the required per occurrence limit.

b) **Automobile Liability Insurance:** The parties shall maintain automobile liability insurance on all Owned and Leased Automobiles to a limit of $5,000,000 throughout the term of this Agreement.

c) **Provisions:** All Insurers must be licensed in Ontario. The parties shall forward a Certificate of Insurance evidencing this insurance with the executed Agreement. The Certificate shall state that coverage will not be suspended, voided, cancelled, reduced in coverage or in limits except after thirty (30) days prior written notice by certified mail to the other party.

It is also understood and agreed that in the event of a claim any deductible or self-insured retention under this policy of insurance shall be the sole responsibility of the party at fault and that this coverage shall preclude subrogation claims against the other party and any other person insured under the policy and be primary insurance as respects the other party. Any insurance or self-insurance maintained by the other party shall be considered excess of the party at fault insurance and shall not contribute with ii. The minimum amount of insurance required herein shall not modify, waive or otherwise alter the party's obligation to fully indemnify the other party under this Agreement.

The City reserves the right to modify the insurance requirements as deemed suitable.

**TERMINATION**

11) The City may immediately terminate the Agreement upon giving notice to the Township in the event that:
   a) the Township breaches any provisions of this Agreement;
   b) the Township breaches any confidentiality or conflict of interest obligation set out in the Agreement;
   c) the Township, prior to or after executing the Agreement, makes a material misrepresentation or omission or provides materially inaccurate information to the City upon which the City relies.

12) Either Party may terminate this Agreement without cause, upon providing one hundred and eighty (180) days' notice to the other Party.

**NOTICE**

13) Any notice required by this Agreement shall be in writing and shall be deemed to have been sufficiently given when delivered personally, sent by prepaid registered post or telecopy (facsimile) to the addresses below:

   **CITY**
   Attention: Legal Services
   The Corporation of the City of Cambridge,
   50 Dickson Street, 2” floor, PO Box 669
   Cambridge, ON   N1R 5W8
   Fax: (519) 740-4695

   **TOWNSHIP**
   Attention: Ashley Sage, Clerk
   The Corporation of the Township of North Dumfries
   2958 Greenfield Road, P.O. Box 1060
   Ayr, ON   N0B 1E0
   Fax: (519) 632-8700
APPLICABLE LAW

14) This Agreement and any information provided pursuant to this Agreement is subject to the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. M.56.

15) The parties shall conform to all applicable federal and provincial law and to any applicable City by-laws, policies and practices.

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

16) Upon termination or expiry of this Agreement, the Township shall return to the City all written or descriptive matter, including but not limited to drawings, prints, descriptions or other papers, documents or any other material maintained in any format, including digital format, which contains any Confidential Information whatsoever.

17) Subject to the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. F.31 and the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. M.56 and any amendments thereto, and except as expressly provided in this clause, no Confidential Information shall be disclosed in any manner whatsoever without the approval in writing of the City.

18) The Township shall hold all Confidential Information obtained in trust and confidence for the City and shall not disclose any such Confidential Information, by publication or other means, to any person, company or other government agency nor use same for any other project other than for the benefit of the City as may be authorized by the City in writing.

19) Any request for such approval by the City shall specifically state the benefit to the City of the disclosure of the Confidential Information.

20) Any use of the Confidential Information shall be limited to the express purposes as set out in the approval of the City.

21) The Township shall not, at any time during or after the term of this Agreement, use any Confidential Information for the benefit of anyone other than the City.

WAIVER

22) The waiver of any provision in the Agreement or the failure of any party hereto to enforce any right shall apply to that provision or right only and shall not be deemed to effect the validity of the remainder of the Agreement.

23) No departure from or waiver of the terms of this Agreement shall be deemed to authorize any prior or subsequent departure or waiver and the City shall not be obligated to continue any departure or waiver or to permit any subsequent departure or waiver.

COVENANTS

24) The Parties agree that all covenants and conditions contained in this Agreement shall be severable, and that should any covenant or condition in the Agreement be declared invalid or unenforceable by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining covenants and conditions and the remainder of the Agreement shall remain valid and not terminate thereby.

SURVIVAL

25) The provisions of this Agreement pertaining to indemnity and limitation shall survive the termination or expiration of this Agreement for any reason whatsoever, including expiry at the end of the term, in addition to any other provision which survives by operation of law or which expressly or by implication remains in full force and effect on and after the termination or expiration of this Agreement.

NOT AN AGENT

26) The Township and the City agree that the Township, its servants, agents and employees shall under no circumstances be deemed agents or representatives of the City and except as the City may specifically authorize in writing, shall have no right to enter into any contracts or commitments in the name of or on behalf of the City or to bind the City in any respect whatsoever.

COMPLETE AGREEMENT

27) The Agreement embodies the entire agreement between the parties with regard to the provision of deliverables and additional deliverables and supersedes any prior understanding or agreement, collateral, oral or otherwise with respect to the provision of
the deliverables and additional deliverables, unless they are incorporated by reference in
the Agreement, existing between the parties at the date of execution of the Agreement.

28) This Agreement shall be constructed with all changes in number and gender as may be
required by the context. Any titles used within this document are for reference purposes
only and not an aid to interpretation.

29) All obligations herein contained, although not expressed to be covenants, shall be
deemed to be covenants.

30) Whenever a statement or provision in this Agreement is followed by words denoting
inclusion or example and then a list of or reference to specific items, such list or
reference shall not be read so as to limit the generality of that statement or provision,
even if words such as "without limiting the generality of the foregoing" do not precede
such list or reference.

31) The Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the
Province of Ontario and the federal laws of Canada applicable therein.

ASSIGNMENT

32) This Agreement shall not be assignable by the Township without the prior written
consent of the City, in its sole discretion.

SUCCESSORS

33) The Agreement shall be binding upon, the heirs, executors, administrators, successors
and permitted assigns of the parties hereto.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

34) The parties to this Agreement shall not knowingly place public office holders in a conflict
of interest or in breach of the public office holders’ codes of conduct or standards of
behaviour. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the parties shall not, directly or indirectly,
offer or provide any gift or benefit to Township or City Members of Council or their staff
in regard to this Agreement.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

35) In the event of a dispute between the parties,

a) Each of the parties shall use their best efforts exercised in good faith to resolve the
dispute by negotiation between the City and the Township. If the parties are unable
to resolve any dispute referred to them within ten (10) business days following such
referral, the parties agree to the procedure for an informal referee set forth below.

b) The referee shall be an impartial professional with at least five (5) years’ experience
in the negotiation of agreements. The parties agree that the purpose of such
reference is for the economical and expedient resolution of the dispute and that it
shall not be in the nature of an arbitration as contemplated by the Arbitrations Act
(Ontario) and that the decision of the referee shall not be binding upon the Parties
but shall be considered as a bona fide attempt by the referee to resolve the matter in
dispute. For this purpose, either party may compel the attendance of the other party
before a referee by serving the other party with notice of such intention which notice
shall contain the proposed time and location of the reference and a list of at least
three and not more than five proposed referees.

c) Upon receipt of such notice, the notified party shall within five (5) business days
following receipt select one of the proposed individuals as the referee. In the event
that it should fail to do so within five (5) business days of receiving such notice, the
compelling party shall be free to select the referee of its choice from the same list.

d) The referee shall be required to proceed to hear and to referee the matter and shall,
within the next ensuing ten business days or so soon thereafter as may be
practical, render his decision in writing.

e) The costs of the referee and the cost of the location of the reference shall be equally
borne between the parties. Any other costs of the reference, including legal costs,
shall be borne by the party incurring such costs.

f) The parties agree that if any dispute or claim arising out of or in connection with
this Agreement that is solely as between the parties hereto cannot be resolved
through good faith negotiation to the satisfaction of the parties within thirty days
(or such longer period as may be agreed upon in writing) from the date that either party notifies the other in writing that such dispute or claim exists, then the parties agree to the fullest extent permitted by applicable law that any dispute relating to this Agreement and/or all of the matters contemplated herein shall be exclusively and finally resolved by binding arbitration before a single arbitrator selected by the parties. If the parties cannot agree on an arbitrator, each party shall select one arbitrator and said arbitrators shall then select a third arbitrator and all three arbitrators shall then arbitrate the dispute. The arbitrator(s) shall take all reasonable steps to render his decision in writing within ninety (90) days after the commencement of the arbitration proceeding. The decision of the arbitrator(s), or any two of the three arbitrators, shall be final and binding on the parties and all of their respective heirs, executors, administrators, successors and assigns. Judgment rendered by the arbitrator(s) may be entered in any court having jurisdiction. Any requirement for arbitration in accordance with this Agreement shall be governed by the Arbitration Act, 1991 (Ontario), or any successor legislation thereto, and the arbitration shall be held in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties hereto have hereunto affixed their respective Corporate Seals, attested to by their respective officers in that behalf duly authorized.

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

________________________________________
Katheryn McGarry, Mayor

________________________________________
Danielle Manton, Clerk

THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF NORTH DUMFRIES

________________________________________
Susan Foxton, Mayor

________________________________________
Ashley Sage, Clerk
North Dumfries Fire Protection Area – Schedule ‘A’

Service area population (2020): 3157
## CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
### FIRE CONTRACT FEES
**Based on 2021 Budget Expenses and 2022 Forecast**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2021 Approved Budget</th>
<th>2022 Forecast</th>
<th>2023 Forecast</th>
<th>2024 Forecast</th>
<th>Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Fire Salary &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>934,900</td>
<td>949,900</td>
<td>966,300</td>
<td>982,300</td>
<td>Based on 2022-2024 Projected Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Fire Other Costs</td>
<td>117,800</td>
<td>136,800</td>
<td>123,800</td>
<td>126,276</td>
<td>Based on 2022-2024 Projected Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Prevention Salary &amp; Benefits - Removed</td>
<td>995,800</td>
<td>991,600</td>
<td>1,010,600</td>
<td>1,028,900</td>
<td>Based on 2022-2024 Projected Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Prevention Other Costs - Removed</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>13,700</td>
<td>6,834</td>
<td>6,971</td>
<td>Based on 2022-2024 Projected Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Mechanical Salary &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>326,000</td>
<td>287,900</td>
<td>292,400</td>
<td>296,800</td>
<td>Based on 2022-2024 Projected Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Mechanical Other Costs</td>
<td>440,000</td>
<td>382,500</td>
<td>397,700</td>
<td>419,600</td>
<td>Based on 2022-2024 Projected Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Training Salary &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>459,900</td>
<td>473,700</td>
<td>481,600</td>
<td>489,300</td>
<td>Based on 2022-2024 Projected Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Training Other Costs</td>
<td>152,700</td>
<td>215,500</td>
<td>134,700</td>
<td>84,700</td>
<td>Based on 2022-2024 Projected Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Communications Salary &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>188,100</td>
<td>192,100</td>
<td>194,800</td>
<td>197,600</td>
<td>Based on 2022-2024 Projected Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Communications Other Costs</td>
<td>1,108,200</td>
<td>1,146,000</td>
<td>1,146,000</td>
<td>1,146,000</td>
<td>Based on 2022-2024 Projected Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Suppression Salary &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>20,763,000</td>
<td>21,168,900</td>
<td>21,696,500</td>
<td>22,150,900</td>
<td>Based on 2022-2024 Projected Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Suppression Other Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #1</td>
<td>138,100</td>
<td>150,400</td>
<td>153,500</td>
<td>156,900</td>
<td>Based on 2022-2024 Projected Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #2</td>
<td>28,100</td>
<td>30,200</td>
<td>31,400</td>
<td>32,700</td>
<td>Based on 2022-2024 Projected Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #3</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>34,400</td>
<td>36,100</td>
<td>Based on 2022-2024 Projected Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #4</td>
<td>33,600</td>
<td>38,300</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>41,900</td>
<td>Based on 2022-2024 Projected Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #5</td>
<td>34,100</td>
<td>37,600</td>
<td>39,600</td>
<td>41,800</td>
<td>Based on 2022-2024 Projected Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #6</td>
<td>34,400</td>
<td>36,600</td>
<td>38,200</td>
<td>39,900</td>
<td>Based on 2022-2024 Projected Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Public Safety Salary &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>559,600</td>
<td>636,100</td>
<td>626,300</td>
<td>637,900</td>
<td>Based on 2022-2024 Projected Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Public Education Salary &amp; Benefits - Removed</td>
<td>(1,247,800)</td>
<td>(1,254,800)</td>
<td>(1,269,434)</td>
<td>(1,290,571)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Public Education Other Costs</td>
<td>180,500</td>
<td>185,600</td>
<td>188,100</td>
<td>190,800</td>
<td>Based on 2022-2024 Projected Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Public Education Other Costs - Removed</td>
<td>64,800</td>
<td>63,900</td>
<td>63,900</td>
<td>63,900</td>
<td>Based on 2022-2024 Projected Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Costs</td>
<td>25,365,600</td>
<td>25,931,842</td>
<td>26,413,787</td>
<td>26,897,511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Contract Settlement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Included in previous contract (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Costs</td>
<td>201,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Included in previous contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor &amp; Council</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Allocated Based on FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the City Manager - Admin</td>
<td>101,100</td>
<td>102,300</td>
<td>103,500</td>
<td>103,500</td>
<td>Allocated Based on FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Solicitor</td>
<td>149,100</td>
<td>151,200</td>
<td>153,300</td>
<td>153,300</td>
<td>Allocated Based on FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Corporate Services</td>
<td>99,300</td>
<td>100,300</td>
<td>101,300</td>
<td>101,300</td>
<td>Allocated Based on FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin City Clerk</td>
<td>306,200</td>
<td>314,200</td>
<td>319,700</td>
<td>319,700</td>
<td>Allocated Based on FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Allocated Based on FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>499,600</td>
<td>507,800</td>
<td>514,100</td>
<td>514,100</td>
<td>Allocated Based on FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>150,100</td>
<td>153,700</td>
<td>156,900</td>
<td>156,900</td>
<td>Allocated Based on FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Services</td>
<td>517,420</td>
<td>579,458</td>
<td>604,475</td>
<td>604,475</td>
<td>Based on Total PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Audit &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>220,700</td>
<td>239,700</td>
<td>258,700</td>
<td>258,700</td>
<td>Allocated Based on FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting &amp; Budget</td>
<td>338,000</td>
<td>344,800</td>
<td>351,000</td>
<td>351,000</td>
<td>Allocated Based on FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>61,800</td>
<td>63,600</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>Allocated Based on FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Indirect Costs</td>
<td>201,700</td>
<td>2,443,320</td>
<td>2,557,056</td>
<td>2,627,975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>25,567,300</td>
<td>28,375,162</td>
<td>28,970,844</td>
<td>29,525,486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>2021 Approved Budget</td>
<td>2022 Forecast</td>
<td>2023 Forecast</td>
<td>2024 Forecast</td>
<td>Basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Cambridge</td>
<td>140,827</td>
<td>142,269</td>
<td>143,711</td>
<td>145,153</td>
<td>Data provided by Planning Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Costs</td>
<td>181.55</td>
<td>199.45</td>
<td>201.59</td>
<td>203.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population North Dumfries</td>
<td>2,875</td>
<td>3,157</td>
<td>3,157</td>
<td>3,157</td>
<td>Based on population density and Environics data supplied by ESRI’s ArcGIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to North Dumfries</td>
<td>522,000</td>
<td>629,700</td>
<td>636,400</td>
<td>642,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Payable</td>
<td>402,200</td>
<td>408,233</td>
<td>414,356</td>
<td>420,572</td>
<td>Annual 1.5% increases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus / (Discount)</td>
<td>(119,800)</td>
<td>(221,467)</td>
<td>(222,044)</td>
<td>(221,628)</td>
<td>New Baseline of $402,200 in 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: COUNCIL

Meeting Date: 12/14/2021

Subject: Township of Puslinch Fire Protection Agreement

Submitted By: Brian Arnold, Fire Chief

Prepared By: Brian Arnold, Fire Chief

Report No.: 21-323(CRS)

File No.: 2021-FIR-04

**Recommendation(s)**

THAT Report 21-323(CRS) Township of Puslinch Fire Protection Agreement be received;

AND THAT a three-year extension to the Fire Protection Agreement with the Township of Puslinch be approved as per Report 21-323(CRS);

AND FURTHER THAT the Mayor and Clerk be authorized to execute the Agreement, subject to the satisfaction of the City Solicitor.

**Executive Summary**

**Purpose**

- The City has an existing fire services agreement with the Township of Puslinch that expires on December 31, 2021.

- Puslinch Administration approached City staff to discuss a three-year continuation of the fire agreement beyond 2021.

- The Fire Protection and Prevention Act, 1997, S.O. 1997, c.4 provides the ability for municipalities to enter into fire protection agreements to provide specified fire protection services to lands or premises that are situated outside the territorial limits of the municipality and also receive such services as specified in an agreement.

- The intent of this report is to authorize the execution of a fire protection agreement with the Township of Puslinch.
Key Findings

- There are no material changes to the fire protection services provided by the City of Cambridge Fire Department to the Township of Puslinch.

- Response service levels and the fire protection coverage area as set out in Schedule ‘A’ remain unchanged.

Financial Implications

- The revenue formula is determined by using 100% of the Cambridge per capita cost for fire protection, less Fire Prevention and Public Education expenditures, multiplied by the Puslinch population served, using figures from preceding years.

- The annual fee is discounted by the City, as agreed to with the Township. Annual increases to the net annual fee over the course of the Agreement are 1.6%, 1.5% and 1.5%, as set out in Schedule ‘B’.

- Without the discounting, the percentage increase for the first year of the agreement would amount to 6.24%, creating an affordability concern for the Township.

Background

The Fire Protection and Prevention Act, 1997, S.O. 1997, c.4 provides the ability for municipalities to enter into automatic aid/fire protection agreements to provide specified fire protection services to lands or premises that are situated outside the territorial limits of the municipality and also receive such services as specified in an agreement.

To enable such agreements, the City of Cambridge must enact a bylaw and/or provide delegated authority to staff to be able to proactively execute, bind, review and where appropriate modify the agreements in response to changing circumstances.

Puslinch Administration approached City staff to discuss a three-year continuation of the fire agreement beyond 2021, as the current Township of Puslinch Fire Protection Agreement expires on December 31, 2021.

Township of Puslinch Council approved the agreement at their meeting of November 10, 2021. Two signed copies of the agreement have been provided by the Township of Puslinch to the City of Cambridge.
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 2.4 Work collaboratively with other government agencies and partners to achieve common goals and ensure representation of community interests.

Entering into a shared services agreement showcases the City’s collaborative efforts working with other municipal partners. By doing so, better use of service delivery and partnerships are formed at the municipal level.

Comments

There are no material changes to the fire protection services provided by the City of Cambridge Fire Department to the Township of Puslinch. Response service levels and revenue formula calculations remain unchanged.

Existing Policy/By-Law

By-Law No. 214-03

Financial Impact

- The revenue formula is determined by using 100% of the Cambridge per capita cost for fire protection, less Fire Prevention and Public Education expenditures, multiplied by the Puslinch population served, using figures from preceding years.

- The annual fee is discounted by the City, as agreed to with the Township. Annual increases to the net annual fee over the course of the Agreement are 1.6%, 1.5% and 1.5%, as set out in Schedule ‘B’.

- Without the discounting, the percentage increase for the first year of the agreement would amount to 6.24%, creating an affordability concern for the Township.

- The proposed Cambridge per capita cost will increase from $198.54 in 2021 to $199.45, $201.59 and $203.41 in 2022, 2023 and 2024, respectively.

- The Puslinch population will remain unchanged from 2021 for the three-year duration of the agreement.
• 2021 City revenue of $137,800 will see annual increases of 1.6%, 1.5% and 1.5% resulting in revenue expectations of $140,000 in 2022, $142,100 in 2023 and $144,232 in 2024.

Public Input

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

Internal/External Consultation

This document and attachments were reviewed by Finance, the City Clerk’s office and Legal Services.

Conclusion

There are no material changes to the fire protection services provided by the City of Cambridge Fire Department to the Township of Puslinch. Response service levels and revenue formula calculations remain unchanged.

Staff are recommending an extension to the Fire Protection Agreement for an additional three-year period.

Signature

Division Approval

Reviewed by the CFO

Reviewed by Legal Services

Name: Brian Arnold
Title: Fire Chief

Departmental Approval

Name: Dave Bush
Title: Deputy City Manager
City Manager Approval

Name:  David Calder
Title:  City Manager

Attachments

Appendix 1:  2022-2024 Cambridge-Puslinch Fire Protection Agreement
Appendix 2:  Schedule ‘A’ 2022 CFD-Puslinch Service Area
Appendix 3:  Schedule ‘B’ 2022-2024 Fire Contract Fees Puslinch
THIS AGREEMENT made this ___ day of __________, 2021

BETWEEN:

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
(hereinafter referred to as “the City”)

OF THE FIRST PART

AND

THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
(hereinafter called “the Township”)

OF THE SECOND PART

WHEREAS the City provides a fire service for the benefit of the residents of the City of Cambridge

AND WHEREAS the Township has requested that the City provide fire services in the Township

AND WHEREAS subsection 2(5) of the Fire Protection and Prevention Act, 1997 permits municipalities to enter into agreements to provide, and to receive, fire services outside of their geographic boundaries

AND WHEREAS the City and the Township wish to define their respective responsibilities for the provisions of fire services in the Township

NOW WITNESSETH that in consideration of mutual covenants and agreements contained and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the parties hereby covenant and agree as follows:

RECITALS

1) The parties warrant that the above recitals are true and the same are hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference.

2) The schedules to this Agreement form an integral part of the Agreement.

DEFINITIONS

3) In this Agreement, the following words and phrases shall have the following meanings:

a) “Confidential Information ” means information disclosed to or obtained by the Township in connection with the fulfillment of the terms of this Agreement and which has been identified by the City as information which should be treated as confidential,

b) “Schedule A” means the map of the Township of Puslinch identifying various Serviced Areas attached and forming part of this Agreement,

c) “Schedule B” means the costs of the City's fire services to be paid by the Township to the City attached and forming part of this Agreement,

d) “Serviced Area” means that portion of the Township indicated as Part 1 in Schedule ‘A’ hereto annexed, including the properties located on both sides of Sideroad 10 South.

TERM

4) Except as otherwise provided in this Agreement, the term of this Agreement shall be three years, commencing on January 1, 2022 and expiring December 31, 2024.

TOWNSHIP RESPONSIBILITIES

5) The Township agrees as follows:

a) That the Township Fire Department shall provide assistance or relieve the Cambridge Fire Department from any further responsibility at the scene as soon as reasonably practical after the arrival of the City at the scene, should the estimated duration of the incident exceed one hour.

b) The Township will pay annually to the City, for the duration of this Agreement, a fee based on one hundred percent (100%) of the total Cambridge per capita direct and indirect costs for fire protection in the City (less Fire Prevention and Public Education expenditures); such fee to be calculated using the following formula:
i. The annual fee shall be calculated by multiplying the City of Cambridge per capita direct and indirect cost of fire protection in the City, as identified by the City for the applicable year, (less Fire Prevention and Public Education expenditures) by the population figure for the Serviced Area within the Township, located in Part 1 on Schedule ‘A’ in the preceding year, to be determined on an annual basis using population figures as agreed to by the Township and the City.

ii. The annual fee may be discounted by the City as agreed to by the Township and the City with 1.5% annual increases to the net annual fee over the course of the Agreement as set out in Schedule ‘B’.

c) Payment of the fee shall be made in four (4) instalments on the thirty-first day of March and the first of each of the months of June, September and December in each year.

d) The Township will identify all properties within the Serviced Area covered by this Agreement by civic addresses in accordance with the policy established by the Office of the Fire Marshal for rural areas.

e) This Agreement includes and is applicable to any and all fire or other emergency calls made to the City by a municipal officer of the Township or by a resident of the said Township or by any other person.

f) The Township will complete all fire reports to the Office of the Fire Marshal in accordance with the Fire Protection and Prevention Act, 1997 relating to all fires and emergencies originating in the Township.

CITY RESPONSIBILITIES

6) The City agrees as follows:

a) To respond immediately with its own equipment and personnel to all fire and other emergencies occurring in that portion of the Township of Puslinch indicated described as Part 1 on Schedule “A”.

b) To respond to the first alarm with a maximum of six (6) vehicles and sixteen (16) firefighting personnel; the type of vehicles and the number of personnel are at the present time as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VEHICLES</th>
<th>PERSONNEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Pumper or Quint</td>
<td>4 Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pumper/Tanker</td>
<td>1 Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pumper or Quint</td>
<td>4 Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pumper or Quint</td>
<td>4 Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Rescue</td>
<td>2 Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Supervisory Vehicle</td>
<td>1 Person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) The number of vehicles and persons, up to the above-mentioned maximum and the type of vehicle to be dispatched, shall be within the sole discretion of the City.

d) For reported structure fires, the area described as Part 1 on Schedule ‘A’ will receive the same response as provided within the City in accordance with City policies and practices subject to the provisions of this Agreement.

e) The Incident Commander (IC) of the fire or emergency shall, upon arrival at the fire or emergency scene and until such time as the Township Fire Department relieves the Cambridge Fire Department with the necessary fire vehicles, equipment and personnel, have the authority to call for assistance as may be required from the City in order to combat and care for the fire or emergency in accordance with City policies and practices.

f) The City shall notify the Township Fire Chief or Designate of any structure fires within Part 1 of Schedule ‘A’ as soon as reasonably practical and the estimated duration of attendance by the Cambridge Fire Department.

g) The City will supply all necessary information to the Township regarding fires and emergencies they attend within Part 1 of Schedule ‘A’.
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h) The City will classify any response by Cambridge Fire Department to motor vehicle emergencies occurring on King's Highways or municipal rights-of-way within Part 1 on Schedule A as an emergency call under this Agreement and will claim costs from the Ministry of Transportation or any other applicable source i.e. insurance company. If both the Cambridge Fire Department and the Puslinch Fire Department respond to such a motor vehicle emergency, then one of the Fire Departments will claim the costs on behalf of both Departments and the municipality which submits the claim and receives the fees will reimburse the other.

CITY’S LEVEL OF SERVICE
7) The City and the Township agree that:
   a) the City will provide fire services in the area described as Part 1 on Schedule ‘A’.
   b) the level of service provided by the City, under this Agreement, is subject to the availability of resources that are not required first to manage fire services including emergencies within the City of Cambridge, solely determined by the City in its discretion.

INDEMNIFICATION
8) The Township shall both during and after the term of this Agreement, shall at all times, and at its own cost, expense and risk, defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City, its elected officials, officers, employees, volunteers, agents, contractors, and all respective heirs, administrators, executors, successors and assigns from any and all losses, damages (including, but not limited to, incidental, indirect, special and consequential damages, or any loss of use, revenue or profit by any person, organization or entity), fines, penalties and surcharges, liabilities (including, but not limited to, any and all liability for damage to property and injury to persons, including death), judgments, claims, demands, causes of action, contracts, suits, actions or other proceedings of any kind (including, but not limited to proceedings of a criminal, administrative or quasi criminal nature) and expenses (including, but not limited to, legal fees on a substantial indemnity basis), which the indemnified person or persons may suffer or incur, howsoever caused, arising out of or in consequence of or directly or indirectly attributable to the activities contemplated by this Agreement and/or required to be performed by the Township, its agents, employees and sub-contractors on behalf of the City, whether such losses, damages, fines, penalties and surcharges, liabilities, judgments, claims, demands, causes of action, contracts, suits, actions or other proceedings of any kind as defined above are due or claimed to be due to the negligence, breach of contract, and/or breach of law of the Township, its agents, employees or sub-contractors, or the City, its agents or employees.

9) The City shall both during and after the term of this Agreement, shall at all times, and at its own cost, expense and risk, defend, indemnify and hold harmless the Township, its elected officials, officers, employees, volunteers, agents, contractors, and all respective heirs, administrators, executors, successors and assigns from any and all losses, damages (including, but not limited to, incidental, indirect, special and consequential damages, or any loss of use, revenue or profit by any person, organization or entity), fines, penalties and surcharges, liabilities (including, but not limited to, any and all liability for damage to property and injury to persons, including death), judgments, claims, demands, causes of action, contracts, suits, actions or other proceedings of any kind (including, but not limited to proceedings of a criminal, administrative or quasi criminal nature) and expenses (including, but not limited to, legal fees on a substantial indemnity basis), which the indemnified person or persons may suffer or incur, attributable to the activities contemplated by this Agreement and/or required to be performed by the City, its agents, employees and sub-contractors on behalf of the Township, whether such losses, damages, fines, penalties and surcharges, liabilities, judgments, claims, demands, causes of action, contracts, suits, actions or other proceedings of any kind as defined above are due or claimed to be due to the negligence, breach of contract, and/or breach of law of the City, its agents, employees or sub-contractors, or the Township, its agents or employees.

INSURANCE
10) The parties shall insure themselves under the following minimal coverages so as to protect and indemnify and save harmless the other party:
a) **General Liability Insurance**: The Parties shall maintain liability insurance acceptable to each other throughout the term of this Agreement. Coverage shall consist of a comprehensive policy of public liability and property damage insurance in an amount of not less than $5,000,000 per occurrence. **Such insurance shall name the other party as an additional insured** thereunder and shall be endorsed to include a Cross-Liability Endorsement with a Severability of Interests Clause, Blanket Contractual Liability, if required and Non-Owned Automobile Liability. The policy SIR/deductible shall not exceed $100,000 per claim and if the policy has an aggregate limit, the amount of the aggregate shall be double the required per occurrence limit.

b) **Automobile Liability Insurance**: The parties shall maintain automobile liability insurance on all Owned and Leased Automobiles to a limit of $5,000,000 throughout the term of this Agreement.

c) **Provisions**: All Insurers must be licensed in Ontario. The parties shall forward a Certificate of Insurance evidencing this insurance with the executed Agreement. The Certificate shall state that coverage will not be suspended, voided, cancelled, reduced in coverage or in limits except after thirty (30) days prior written notice by certified mail to the other party.

It is also understood and agreed that in the event of a claim any deductible or self-insured retention under this policy of insurance shall be the sole responsibility of the party at fault and that this coverage shall preclude subrogation claims against the other party and any other person insured under the policy and be primary insurance as respects the other party. Any insurance or self-insurance maintained by the other party shall be considered excess of the party at fault insurance and shall not contribute with ii. The minimum amount of insurance required herein shall not modify, waive or otherwise alter the party's obligation to fully indemnify the other party under this Agreement.

The City reserves the right to modify the insurance requirements as deemed suitable.

**TERMINATION**

11) The City may immediately terminate the Agreement upon giving notice to the Township in the event that:

   a) the Township breaches any provisions of this Agreement;
   
   b) the Township breaches any confidentiality or conflict of interest obligation set out in the Agreement;
   
   c) the Township, prior to or after executing the Agreement, makes a material misrepresentation or omission or provides materially inaccurate information to the City upon which the City relies.

12) Either Party may terminate this Agreement without cause, upon providing one hundred and eighty (180) days' notice to the other Party.

**NOTICE**

13) Any notice required by this Agreement shall be in writing and shall be deemed to have been sufficiently given when delivered personally, sent by prepaid registered post or telecopy (facsimile) to the addresses below:

**CITY**

Attention: Legal Services
The Corporation of the City of Cambridge
50 Dickson Street, 2nd floor, PO Box 669
Cambridge, ON N1R 5W8
Fax: (519) 740-4695

**TOWNSHIP**

Attention: Courtenay Hoytfox, Clerk
The Corporation of the Township of Puslinch
7404 Wellington Road #34
Puslinch, ON N0B 2J0
Fax: (519) 763-5846
APPLICABLE LAW

14) This Agreement and any information provided pursuant to this Agreement is subject to the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. M.56.

15) The parties shall conform to all applicable federal and provincial law and to any applicable City by-laws, policies and practices.

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

16) Upon termination or expiry of this Agreement, the Township shall return to the City all written or descriptive matter, including but not limited to drawings, prints, descriptions or other papers, documents or any other material maintained in any format, including digital format, which contains any Confidential Information whatsoever.

17) Subject to the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. F.31 and the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. M.56 and any amendments thereto, and except as expressly provided in this clause, no Confidential Information shall be disclosed in any manner whatsoever without the approval in writing of the City.

18) The Township shall hold all Confidential Information obtained in trust and confidence for the City and shall not disclose any such Confidential Information, by publication or other means, to any person, company or other government agency nor use same for any other project other than for the benefit of the City as may be authorized by the City in writing.

19) Any request for such approval by the City shall specifically state the benefit to the City of the disclosure of the Confidential Information.

20) Any use of the Confidential Information shall be limited to the express purposes as set out in the approval of the City.

21) The Township shall not, at any time during or after the term of this Agreement, use any Confidential Information for the benefit of anyone other than the City.

WAIVER

22) The waiver of any provision in the Agreement or the failure of any party hereto to enforce any right shall apply to that provision or right only and shall not be deemed to effect the validity of the remainder of the Agreement.

23) No departure from or waiver of the terms of this Agreement shall be deemed to authorize any prior or subsequent departure or waiver and the City shall not be obligated to continue any departure or waiver or to permit any subsequent departure or waiver.

COVENANTS

24) The Parties agree that all covenants and conditions contained in this Agreement shall be severable, and that should any covenant or condition in the Agreement be declared invalid or unenforceable by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining covenants and conditions and the remainder of the Agreement shall remain valid and not terminate thereby.

SURVIVAL

25) The provisions of this Agreement pertaining to indemnity and limitation shall survive the termination or expiration of this Agreement for any reason whatsoever, including expiry at the end of the term, in addition to any other provision which survives by operation of law or which expressly or by implication remains in full force and effect on and after the termination or expiration of this Agreement.

NOT AN AGENT

26) The Township and the City agree that the Township, its servants, agents and employees shall under no circumstances be deemed agents or representatives of the City and except as the City may specifically authorize in writing, shall have no right to enter into any contracts or commitments in the name of or on behalf of the City or to bind the City in any respect whatsoever.

COMPLETE AGREEMENT

27) The Agreement embodies the entire agreement between the parties with regard to the provision of deliverables and additional deliverables and supersedes any prior understanding or agreement, collateral, oral or otherwise with respect to the provision of
the deliverables and additional deliverables, unless they are incorporated by reference in
the Agreement, existing between the parties at the date of execution of the Agreement.

28) This Agreement shall be constructed with all changes in number and gender as may be
required by the context. Any titles used within this document are for reference purposes
only and not an aid to interpretation.

29) All obligations herein contained, although not expressed to be covenants, shall be
deemed to be covenants.

30) Whenever a statement or provision in this Agreement is followed by words denoting
inclusion or example and then a list of or reference to specific items, such list or
reference shall not be read so as to limit the generality of that statement or provision,
even if words such as "without limiting the generality of the foregoing" do not precede
such list or reference.

31) The Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the
Province of Ontario and the federal laws of Canada applicable therein.

ASSIGNMENT

32) This Agreement shall not be assignable by the Township without the prior written
consent of the City, in its sole discretion.

SUCCESSORS

33) The Agreement shall be binding upon, the heirs, executors, administrators, successors
and permitted assigns of the parties hereto.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

34) The parties to this Agreement shall not knowingly place public office holders in a conflict
of interest or in breach of the public office holders’ codes of conduct or standards of
behaviour. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the parties shall not, directly or indirectly,
offer or provide any gift or benefit to Township or City Members of Council or their staff
in regard to this Agreement.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

35) In the event of a dispute between the parties,

a) Each of the parties shall use their best efforts exercised in good faith to resolve the
dispute by negotiation between the City and the Township. If the parties are unable
to resolve any dispute referred to them within ten (10) business days following such
referral, the parties agree to the procedure for an informal referee set forth below.

b) The referee shall be an impartial professional with at least five (5) years’ experience
in the negotiation of agreements. The parties agree that the purpose of such
reference is for the economical and expedient resolution of the dispute and that it
shall not be in the nature of an arbitration as contemplated by the Arbitrations Act
(Ontario) and that the decision of the referee shall not be binding upon the Parties
but shall be considered as a bona fide attempt by the referee to resolve the matter in
dispute. For this purpose, either party may compel the attendance of the other party
before a referee by serving the other party with notice of such intention which notice
shall contain the proposed time and location of the reference and a list of at least
three and not more than five proposed referees.

c) Upon receipt of such notice, the notified party shall within five (5) business days
following receipt select one of the proposed individuals as the referee. In the event
that it should fail to do so within five (5) business days of receiving such notice, the
compelling party shall be free to select the referee of its choice from the same list.

d) The referee shall be required to proceed to hear and to referee the matter and shall,
within the next ensuing ten business days or so soon thereafter as may be
practical, render his decision in writing.

e) The costs of the referee and the cost of the location of the reference shall be equally
borne between the parties. Any other costs of the reference, including legal costs,
shall be borne by the party incurring such costs.

f) The parties agree that if any dispute or claim arising out of or in connection with
this Agreement that is solely as between the parties hereto cannot be resolved
through good faith negotiation to the satisfaction of the parties within thirty days
(or such longer period as may be agreed upon in writing) from the date that either party notifies the other in writing that such dispute or claim exists, then the parties agree to the fullest extent permitted by applicable law that any dispute relating to this Agreement and/or all of the matters contemplated herein shall be exclusively and finally resolved by binding arbitration before a single arbitrator selected by the parties. If the parties cannot agree on an arbitrator, each party shall select one arbitrator and said arbitrators shall then select a third arbitrator and all three arbitrators shall then arbitrate the dispute. The arbitrator(s) shall take all reasonable steps to render his decision in writing within ninety (90) days after the commencement of the arbitration proceeding. The decision of the arbitrator(s), or any two of the three arbitrators, shall be final and binding on the parties and all of their respective heirs, executors, administrators, successors and assigns. Judgment rendered by the arbitrator(s) may be entered in any court having jurisdiction. Any requirement for arbitration in accordance with this Agreement shall be governed by the Arbitration Act, 1991 (Ontario), or any successor legislation thereto, and the arbitration shall be held in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties hereto have hereunto affixed their respective Corporate Seals, attested to by their respective officers in that behalf duly authorized.

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

_____________________
Katheryn McGarry, Mayor

_____________________
Danielle Manton, Clerk

THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH

_____________________
James Seeley, Mayor

_____________________
Courtenay Hoytfox, Clerk
Puslinch Fire Protection Area – Schedule ‘A’

Part 1 | Pop. - 734

Part 2 | Pop. - 7002

Legend
- Part 1 | CFD Fire Protection Services
- Part 2 | PFD Coverage
- City of Cambridge
- Municipal Boundaries
- Major Roads
- Watercourse

Service area population (2020): 734
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## CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
### FIRE CONTRACT FEES
#### BASED ON 2021 BUDGET EXPENSES AND 2022 FORECAST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2021 Approved Budget</th>
<th>2022 Forecast</th>
<th>2023 Forecast</th>
<th>2024 Forecast</th>
<th>Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Fire Salary &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>934,900</td>
<td>949,900</td>
<td>966,300</td>
<td>982,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Fire Other Costs</td>
<td>117,800</td>
<td>136,800</td>
<td>123,800</td>
<td>126,276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Prevention Salary &amp; Benefits - Removed</td>
<td>995,800</td>
<td>991,600</td>
<td>1,010,600</td>
<td>1,028,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Prevention Other Costs - Removed</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>13,700</td>
<td>6,834</td>
<td>6,971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Mechanical Salary &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>326,000</td>
<td>287,900</td>
<td>292,400</td>
<td>296,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Mechanical Other Costs</td>
<td>440,000</td>
<td>382,500</td>
<td>397,700</td>
<td>419,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Training Salary &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>459,900</td>
<td>473,700</td>
<td>481,600</td>
<td>489,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Training Other Costs</td>
<td>152,700</td>
<td>215,500</td>
<td>134,700</td>
<td>84,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Communications Salary &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>188,100</td>
<td>192,100</td>
<td>194,800</td>
<td>197,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Communications Other Costs</td>
<td>1,108,200</td>
<td>1,146,000</td>
<td>1,146,000</td>
<td>1,146,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Suppression Salary &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>20,763,000</td>
<td>21,168,900</td>
<td>21,696,500</td>
<td>22,150,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Suppression Other Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #1</td>
<td>138,100</td>
<td>150,400</td>
<td>153,500</td>
<td>156,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #2</td>
<td>28,100</td>
<td>30,200</td>
<td>31,400</td>
<td>32,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #3</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>34,400</td>
<td>36,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #4</td>
<td>33,600</td>
<td>38,300</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>41,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #5</td>
<td>34,100</td>
<td>37,600</td>
<td>39,600</td>
<td>41,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #6</td>
<td>34,400</td>
<td>36,600</td>
<td>38,200</td>
<td>39,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Public Safety Salary &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Public Safety Other Costs</td>
<td>559,600</td>
<td>636,100</td>
<td>626,300</td>
<td>637,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Public Education Salary &amp; Benefits - Remove</td>
<td>180,500</td>
<td>185,600</td>
<td>188,100</td>
<td>190,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Public Education Other Costs - Remove</td>
<td>64,800</td>
<td>63,900</td>
<td>63,900</td>
<td>63,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>25,365,600</td>
<td>25,931,842</td>
<td>26,413,787</td>
<td>26,897,511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Direct Costs

- Computer Application Cost - FDM, and Telestaff - Web based: 5,100 (5,177) 5,254 (5,333) Based on 1.5% Increases
- Computer Application Annual Support & Maintenance Cost - CriSys, FDM, and Telestaff: 5,100 (9,375) 9,516 Based on 1.5% Increases
- Upgrades Every Three Years to FDM, and Telestaff: 1,900 (1,957) 1,987 Based on 1.5% increase Pay 1/3 per year
- PC cost with replacement every three years: 0 (0) (0) (0)

### Indirect Costs

- Mayor & Council: 224,400 0 0 0 Allocated Based on FTE
- Office of the City Manager - Admin: 95,000 (102,300) 103,500 Based on FTE
- City Solicitor: 148,700 (151,200) 153,300 Based on FTE
- Admin Corporate Services: 89,300 (100,300) 101,300 Based on FTE
- Admin City Clerk: 295,000 (314,200) 319,700 Based on FTE
- Election: 23,200 0 0 0 Allocated Based on FTE
- Human Resources: 480,900 (507,800) 514,100 Based on FTE
- Communications: 163,700 (153,700) 156,900 Based on FTE
- Technology Services: 486,337 (579,458) 604,475 Based on Total PC
- Internal Audit & Insurance: 201,700 (239,700) 258,700 Based on FTE
- Accounting & Budget: 328,600 (344,800) 351,000 Based on FTE
- Purchasing: 59,600 (63,600) 65,000 Based on FTE

### Total Indirect Costs

- Total Indirect Costs: 2,594,437 (2,557,056) 2,627,975

### Total Costs

- Total Costs: 27,960,037 (28,970,844) 29,525,486

### Population Cambridge

- Population Cambridge: 140,827 (143,711) 145,153 Data provided by Planning Department

### Surplus / (Discount)

- Surplus / (Discount): (7,900) (6,400) (5,069)

### PART 1 Total Payable

- PART 1 Total Payable: 137,800 (142,100) 144,232
MINUTES

Cambridge Environmental Advisory Committee
No. 2-21
Wednesday, October 27, 2021
Virtual via Zoom

Committee Members in Attendance: Alison Fraser, Connie Cody, Jonas Duarte, Kelly Pritchard, Lisa Grbinicek, Lorri Detta, Nicole Semper, Tom VanAarsen and Councillor Wolf (left at 7:15 p.m.)

Regrets: Allison Robson, Kathryn Hogan, Kevin Hiebert

Staff in Attendance: Kathy Padgett, Senior Planner – Environment and Karin Stieg-Drobig, Recording Secretary

Meeting Called to Order

The regular meeting of the Cambridge Environmental Advisory Committee (CEAC) was held virtually via Zoom. Chair, Jonas Duarte, welcomed everyone to the second meeting of the year after an 8-month hiatus due to COVID-19 and the meeting was called to order at 7:06 p.m.

Disclosure of Interest

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest.

Presentations NIL

Delegations NIL

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Moved by: Councillor Wolf
Seconded by: Nicole Semper

THAT the decisions contained in the January 27, 2021 minutes be adopted as written.

CARRIED

Reports

Subcommittee Reports

1. City Green Subcommittee

Kelly Pritchard thanked Paul Willms for providing a synopsis of the City Green meeting minutes. She noted that while the spring cleanup event was cancelled this year, they had recently held an autumn cleanup event that was tied to World Cleanup Day on September 18, 2021 where they
had approximately 300 participants. The spring cleanup will be held in April 2022. Tree planting has been put on hold as they wait for more available sites and replace broken and stolen equipment. Stewardship of the Ancient Mariners Canoe Club Pollinator Preserve continues and will be planted again in 2022. She further noted that Cambridge is now designated as a Bee City; signs are available to promote and showcase pollinator gardens.

The City Green Meetup page continues to provide information to the public on various events and initiatives. This includes making the Cambridge Natural Heritage Booklet available as an online resource and ‘Treemendous’ which allows the public to look up a tree at any location and receive information regarding that tree and what that tree provides to the environment. They are also looking to take a live walking tour and provide a self-guided online tour. Lastly, she noted that they continue to work at partnering with other community groups such as Idea Exchange and to engage youth through the Youth Advisory Committee.

a) Subcommittee Meeting Notes

Moved by: Tom VanAarsen
Seconded by: Connie Cody

THAT the Cambridge Environmental Advisory Committee (CEAC) receives the meeting notes from the January 11, February 1, March 1, April 12, May 3, June 7, and August 25, 2021 meetings of City Green;

AND FURTHER THAT they be appended to the CEAC minutes for distribution.

CARRIED

Correspondence

2/3. Letter and response regarding waste disposal

A letter from a Cambridge resident regarding waste disposal and the response letter from City staff were shared for information.

Information Items

4. Cambridge Cycling and Trails Advisory Committee (CCTAC)

The September 9, 2021 minutes were shared for information.

5. Regional Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee (EEAC)

The January 25, February 22 and April 26, 2021 minutes were shared for information.

6. Natural Heritage Trust Fund

Kathy Padgett provided an update on the large spade tree plantings to be undertaken at City-owned splashpad and/or playground locations with the Natural Heritage Trust Fund. A total of nine trees consisting of Swamp White Oak and Sugar Maple will be planted.
Other Business

Member Lisa Grbinicek requested a recap of active sub-committees; staff will provide an update to members via email.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of CEAC will be held virtually on November 24, 2021.

Close of Meeting

Moved by: Connie Cody
Seconded by: Tom VanAarsen

THAT the CEAC meeting does now adjourn at 7:39 p.m.

CARRIED

Jonas Duarte
Chairperson

Karin Stieg-Drobig
Recording Secretary
Kelly Pritchard assumed the Chair in Linda Simpson’s absence.

1. Review of Meeting Notes and Action Items
   - The group briefly reviewed the September and November Meeting Notes (and 2020 City Green Annual Report).
   - ACTIONS CARRIED FORWARD:
     - PW to seek permission for the April 24th event, and Organize Your Own three lending kits for groups, through the Pandemic Task Force Re-Instatement of Service process.

2. DECISION – dates?
   - The group decided to meet virtually monthly until June
     - February 1
     - March 1
     - April 5
     - May 3
     - June 7
   - Events requiring in-person attendance would be subject to evolving COVID mandates and restrictions but included the following possibilities:
     - Cambridge Community Clean Up Day – April 24th, 9-12 noon
     - Jane’s Walk – May 3rd (subject to Andrew and Kelly confirmation as walk leaders and whether the event will be virtual (as in 2020) or in-person
     - Tree Tag installation – TBC
     - Ancient Mariners Cambridge Pollinator Preserve Planting – TBC, last week in May
     - City Nature Challenge – April 30-May 9
     - World Clean Up Day – Saturday, September 18 (TBC)

3. City Green (and COVID) in the Community...
   - DECISION – “announcement” on www.CambridgeCityGreen.ca noting the group is looking forward to environmental action projects. The group discussed posting an update but it was unclear what the message would be. PW noted that we can continue to post Reep Backyard Tree Planting workshops and events and also an update on the Clean Up Day once we get closer to the date. Although there was general support for a message there wasn’t a clear idea of what it would be at this time with uncertainty.
4. Cambridge Community Clean Up

- SF noted that the group was far more optimistic in November than at this juncture January 11th that the normal April Community Clean Up Day would proceed.
- PW noted that there was a process to having “services” or other events by the City approved to go ahead that would have to be completed. It involved a form and internal City management committee and then the regional pandemic group review and approval.
- The group discussed what was the deadline for making a decision either way whether or not the event would proceed. It was felt that we have supplies (except nitrile gloves) but the promotion (signs etc.) are normally done in January. A decision would have to be made whether or not to proceed in February or March CG meetings.
- DR suggested that perhaps the group should consider World Clean Up Day instead as it took place in the third Saturday of September (in 2020). She also offered to look into the Allianz parking lot for “curb side pickup” / as an alternative City Green booth location for distribution of supplies given past experience with a food drive campaign. September 18th was the likely date for World Clean Up Day in 2021.

5. Cambridge Stewardship

- **Bee City** - PW noted that he had met with various community organizations to form a Bee City Committee and pursue designating Cambridge – through a Council resolution – in April. The organizations included Idea Exchange, rare Charitable Research Reserve, Ancient Mariners Canoe Club, Seeds of Diversity, Cambridge Butterfly Conservancy, Cambridge Self-Help Food Bank. PW noted that both the City and City Green should join the BCC and contribute to the application. City Green had worked with many organizations on pollinator projects including hosting several workshop events on the subject.

**ACTION**
- PW to pursue completion of the Bee City Canada application through a Council report in April on behalf of the Bee City Committee organizations. PW to represent the interests of the City and Cambridge City Green (unless a City Green member wishes to be part of this Committee?)

- **Tree City** – PW noted that he was pursuing designation of the City as a **Tree City of the World**. Derek Coleman of Ages Foundation (and long-time supporter of Cambridge Stewardship) had suggested the City should pursue the designation. At this time only 10 cities in Canada, 5 in Ontario, were recognized (Guelph, Toronto, Whitby, Thunder Bay, Mississauga). The deadline for the application is January 29, 2021. The announcement would be made. It is an international program, with the main partners being the United Nations (Food & Agriculture program), Arbor Day Foundation, and Tree Canada. The announcement would likely be consistent with Arbor Day.

**ACTION**
- PW to complete the Tree City of the World application.

- **Tree Tag project**

  - PW presented a draft of the tree tag (see below) for input. The tree tag project involves choosing a high profile / high traffic park or trail location and affixing signs...
temporarily to 10-15 trees that provide information on the benefits of trees in terms of “ecosystem services” (i.e. how much rainwater, carbon, energy savings, and property value increase the particular tree provides). This was explored by the City in the City’s Canopy Assessment work that led up to the Urban Forest Plan, by TD Bank, and by other municipalities in Canada in an effort to understand the values that trees, and the overall urban forest, brings to residents. The City Green volunteers would figure out the species, use the online calculator and then write the benefits on the tags and affix them to trees (see photo example). It was suggested that this be piloted at Lincoln Park in east Galt and from there could be done at various trails and parks throughout the city for 5 day periods before the signs would be taken down. The media would be advised for greater reach of the information. In the past, City Green provided this type of information at several workshop events for participants and customized the information to the person’s street tree. The City’s canopy assessment (as well as street tree information) is available at this page.

COMMENTS:
- materials should be re-usable and not coroplast which is weather proof but not recyclable and preferably compostable (corn-based signs)
- audience for these tree tags? Speak to them
- Share benefits that are most relatable to people i.e. this trees gives off X% of oxygen; reduces carbon by X%
- Keep it simple, use more relateable terms, maybe even an infographic / graphic?
- Make it more interactive: Hug a tree!....à scavenger hunt. Get school kids involved? Reep - guided component - workshop in a park, with different themes (biodiversity, etc.). Tie to Jane’s Walk either by Reep, Kelly in Victoria Park, or other location.
- Social media campaign - ‘Me and my tree’
- Develop a QR code that people could scan with their smartphones to find out more about the tree
- Timing is open, ie. it could be coordinated with the Tree City of the World announcement or Earth Day (end of April for both) but will depend on the complexity of the campaign (i.e. if it is City Green affixing tags or a larger campaign with other components)

6. Information Items
- Cambridge City Green Meetup www.CambridgeCityGreen.ca = 276 members

7. Other Business

8. Adjournment (NEXT MEETING – February 1, 2021)
CAMBRIDGE ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Cambridge CITY GREEN
Meeting Notes
Monday February 1, 2021  6 – 7:30 p.m.
Zoom Virtual Meeting

Attendance: Paul Willms, Diane Day, Kelly Pritchard, Laura Pritchard, Sandy Forsyth, Linda Simpson, Bonnie Wheeler, Dennis Samulak, Kathryn Hogan, Andrew Ramsaroop

Regrets: Danielle Glendinning, Debbie Robinson

1. Review of Meeting Notes and Action Items
   The group reviewed the actions.

2. City Green (and COVID) in the Community
   - DECISION: Join the City Nature Challenge (April 30-May9) by promoting the event on City Green’s website and individuals are free to participate
   - DECISION: Join the “Bee City Committee” / initiative to have Cambridge designated a Bee City of Cambridge

   ACTIONS:
   - PW to post the City Nature Challenge on the www.CambridgeCityGreen.ca site
   - PW to represent City Green’s interests and projects on the Cambridge Bee City Committee.

   CALENDAR
   - City Green Meetings February 1, March 1, April 5, May 3, June 7
   - City Nature Challenge (April 30-May 9)
   - Cambridge Community Clean Up – cancelled for April, postponed to World Clean Up Day September 18
   - Jane’s Walk – cancelled (group exploring alternatives such as self-guided walks, videos, virtual tour, etc.)
   - June 19 – pollinator week (possible signs, seeds give-aways) - TBC
   - Tree Tag installation at a park – TBC
   - Ancient Mariners Cambridge Pollinator Preserve Planting – TBC
   - World Clean Up Day – Saturday, September 18 - TBC

3. Cambridge Community Clean Up
   DECISION: discontinue planning the Cambridge Community Clean Up for April 24th. Shift focus, and the Cambridge Community Clean Up, to World Clean Up Day Saturday, September 18th (date TBC by both WCUD and City Green)
   - The group does not feel safe with curbside pick up and other alternatives which would put them in direct contact with hundreds of people. It is also not clear what the
restrictions for participants might be at that time or the “perception” of a large community event happening even though participants are more or less engaging as individuals in parks or families. It is also not clear what level of support the City could offer in terms of Organize-Your-Own, distributing supplies as City Hall and other public facilities where supplies could be distribuyted are routinely closed, or for pickup and disposal of thousands of bags.

**ACTIONS:**
- PW to post the postponement on the [www.CambridgeCityGreen.ca](http://www.CambridgeCityGreen.ca) site

4. Jane’s Walk

- The group cancelled Jane’s Walk (May 7-9) and A.R. and K.P have hosted walks in the past along Mill Creek and Victoria Park forest respectively.
- A.R. noted that the Kitchener Planning Dept (where he works) was contemplating doing videos and self-guided walks
- D.S. suggested that a walk along a route featuring tree tags would be interesting and work for a self-guided tour
- The group discussed self-guided tour options (for the A.R. Mill Creek tour) such as
  - QR codes on small steel signs along the Mill Creek trail route that would take a smartphone to a video segment by a City Green member on a particular topic as per A.R.’s tour notes.
  - Convert the tour to a Google Map and attach the videos (this does not involve QR codes on the landscape) but would be hosted on the City website as a walking tour or promoted as a recreational activity

**ACTIONS:**
- PW to follow up with AR on his tour notes
- PW to investigate Google Maps, Google Earth platforms for hosting a tour/video and connect with City Communications as they may have produced similar walking tours

5. Cambridge Stewardship

- **Tree Tag project**

PW noted that Debbie Robinson had contacted him with a lot of good ideas and had offered to reframe the project.

The tree tag project involves choosing a high profile / high traffic park or trail location and affixing signs temporarily to 10-15 trees that provide information on the benefits of trees in terms of “ecosystem services” (i.e. how much rainwater, carbon, energy savings, and property value increase the particular tree provides). This was explored by the City in the City’s Canopy Assessment work that led up to the Urban Forest Plan, by TD Bank, and by other municipalities in Canada in an effort to understand the values that trees, and the overall urban forest, brings to residents. The City Green volunteers would figure out the species, use the online calculator and then write the benefits on the tags and affix them to trees (see photo example). It was suggested that this be piloted at Lincoln Park in east Galt and from there could be done at various trails and parks throughout the city for 5 day periods before the signs would be taken down. The media would be advised for greater reach of the information. In
the past, City Green provided this type of information at several workshop events for participants and customized the information to the person’s street tree. The City’s canopy assessment (as well as street tree information) is available at this page

**ACTIONS:**
- PW to follow up with DR – DR to bring back some initial ideas to the April meeting.

6. **Information Items**
- Cambridge City Green Meetup [www.CambridgeCityGreen.ca](http://www.CambridgeCityGreen.ca) = 276 members

7. **Other Business**

8. **Adjournment** (NEXT MEETING – March 1, 2021)
This tree will provide $ __________ in annual benefits

This tree’s value is $ __________

Your neighbourhood tree canopy is _________%
Our city-wide tree canopy is _____________%

For more information on the City’s Urban Forest Plan or the Backyard Tree Planting Program visit www.Cambridge.ca.Forestry
CAMBRIDGE ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Cambridge CITY GREEN
Meeting Notes
Monday March 1, 2021   6 – 7:30 p.m.
Zoom Virtual Meeting

Attendance: Paul Willms, Diane Day, Laura Pritchard, Tammy Bellingham, Sandy Forsyth, Linda Simpson, Elaine Bloom, Kathryn Hogan, Andrew Ramsaroop, Debbie Robinson

Regrets: Danielle Glendinning, Bonnie Wheeler, Dennis Samulak

1. Review of Meeting Notes and Action Items
   The group reviewed the actions.

2. City Green in the Community
   
   - PW updated the group on the Bee City initiative. It will proceed to May 11th Council for approval and a presentation by Idea Exchange staff. The regional Bee group (including Cambridge) is producing Bee City signs for distribution to residents to promote pollinator gardens at home.

   - PW noted that the City was recognized as a Tree City of the World, one of only a handful in Canada, and part of the designation recognized the work that City Green and thousands of volunteers have done through the Cambridge Stewardship tree planting and other engagement around trees like the workshop events.

   - PW reported that he investigated options for the online component for a self-guided Mill Creek / Jane’s Walk tour based on Andrew’s research and past hosting of the tour. The way it could be accomplished is through some images and maps being sourced from Archives, Andrew’s text, and then use the similar Cambridge Natural Heritage Tour as the basis. Following this, small QR code permanent signs could be placed along the trail from Soper Park to Main St. and additional locations depending on the text (e.g. sites where there used to be mill ponds, or perhaps on the School of Architecture property or even Pedestrian Bridge for looking at the confluence of Mill Creek and Grand River).

  ACTIONS:
  - LS to post the City Nature Challenge on the www.CambridgeCityGreen.ca site.

  - PW to follow up with GIS/Mapping on using the Cambridge Natural Heritage Tour format for animating AR’s Mill Creek/Jane’s Walk walking tour route.
3. TREEmendous Cambridge

- DR took the group through a Terms of Reference where she captured a number of ideas. [LS later refined the document following a March 15th meeting of a subcommittee and it was sent with the April 12 agenda].

- PW and KH took the group through a presentation of “sustainable signs” but unfortunately no option rose to the top as viable, safe, within budget, sustainable, and achieves the group’s objectives. PW suggested that perhaps we focus on the online portion of the project and after that is settled perhaps the sign can be addressed as part of the promotion campaign (instead of being the way we communicate the information, e.g. he suggested a small QR code sign).

- Members indicated some of their favourite trees. PW noted that he had received an email from CG member Keith Tobey with additional tree suggestions. Some trees had “stories” such as the Sculpture Garden oak or the tree that was in the middle of the street but when paradise was paved an interpretive sign was established at 330 Main St./Flora St. to remember it. 151 Concession London plane tree. Shade’s Mill maple. St. Benedicts SS oak. Hespeler oak at Housler/Hammet hammerhead. Karch elm in New Hope Cemetery.

**ACTIONS:**
- PW to meet with Operations and Mapping staff to discuss signs and how to host information about the trees online.
- Following the meetings with City staff, and sorting out of the online part of the project, the group will return to the “sustainable sign” issue to resolve as part of the promotion / social media / educational campaign.
- A subcommittee to meet March 15th and further explore issues

4. Information Items
- Cambridge City Green Meetup [www.CambridgeCityGreen.ca](http://www.CambridgeCityGreen.ca) = 276 members

5. Other Business

6. Adjournment (NEXT MEETING – April 12, 2021 given April 5th Easter Monday)

**CALENDAR**
- City Green Meetings February 1, March 1, April 5, May 3, June 7
- City Nature Challenge (April 30-May 9)
- Earth Day – April 22
- Cambridge Community Clean Up – cancelled for April
- Jane’s Walk – cancelled (group exploring alternatives such as self-guided walks, videos, virtual tour, etc.)
- June 19 – pollinator week (possible signs, seeds give-aways) - TBC
- Tree Tag installation at a park – TBC
- Ancient Mariners Cambridge Pollinator Preserve Planting – TBC
- World Clean Up Day – Saturday, September 18 - TBC
CAMBRIDGE ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Cambridge CITY GREEN

Meeting Notes
Monday April 12, 2021  6 – 7:30 p.m.
Zoom Virtual Meeting

Attendance: Nichole Bonner, Paul Willms, Diane Day, Laura Pritchard, Kelly Pritchard, Sandy Forsyth, Linda Simpson, Elaine Bloom, Kathryn Hogan, Debbie Robinson

Regrets: Danielle Glendinning, Bonnie Wheeler, Dennis Samulak

Welcome Guests / New Members: Nichole Bonner. Moved to Cambridge a year ago, a sustainability consultant, member of Galt Horticultural Society, Waterloo Field Naturalists.

1. Review of Meeting Notes and Action Items
The group reviewed the actions.

2. City Green in the Community

Bee City
- PW updated the group on the Bee City initiative. It will proceed to May 11th Council for approval and a presentation by Idea Exchange staff. The regional Bee group (including the City of Cambridge) is producing Bee Canada garden signs for distribution to residents to promote pollinator gardens at home. The distribution date and “curbside pickup” model is tentatively scheduled for Saturday June 26th, 9-12 am at the Kitchener Auditorium (and other means of getting signs to people are being explored). 125 signs will be available for Cambridge.

Jane’s Walk Self-Guided Tour
- PW reported that he investigated options for the online component for a self-guided Mill Creek / Jane’s Walk tour based on Andrew’s research and past hosting of the tour. The way it could be accomplished is through some images and maps being sourced from Archives, Andrew’s text, and then use the similar Cambridge Natural Heritage Tour as the basis. Following this, small QR code permanent signs could be placed along the trail from Soper Park to Main St. and additional locations depending on the text (e.g. sites where there used to be mill ponds, or perhaps on the School of Architecture property or even Pedestrian Bridge for looking at the confluence of Mill Creek and Grand River).

ACTIONS:
- PW to follow up with GIS/Mapping on using the Cambridge Natural Heritage Tour format for animating AR’s Mill Creek/Jane’s Walk walking tour route.
- PW to follow up with the Bee Region garden signs initiative and if City Green volunteers want to help on June 26th distribution or to get a sign for their gardens let him know.
3. Cambridge Community Clean Up

- PW noted a lot of calls this year (in comparison to last year) with people wanting to organize litter cleanups and/or somehow conduct cleanups. The City had the same program as last year (i.e. no supplies or pickup and staff would clean up as best they can and people could report litter areas through the “app”). City staff reported some litter clean up bags in parks across the City that they picked up. SF noted that in 2022 the City Green “pop up” displays would be in Idea Exchange branches starting in March when the snow melts to address the first wave and the demand for clean up supplies at that time. DR offered the Allianz site (her workplace) to host a City Green booth on Cambridge Community Clean Up Day and/or for the March early bird requests.

4. Cambridge Stewardship

**Ancient Mariners Canoe Club Cambridge Pollinator Preserve planting event**

- Given the Provincial orders extending to May 20th (e.g. essential trips only, no gatherings of over 5 people, etc.) the AMCC planting event has been cancelled for the second year in a row

**Cambridge Natural Heritage Tour**

- PW noted that in the process of working on the Jane’s Walk and TREEmendous Cambridge projects he had found the long-lost online version of the Cambridge Natural Heritage Tour. He suggested it could be the online template to use for the Mill Creek Jane’s Walk. He also noted that in addition to the ecosystem services and other info about specific Cambridge trees, the “Street Tree / Canopy Map” could also tell someone how much canopy is on their property and the species and size of their street tree (if it isn’t one of our huge 800 TREEmendous trees....)

**TREEmendous Cambridge**

- PW reported back on the City Operatoins staff discussions about signage (i.e. that it was likely not going to work). Secondly, he reached out to Mapping staff and produced a template and spreadsheet to input ecosystem services data (and any other cool stories about the tree) into a pop-up box. The idea would change the project from “signs on the landscape” to “online”. The group could still do a random 10-15 sign “tree tag” installation but it would be for promotional purposes to drive people to the site. Social media, scavenger hunts, and other great ideas could also complement the online map or add to it (e.g. people could suggest stories and personal anecdotes about trees to add to the notes in the pop-up)

- PW demonstrated the [map](#) and spreadsheet by using the elm tree in New Hope Cemetery as an example. He noted that the 800 trees in the spreadsheet...
(large, 100cm in diameter) would need to get “ground-truthed” and whittled down (pun intended) as some of them included multiple tree trunks (that added up to 100+ cm in diameter) and so weren’t really “tremendous”.

- KP suggested people have a look at https://www.treepeople.org/22-benefits-of-trees/ maybe pick top three from this at high level and calculate as necessary or add as a link within the pop-up tree box.

- NB suggested that in addition to the ecosystem services info, or even the anecdote info, some interesting info from native plant databases could be added (e.g. Evergreen or Ladybird Johnson databases....)

**ACTIONS:**

- PW to post https://www.meetup.com/Cambridge-City-Green/events/277544695/ the Cambridge Natural Heritage Tour and Street Tree/Canopy links on the www.CambridgeCityGreen.ca site and request that Communications promote the Cambridge Natural Heritage Tour as something people can do for Earth Day (i.e. check out the 30 sites and perhaps visit one of the publicly-accessible sites).

**Street Tree and Tree Canopy Map**

**Cambridge Natural Heritage Sites**

- PW to  
  - Ground-truth the spreadsheet of 100cm + diameter trees and remove those that aren’t really tremendous (e.g. have multiple trunks that happen to take them over 100cm in diameter)
- Populate the spreadsheet with ecosystem services info to gain an understanding of the process. City Green volunteers could then be given sections of the spreadsheet, the online calculator, and could do the same (e.g. each of us take 50 or so trees to do)

5. Information Items
   • Cambridge City Green Meetup www.CambridgeCityGreen.ca = 304 members

6. Other Business

7. Adjournment (NEXT MEETING – May 3, 2021)

CALENDAR
   o City Green Meetings February 1, March 1, April 5, May 3, June 7
   o June 19-26 – pollinator week (possible signs, seeds give-aways) – TBC – Saturday June 26th, 9-12 Kitchener Auditorium
   o Tree Tag installation at a park – TBC
   o Ancient Mariners Cambridge Pollinator Preserve Planting – cancelled for this year
   o World Clean Up Day – Saturday, September 18 - TBC
Welcome Guests / New Members:

ACTION: PW to add Nichole Bonner to the City Green email distribution list.

1. Review of Meeting Notes and Action Items
The group reviewed the actions.

ACTION: City Green members to participate in the City Nature Challenge May 1st.

2. City Green in the Community

Bee City / Bee Region

- PW updated the group on the Bee City initiative (i.e. proceeding to Council May 11th followed by submission of application).

- Bee City Canada garden signs - In lieu of an annual event, the regional municipalities under “Bee Region” (i.e. Region of Waterloo, Kitchener, Wellesley, Waterloo, and Cambridge) wrote a collaborative grant application and provided funds to distribute garden signs as a social marketing project to get neighbours taking about planting native species beneficial to pollinators. The group discussed alternative distribution possibilities given COVID (e.g. Idea Exchange, mailing) but came to the conclusion that the central distribution curbside pickup format would likely be simplest and best. Some members (Kathryn, Debbie, Diane, Sandy, Nichole) noted they wanted garden signs and requested PW set aside signs. (PLEASE NOTE: PW misspoke at the meeting and signs cannot be set aside according to the grant and other partners. CG members will have to fill out the online form and pick up signs).

ACTIONS:

➢ PW to append Cambridge Bee City application to May Meeting Notes and submit to Bee City Canada following Council approval of the Resolution.
➢ PW to bring details to the June CG meeting about the Kitchener Auditorium distribution day for the garden signs (Saturday, June 26th) and ask for four volunteers for 8:30-12 noon.

Jane’s Walk Self-Guided Tour

- PW reported that he continues to investigate options for the online component for a self-guided Mill Creek / Jane’s Walk tour based on Andrew’s research and past hosting of the tour. He was looking at the platform used for the Cambridge Natural Heritage Tour but had questions around it’s applicability to a mobile phone and is following up with various staff on aspects of the project.

**ACTIONS:**

- PW to follow up with various City staff (IT, Mapping, Communications, Transportation and Engineering, etc.) on how to best create an online / phone “app” for translating AR’s Mill Creek Jane’s Walk into a self-guided always-available online tour. Initially this involves creating an online desktop version with the ultimate vision involving the creation of a smartphone application, QR-code signage, wayfinding signage pointing out a route, possible interpretive signs along the way (for those who do not have a phone or wish to follow the “lost creek” to it’s confluence with the Grand River), and that City Green volunteers do short 1-2 minute videos based on Andrew’s script/subject matter as part of the online experience.

3. Cambridge Community Clean Up

- The group did not discuss Clean Up issues but noted that the June meeting would need to be dedicated to logistics given the summer recess of City Green. Debbie Robinson offered the Allianz parking lot at 700 Jamieson (TBC) for a City Green distribution booth.

**ACTIONS:**

- City Green to discuss a possible September 18th (World Clean Up Day) at the June meeting
- PW to add Debbie’s offer of Allianz as a City Green Clean Up location to the Clean Up Logistics Notes

4. Cambridge Stewardship

**TREEmendous Cambridge**

- PW updated the group that he was culling the large list of 866 trees due to some of them not being “treemendous” (i.e. they were multi-stem trees, or even cedar hedges (!) that because of multiple trunks added up to over 100cm in diameter, i.e. a large mature tree but actually weren’t and so should be removed from the list). He also noted that the “ecosystem services” info was still not resonating (e.g. “this tree adds $211 to property value this year”) and asked for the group’s input on the type of info that should pop up about each tree. The info should not be generic “trees are good for...” type statements but hopefully be more custom-tailored to the tree – this is the
strength of the National Tree Benefits Calculator and perhaps the task involves exploring some of the tabs associated with the quantitative factoids and seeing if any of the info there is more relatable. NB suggested that in addition to the ecosystem services info, or even the anecdote info, some interesting info from native plant databases could be added (e.g. Evergreen or Ladybird Johnson databases...). KP suggested people have a look at https://www.treepeople.org/22-benefits-of-trees/ maybe pick top three from this at high level and calculate as necessary or add as a link within the pop-up tree box. PW demonstrated the map and spreadsheet by using the elm tree in New Hope Cemetery as an example and noted that City Green volunteers will be needed to fill in the spreadsheet using the National Tree Benefits Calculator (e.g. each of us takes 100 trees).

ACTIONS:

➢ PW ground-truth the spreadsheet of 100cm + diameter trees and remove those that aren’t really tremendous (e.g. have multiple trunks that happen to take them over 100cm in diameter)

➢ Populate the spreadsheet with ecosystem services info to gain an understanding of the process. City Green volunteers could then be given sections of the spreadsheet, the online calculator, and could do the same (e.g. each of us take 100 or so trees to do)

➢ CG members to send PW 2-3 trees and as much info as they can (e.g. diameter estimate, location.) – these trees may not be on City property (e.g. Shade’s Mill or Dumfires, St. Benedicts, Region/Burnett Ave/Hillborn Knoll. This will give us experience for when we open up the offer to submit additional trees to the public.

➢ CG members to take a second look at the national tree benefits calculator and advise if there are more relatable factoids in the tabs as opposed to the dollar figure or other facts that do not resonate. At this time, the “ecosystem services” outputs of the Calculator are what will populate the spreadsheet and pop up when someone looks at a tree but it was felt that this info is out of context/does not resonate...at the same time, the info should not be “generic statements” but should be tailored to the specific tree. The exercise involves looking through the Calculator and coming to the next meeting with some sample sentences or facts that we can input for each of the ~800 trees (e.g. “this tree intercepts 6,213 gallons of rainwater and this is equal to 600 bathtubs” may be more relatable than “this tree provides $346 in stormwater management services”).

5. Information Items
- Cambridge City Green Meetup www.CambridgeCityGreen.ca = 304 members

6. Other Business
- City Green’s online presence – PW asked the group if MeetUp was still meeting their needs for a website that was events-focused and allowed members to make changes
and post events (www.CambridgeCityGreen.ca). PW noted that the cost of the Meetup site was approx. ~$300/year. LS noted that Meetup has a lot of utilities for event planning and hosting. The group discussed Facebook, Instagram, etc. It was noted that members, and some others who are part of the group, do maintain the City Green Facebook group and post positive articles and local events and happenings. PW noted though that we don’t promote this Facebook group and perhaps it should be used and promoted more? The group did not think getting and maintaining a standalone website, or going to a City webpage, was an action to pursue. The group felt good sticking with Meetup and the Facebook sites for now.

**ACTIONS:**

- City Green members to check out the City Green Facebook page and post and share if so inclined.

7. Adjournment (NEXT MEETING – June 7, 2021)

**CALENDAR**

- City Green Meetings: September 13, October 4, November 1, December 6
- June 19-26 – pollinator week (possible signs, seeds give-aways) – TBC – Saturday June 26th, 9-12 Kitchener Auditorium
- World Clean Up Day – Saturday, September 18 - TBC
Bee City Canada

Application
A) City or Community Information

Municipality/First Nation  City of Cambridge
Province/Territory  Ontario

Mayor, Chief or Chair of Commission
Name & Title  Kathryn McGarry, Mayor, City of Cambridge

Name of Applicant & Title  Paul Willms, Sustainability Planner, City of Cambridge

Organization or Department  Park Operations Division–Infrastructure Services Department

Address  Cambridge City Hall, P.O. Box 669, 50 Dickson Street

City/First Nation  Cambridge  Province/Territory  Ontario
Postal Code  N1R 5W8
Email  willmsp@cambridge.ca  Phone  (519) 740-4681, ext. 4262

Bee City Liaison & Title  Paul Willms, Sustainability Planner

Organization or Department  City of Cambridge

Address  Cambridge City Hall, P.O. Box 669, 50 Dickson Street

City/First Nation  Cambridge  Province/Territory  Ontario
Postal Code  N1R 5W8
Email  willmsp@cambridge.ca  Phone  (519) 740-4681, ext. 4262
Please list the members of your Bee City Pollinator Team. This group will oversee the Bee City program. (Expand or reduce table as required)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Willms</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td><a href="mailto:willmsp@cambridge.ca">willmsp@cambridge.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Lantz</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lantzn@cambridge.ca">lantzn@cambridge.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Campbell</td>
<td>Idea Exchange</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ecampbell@ideaexchange.org">ecampbell@ideaexchange.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Paravinja</td>
<td>Idea Exchange</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cparavinja@ideaexchange.org">cparavinja@ideaexchange.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Lanigan</td>
<td>Idea Exchange</td>
<td><a href="mailto:blanigan@ideaexchange.org">blanigan@ideaexchange.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Runstedler</td>
<td>Idea Exchange</td>
<td><a href="mailto:trunstedler@ideaexchange.org">trunstedler@ideaexchange.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Dyer</td>
<td>Ancient Mariners Canoe Club / Cambridge Pollinator Preserve</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jamesdyer@sympatico.ca">jamesdyer@sympatico.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taryn Jarvis</td>
<td>rare Charitable Research Reserve</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Taryn.Jarvis@raresites.org">Taryn.Jarvis@raresites.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siobhan Bonisteel-Topping</td>
<td>Cambridge Self-Help Food Bank</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sbonisteel@cambridgefoodbank.on.ca">sbonisteel@cambridgefoodbank.on.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Simpson</td>
<td>Cambridge City Green</td>
<td><a href="mailto:linda@galtmassage.ca">linda@galtmassage.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Friends of the Cambridge Bee City Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Wildfong</td>
<td>Seeds of Diversity</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bob@seeds.ca">bob@seeds.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne Brewster</td>
<td>Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory</td>
<td>Bee City Canada Partner organization; technical support and advice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members of the Waterloo Bee Region including the current members and their respective pollinator committees from the City of Waterloo, City of Kitchener, Region of Waterloo and Townships of Woolwich and Wellesley whom the Cambridge Bee City Committee will collaborate on annual event and awareness projects.

**Media Contact** (if not Applicant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Title</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susanne Hiller, Director of Communications</td>
<td>Office of the City Manager, City of Cambridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Email** HillerS@cambridge.ca  **Phone** (519) 623-1340 x.4831
Tell us about any initiatives currently taking place in your city, community or region which protect pollinators. These may include existing pollinator gardens, habitat restoration projects, efforts to reduce or eliminate the use of pesticides and public education activities to raise awareness about pollinators.

The members of the Cambridge Bee City Committee have implemented pollinator education, habitat creation, and monitoring projects for almost two decades. Some initiatives mentioned below were completed in the past but many are ongoing and will therefore also be featured in the next section (Commitments and Actions). Many of the initiatives below are collaborative projects involving more than one Cambridge Bee City Committee member or other organizations/individuals in the community.

City of Cambridge

- The City stopped pesticide use on City properties prior to former Region of Waterloo Pesticides by-law (2005) and current Provincial regulations banning cosmetic pesticides.

- The City propagates many flowering plants in its greenhouse and maintains beds and gardens throughout the City. Design choices consider the use of pollinator friendly plants and areas are planted to encourage bee and butterfly habitat. Some examples include the Soper Park gardens; an oak savannah project featuring mostly prairie herbaceous grasses and flowers in Victoria Park; the Craig’s Crossing Pedestrian Bridge project native plantings; the Hespeler pumping station project that featured native seed mixes.

- The City has been a partner with Horticultural Societies, Cambridge City Green and the Cambridge Stewardship planting project, schools, Ancient Mariners Canoe Club, and other organizations in their efforts to bring native wildflowers that support pollinators to various locations in Cambridge as well as hosting educational events at City Hall.
Cambridge City Green

- Cambridge City Green is a group of volunteers that has existed since 1993 to encourage environmental projects in Cambridge and leverage volunteer action with the call to action of “Be the Change…” Members plan various initiatives and engage over 100 community partners and 3,000 – 6,000 volunteers annually in projects such as the Cambridge Community Clean Up, Jane’s walk, City Green Workshops and Cambridge Stewardship planting events. City Green has contributed to various pollinator habitat and education projects including the Bee the Change Workshop, Monarchs and Milkweed Workshop, Coronation Public School pollinator garden, Hespeler Public School native plantings, and Ancient Mariners Canoe Club Cambridge Pollinator Preserve. The Cambridge Stewardship project has established over 12,000 native stems (5,500 trees, 4,500 wildflowers, 2000 shrubs) representing over 175 native species at over 100 volunteer planting events with 3500 volunteers at 30 sites across the city.

Cambridge Self-Help Food Bank

- The Cambridge Self-Help Food Bank works in partnership with 5 local gardens to grow fresh food for those in need. These gardens produce approximately 10,000 lbs. a year of fresh open pollinated food for those who live and work in poverty. We work hard to be pollinator friendly by not using any pesticides in these gardens and through the planting of pollinator friendly plants. We also use our work in gardens as teaching tools about the importance of local food in supporting pollinators, biodiversity, and vulnerable populations. This includes working with the rare Charitable Research Reserve and Seeds of Diversity Canada to offer seed saving workshops and other pollinator activities to our participants and the broader community. We also highlight the importance of pollinators in the food system through our internal programming. This includes making essential links between pollinators and food in our cooking programs. We want our participants to not only develop food skills that go from seed to fork but to also understand the linkages of food to ecological systems, poverty, and community development.
rare Charitable Research Reserve

- over 1000 acres of land being preserved intact in perpetuity
- 3 acre Community Garden that includes garden plots for growing vegetables, herbs, berries, fruit trees and flowers
- village meadow of native flowering plants behind our main office
- rain garden with native flowering plants
- native plant gardens at 1679 Blair Rd, 768 Blair Rd, 681 Blair Rd
- Butterfly Loop walking trail with interpretive signage specific to pollinators
- Savvas Chamberlain Family Pollinator Conservatory
- education programs for all ages (ECO camp, guided walks, public workshops)
- butterfly research conducted by rare staff annually
- rare hosts an annual butterfly count every July
- hosts a spring plant sale where we sell native plants
- hosts a Seedy Saturday with free handouts of native plant seeds
- expanding our Native Plant Propagation Program with a new, dedicated greenhouse being built
In 2009 the Ancient Mariners Canoe Club (AMCC) began their habitat restoration project, the Cambridge Pollinator Preserve (CPP), on two acres of flood plain along the Grand River in Riverbluffs Park. This eco-friendly pollinator habitat is maintained by the AMCC.

AMCC members have carried out annual volunteer planting days since 2009 to establish a diverse community of native flowering vegetation that provides floral forage for pollinators, free of pesticides. As well as biodiversity, the wide variety of plant selections serves to identify those plants that are best suited to the soil and microclimate of the site.

The second goal of the CPP was to help the public learn about the critical role and plight of pollinators. To fulfill this role a five-panel Education Centre was opened to the public in 2012. A portable copy of these panels has allowed the CPP experience to be shared at many regional public events. Numerous groups have visited the CPP to learn about observing pollinators and creating pollinator habitat. As the oldest pollinator habitat project in operation in the region, the CPP is an important benchmark for habitat projects.

AMCC has hosted two high profile public events at the CPP: the dedication of the Education Centre in 2012 and the 10th Year Anniversary Celebration of CPP Operation in 2019. Both events were attended by local politicians, city officials and other important players in the regional pollination conservation scene. These two successful events demonstrate the potential of the CPP as a venue for future Pollinator Week celebrations.
The Preston branch has a small pollinator garden. This was planted with assistance from Reep Green Solutions to select native plants that attract pollinators. Our pollinator garden is located within our community vegetable garden where we host many of our youth and family programs throughout Spring, Summer and Fall. The pollinator garden offers great habitat as well as great opportunities to educate members of our community on native plants and the importance of protecting and attracting pollinators.

Our Preston branch has a community seed library that is entirely reliant on donations. Since our launch in 2015 we have accepted any vegetable, flower and herb seed donations that have come from the community. However, our goal for the future is to limit our flower donations to accepting only native, non-invasive flowering plants. This will be an education project where we can teach the community about which plants are native to our area. And this will encourage habitat creation within our city as more residents take seeds and plant them in their gardens.

We host school tours and in 2018 we created a garden field trip tour at our Preston branch that is targeted at Grade 3 students that focuses on the parts of plants, the needs of plants, different ways that plants are grown for food and the ways in which plants and animals depend on each other (e.g. bees and pollination). The tour includes an interactive game to help students learn how pollination occurs with bees. In 2018 and 2019 we had 274 local students participate in this tour. In our school tour the students have an opportunity to use saved seeds that have been donated to our seed library. They learn about seed saving and each student gets to plant a flower seed to take back to school/home. By limiting our focus to native and non-invasive flowering plants in our seed library, the students on this school tour will also be playing a role in habitat creation in our city. We will be expanding the tour to be offered at all Idea Exchange locations in Cambridge and to include an optional add-on where the teacher can choose to have the class plant more than one native, non-invasive flowering plant each (for example if they would like to start a pollinator garden at their school).

B) Yearly Renewal Fees

There are no fees on the initial application. The fees below apply on the yearly renewal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Range</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5000 population</td>
<td>FREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 – 10,000 population</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 – 25,000 population</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 – 50,000 population</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,0001 – 100,000 population</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,001 – 250,000 population</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,001 – 500,000 population</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,001 – 1,000,000 population</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 1,000,000 – population</td>
<td>$1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C) Commitments and Actions

I/we, the undersigned, understand that the Bee City Canada program consists of three commitments, and we will take the indicated actions to support those commitments:

1. **Creating Biodiversity in Pollinator Habitats:** Describe your plans to create, improve and maintain pollinator habitat, while reducing or eliminating pesticide use.
   - The City of Cambridge will explore new pollinator habitats in parks and natural areas in partnership with community organizations and City Green’s Cambridge Stewardship project.
   - The Ancient Mariners Canoe Club will continue to plant and maintain the Cambridge Pollinator Preserve at Riverbluffs Park.
   - *rare* Charitable Research Reserve will continue to maintain and expand various pollinator and native plant projects on its lands.
   - The Idea Exchange will continue to maintain its pollinator garden
   - The Cambridge Self-Help Food Bank will continue the important work in local gardens while expanding to include more garden partners that will grow food for those in need in ecologically friendly ways, which both support pollinators and vulnerable people. We also are working to build deeper relationships with local growers and farmers that produce food for people in need while too eliminating industrial chemicals used in large food production which is harmful to pollinators. We also run a city-wide gleaning program that promotes back yard fruit growing without the use of herbicide and pesticides.
   - The Cambridge Bee City Committee will coordinate an annual event and awareness project(s) with the Region of Waterloo Bee Region partners

2. **Educating the public about the importance of pollinators:** Describe how you plan to educate residents, city staff and others about the importance of pollinators and what people can do to protect them.
   - The Cambridge Bee City Committee members will continue their respective education programs and projects to provide the general public with seeds, information, and opportunities to expand pollinator habitat projects on public as well as private lands. The Cambridge Bee City Committee members participate in various events with their pollinator displays and educational materials through programs with schools as well as for the general public (e.g. *Idea Exchange Earth Day* event). Bee City Canada signs may be installed as appropriate at various pollinator gardens throughout the city. The Cambridge Self-Help Food Bank will educate participants on the importance of fresh food grown in pollinator friendly ways through our programming and when we share food at our facility. We will also educate the public more broadly, mainly through our social media channels and as poverty advocates at the municipal level, regarding the importance of healthy food grown for those in need while not harming ecological systems.
3. **A yearly commitment to celebrate**: Describe the cities plan to celebrate pollinators during International Pollinator Week (third week of June).

- The Cambridge Bee City Committee members host their respective events (e.g. rare Charitable Research Reserve and Idea Exchange Seedy Saturday native plant seed events). The Cambridge Self-Help Food Bank will host garden opening celebrations at the beginning of each season and events throughout the summer. During Pollinator Week we will focus our workshops and internal cooking programs on the importance of pollinators and their role in our food system. We also have a Children's Wellness Hub which plans to highlight pollinators in our children's activities during Pollinator Week.

- The Cambridge Bee City Team will join designated Bee City Canada municipalities and partners in the Region of Waterloo and plan an annual event and has already been in touch to indicate our desire to collaborate.

4. **Briefly discuss your cities long term pollinator strategy**. How will your cities landscape change in the next year? In the next 5 years?

- In the next year Cambridge Bee City Committee members plan on introducing the public to their respective ongoing projects to create awareness, appreciation and capacity for others to join.

- The Cambridge Bee City Committee will explore landscape change opportunities including:
  
  1. Explore new potential pollinator garden sites, or additions of native plants for native pollinators at tree planting project sites through City Green’s Cambridge Stewardship project.
  
  2. Expand the Ancient Mariners Canoe Club Cambridge Pollinator Preserve by adding new cells of native plants and flowering native trees each year.
  
  3. Distribution of native seeds (Idea Exchange, rare Charitable Research Reserve) for additional habitat in residential areas.
  
  4. Collaboration with Region of Waterloo Bee Region members on awareness projects.
5. Please provide a 50 to 100 word write up on what it means to be a Bee City. We will share this exciting news through our social media outlets.

The Cambridge Bee City designation gave us a chance to look back at what we’ve accomplished and look forward to the future of pollinator possibilities. We’ve changed the landscape by establishing thousands of native plants, we have organizations providing a variety of educational and citizen science opportunities to all ages, and in the near future we’ll collaboratively do great things for pollinators and the community as a Bee City! We recently saw bald eagles return to our local watersheds and now look forward to the Monarch and native pollinators coming back and contributing to Cambridge’s biodiversity.

D) Other Requirements

I/we, the undersigned agree to:

1. Publicly display Bee City Canada designation through signs, city/region/community website and other means.

2. To annually report to Bee City Canada. A renewal form and an invoice for applicable fees will be emailed one month prior to renewal date.

E) Requested Attachments

With your completed application, please provide:

1. Your city, region or First Nation logo (png format) and any usage guidelines.
2. Any photos you would like us to share on social media. This could include pollinator gardens, public events, etc.

- City logo and photos provided as separate files

F) Signatures

Applicant

Paul Willms
Print Name

Sustainability Planner

April 14, 2021
Date
G) Next Steps

1. (Applicant) Email completed application and resolution (in PDF format) with requested attachments to applications@beecitycanada.org with “APPLICATION” in the subject line.

2. (Bee City Canada) Your application will be reviewed within three business days. We will notify you as soon as your application has been approved or promptly request any clarification, if necessary.

H) Bee City Canada’s Commitment

Bee City Canada is committed to publicizing your designation as a Bee City through our website, social media and other channels. In addition, our “Bee City Welcome Package” will be sent to you and will include an official Declaration, recognizing your city or First Nation as a Bee City.

Bee City Canada is grateful for your commitment to take positive actions to help pollinators and for being a role model for other communities across Canada.
APPENDIX A – Bee City Canada Resolution

WHEREAS pollinators around the world have experienced dramatic declines due to land fragmentation, habitat loss, pesticides use, industrialized agriculture, climate change, and the spread of pests and diseases, with serious implications for the future health of flora, fauna, and the security of our food system;

WHEREAS the goal of a Bee City Canada designation is to promote healthy, sustainable habitats and communities for pollinators;

WHEREAS the designation is consistent with the City of Cambridge Strategic Plan environment, parks, and community engagement goals and objectives;

WHEREAS community organizations and individual residents have a strong tradition of developing educational, native plant, and monitoring projects that has resulted in awareness, enhanced natural areas, citizen science capacity, and increased interactions and collaboration among community stewards;

WHEREAS the designation will endorse the past efforts of the collaborative partners, highlight their ongoing initiatives, and set the stage for new projects and participants to join in making Cambridge a better place; and,

WHEREAS the designation will allow the City of Cambridge and collaborative partners to work together on an annual event and joint educational projects with the Bee Region consisting of the Region of Waterloo, area municipalities, and community partners.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED

THAT the City of Cambridge Council commits to the standards of the Bee City Canada Program and that staff be authorized to submit the Bee City Canada Application on behalf of the Cambridge Bee City collaborative partnership.

Read, approved and adopted this

_____day of ___________________, 20_____.

________________________  __________________________
Municipality  Kathryn McGarry, Mayor

________________________
David Calder, City Manager
CAMBRIDGE ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Cambridge CITY GREEN

Meeting Notes
Monday June 7, 2021   6 – 7:30 p.m.
Zoom Virtual Meeting

Attendance: Nichole Bonner, Bonnie Wheeler, Paul Willms, Laura Pritchard, Kelly Pritchard, Sandy Forsyth, Linda Simpson, Kathryn Hogan, Debbie Robinson, Elaine Bloomfield

Regrets: Dennis Samulak, Danielle Glendinning (due to work commitments Danielle has to step back for awhile but is still interested in receiving the information at this time)

Welcome Guests / New Members:

1. Review of Meeting Notes and Action Items

2. City Green in the Community

Bee City Committee Update

- Garden signs curbside pickup distribution. Saturday, June 26th, Kitchener Auditorium, Lot G, 8:30-12 noon. City Green Volunteers:

- PW noted that City Green members interested in receiving a sign will have to submit the form/pick up at Kitchener Auditorium. Form should be posted in the next week.

ACTIONS:

➢ PW and the following volunteers to help out on June 26th from 8:30-12 noon: Debbie, Nicole. Other CG members are welcome to volunteer! PW to send a map to volunteers.

➢ Send notice of the sign give-away and form to CG members

Jane’s Walk Self-Guided Tour

ACTIONS:

➢ PW to follow up with City Mapping Staff and provide Andrew’s notes and images to produce an online version using the Cambridge Natural Heritage Tour as a template
TREEmendous Cambridge

**ACTIONS:**
- PW to work with Debbie’s template, and the National Tree Benefits Calculator to complete a first draft of the database

3. Cambridge Community Clean Up
   - The agenda presented “existing and proposed clean up events” for discussion including the following:
     - **Digital Clean Up Day** – March 20th
     - **Early Birds and Lone Wolves** (not a new Country and Western group but a way to clean up just after the snow melts) – City Green Idea Exchange booths month of March
     - **Cambridge Community Clean Up Day** – third or fourth Saturday in April
     - **World Clean Up Day** – September 18th
     - **Organize Your Own** – this is generally for larger groups and supplies are provided all year long
   - Not mentioned above is the 20 Minute Makeover The City Green group used to note this as an event that would take place the Friday before the Cambridge Community Clean Up. The basic idea was that small bags would be handed out and everyone would leave their workplace or school and clean up around for a short time (20 minutes). Most groups that participated however treated it as an Organize Your Own, used larger bags, stayed out for 1 hour, etc. and so it was discontinued to simplify to just the Cambridge Community Clean Up (for individuals, families) and Organize Your Own (for larger groups).

WORLD CLEAN UP DAY – SATURDAY SEPTEMBER 18, 9-12 NOON (WATCH VIDEO)
….achieves 9 of 17 international sustainable development goals….

   - The group reviewed the “Task List” as provided in the Agenda
   - CG to set up 3 locations (not the full CCCup setup) in Preston, Galt, Hespeler. No coffee / timbits. Tim Hortons / Mark Trombley cannot be involved unfortunately due to COVID.
   - Date = Saturday, September 18, 9-12 noon (for supplies distribution, participants can do their clean up any time that day, Sunday, etc. if it’s raining)
   - Locations: Galt (Dickson); Preston (Riverside); Hespeler (Arena) – areas with large parking lots that are City-owned thereby reducing/simplifying the permission process
   - Need to keep people in their cars / assume gathering limits will be in force at that time. A drive-through setup. No registration or timed pick-ups. Need signs that say
“please stay in their cars unless you need to open your trunk or door to receive your supplies. Contactless pick-up. Waiver sign-up / tell how many supplies they need

- Glove size
- Give 2 red bags per person
- Give picker per person

Could set it up as three lanes at each location. Would need 7 people at each location (21 in total for the three locations). Alternatively we could go to two lanes with 5 people minimum at each location (15 in total). Reach out to Youth Advisory Committee of Council or Community Associations for additional volunteers beyond City Green folks.

• Nitrile gloves for CG people and a mask as well as hand-sanitizer. Table with supplies

• No waiver / no signatures – hand out the postcard explaining that it gives the www.Cambridge.ca/CleanUpRequest website, phone, or email (cleanup@cambridge.ca) for pick up of bags and the things people should be aware of that are risks (i.e. don’t clean up roadsides, fast-flowing water is dangerous, no needle pick ups etc.)

• It was confirmed that we have supplies in inventory, including pickers that could support the event

• Mobile signs – advertise for 3 weeks and then a thank-you version during the 4th week. Use City promotion methods, and other promotional opportunities (www.CambridgeCityGreen.ca)

**ACTIONS:**

- PW to seek permission for the event and the locations
- PW should provide maps of each location with 2-lane and 3-lane configurations for the curbside pick up for discussion at the next meeting.
- PW to book 3 mobile signs (for the locations) and perhaps 1-2 others on high traffic areas
- PW to send postcard to CG members for editing and inclusion of Informed Consent aspects as an alternative to waiver to eliminate contact
- PW to follow up with Graphics on a poster – libraries, neighbourhood associations, City facilities, include in neighbourhood association facebook and other methods
- PW to rent cube van to deliver tables and supplies to the three locations
- City Green would like to meet in July to continue to plan – PW to send out Doodle Poll with details. Decide if other meetings are needed. Pick three dates.
4. Other Business

- May 1-2 City Nature Challenge event results (scroll until you reach “Waterloo Region (Cambridge), Ontario, Canada”)
  - 169 people participated and submitted 1,948 observations of 551 species. Cambridge ranked 9th in Canada out of 25 participating Canadian cities.
  - Globally, 419 cities from 44 countries participated. 52,777 people participated to make 1,270,767 observations of 45,300 species, 2,100 of which were rare or endangered.

5. Information Items

- Check out and share.....
  - the Cambridge Natural Heritage Sites website. This is the digital version of the 50-page booklet that City Green used to distribute at workshop and other events.
  - This version of the Cambridge Natural Heritage Sites Tour also includes a preamble summary of geological history of Cambridge that you scroll through before getting to the tour. Same link / site as above just with the added bonus of the preamble.
  - the Tree Canopy/Street Tree Inventory – is a combination of our canopy mapping that is updated every 5 years and includes the City-wide canopy, 38 neighbourhoods canopy, individual properties canopy, and then our Urban Forest Inventory (UFI) of individual street trees as you continue to zoom in.

6. Adjournment 7:30 pm (NEXT MEETINGS):

- July – PW to send out Doodle Poll
- August – TBD – group will decide in July whether another meeting is needed
- September 13, 2021 (this meeting may take place in person / Secord Room, TBC)

CALENDAR

- City Green Meetings: possible meeting in July and August, September 13, October 4, November 1, December 6
- June 19-26 – pollinator week (possible signs, seeds give-aways) – TBC – Saturday June 26th, 9-12 Kitchener Auditorium
- World Clean Up Day – Saturday, September 18
CAMBRIDGE ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Cambridge CITY GREEN
Meeting Notes
August 25, 2021  6:30 – 8:30 p.m.
Zoom Virtual Meeting

Attendance: Nichole Bonner, Paul Wilms, Laura Pritchard, Kelly Pritchard, Sandy Forsyth, Linda Simpson, Kathryn Hogan, Debbie Robinson, Elaine Bloomfield

Regrets: Dennis Samulak, Bonnie Wheeler, Danielle Glendinning (due to work commitments Danielle has to step back for awhile but is still interested in receiving the information at this time)

SPECIAL SUMMER MEETING TO PLAN WORLD CLEAN UP DAY

BACKGROUND

• Cambridge City Green will set up three City-owned park locations in order to distribute supplies and encourage clean ups by individuals, families, and small groups on September 18th, World Clean Up Day (WATCH VIDEO).

• Organize-Your-Own groups will be supported by Paul and supplies will be available for pick up at at Dickson Arena, 30 Park Hill Rd. W. Groups would need to adhere by gathering limits in force at the time (i.e. at this time, Stage 3, it is 100 but if the Delta variant causes the Province to go back to Stage 2, it will be 25 persons). Masks, sanitizer, distancing and all other COVID protocols are the responsibility of the group’s organizer.

• A “Re-instatement of Service” form / process was approved by the City for this event.

• No waiver / no signatures – we will move to a postcard instead of the waiver and it will explain the risks. On the opposite side will be the bag pick up info (i.e. the www.Cambridge.ca/CleanUpRequest smart phone form and QR code as well as alternatives, phone, or email (cleanup@cambridge.ca) for pick up of bags.

• Nitrile gloves for CG people and a mask as well as hand-sanitizer, distancing in effect in terms of the lineup and safety glasses or visor need to be worn. Suggest spacing tables with some supplies on each (e.g. gloves, then bags and postcards, then pickers...)

• rain / contingency plan? RAIN OR SHINE (poster emphasize that the supplies will ONLY be available Sept. 18 but the participants can conduct their clean up at any time if it is raining. Supplies for groups will be available until end of September.

• washroom available at Riverbluffs (boathouse) and Riverside Parks (grandstand) and a portapotty unit has been arranged for Hespeler Arena
ACTION ITEMS

1. PW to inquire about if Park Operations staff / those picking up and disposing of bags can report on weight of litter collected. In the past this was done by keeping scale receipts from the Savage Dr. landfill transfer station. This info is then to be reported on the World Clean Up Day site.

2. PW to register the City Green cleanup event on the World Clean Up Day site and follow up with any reporting.

3. PW follow up with Youth Advisory Committee of Council staff liaison Heather Melo about the event, promotion through schools, and possibly booth volunteers (although we do have enough CG volunteers to run the booths). Community Associations / Rachel Fraser staff liaison should also be contacted as they regularly participate in Community Clean Up Day.

4. PW order a portapotty for Hespeler Arena (8 am – 1 pm)

5. PW to check storage for three maps and include in the supplies kits. It is not possible to get maps printed at this time. Failing a map, PW and City Green members should have a list handy of locations of nearby publicly-owned parks, trails, natural areas, etc. that participants can clean up as we are often asked at the booths where volunteers are needed most. Also, if at the booth a City Green volunteer can ask where people are going and keep track on the list or map we can ensure that places do not get too many people, especially the more popular parks or trails. Here are some potential locations to recommend to participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Green booth location</th>
<th>Hespeler Arena</th>
<th>Riverbluffs Park</th>
<th>Riverside Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nearby parks</td>
<td>Optimist park/Hespeler Arena</td>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
<td>Preston Heights area: John Erb Park, Ravine Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forbes Park</td>
<td>Soper Park</td>
<td>Central Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sault Park</td>
<td>Churchill Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby schools</td>
<td>St. Elizabeth and Woodland both abut the Hespeler Arena/Optimist Park</td>
<td>GCI</td>
<td>Parkway Public School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our Lady of Fatima / Hillcrest School</td>
<td>St. Benedicts</td>
<td>Preston High School / St. Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacob Hespeler SS</td>
<td>Glenview SS</td>
<td>Ryerson Public School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby trails and natural areas</td>
<td>Hespeler woodlot trail from Housler/Hammet to Queen St. E. / River Rd.</td>
<td>Victoria Park forest</td>
<td>Linear Park / Bob McMullen trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mill Run Trail – start at Sheffield St.</td>
<td>Devil’s Creek trail</td>
<td>Dumfries Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mill Pond Subdivision trails</td>
<td>River front trails on both sides of the river and bridges (where safe, e.g. around Pedestrian Bridge)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. PW register City Green through World Clean Up Day website

7. Small signs at each booth location (5 signs) production and installation (SF and PW)

8. Promotion

- production of poster, postcard, Social, and facilities screens messaging (PW).
- Any poster and postcard text for edits by CG members to PW by Sept.1st
- PW to forward materials to CG members and any other organizations as soon as they are produced (e.g. Youth Advisory Committee and schools, Community Associations, etc.).
- PW to post on the www.CambridgeCityGreen.ca site.
- Mobile signs to be placed at 7 locations.

9. City Green booths

(Paul will stop in at each booth / be available as a Go-For for any supply shortages or other issues 226-988-2422)

Hespeler - Hespeler Arena / 640 Ellis Rd.
  - Sandy (plus John Forsyth, John Mactanel, Matt and Andrea)
  - Debbie

Preston – Riverside Park (King St. entrance area) / 49 King St. W.
  - Elaine
  - Diane
  - Kelly
  - Laura

Galt – Riverbluffs Park / 251 George St. N.
  - Linda
  - Nichole
  - Kathryn
  - Andrew

10. Supply Pickups – Friday September 17th at Dickson Arena (30 Park Hill Rd. W) at designated times. Park in the closest spots to the arena building and Park Hill Rd.. PW will bring out supplies from the Park Hill Rd. entrance to your vehicle. When returning supplies we will do the same – park and unload onto a cart (PW will have two carts in operation).

  - Kelly / Laura (Preston) – 11 am
  - Nichole (Galt) – 1pm
  - Sandy (Hespeler) – 2pm

11. New meeting time – the group decided that it liked the later meeting time of 6:30pm over 6pm given the experience of the summer meetings. Going forward all City Green meetings will be 6:30-8pm
Committee Members in Attendance: Sue Brown, Nelson Cecilia, Michelle Goodridge, Mark Leclair (arrived 7:47 p.m.), Scott Roberts, Councillor Pam Wolf and Nancy Woodman with John Oldfield in the Chair

Regrets: Kimberly Livingstone

Staff in Attendance: Laura Waldie, Senior Planner – Heritage, Abraham Plunkett-Latimer, Senior Planner - Heritage, Karin Stieg-Drobig, Recording Secretary and Greg Elgie, Network Administrator

Meeting Called to Order

The meeting of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee was held virtually via Zoom and live streamed to the City of Cambridge website. John Oldfield, MHAC Chair, welcomed everyone present, introductions were made and he advised those present that in its advisory role, MHAC makes recommendations that then go to Council for a decision. The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. and the meeting adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

Declarations of Interest: NIL

Presentation:

Michelle Bartlett, Supervisor of Historic Sites (McDougall Cottage), Region of Waterloo, gave a presentation on the proposed sign for 89 Grand Avenue North. She thanked the Committee for the opportunity to speak to questions raised at the September 16, 2021 meeting. Ms Bartlett noted the proposed location of the sign is meant to allow access of the pathway around the cottage and would not block the cottage along the south or north looking streetscape. She further noted that the proposed sign will not be attached to the cottage and is not meant to be a permanent installation. Ms Bartlett added that the cottage is known for its interior murals and the proposed Indigenous mural is meant as a conscious disruption to encourage conversations about truth and reconciliation, to draw visitors into the cottage and give staff the opportunity to discuss the history of the cottage, the area and the Indigenous peoples through programming and conversations.

The Committee asked about consultation with Indigenous groups, whether the art will be juried, alternate locations around the cottage, the size of the proposed mural, how...
long the proposed mural art will be displayed, plans for additional displays, how long the proposed sign would be in that particular location and any impacts to the vegetation in the surrounding gardens. The Chair thanked Ms. Bartlett for her presentation.

Wally Malcolm, Project Manager, gave a presentation on the Dickson Hill Globe Light Replacement Project. Steven Huang, Project Engineer was also present to answer questions from the Committee. Mr. Malcolm explained there are actually two projects underway; the addition of 7 Globe Lights along Salisbury Avenue next to Victoria Park as requested by Council in 2020 and the replacement of the decorative light standards and the conversion to LED lights as part of a partnership to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. He further noted that the existing light standards are deteriorating and it is no longer possible to obtain parts needed to keep these compliant with current CSA/ESA standards. The goal is to maintain the heritage character of the current globe lights while providing up to date, cost effective, CSA/ESA safe lighting.

The Committee inquired about the remaining number of original cast iron poles versus aluminium, creating a new mold from existing lights, costs associated with making a new mold, the cost of producing the light standards, various ways to ensure the height and diameter, green of the light standards and orange hue of the globe lights remain true to the originals. The Chair thanked Mr. Malcolm for his presentation.

Delegations: NIL

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Moved by: Nelson Cecilia
Seconded by: Susan Brown

THAT the minutes of the September 16, 2021 meeting of the Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee be considered for errors and omissions and be adopted.

CARRIED

1. Sign Permit Request for Part IV Designated Property – 89 Grand Avenue

Moved by: Nancy Woodman
Seconded by: Nelson Cecilia

The Committee discussed the importance of keeping museums relevant and vibrant, the size of the proposed mural, consultations with the Art Board, location and length of time that the proposed sign would be installed for and blocking the heritage elements at the front of the cottage.
THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommends approval of the request to erect a freestanding sign adjacent to the front façade of the property municipally known as 89 Grand Avenue as outlined in Report 21-024 (MHAC).

AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC has no concerns with the variance required to the Sign By-Law to permit the erecting of a sign greater than 1.25 metres in area as outlined in Report 21-024 (MHAC).

NOT CARRIED

2. Request for New Decorative Light Standards for the Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District

Moved by: Michelle Goodridge
Seconded by: Nancy Woodman

The Committee discussed the staff report, trialing the proposed light standards on Salisbury Ave where 7 new light standards have been approved, creating a new cast iron mold based upon the original 1914 design, replicating the colours and sizes of the light standards and the globe lights, costs associated with the changes, timing of replacements, and implementation. A revised recommendation was proposed.

Moved by: Nancy Woodman
Seconded by: Councillor Wolf

THAT Report 21-027 (MHAC) – Request for New Decorative Light Standards for the Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommend the Council approve the request for a new Decorative Globe Style Light Standard which includes incorporating LED lighting and concrete poles to be used on the 7 lights at Victoria Park on Salisbury Ave. only.

CARRIED AS AMENDED

In addition, the Committee discussed the addition of a further recommendation.

Moved by: Susan Brown
Seconded by: Scott Roberts

THAT MHAC recommends a new mold be cast from an existing original cast iron globe light standard (circa 1914) be made and used for replacement of the globe light standards going forward in the City that will incorporate the desired LED lights that
replicate the desired warm tone and colour of the existing low sodium globe lights when illuminated.

CARRIED AS AMENDED

3. Sign Permit Request for Part IV Designated Property – 14 Queen’s Square

Moved by: Michelle Goodridge
Seconded by: Susan Brown

The Committee discussed projecting signs, size, height from the sidewalk and the sign by-law.

THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommends approval of the request to alter the property municipally known as 14 Queen’s Square by permitting the erection of a projecting sign as outlined in Report 21-029 (MHAC).

AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC has no concerns with the variance required to the Sign By-Law to permit the erecting a projecting sign on a Part IV designated property as outlined in Report 21-029 (MHAC).

CARRIED

4. To Advise MHAC of Minor Work Regarding Part V Designated Property – 20 Old Mill Road

Moved by: Nancy Woodman
Seconded by: Nelson Cecilia

The Committee discussed the proposed replacement from cedar to asphalt shingles noting that cedar shingles used in recent years appear to no longer have the lifespan previously enjoyed, thereby making the cost prohibitive.

THAT Memo 21-05 (MHAC) – Minor work regarding Part V Designated Property – 20 Old Mill Road be received as information.

CARRIED

Correspondence - NIL

Other Business – NIL
Chair’s Comments:

John Oldfield noted that while it is difficult to accept some of the proposed development such as the recently proposed towers on Water Street North, it is important to keeping the core areas viable and vital with people living in the area and that it is not too close to the main core area. He is hopeful the proposed HCD and height guidelines will hold developers to respect the heritage of our core areas, that the rules and regulations of the HCD are abided by and that there is plenty of opportunity for development outside of the HCD. He further noted that as the Gaslight Towers are not yet occupied, there is no sense of what the increased number of people will have on traffic, livability within the core and whether they will positively impact the merchants with in the core.

Council Report/Comments:

Councillor Wolf noted it has been a very busy time with major projects coming to Council and it is key to try and keep a balance between making the City vibrant and livable while also preserving the heritage of the City. She noted that while it was a narrow vote for the Pearle Development project, they were encouraged to be bold by business owners. The Galt Core Height Guideline Study was approved to move forward and will encourage public comments; further funding was approved for core area businesses.

Staff/Senior Planner- Heritage comments:

Abraham Plunkett-Latimer advised that the Galt Core HCD Study was endorsed by Council, and so are moving forward with preparing a Heritage Conservation District Plan with a timeline of approximately six months. He noted that MHAC will be kept up to date for further opportunities to take part in any initiatives. Abraham further noted that he had sent out information regarding place making earlier in the week and encouraged the Committee members to take part in the survey on the Engage website that is available until October 31, 2021.

General Heritage Matters – Updates by Committee Members:

Susan Brown asked if there were any funds still available in the Heritage Grant Fund for this year. Staff advised that there are no funds available at this time and that receipts are requested by November 1st for any completed work or to make arrangements for previously approved work.

Michelle Goodridge asked about the school house property on Fountain Street that sustained a fire. Staff noted that they received the engineering report, are working with the owner on plans for commemorating the structure and that a report to the MHAC is forthcoming.
Next Meeting

Date & Time: November 18, 2021, 7:00 p.m.
Location: Virtually via Zoom

Close of Meeting

Moved by: Councillor Wolf
Seconded by: Mark Leclair

THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee meeting does now adjourn at 9:17 p.m.

CARRIED

Chairperson
John Oldfield

Recording Secretary
Karin Stieg-Drobig
MINUTES

Meeting of
Cambridge Cycling and Trails Advisory Committee
October 14th, 2021
7:00 p.m. – Virtual (Zoom)

Committee Members in Attendance: Chris Smith, Victoria Lewin, Stephanie Bangarth, Rebecca Roy, Julie Graham and Councilor Nicholas Ermeta

Regrets: Selwyn Langlois and Kristi Enns

Staff Members in Attendance: Jason Leach, Sustainable Transportation Coordinator and Claire McLoughlin, Landscape Architect

1) Meeting Called to Order
The regular meeting of the Cambridge Trails Advisory Committee of the City of Cambridge was held virtually via Zoom. Stephanie Bangarth, Chair, welcomed everyone present and called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

2) Disclosure of Interest
There was no disclosure of interest.

3) Standing Items
Approval of September 9th, 2021 CCTAC minutes

Motion #1
Moved by: Chris Smith
Seconded by: Victoria Lewin
THAT the CCTAC minutes of Thursday September 9th, 2021 be adopted as printed.
CARRIED

4) Presentations
No presentations.
5) Agenda items

a) Placemaking
Alix Aiken (Manager of Recreation and Culture) joined the meeting to lead the Placemaking discussion. The committee brainstormed Placemaking ideas that Alix will include in an upcoming report to Council.

b) Capital Project Ranking
Jason provided a summary overview of the projects to be ranked. The committee proceeded to discuss and rank the projects on the list. The final ranking has been attached to these minutes.

- Subdivisions and development related trails were not deemed to be high on the priority list as many are already committed through Draft Plan of Subdivision or Subdivision Agreements and they also serve more of a local need rather than contributing to the overall network.

- Addressing barriers (such as bridges over water) and gaps in the network were thought to have more significance.

- Sidewalks and smaller infill projects were considered important as they add to the overall network and increase safety.

- The Hespeler trail was considered to be a more active trail and potentially a commuter trail compared to the North Boxwood Trail which was considered to be more recreational.

- The Dan Springs Trail was considered to be a priority as it is one of the only connections from the Delta to downtown Galt and takes bikes off of Water Street.

Additional, items raised through this discussion were;

- Councillor Ermeta requested an active transportation connection be provided from the Red Wildfong Park to River Road.

- The committee requested that the asset management trail bridges report be shared with members.

- Stephanie noted that the wooden structure on the north side of the Russ Street pedestrian bridge is in rough shape and she has seen people trip on some of the boards.
c) **Regional ATAC meeting agendas**
   Chris noted Maple Grove Road improvements were on the last Region of Waterloo ATAC meeting agenda. Jason will follow-up with the Region on what was discussed.

d) **Project updates**
   Jason mentioned that new signs and markings are being installed on the multi-use trails on Fountain Street from Shantz Hill Road to King Street and on King Street from Fountain Street to Eagle Street.

   Clair noted that North Boxwood trail alignment concepts will be coming to a future meeting.

   Clair also mentioned that Blair Trail and Grand Trunk trail signage has been installed.

e) **Black Bridge Rd at Townline Rd bike lane types**
   This item was removed from the agenda. CCTAC will have an opportunity to review the latest plans around the time that the next project public consultation occurs.

f) **Downtown Cycling Loop (T. Strickland correspondence)**
   The committee has reviewed the latest correspondence from T. Strickland and passed a motion that the email correspondence dated June 25, 2021 be received for information.

   **Motion #2**
   Moved by: Chris Smith
   Seconded by: Victoria Lewin

   THAT the email correspondence received from T. Strickland dated June 25, 2021 be received for information.

   CARRIED

g) **Cycling and Trail map**
   Jason will take the lead on the creation of a Cambridge cycling and trails map with input from CCTAC. This initiative will begin in early 2022.
6) Other News / Business

a) As McQueen Shaver Boulevard is still not open it was decided that the end of season ride would be cancelled and instead a spring ride will be planned.

b) Julie noted a few recent articles in the Cambridge Times regarding cycling in Cambridge.

c) A discussion was held regarding the implementation of Seasonal Traffic Calming signs and their impact on cyclists. Jason noted that there are several different installation configurations of these signs and some have more of an impact on cyclists than others. Jason will add cyclist considerations to the installation guidelines for when staff are reviewing future installations.

Next Meeting: November 11th 2021, 7pm via Zoom link.

Close of Meeting

Moved by: Chris Smith
Seconded by: Rebecca Roy

THAT the Cambridge Cycling and Trails Advisory Committee meeting does now adjourn at 9:00 p.m.

CARRIED

Chairperson
Stephanie Bangarth

Recording Secretary
Claire McLoughlin
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Transportation Projects</th>
<th>CCTAC Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preston/Blair Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Road Sidewalk</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbar Rd MUT Phase 2 (Industrial Rd to Hespeler Rd)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston Parkway Sidewalk</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hespeler Trail - Queen to Guelph</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Spring Way Trail Replacement</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soper Park Pedestrian Tunnel (repointing)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Bridges</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hespeler Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Boxwood Trail has a typo as Trail Bridges</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbar Rd MUT Phase 3 (Hespeler Rd to Conestoga Blvd)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinebush/Branthaven Subdivision Trails</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw Subdivision Trails</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Point Subdivision Trails</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge West Subdivision Trails</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeview-Morrison Estates Subdivision Trails</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Road Secondary Plan area</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Members in Attendance: Gerald Menezes, Frances Seward, Sandi Nicholls, Chair and Don Drackley.

Regrets: Amal Charif

Staff Members in Attendance: Lisa Chominiec, Secretary Treasurer, Edmund Carlson, Recording Secretary and Greg Elgie, Tech Services

Meeting Called to Order

The regular meeting of the Committee of Adjustment of the City of Cambridge was held on Zoom and live streamed on the City of Cambridge YouTube channel. Sandi Nicholls, Chair, welcomed the Committee and everyone present and called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. and the meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Disclosure of Interest:

N/A

Committee Business

Adoption of Committee Minutes

Moved by: Don Drackley

Seconded by: Frances Seward

THAT the Committee of Adjustment minutes from the December Sept 1, 2021 meeting be approved.

CARRIED

Notice

The Secretary-Treasurer provided the Committee Chair with sworn declarations of circulation for the applications being considered.
Applications

Application No.: A70/21

Property: 99 Green Bank Drive
RCP 1383 PT LOT 25 PLAN;58M192 LOT 25 AND RP;58R14323 PART 1

Property Owner: Badin Mohamed Hasim
Applicant: Badin Mohamed Hasim

Presentation

Using a Power Point presentation, Lisa Chominiec, Secretary Treasurer, provided an overview of the minor variance application.

Delegations

1. Ahmed Syed (Shams), was present to speak to the application on behalf of the agent.

No further persons came forward to speak to the minor variance application.
DECISION

Application No.: A70/21

DECISION: 99 Green Bank Drive  
RCP 1383 PT LOT 25 PLAN;58M192 LOT 25 AND RP;58R14323 PART 1

That the applicant’s request for the following minor variance from Zoning By-law 150-85 to permit:

1. A minimum exterior side yard setback of 4.73 m (15.5 ft) for a below grade staircase, whereas the bylaw requires a 6 m (19.69 ft) setback for corner lots.

be approved, subject to the following condition:

1. That the designs be substantially in keeping with the plans submitted with the minor variance application.

Moved By: Don Drackley  
Moved By: Frances Seward  
Abstained: Gerald Menezes

CARRIED

REASONS:

The Committee considered staff’s recommendation, and the applicant’s oral comments. The application is approved, subject to the one condition, as it is the opinion of the Committee of Adjustment, that the proposal meets the general intent of the Zoning By-law and Official Plan, is minor and will result in the appropriate development of the site.
Application No.:   A71/21

Property:   333 Grand Ridge
            PLAN 1342 LOT 11

Property Owner:  Manjinder and Parveen Dhillon
Applicant:       Manjinder Dhillon

Presentation

Using a Power Point presentation, Lisa Chominiec, Secretary Treasurer, provided an overview of the minor variance application.

Delegations

1. Manjinder Dhillon, an owner of the subject property, was present to speak to the application.

No further persons came forward to speak to the minor variance application.
DECISION

Application No.: A71/21

DECISION: 333 Grand Ridge Drive
PLAN 1342 LOT 11

That the applicant’s request for the following minor variance from Zoning By-law 150-85 to permit:

1. A minimum lot area of 370.94 m$^2$ (0.037 hec) for a secondary dwelling unit, whereas the bylaw requires 450m$^2$ (0.045 hec).

be approved, subject to the two (2) following condition:

1. That the designs be substantially in keeping with the plans submitted with the minor variance application.
2. That the secondary dwelling unit be restricted to one bedroom.

Moved by: Gerald Menezes
Seconded by: Don Drackley

CARRIED

REASONS:

The Committee considered staff’s recommendation, and the applicant’s oral comments. The application is approved, subject to the two (2) conditions, as it is the opinion of the Committee of Adjustment, that the proposal meets the general intent of the Zoning By-law and Official Plan, is minor and will result in the appropriate development of the site.
Application No.: A72/21

Property: 488 Equestrian Way
PLAN 58M-604 LOT 108

Property Owner: Jahan Nusrat
Applicant: Jahan Nusrat

Presentation

Using a Power Point presentation, Lisa Chominiec, Secretary Treasurer, provided an overview of the minor variance application.

Delegations

1. Syed Ahmed, the applicant, was present to speak to the application.

No further persons came forward to speak to the minor variance application.
DECISION

Application No.: A72/21

DECISION: 488 Equestrian Way
           PLAN 58M-604 LOT 108

The applicant is requesting a minor variance from Zoning By-law 150-85 to permit:

1. A minimum lot area of 363 m\(^2\) (0.036 hec) for a secondary dwelling unit, whereas the bylaw requires 450 m\(^2\) (0.045 hec).

be refused.

Moved By: Don Drackley
Seconded By: Gerald Menezes

CARRIED

REASONS:

The Committee considered staff’s recommendation, and the applicant’s oral comments. The application is refused, as the Committee is of the opinion that the proposal does not pass the four tests of a minor variance. The Committee has been consistent in their decisions with the R6 zone, while this site is already further intensified with special provisions reducing setbacks, frontage and lot area. Applications within this subdivision have been turned down in the past for reasons of traffic safety and over intensification.
Application No.: A73/21

Property: 47 Crombie Street
PLAN 462 LOT 79 PT LOT 80

Property Owner: Ontario Inc. 2748058
Applicant: Hans Madan

Presentation

Using a Power Point presentation, Lisa Chominiec, Secretary Treasurer, provided an overview of the minor variance application.

Delegations

1. Hans Madan the agent was present to speak to the application with the use of a map previously submitted.
2. Al St Clair, a neighbour at 54 Crombie, was present to speak against the application.
3. Patti Brooks, a neighbour at 50 Crombie, was present to speak against the application

No further persons came forward to speak to the minor variance application.
DECISION

Application No.: A73/21

DECISION: 47 Crombie Street
PLAN 462 LOT 79 PT LOT 80

That the applicant’s request for the following minor variances from Zoning By-law 150-85 to permit:

1. A minimum lot frontage of 11.25 m (36.91 ft), whereas the by-law requires 15 m (49.21 ft); and,
2. A minimum lot area of 404 m$^2$ (0.0404 ha), whereas the bylaw requires 450 m$^2$ (0.045 ha).

be refused

Moved By: Frances Seward
Seconded By: Don Drackley
Dissented: Gerald Menezes

CARRIED

REASONS:

The Committee considered staff’s recommendation, the applicant’s oral comments, and delegate comments in relation to the application. Therefore, the application is refused, as it is the opinion of the Committee of Adjustment, that the variances are not minor in nature, that the proposal does not meets the general intent of the Zoning By-law and Official Plan, and would result in inappropriate development of the site.
Committee of Adjustment  
Tuesday April 20, 2021  
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**Application No.:** B22/21

**Property:** 47 Crombie Street  
PLAN 462 LOT 79 PT LOT 80

**Property Owner:** Ontario Inc. 2748058  
**Applicant:** Hans Madan

**Presentation**

Using a Power Point presentation, Lisa Chominiec, Secretary Treasurer, provided an overview of the minor variance application.

**Delegations**

1. Hans Madan the agent was present to speak to the application with the use of a map previously submitted.
2. Al St Clair, a neighbour at 54 Crombie, was present to speak against the application.
3. Patti Brooks, a neighbour at 50 Crombie, was present to speak against the application

No further persons came forward to speak to the minor variance application.
DECISION

Application No.: B22/21

DECISION: 47 Crombie Street

PLAN 58M-604 LOT 108

That the applicant’s request to sever a residential property for the creation of a new lot, with the severed lands being a $404 \text{ m}^2$ (0.0404 hec) with a 11.25 m (36.91 ft) frontage along Crombie Street and the retained lands a of $685 \text{ m}^2$ (0.0685 hec) with a 22.80 m (74.80 ft) frontage along Crombie Street,

be deferred for 90 days.

Moved By: Gerald Menezes
Seconded By: Don Drackley
Abstained: Frances Seward

CARRIED

REASONS:

The Committee considered staff’s recommendation, and the applicant’s oral comments. The application is deferred for 90 days to allow the applicant to resolve issues, consult the community and attempt to reach consensus.
Application No.: B20/21

Property:  300 Sheldon Drive
PLAN 1383 LOT 9 RP 67R454;PART 4 AND 5

Property Owner:  Bishop Street Property Corp.
Applicant:  Victor Labreche c/o IBI Group

Presentation

Using a Power Point presentation, Lisa Chominiec, Secretary Treasurer, provided an overview of the minor variance application.

Delegations

1. Victor Labreche, the applicant, spoke to the application including a request for an amended wording of the third condition recommended by City staff.

No further persons came forward to speak to the minor variance application.
Committee of Adjustment  
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DECISION

Application No.: B20/21

DECISION: 300 Sheldon Drive

PLAN 1383 LOT 9 RP 67R454; PART 4 AND 5

That the applicant's request to sever an industrial property for the creation of a new lot, with the severed lands being a 4,043 m\(^2\) (0.404 ha) parcel with an estimated frontage of 49.30 m (161.75 ft) along Sheldon Dr and the retained lands a 5,973 m\(^2\) (0.597 ha) parcel with an estimated frontage of 65.11 m (213.62 ft) along Sheldon Dr,

be approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. That prior to final approval, the owner/applicant submits a copy of the deposited reference plan indicating the boundaries of the parcels, any easements/rights-of-way and building locations, to the satisfaction of the Planning Services Division;

2. That the applicant submits a spatial separation report to the satisfaction of the Building Division to verify that the requirements of the Ontario Building Code are met for the amount of unprotected opening areas of the existing building facing the proposed property line;

3. That the applicant verifies the location of any existing sanitary, storm and water services on the property to the satisfaction of the Building Division in order to confirm that no services will cross over any proposed property lines or are shared with any adjacent properties. Where services cross property lines easements and/or servicing agreements shall be registered on title which may include a blanket reciprocal easement over the proposed severed and retained parcels for grading and storm water management purposes;

4. That the proposed shared access easement be registered on title for both properties;

5. That an access permit through Transportation Engineering be obtained prior to the removal of, alteration to or construction of any new accesses. The application for an access permit can be found on the City’s website at www.cambridge.ca;

6. That a servicing plan be prepared, to the satisfaction of City of Cambridge Development Engineering, detailing the location of the existing and proposed services for each lot;
7. That a grading plan be prepared, to the satisfaction of City of Cambridge Development Engineering, for the overall development, including proposed locations of roof leaders, rear yard catch basins (if required) and swales;

8. That prior to final approval, the owner/applicant pay cash-in-lieu of parkland at 2% of the value of the severed land. The applicant shall provide an opinion of value from a qualified appraiser, to the satisfaction of Realty Services, in determining the value of the severed land; and,

9. That the above noted conditions must be fulfilled and the document for conveyance be presented with the required fee for signing on or before **October 15, 2022**, after which time this consent will lapse.

Moved By: Gerald Menezes  
Seconded By: Don Drackley  

**CARRIED**  

**REASONS:**

The Committee considered staff’s recommendation, and the applicant’s oral comments. The application is **approved, subject to the nine (9) conditions**, as it is the opinion of the Committee of Adjustment, that the proposal meets the general intent of the Zoning By-law and Official Plan, is minor and will result in the appropriate development of the site.
Application No.: B21/21

Property: 43 Wayne Avenue
PLAN 1365 PT LOTS 4 AND 11;RP 58R11573 PART 5 RP;67R1998 PT PART 3

Property Owner: Farooq Rana
Applicant: Farooq Rana

Presentation

Using a Power Point presentation, Lisa Chominiec, Secretary Treasurer, provided an overview of the minor variance application.

Delegations

1. Farooq Rana the owner spoke to the application.
2. Francis Augusti, neighbour at 52, spoke in favour of the application

No further persons came forward to speak to the minor variance application.
DECISION

Application No.: B21/21

DECISION: 43 Wayne Avenue

PLAN 1365 PT LOTS 4 AND 11;RP 58R11573 PART 5 RP;67R1998 PT PART 3

That the applicant’s request to sever a residential property for the creation of a new lot, with the severed lands being a 554m² (5,963.2 ft²) parcel with an estimated frontage of 16.14 m (53 ft) along Wayne Avenue and the retained lands a 1,062 m² (11,431.3 ft²) parcel with an estimated frontage 18.62 m (61 ft) along Wayne Ave, be approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. That prior to final approval, the owner/applicant submits a copy of the deposited reference plan indicating the boundaries of the parcels, any easements/rights-of-way and building locations, to the satisfaction of the Planning Services Division;
2. That the owner/applicant submit a legal survey showing the existing property, existing easements, existing dwelling, existing hydro pole(s), anchors, secondary hydro wire-feed to the existing dwelling, proposed severance, proposed dwellings, proposed driveway, proposed electric plant. The survey must include dimensions. The Applicant is cautioned that a minimum clearance between the proposed driveway entrance and existing poles, guy wires and anchors is 1.5 metres;
3. The Applicant will be responsible for 100% cost to service the new lot. The Applicant will be responsible for all costs to re-locate or upgrade if required as a result of this Application. Energy+ Inc. WILL NOT approve a severance on a lot with no service. As per Current Conditions of Service, latest edition, only one service per property is permitted. Allow MINIMUM 6 months for Energy+ Inc. to process an estimate;
4. That all EASEMENTS (will be determined once satisfactory legal plan has been submitted) must be APPROVED and REGISTERED at customer’s cost, to the satisfaction of Energy +;
5. That prior to final approval, the owner/applicant submit the consent review fee of $350.00 per new lot created;
6. That prior to final approval, the owner/applicant complete an Environmental Noise Study and enter into an agreement with the City of Cambridge to provide for implementation of
the accepted noise assessment attenuation measures, to the satisfaction of the Region of Waterloo;

7. That the owner/applicant obtain an access permit through Transportation Engineering prior to the removal of, alteration to or construction of any new accesses. The application for an access permit can be found on the City’s website at www.cambridge.ca;

8. That the applicant verifies the location of any existing sanitary, storm and water services on the property to the satisfaction of the Building Division in order to confirm that no services will cross over any proposed property lines or are shared with any adjacent properties. Where services cross property lines easements and/or servicing agreements shall be registered on title;

9. That a servicing plan be prepared, to the satisfaction of City of Cambridge Development Engineering, detailing the location of the existing and proposed services for each lot;

10. That a grading plan be prepared, to the satisfaction of City of Cambridge Development Engineering, for the overall development, including proposed locations of roof leaders, rear yard catch basins (if required) and swales;

11. That prior to final approval, the applicant pay cash-in lieu of parkland at 5% of the value of the new lot. The applicant shall provide a qualified appraiser’s opinion of value to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department in determining the value of the severed land; and,

12. That the above conditions must be fulfilled and the document for conveyance be presented with the required fee for signing on or before October 15, 2022 after which time this consent will lapse.

Moved By: Gerald Menezes
Seconded By: Don Drackley

CARRIED

REASONS:

The Committee considered staff’s recommendation, and the applicant’s oral comments. The application is approved, subject to the twelve (12) conditions, as it is the opinion of the
Committee of Adjustment, that the proposal meets the general intent of the Zoning By-law and Official Plan, is minor and will result in the appropriate development of the site.
Other Business

O.L.T. Update

Close of Meeting

Moved By: Gerald Menezes

Seconded By: Don Drackley

THAT the Committee of Adjustment Committee meeting does now adjourn at 8:15 p.m.

CARRIED

___________________________
Don Drackley, Chair

____________________________
Edmund Carlson, Recording Secretary
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November 8, 2021

Re: Item for Discussion – Request for Action Related to “Renovictions” (Councillor, C. Wilson)

At its meeting of October 20, 2021, the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Bracebridge ratified motion 21-GC-251, regarding Request for Action Related to “Renovictions”, as follows:

“WHEREAS “Renovictions” happen when a landlord evicts a tenant by claiming they will complete major renovations (or demolish the unit or convert it to commercial use);

AND WHEREAS Citizens and communities are hurt by these unscrupulous practices which can and does directly impact the affordable housing crisis, as well as inflict damage (both financially and mentally) particularly on our most vulnerable citizens;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Bracebridge request that the Government of Ontario take additional and meaningful steps to address the ever-increasing problem of “Renovictions” in The Province of Ontario;

AND FURTHER THAT this resolution be sent to other Municipalities in Ontario for their consideration and endorsement.”

In accordance with Council’s direction, I am forwarding you a copy of the resolution for you reference.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can provide any additional clarification in this regard.

Yours truly,

Lori McDonald
Director of Corporate Services/Clerk
November 1, 2021

Honourable Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building
Queen’s Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A1

Dear Premier Ford:

This is to advise that City Council, at a meeting held on October 18, 2021, passed the following resolution regarding “Renovictions”:

“WHEREAS safe and adequate housing is recognized as a fundamental human right by the Federal Government, whose effect as a major social determinant of health and wellbeing goes well beyond a basic requirement for shelter; and,

WHEREAS Kitchener’s housing situation has dramatically shifted since 2016, a Housing Needs Assessment demonstrating the average price for a house increased by 104% between 2009 to 2019, with the greatest increase since 2016, and rents increased by an average of 41%; and,

WHEREAS the City is experiencing a gap in the provision of housing, in particular the need for 450 units of supportive housing, over 5,000 units of community housing and 9,300 units of affordable rental housing to address the gaps in the existing supply; and,

WHEREAS the City of Kitchener has adopted “Housing for All – The City of Kitchener’s Housing Strategy” demonstrating a commitment to realizing the right to housing locally and addressing the housing crisis within the municipality; and,

WHEREAS landlords and investors are adding to the strain on the housing supply through the unscrupulous act of “Renovictions” by claiming they are completing major renovations and evicting and displacing existing tenants, and subsequently raising rents which affects those generally identified as lower income earners and their ability to find safe, adequate and affordable housing; and,
WHEREAS citizens and communities are hurt by these practices which can and does directly impact the housing and homelessness crisis, as well as inflict damage and trauma (both financially and mentally) particularly on our most vulnerable citizens;

THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED that the City of Kitchener lobby the Province of Ontario to take additional and meaningful steps to address the ever-increasing problem of “Renovictions”;

THEREFORE IT FURTHER BE RESOLVED that the City of Kitchener urge all levels of government to collaborate in data sharing and collection related to renovations, specifically the impacts of renovations on tenancy;

THAT IT FINALLY BE RESOLVED that a copy of this motion be sent to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, the Premier of Ontario, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and housing, the Region of Waterloo and other Municipalities in Ontario for their consideration and possible endorsement.

Yours truly,

C. Tarling
Director of Legislated Services
& City Clerk

c: Honourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Monika Turner, Association of Municipalities of Ontario
William Short, Regional Clerk, Region of Waterloo
Ontario Municipalities
RESOLUTION NO. 21-247

Moved by: Marc Dupuis
Seconded by: Steve Brousseau

WHEREAS the government of Ontario recently announced the continued postponement of the province-wide assessment update for the 2022 and 2023 taxation years, and;

WHEREAS this means that property values will continue to be based on the January 1, 2016 valuation date until at least 2024, and;

WHEREAS the Municipality of Mattice – Val Côté is aware of the important increase in property values throughout the province and within its own jurisdiction and;

WHEREAS the continued postponement of property valuation translates into a significant loss of taxation revenue for Municipalities;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council for the Municipality of Mattice – Val Côté urges the government of Ontario to reconsider its decision and to direct MPAC to proceed with a province-wide assessment update in order for Ontario Municipalities to be able to collect property taxes based upon actual property values, and;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Premier of Ontario, to MPAC, to AMO, to all Ontario municipalities and to our federal and provincial government representatives, Carol Hughes and Guy Bourgouin.

- CARRIED -

I, Guylaine Coulombe, CAO/Clerk of the Municipality of Mattice – Val Côté, do hereby certify this to be a true and complete copy of Resolution 21-247, passed by the Council of the Municipality of Mattice – Val Côté at its meeting held the 8th day of November 2021.

DATED at Mattice, Ontario
This 10th day of November 2021

Guylaine Coulombe
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November 1, 2021

Honourable Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building
Queen’s Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A1

Dear Premier Ford:

This is to advise that City Council, at a meeting held on October 18, 2021, passed the following resolution regarding the vaccine passport program:

"WHEREAS the Covid-19 pandemic has been both a health crisis and an economic crisis; and,

WHEREAS lockdown and physical distancing measures have caused significant hardship to businesses, particularly those dependent on in-person delivery or experience (ex: retail, restaurant, hospitality, personal service, etc.); and,

WHEREAS vaccinations have proven to be an effective means of keeping Ontarians safe and can enable businesses to safely remain open without compromising the health of their customers and employees; and,

WHEREAS the Province of Ontario and the Regional Municipality of Waterloo are the primary authorities governing public health in the city of Kitchener;

WHEREAS the Economic Development Advisory Committee expressed concerns about financial supports for businesses and the City’s ability to support, maintain and grow the economy;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Kitchener thank the Province of Ontario for developing the vaccine passport program, but urge the Province to provide financial supports for businesses to cover capital and human resource costs necessary to execute the program; and,
THEREFORE BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honourable Premier of Ontario, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario; and, all other Ontario municipalities."

Yours truly,

C. Tarling
Director of Legislated Services
& City Clerk

C: Honourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
   Monika Turner, Association of Municipalities of Ontario
   Ontario Municipalities
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Core Area Activity in the City of Cambridge

The Core Areas Monitoring Report is produced to provide a summary of the activity and change in the three Cambridge core areas: Galt City Centre, Preston Towne Centre, and Hespeler Village. Through a summary of activities, accomplishments and analysis of specific performance indicators, a better idea on the health of the core areas is provided.

Monitoring the health of our three core areas is essential to understanding the well-being and prosperity of the city. This report will help to provide data to guide the Core Areas Transformation Fund and the future projects it supports.

Core Areas, Population and Workforce

In 2020, the core areas have a combined number of 720 businesses and employ over 3,700 people. The population of each of the 3 core areas continued to increase over previous years. However, Covid-19 created unprecedented challenges for businesses and developers in the downtown which lead to a complete shutdown from mid-March to almost July.

BIA’s

At the start of the pandemic, the three City of Cambridge BIA’s each received $2,500 in funding from the city to create a marketing campaign for the core areas. Many local companies had videos made showcasing their businesses and the marketing campaign was very well received online.

In the summer of 2020, city staff assisted the Hespeler BIA in closing a portion of Queen Street East, in an effort to provide additional room for social distancing, patio expansions, and
pedestrian safety for commercial businesses. The Saturday road closures were very successful in assisting businesses during the challenging pandemic times.

Project Highlights

Preston – work continued on the transformation of the King Street streetscape, a partnership with the City and the Region of Waterloo.

Hespeler – the Hespeler sign project in partnership with the BIA was completed along with the widening of Adam Street.

Downtown (Galt) – Lutz Lane and the Mill Street Parking lot was reconstructed. Work continued in the Gaslight District with the construction starting on the development of 400 new residential units coupled with the opening of Tapestry Hall event space which can hold more than 1000 occupants. The Downtown Cambridge BIA also opened a new store front office for additional exposure to residents, businesses and visitors.

Core Areas Financial Incentives

The Building Revitalization Program came under the purview of the Economic Development Division and staff worked with eight building owners, who took advantage of the program for $106,051.47 in distributed grants and loans in 2020.

Total building permit fees for the Core Areas were $15,551,709.00 and the Development Charge Exemption program from the City of Cambridge and Region of Waterloo was responsible for $181,188.04 in fees waived in 2020.

COVID - 19 Impacts

Overall, the impact of COVID-19 has led the core areas to a number of decreases across various indicators in 2020. Notwithstanding, it is anticipated that the core areas will strongly rebound from the effects of the pandemic with several new projects and investments planned.

With the new financial incentives launching in 2021 and the new mixed use residential projects being completed, staff anticipates seeing larger employment numbers in the core areas as well. Additionally, when festivals and events resume in the core areas they will bring vibrancy and future place making opportunities with them.

Attachments
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Executive Summary – Core Areas Monitoring Report (2020)

In the City of Cambridge, the three core areas, namely Hespeler Village, Preston Towne Centre and Downtown Cambridge (Galt City Centre) continue to play a vital role in the identity, vibrancy and prosperity of the community. The importance of strong core areas was recognized by Council in the 2020-2023 Strategic Plan, Cambridge Connected through its commitment to “Create an inviting downtown that connects and complement core areas and neighbourhoods where people want to live and visit.” In this plan, the City identified an opportunity to lead the way in several key actions, including:

• Creating and activating spaces that offer things for people to do
• Establishing our core areas as attractive destinations
• Laying the foundation for future community building
• Enhancing opportunities to enjoy built and natural heritage

As part of our commitment to delivering public value through greater transparency, this report is the second Core Areas Monitoring Report, which provides an effective snapshot of the health of Cambridge's three core areas. It summarizes both the activities and changes that, together, work towards achieving the goals and objectives of the strategic plan. Further, it provides additional information on the past year’s accomplishments, as well as analysis related to some of the key performance indicators and measures as they relate to these significant community assets. This report will be produced annually, allowing for regular monitoring and analysis to ensure the health and success of these areas into the future. It is also a way in which the City can highlight the value of these areas and their contributions to the sustainability of the community overall.

Section 1: Introduction

This section provides the background on the Core Areas within the City of Cambridge, as well as general information about the features, size and population of each area. It will also include some information on revitalization efforts in the core areas as well as some future projects that may help to further develop the areas.

1.1 Background to the Core Areas

1.1.1 Significance and Importance of the Core Areas

The core areas of Hespeler Village, Preston Towne Centre, and Downtown Cambridge (Galt City Centre) are unique and significant places within the City of Cambridge and greater Region of Waterloo. These core areas are traditional downtowns of the former
municipalities that amalgamated in 1973 to create the City of Cambridge. Traditionally, these have been places where people have found their sense of identity, culture and history.

There is a growing acknowledgement and understanding that maintaining and enhancing existing downtown core areas is important to the overall enrichment and success of any city. Current direction in planning policy and practice throughout Ontario supports the revitalization and redevelopment of downtown core areas. The Provincial Policy Statement (2020) encourages the development of strong communities, while the A Place to Grow: Growth plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2020) highlights the importance of downtowns as growth centres, and emphasizes the need for re-urbanization and redevelopment.

Downtown cores are key locations for infill development, and are critical to reducing the rate of greenfield expansion while accommodating a growing population.

1.2 **Core Area Maps**

Within each core is an established Business Improvement Area (BIA), namely the Hespeler Village BIA, Preston Towne Centre BIA, and Downtown Cambridge BIA (in Galt City Centre). In all cases, the BIA boundaries are significantly smaller than the core area boundaries. The goals of the three BIAs are complimentary to those of the Core Areas Community Improvement Plan and Financial Incentive Programs. City of Cambridge staff works with the BIAs to assist them with their programs, projects and initiatives.

The boundaries of each core area are defined in the City of Cambridge Official Plan and are illustrated on Maps 1, 2, and 3 in the following pages along with the current BIA boundaries.
Map #1 – Hespeler Village

Hespeler Village BIA Area (77,848.13 M²)

Hespeler Village Core Area (207,647.45 M²)
Map #2 – Preston Towne Centre

---

Preston Towne Centre BIA Area (118,523.26 M²)

Preston Towne Centre Core Area (380,098.66 M²)
Map #3 – Downtown Cambridge (Galt City Centre)

---

Downtown Cambridge BIA Area (243,164.60 M²)

Downtown Cambridge Core Area (1,254,017.05 M²)

---
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Section 2: Cambridge Core Areas Accomplishments for 2020

This section provides a summary of the accomplishments and progress made on specific programs, initiatives and projects in each of the Core Areas in 2020.

2.1 All Cambridge Core Areas Accomplishments

2.1.1 Core Areas Financial Incentive Programs

As of the year 2020, the City still retained the Cambridge Core Area Revitalization Program that was approved in 1997. This long-term program provided valuable incentives that were necessary for that time period but had become dated. Accordingly, Staff has listed the Financial Incentives that were in place at the time of this report (2020).

Should Council wish to review the new Financial Incentives approved in July of 2021, they are found in Section 4 of this report.

2.1.2 City of Cambridge Financial Incentive Programs (1997 to 2020)

As noted earlier, the following incentives listed were in force and effect during the time period reviewed in this report:

Building Revitalization Program (BRP)

The BRP provides municipal financial assistance for physical improvements to the exterior of existing buildings. The City can provide interest-free and forgivable assistance towards the eligible costs of revitalizing buildings in each of the core areas. 2020 will be the last full year for the BRP program as it will be replaced with the Core Areas Community Improvement Plan.

Design Guide Program

The Design Guide Program provides funds for property owners to hire a professional design consultant to prepare a design plan for façade improvements of buildings located in core areas. The Design Guide program will also be discontinued in 2021.

Contaminated Site Grants

The Contaminated Sites Grant Program is offered to property owners to help cover the costs of doing environmental clean-up in the Core Areas. This grant can be applied to all new development or redevelopment projects undertaking remediation activities which
result in a “Record of Site Condition” acknowledged by the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks. This program will be discontinued in 2021 as well.

2.1.3 City of Cambridge Exemption Programs

The following fee exemption programs are part of the Cambridge Core Area Revitalization Program:

Sign Permit Fee Exemption
All properties located in the Core Areas are entitled to application fee exemptions for signage.

Development Charges Exemption (Region and City)

The City of Cambridge Development Charge By-law also provides Development Charge Exemptions for various types of properties located citywide, including:

- Industrial buildings, as defined, located within specific areas may receive a reduction of up to 50 percent of the development charges payable for additions
- Contaminated sites, which require remediation, may credit an amount against the development charge otherwise payable equal to the amount of the costs to clean-up the site
- Designated sites, under the Ontario Heritage Act, may be exempt from development charges payable for redevelopment or additions provided the designated building is retained and is an integral part of the development
- Land subject to development charges with existing well and/or septic services may receive a development charge credit for water and/or waste water
- Proposed new buildings for the purposes of farming may not require development charges

Development Application and Building Permit Fee Exemption

All properties located in the Core Areas are entitled to Application Fee Exemptions for the following items:

- Building Permits
- Swimming Pool Permits

As well as Development Applications:
• Severance
• Minor Variance
• Site Plan
• Official Plan Amendment
• Zoning By-law Amendment
• Pre-consultation
• Plan of Subdivision
• Plan of Condominium
• Condominium Conversion
• Part Lot Control

When a Core Area property requests any of these permits, they automatically receive an exemption from charges relating to the above noted application fees.

It is important to note that some of these exemption programs listed above have been modified or replaced by the new Financial Incentive Programs (approved in 2021) detailed in Section 4 of this report.

2.1.4 City of Cambridge Additional Grant Programs

The following Financial incentive grant programs are governed by other legislation in the City of Cambridge and are still active in the core areas:

Heritage Properties

To assist with the development or renewal of heritage properties, the City offers a development charge allowance, as well as our Heritage Grant Program.

Contaminated Sites

To encourage the development or renewal of contaminated sites, the City in cooperation and coordination with the Region of Waterloo, offers a Development Charge allowance and a Tax Increment Grant (TIG).

2.2 Hespeler Village

2.2.1 Key Projects
• Adam Street widening project – The total project value was $525,000. This project was to widen Adam Street to allow for two-way traffic. It consisted of a large retaining wall on the west side being constructed to support the widening. There was also some streetscaping improvements (street trees, bike racks etc.).
• The Hespeler Sign – an exciting focal point of the community and a project that was initiated by the Hespeler Village BIA.
• Riverbank Lofts – Construction began in 2018 and is almost complete on the 42 unit historic riverbank lofts. Located directly on the Speed River in Hespeler it will add to historic charm of this core area.

2.2.2 BIA Projects

• Closure of Queen Street on Saturdays for the summer months to increase patios and promote foot traffic to the core during the pandemic.
• The lighting of Hespeler Village Square trees and Jacob’s Landing Pergola - year-round.
• Installation of Hespeler Rock and Social Media Campaign.
• New Hespeler Village BIA Website.
• Marketing initiatives - Social media paid advertising, promotional video campaigns, business features, and themed fall’s lighting.

2.3 Preston Towne Centre

2.3.1 Key Projects

• King Street Streetscape and Redesign – This project was undertaken in conjunction with the Region of Waterloo. The total project value is $14,986,559 of which the City’s share is $6,524,731. This project involved an extensive redesign of the road, servicing and streetscape and is ongoing. Continued from 2019, this project is anticipated to be completed in 2021.
• King Street Lighting Project – Approved in 2019 the King Street lighting project will replace the existing street lights with new decorative streetlamps. Estimated time of completion is 2022.
• Phase 3 Cameras – In addition to the streetscape and decorative lighting, the city is working on a project to have security cameras installed in certain areas of the core. Estimated time of completion is 2022.

2.3.2 BIA Projects

Preston’s BIA activities were limited in 2019 due to the major reconstruction of King Street. The project is slated to continue to near the end of 2021, therefore staff is expecting to see continued disruptions in the BIA area.
• Magical lighting up of the Central Park Gazebo with lights and with music.
• Increased Facebook advertising – Due to Covid-19 and streetscaping project.
• Free Garland - To any and all businesses in the BIA to decorate their façade at Christmas.
• New Preston Towne Centre BIA Website.

2.4 Downtown Cambridge (Galt City Centre)

2.4.1 Key Projects

• Lutz Street Reconstruction and Mill Street Parking Lot Renewal – The Total Project value was $1,098,762.
• The Gaslight District – This investment is estimated at $120 million and will be a complete community development. It will house over 400 new residential condominiums, and many new commercial and retail opportunities. This development will include public art displays, dining, community and cultural events, in addition to the relocation of the local Energy Plus business offices.
• Tapestry Hall - This newly opened 1000 person event space has combined the heritage of century old limestone factory walls with beautiful modern design and art. It also has a living piece of artwork named “Meander”, which was created by a University of Waterloo School of Architecture faculty member and is part of the Gaslight District Development.

2.4.2 BIA Projects

• New Downtown Cambridge BIA office.
• Introduction of the Covid-19 Recovery Grant to help downtown businesses.
• Downtown marketing initiatives – Video marketing series, social media advertising, lifestyle photoshoots, etc.

Section 3: Performance Indicators: Change and Activity in the Core Areas

The City of Cambridge uses a number of indicators to measure and evaluate the change over time in the core areas. These indicators can also provide an assessment of the effectiveness of the Core Area Revitalization projects. The following indicators are used to provide analysis for the report:

1. Housing
2. Population and Workforce
3. Business Activity and Change
4. Development Activity
5. Financial Incentive Programs
6. Covid-19 Impacts
3.1 Housing

In 2019, the two large condominium towers were started on Grand Avenue in the Gaslight District. As previously noted, the development will add 400 new residential units to Downtown Cambridge (Galt City Centre) with the majority of work projected to be completed in 2022. In the future, staff expects to see more large-scale development as an influx in pre-consultations have been received, and direct investment into the area is increasing. Two major proposed projects in particular are of note, one at Shade and Kerr Street and the other being the development at the Cambridge Mill Site, could add large amounts of new residential units to the area and help to dramatically increase the amount of population of Downtown Cambridge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hespeler Village</th>
<th>% of Core Developments</th>
<th>Preston Towne Centre</th>
<th>% of Core Developments</th>
<th>Downtown Cambridge</th>
<th>% of Core Developments</th>
<th>Annual Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Total Units</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As detailed in Table #1 and Chart #1 (above), over 730 units added to the core areas since 2015. Staff continues to see this trend increasing, specifically within Downtown Cambridge, due to the investments planned for the area. The LRT is planned to
terminate in Downtown Cambridge and with the creation of the Core Areas Transformation Fund and the Core Areas Community Improvement Plan, this will also help draw increased investment in the cores and lead to more place-making opportunities, which will lead to a more vibrant and thriving downtown. Such intensification continues to satisfy the province’s plans for density requirements that are laid out in the Provincial Policy Statement (2020) and the A Place to Grow: Growth plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2020).

Covid-19 created unprecedented challenges for developers in the downtown which lead to a complete shutdown from mid-March to almost July; due to this many new units created were delayed until 2021.

3.2 Population and Workforce

3.2.1 Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hespeler Village</th>
<th>Preston Towne Centre</th>
<th>Downtown Cambridge</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% of Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>2,995</td>
<td>4,912</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>3,031</td>
<td>4,996</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>3,103</td>
<td>5,117</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>3,253</td>
<td>5,368</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table #2 (above) details the projected population of the three core areas for the next 10 years. This estimate has been provided by staff, which has conservatively projected the estimated growth for all of the core areas. Staff is estimating we will see more than 500 new residents move to the core areas over this period. The population of the core areas is roughly 3.5% of the total population of Cambridge, and based on the current estimate we see the population of the core areas will increase slightly to 2029. However, these estimates were done without taking into account the Core Areas Transformation Fund and newly proposed developments in the pre-consultation phase. As these new developments are approved, we may see higher population growth than predicted at this time.

3.2.2 Workforce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hespeler Village</th>
<th>Preston Towne Centre</th>
<th>Downtown Cambridge</th>
<th>Core Areas Total</th>
<th>Cambridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>7,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table #3 - Statistics Canada Business Counts Data (2020)

Table #3 (above) details the number of businesses in each of the core areas and the number of jobs according to the Waterloo Region Workplace Count (2018) and Statistics Canada Business Counts Data (2020). This shows that 6% of the total employment within the City of Cambridge is located in the core areas. Overall, the core areas are home to 720 businesses and employ over 3,700 people. As further development and mixed uses occur, staff expects this number to grow in the coming years.
3.3 Business Activity and Change

In the below charts, the distribution of businesses are shown as organized by North American Industry Classification System Code. (NAICS)

3.3.1 Core Areas Businesses

Chart #2 - Distribution of Business Types within the Core Areas

Chart #2 - Statistics Canada Business Counts Data (2020)

Chart #2 (above) shows the composition of businesses in the core areas as of 2020. From this data, 5 major sectors are evident in the core areas, namely:

- Retail – 20%
- Health Care/Social Assistance – 15%
- Other Services (Private and Household) – 14%
- Accommodation and Food Service – 10%
- Professional/Scientific and Technical - 10%
3.3.2 City of Cambridge Businesses

Chart #3 - Distribution of Business Types within Cambridge

Chart #3 - Statistics Canada Business Counts Data (2020)

Chart #3 (above) details the composition of business in the City of Cambridge as of 2019. From this data, 5 major sectors are evident in the core areas, namely:

- Retail – 19%
- Other Services (Private and Household) – 13%
- Manufacturing – 12%
- Health Care/Social Assistance – 9%
- Accommodation and Food Service – 9%
3.3.3 Summary of Businesses and Activity

The major difference between the core areas and the city overall is that core areas have significantly less manufacturing. Retail still makes up the majority of businesses in the cores, with Health Care and Social Assistance also being strongly represented. The remainder of the other top business categories in the core areas align very closely to the overall business sectors of the City of Cambridge.

3.4 Core Areas Development and Fee Exemptions

The below tables show the Construction Value and the Fee Exemptions (the list of fees exempt provided in section 2.1.2 above) for each of the core areas over the last 6 years.

### Table #5 - Hespeler Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Development Values</th>
<th>Fee Exemptions</th>
<th>% of Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$318,496.00</td>
<td>$1,502.96</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$26,309,700.00</td>
<td>$62,842.42</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$2,108,500.00</td>
<td>$19,554.01</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$13,811,000.00</td>
<td>$33,613.83</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$354,000.00</td>
<td>$3,229.92</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$96,195.00</td>
<td>$1,768.13</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>$42,997,891.00</td>
<td>$122,511.27</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table #6 - Preston Towne Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Development Values</th>
<th>Fee Exemptions</th>
<th>% of Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$963,500.00</td>
<td>$12,118.44</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$10,545,900.00</td>
<td>$128,154.09</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$1,572,000.00</td>
<td>$16,716.81</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$802,601.00</td>
<td>$22,251.14</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$449,258.00</td>
<td>$4,180.03</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$96,195.00</td>
<td>$1,768.13</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>$15,124,984.00</td>
<td>$188,718.11</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table #7 - Downtown Cambridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Development Values</th>
<th>Fee Exemptions</th>
<th>% of Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$2,006,200.00</td>
<td>$60,547.23</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$5,217,408.00</td>
<td>$64,651.94</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$40,641,500.00</td>
<td>$946,237.98</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$7,392,317.00</td>
<td>$342,986.17</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$112,700,000.00</td>
<td>$5,917,675.74</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$14,405,984.00</td>
<td>$172,660.52</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>$182,363,409.00</td>
<td>$7,504,759.58</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since 2015, each of the core areas has seen a major project over $10,000,000 approved for development. 2020 saw an end to this due to Covid-19, which has caused some anomalies in the overall development values. The Fee Exemption programs for the core areas continues to make development more attractive in Cambridge and has resulted in over $7.8 million of waived fees in the core areas. The two major projects that have caused the increase in building values will be discussed below.

The Gaslight District project in Downtown Cambridge (Galt City Centre) increased the development values of 2019 to over $100 million and has taken advantage of more than $7 million dollars in development charge exemptions.

In Hespeler Village, staff saw two large increases in building permit values in 2016 and 2018. This was due to two large high-density housing projects in the core area, the first being the 49 Queen Street apartment building project in 2016 and the second in 2018 being the Riverbank Lofts project in the old American Standard building.

### 3.5 Previous Financial Incentive Programs

The Business Revitalization Program (BRP) was active for the City of Cambridge from 1997 to 2021 and provided building owners with interest-free and partially forgivable loans for specific improvements to buildings and sites on a matching basis. Council has supported this every year which enables the loan and grants portion. As of July 3rd, 2021 the BRP Program was retired and replaced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Total Distributed</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Loan</th>
<th># New Files</th>
<th># Grants</th>
<th>#Loans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$132,121.46</td>
<td>$95,638.46</td>
<td>$38,412.30</td>
<td>$57,226.16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$136,679.65</td>
<td>$135,605.80</td>
<td>$47,462.03</td>
<td>$88,143.77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$42,970.00</td>
<td>$9,565.01</td>
<td>$7,435.93</td>
<td>$2,129.08</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$166,355.17</td>
<td>$117,994.08</td>
<td>$94,648.30</td>
<td>$23,345.94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$156,350.00</td>
<td>$38,060.50</td>
<td>$24,616.55</td>
<td>$13,443.95</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$273,648.00</td>
<td>$209,599.25</td>
<td>$90,764.30</td>
<td>$118,834.95</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$430,072.69</td>
<td>$401,681.81</td>
<td>$147,353.76</td>
<td>$47,392.95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$106,051.47</td>
<td>$5,172.50</td>
<td>$5,172.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 2013-2020</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,444,248.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,013,317.41</strong></td>
<td><strong>$455,865.51</strong></td>
<td><strong>$350,516.80</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$180,531.06</strong></td>
<td><strong>$126,664.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>$56,983.19</strong></td>
<td><strong>$43,814.60</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From 2013 to 2020, over 61 businesses have taken advantage of the BRP program with $1,444,248.44 being distributed to different businesses to help revitalize the core area and help to stimulate new business.

In 2021, staff expects will see a large increase in both the number of files and the amounts given out. In July of 2021, the BRP and DG program were retired, as the Core Areas CIP will be initiated and new financial incentives will take over.

In addition to providing the total summary of funding amount, two notes should be added to clarify the table. First, not all approved projects actually completed the work, hence the discrepancy between the total approved amount and the total distributed amount. Second, as part of the loan portion of this program, in early 2019 the City of Cambridge provided a loan of $206,935 to one property that was approved by Council through a provision in the current Community Improvement Plan. This accounts for the discrepancy in amount of funding distributed in 2019.

### 3.6 COVID-19 Impacts

#### 3.6.1 Business Openings and Closures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table #10 - Businesses Count Change - COVID-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston Towne Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hespeler Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Areas Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through the Covid-19 pandemic, staff kept a close eye on businesses that opened and closed during the pandemic. For Downtown Cambridge, staff noted 9 closures, 2 businesses relocated in Cambridge and 13 new businesses opened. For Preston Towne Centre, 6 closed businesses, 1 business relocated in Cambridge and 10 new businesses opened. Finally, for Hespeler Village, 3 businesses closed, 1 business relocated in Cambridge and 3 new businesses opened. Overall, in the core areas, Staff noted 8 more businesses opening over closing for a net gain in new businesses. Staff will continue to monitor this trend as more possible lockdowns could have further impact on the core areas. The new CIP programs will help to further renovate and revitalize vacant commercial spaces in the cores and staff expects this trend of new businesses opening to continue.

#### 3.6.2 Queen Street Closure 2020
At the beginning of July 2020, city staff assisted the Hespeler BIA in closing a portion of Queen Street East, between Adam Street and Tannery Street, in an effort to provide additional room for social distancing, patio expansions, and pedestrian safety for commercial businesses. The road closure occurred every Saturday (one day per week) and Queen Street was opened at the end of the day. The Saturday road closures were very successful in assisting businesses during the challenging pandemic times.

The final closure date of 2020 was Saturday, October 10th, 2020. This project was funded by both the City and the Hespeler BIA.

3.7 Summary of Indicators – Impacts of COVID-19

Overall, the impact of COVID-19 has led the core areas to a number of decreases across various indicators in 2020. Building permits dropped off dramatically due to lockdowns that in some cases prevented construction of non-essential projects. The Development Charge Exemption program from the City of Cambridge and Region of Waterloo (which will be continued in the new CIP) was responsible for $181,188.04 in fees waived in 2020, making the core areas more desirable for development. While the development values in 2019, are much greater than reported in previous years, staff have since seen an increase in pre-consultation requests for larger housing projects in the core areas. Staff has cautious optimism that this trend will continue post Covid-19, and more developments will follow with the implementation of the Core Areas Transformation Fund and Core Areas Community Improvement Plan.

The core areas have a combined number of 720 businesses and employ over 3,700 people. In addition, eight building owners took advantage of the BRP program for a record amount totalling $106,051.47 in distributed grants and loans in 2020. With the new financial incentives launching in 2021 and the new mixed use residential projects being completed, staff anticipates seeing larger employment numbers in the core areas. Additionally, when festivals and events can resume in the core areas they will bring vibrancy and future place making opportunities with them.
Section 4: Future Direction 2020 and Beyond

4.1 Core Areas Community Improvement Plan

The Core Areas Community Improvement Plan (CIP) 2021 provides the basis for improvement programs and initiatives within designated CIP Project Areas in the City of Cambridge. It focuses on Cambridge’s three core areas as designated in the Official Plan and Community Improvement Project Area By-law. CIPs, programs and initiatives facilitate the planning and financing of development activities that effectively use, reuse and revitalize lands, buildings and infrastructure. They prioritize municipal investment and are intended to stimulate private sector investment, property maintenance and revitalization within the project areas.

The following new programs have been approved by council and launched August 3rd, 2021:

1. Commercial Property Improvement Grant Program (CPIG)

The Commercial Property Improvement Grant Program is intended to provide financial assistance for commercial property owners/authorized tenants within the Core Areas as identified within the Official Plan. The Program aims to improve upon the appearance of commercial properties, support commercial property/business owners with limited rehabilitation of interior space and assist in creating a barrier free and accessible environment.

Buildings that have a linear foot street frontage of 25 feet or less (25’), grants will be paid on a matching 50/50 basis to a maximum of $15,000 for eligible work under the Program.

Buildings that have a linear foot street frontage greater than twenty-five feet (25’), grants will be paid on a matching basis of $600 per linear foot of street frontage up to a maximum of $25,000 for eligible work under the Program.

As a further incentive for corner properties the City will increase the maximum grant amount to $30,000, on a similar matching basis for eligible work under the Program to recognize the importance of flankage facades. The grant amount will be determined by the measurement of the street frontage and the measurement of the corner/exposed wall multiplied by $600 per linear foot.

An additional $5,000 will be added to the maximum funding for each item listed below:

Heritage listed – additional $5,000
River frontage – additional $5,000
Accessibility features – additional $5,000

This brings a maximum funding amount of any property to $45,000.

2. Commercial Building Restoration, Renovation and Improvement Grant Program (CBRRIG)

This grant has the potential to leverage significant private sector investment in interior building renovations and improvements, and help address the costs involved with renovations.

This program is restricted to the conversion of vacant, residential, or underutilized space to use as: a restaurant, market or Place of Assembly related to arts, culture, and/or recreation or rehabilitation of existing, or conversion of space for commercial use.

The program will be matching grants of up to 50% of eligible costs up to a maximum grant amount. If the building is a single commercial floor, the grant amount will be $50,000 per property. If the building is two or more floors of commercial use, the grant amount will be up to $100,000 per property.

The maximum grant may increase by $5,000 for the inclusion of enhanced accessibility elements. This will be the total maximum funding amount to $105,000.

3. Mixed Use Conversion and Restoration Grant Program (MUCRG)

The Mixed Use Conversion and Restoration Grant Program is aimed at attracting new investment and interest in converting currently non-residential vacant or underutilized upper storey space to residential units and renovating the existing commercial space located below by providing a financial incentive that will be targeted at the costs of converting the space. It is intended to stimulate the creation of new residential units on the upper storeys of existing mixed use buildings and renovating or restoring ground floor commercial occupancies.

The Commercial Restoration portion of the matching grant will be up to 50% of eligible costs up to a grant of $50,000 per property. The maximum grant may increase by $2,500 for the inclusion of enhanced accessibility elements to $52,500 per property.

The Residential Conversion portion of the Grant Program will consist of a grant, whereby property owners will be eligible to receive a grant of up to $10,000 for every new residential unit created or every unit that has been vacant on the upper floors of an existing mixed use building, up to a grant of $100,000 per property. The maximum grant may increase by $2,500 per unit for the creation of accessible residential units up to a maximum of $125,000 per property.
The total amount combined of the grant of the eligible costs is up to a maximum grant of $150,000 per property. The total amount for projects that include accessible residential units as well as enhanced accessibility elements on the ground floor is a maximum grant of $177,500 per property.

4. Core Areas Waiver of Application Fees

The following application fees may be waived if applications are for properties that are located within the Core areas as defined in the Official Plan. This waiver will only be applicable to mixed used, commercial and high-density housing, and will not be for single detached homes.

- Development Applications (Severance; Minor Variance; Official Plan Amendment; Zoning By-law Amendment; Pre-consultation; Plan of Subdivision; Plan of Condominium; Condominium Conversion; Part Lot Control) that can be supported by Planning staff and the decision to approve is made by Council or the Committee of Adjustment will be granted back following final inspection and building permit completion.
- Site Plan Application, Sign Permits and Sign Variance application fees as well as Building Permit fees will not be collected.

5. Tax Increase-based Equivalent Grant Program (TIEG)

The Tax Increase-based Equivalent Grant Program offers grants to eligible applicants whose City property tax has increased as a result of the planning or replanning, design or redesign, resubdivision, clearance, development or redevelopment, reconstruction and rehabilitation of a property within one of the designated Community Improvement Project Areas, resulting in the incremental improvement of the built character of these areas.

Property taxes for the City of Cambridge are calculated by the following ratio:

- Waterloo Region: 35.60%
- School Board: 39.27%
- City of Cambridge: 25.13%

Annual grants may be equal to 75% of the City's portion of the property tax increase. The development must meet and incorporates exemplary design standards and contributes to maintaining the heritage character of the Community Improvement Project Area.
4.2 Economic Development Strategy

In 2021-2022, the City will be creating an Economic Development Strategy. This strategy will aim to capture new trends and give direction for the future economic prosperity of Cambridge.
November 15, 2021

Honourable Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building
Queen’s Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A1

Dear Premier Ford:

This is to advise that City Council, at a meeting held on October 18, 2021, passed the following resolution regarding liquor licence sales and patio extensions:

"WHEREAS the Covid-19 pandemic has been both a health crisis and an economic crisis; and,

WHEREAS the Alcohol and Gaming Commission of Ontario (AGCO), an agency of the Province of Ontario, regulates licensed establishments; and,

WHEREAS the requirements for temporary extension of a liquor licence sales and temporary patio extensions have been relaxed throughout the pandemic, including downloading of certain approvals to the municipality, and proved beneficial to business operators; and,

WHEREAS the Downtown Kitchener BIA has invested $600,000 into new downtown restaurant patios and the Belmont Village BIA invested in creating a new pedestrian-only patio experience; and,

WHEREAS the City of Kitchener has provided $100,000 in business recovery grants to support Kitchener restaurants in adapting their patios to respond to the pandemic; and,

WHEREAS the City of Kitchener has developed a seamless system for approving patio expansion during the pandemic, supporting more than 60 restaurant owners across the city; and,

WHEREAS the City of Kitchener would like to provide further opportunities for helping strengthen our economy, continue to support local businesses, and have successfully managed the new licensed-area extension approvals delegated to the municipality;
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Kitchener strongly encourages the Province of Ontario to continue the relaxed regulations in perpetuity, including, but not limited to, the following: i) permitting extensions of licensed areas without requiring AGCO approval, subject to municipal authorization; and, ii) flexibility on the requirements for demarcation of the limits of a patio, such as not requiring a prescribed physical barrier;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that should the AGCO propose to complete a comprehensive review of the temporary extension of a liquor licence sales and temporary patio extension regulations, The City of Kitchener wishes to volunteer to participate in any pilot programs that would allow the current regulations that are in effect until 3:00 a.m. on January 1, 2022 to be maintained, as the City would like to continue to show support to our local businesses;

THEREFORE BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Premier of Ontario, Tom Mungham, Chief Executive Officer, AGCO, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, Federation of Canadian Municipalities and all other municipalities in Ontario."

Yours truly,

C. Tarling
Director of Legislated Services
& City Clerk

c: Tom Mungham, Chief Executive Officer, AGCO
    Monika Turner, Association of Municipalities of Ontario
    Joanne Vanderheyden, President, Federation of Canadian Municipalities
    Ontario Municipalities
November 15, 2021

The Right Honourable Justin Trudeau
Prime Minister of Canada
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A6
justin.trudeau@parl.gc.ca

Dear Prime Minister Trudeau,

Re: COVID-19 Testing Requirement at Land Border

At the November 9, 2021 Regular Meeting of Council, Town of LaSalle Council gave consideration to correspondence received from a resident, dated November 2, 2021, regarding the COVID-19 testing requirement for travelers crossing the land border into Canada.

The following points were considered:

- The vast majority of the population of Essex County, including the Town of LaSalle, is fully vaccinated against COVID-19;
- Essex County, including the Town of LaSalle, has strong economic and social ties to Metropolitan Detroit and southeast Michigan;
- The United States has opened their land border to fully vaccinated Canadians without COVID-19 testing requirements; and
- The City of Windsor has asked the federal government to remove COVID-19 testing as a requirement for fully vaccinated travelers crossing the land border into Canada.

At the Meeting, the following Resolution was passed:

698/21
Moved by: Councillor Renaud
Seconded by: Councillor Carrick

That the Corporation of the Town of LaSalle requests that the Federal Government remove the requirement for Canadian Travelers to be tested for COVID-19 when using a land border crossing into the United States and then returning to Canada after the November 8, 2021 re-opening.
Your favourable consideration of this request is respectfully requested.

Yours Truly,

Jennifer Astrologo
Director of Council Services/Clerk
Town of LaSalle
jastrologo@lasalle.ca

cc.  The Honourable Doug Ford
     Chris Lewis, MP, Essex
     Taras Natyshak, MPP, Essex
     Gary McNamara, Warden, County of Essex
     All Members of Parliament
     All Members of Provincial Parliament
     All Ontario Municipalities
November 9, 2021

Township of Adelaide Metcalfe
Attention: Mike Barnier, Manager of Legislative Services/Clerk
2340 Egremont Drive
Strathroy, ON N7G 3H6

Dear Mr. Barnier:

RE: Correspondence – Resolution requesting Support for Federal and Provincial Funding of Rural Infrastructure Projects

On behalf of the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Lake of Bays, please be advised that the above-noted correspondence was presented at the last regularly scheduled meeting on November 9, 2021, and the following resolution was passed:

"Resolution #7(b)/11/09/21

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Lake of Bays hereby receives the correspondence from Mike Barnier, Manager of Legislative Services/Clerk for the Township of Adelaide Metcalfe and supports their request for the Federal and Provincial Government to provide more funding to rural municipalities to support infrastructure projects related to major bridge and culvert replacements, dated September 13, 2021.

AND FURTHER THAT this resolution be forwarded to the Premier of Ontario, Provincial Minister of Finance, Federal Finance Minister, AMO, and all Ontario municipalities.

Carried."

Sincerely,

Carrie Sykes, Dipl. M.A., CMO, AOMC,
Director of Corporate Services/Clerk.

CS/cw

Copy to: Hon. Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario
Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy, Provincial Minister of Finance
Hon. Chrystia Freeland, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance
Association of Municipalities of Ontario
All Ontario Municipalities
October 8, 2021

Township of Scugog
181 Perry Street
PO Box 780
Port Perry, ON
L9L 1A7

ATTENTION: BECKY JAMIESON, DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE SERVICES/MUNICIPAL CLERK

RE: SUPPORT OF RESOLUTION – FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL FUNDING OF RURAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

Please be advised that the Council of the Township of Adelaide Metcalfe, at the regular meeting of October 4, 2021, supported and passed The Township of Scugog resolution as follows.

THAT the Province of Ontario and the Government of Canada be encouraged to provide more funding to rural municipalities to support infrastructure projects related to major bridge and culvert replacements.

CARRIED.

Kind regards,

[Signature]

Mike Barnier
Manager of Legislative Services/Clerk
"That the Public Works Committee, having considered the resolution from the Town of Scugog, recommend that County Council support the request to encourage the Province of Ontario and the Government of Canada to provide more funding to rural municipalities to support infrastructure projects, including those projects related to major bridge and culvert replacements; and

Further That Council's resolution and a copy of the Town of Scugog's correspondence be sent to MP Philip Lawrence, The Honourable David Piccini - Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks and MPP Northumberland Peterborough-South, the federal and provincial Ministries of Infrastructure, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO), and all Ontario municipalities."

Carried attended by virtual conference
Committee Chair’s Signature

Defeated
Committee Chair’s Signature

Deferred
Committee Chair’s Signature
Council Resolution

Moved By B. Ostrander
Seconded By M. Martin

Agenda Item 10
Resolution Number 2021-11-17-783

Council Date: November 17, 2021

"That Council adopt all recommendations from the six Standing Committees, as contained within the Committees' Minutes (November 1, 2, 3, 2021), with the exception of the following items held by Council for further discussion, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item ##</th>
<th>Item Name</th>
<th>Held by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Support</td>
<td>Nov. 2, 2021</td>
<td>7.f</td>
<td>Term of Office for Warden</td>
<td>W. Cane;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Nov. 1, 2021</td>
<td>7.b</td>
<td>Thompson Bridge</td>
<td>R. Sanderson;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and, with the exception of the business listed for separate discussion in Item 11 of the agenda."

Recorded Vote Requested by
Councillor's Name
Carried
Warden's Signature
Deferred
Warden's Signature
Defeated
Warden's Signature
September 17, 2021

The Honourable Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building, Queen’s Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1

sent via email: premier@ontario.ca

Re: Structure Inventory and Inspections

Dear Premier:

At the last regular General Purpose and Administration Committee meeting held September 13, 2021 the above captioned matter was discussed.

I wish to advise that the following resolution was passed which will be going forward for ratification at the September 27, 2021 Township of Scugog Council meeting:

THAT Report PWIS-2021-027, 2021 Structure Inventory and Inspections, be received;

THAT the Township of Scugog 2021 Ontario Structure Inspection Manual Inventory and Inspection Summary Report, prepared by Planmac Engineering Inc., be received;

THAT as part of the annual budget process, the Township continue to increase the amount of funding available for bridges and culverts through the continuation of Roads and Other Infrastructure Levy;

THAT as part of the annual budget process, the Township continue to increase the investment in bridge and culvert maintenance and repair through other means including identifying efficiencies and cost savings and applying for grants through other levels of government for major bridge and culvert replacements;

THAT the Township follow the principles of Asset Management and prioritize preventative maintenance such as waterproofing decks, repaving decks, repair concrete soffits, parapet walls, abutments and wingwalls, etc.

THAT the Province of Ontario and the Government of Canada be encouraged to provide more funding to rural municipalities to support infrastructure projects related to major bridge and culvert replacements; and
THAT a copy of the staff report and resolution be forwarded to the Premier of Ontario, Provincial Minister of Finance, Federal Finance Minister, MP Erin O’Toole, MPP Lindsey Park, AMO, Durham Region and all Ontario municipalities."

Should you require anything further in this regard, please do not hesitate to contact Kevin Arsenault, Capital Projects Technologist at 905-985-7346 ext. 138.

Yours truly,

Becky Jamieson
Director of Corporate Services/Municipal Clerk
Encl.

cc:
Kevin Arsenault, Capital Projects Technologist
Honourable Chrystia Freeland, Federal Minister of Finance
Honourable Peter Bethenfalvy, Ontario Minister of Finance
Lindsey Park, MPP, Durham
Erin O’Toole, MP
Ralph Walton, Regional Clerk, The Regional Municipality of Durham
Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO)
All Ontario Municipalities

karsenault@scugog.ca
chrystia.freeland@fin.gc.ca
Minister.fin@ontario.ca
Lindsey.park@pc.ola.org
Erin.OToole@parl.gc.ca
clerks@durham.ca
amo@amo.on.ca
November 24, 2021

The Honourable Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario
Room 281
Legislative Building, Queen’s Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1

Dear Premier Ford:

RE: Bus Stop Dead End Roads, Our File: T02

Council of the Region of Durham, at its meeting held on November 24, 2021, adopted the following resolution:

“Whereas Dead-End Road delegations have been received from parents in attached correspondence, website www.durhamdeadendroadkids.ca and video www.youtube.com/watch?v=___pCVNLSUKk&t=18s noting approximately 386 Durham Region kids and families remain in crisis walking kilometres daily to wait on highspeed roadway shoulders with winter dark coming;

And whereas the Ontario Ministry of Transportation has responded and now amended their Policy to allow and provide guidelines for reversing a school bus on a dead end road https://www.ontario.ca/document/official-ministry-transportation-mto-bus-handbook/special-safety-precautions-school-bus-drivers which is in keeping with the previous historic practice of using smaller buses, doing 3-point turns and using a spotter in rural areas;

And whereas to date 10 municipalities across Ontario have passed a resolution endorsing Scugog’s bus stops on dead end roads Resolutions CR-2021-086 (April 26, 2021) and CR-2021-175 (June 28, 2021), given family safety challenges exist on dead-end roads throughout the province;

And whereas Report PWIS-2021-022, Williams Point Road and Beacock Road School Bus Turnarounds, be received noting municipal cost for construction of school bus turnarounds is prohibitive with 178 dead end roads now not accessed by Durham District School Board alone not including hundreds of roads around province, and any funds invested in turnarounds would not be consistent with asset management priorities promoted by the Province of Ontario;

Now therefore be it resolved:

That Council request the Ministry of Education and the Province of Ontario to amend policies requiring Student Transportation Services and School Boards around the Province work with parents to facilitate the use of smaller buses, spotters, and 3-point turns or backing up where necessary, to provide safer service to dead-end and private road children and prevent the need for additional turnarounds to be constructed on municipal roads; and

That a copy of this motion and the staff report from the Township of Scugog be forwarded to Premier Doug Ford, Honorable Stephen Lecce (Minister of Education), Honorable Caroline Mulroney (Minister of Transport), Durham Student Transportation Services, all school boards serving Durham Region, Haliburton-Kawartha Lakes-Brock MPP Laurie Scott, all Durham MPPs, all Ontario Municipalities, Rural Ontario Municipal Association (ROMA), Ontario Good Roads Association (OGRA), and Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO).”

Please find enclosed a copy of Report #PWIS-2021-022, from the Township of Scugog, for your information.

Ralph Walton
Ralph Walton,
Regional Clerk/Director of Legislative Services
RW/ks
Attachment

c:  The Honourable Stephen Lecce, Minister of Education
    The Honourable Caroline Mulroney, Minister of Transport
    Nadiya Viytiv, Durham Student Transportation Services
Durham Catholic District School Board
Durham District School Board
Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board
Peterborough, Victoria, Northumberland and Clarington Catholic
  District School Board
Conseil Scolaire Catholique MonAvenir
Conseil Scolaire Viamonde
Rod Phillips, MPP (Ajax)
Lindsey Park, MPP (Durham)
Laurie Scott, MPP (Haliburton/Kawartha Lakes/Brock)
David Piccini, MPP (Northumberland/Peterborough South)
Jennifer French, MPP (Oshawa)
Peter Bethlenfalvy, MPP (Pickering/Uxbridge)
Lorne Coe, MPP (Whitby)
All Ontario Municipalities
Rural Ontario Municipal Association (ROMA)
Ontario Good Roads Association (OGRA)
Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO)
S. Siopis, Commissioner of Works
Township of Scugog Staff Report

To request an alternative accessible format, please contact the Clerks Department at 905-985-7346.

Report Number: PWIS-2021-022
Prepared by: Carol Coleman, Director of Public Works and Infrastructure
Department: Public Works and Infrastructure Services
Report To: Council
Date: June 28, 2021
Reference: Strategic Plan Direction#1: Roads & Municipal Infrastructure
Strategic Plan Direction#7: Complete Community
Motion CR-2021-086 Re: Dead-End Road Kids – April 26, 2021
Report Title: Williams Point Road and Beacock Road School Bus Turnarounds

Recommendations:

1. **That** Report PWIS-2021-022, Williams Point Road and Beacock Road School Bus Turnarounds, be received;

2. **That** funding not to exceed $150,000 for the construction of turnarounds on Williams Point Road and Beacock Road to accommodate school buses, be provided through the Municipal Projects Reserve;

3. **That** the Mayor and Clerk be authorized to enter into Permission to Enter agreements on Beacock Road and Williams Point Road at the location of the turnarounds; and

4. **That** Council and staff continue to work with Province of Ontario and the local school boards to change their policies to allow 3-point turns or backing up where necessary, to provide safer service to dead-end and private road children and prevent the need for additional turnarounds to be constructed on Township of Scugog roads.
1. Background:

In June 2020, Durham Student Transportation Services (DSTS) notified the Township of Scugog that due to changes to their policy school buses would no longer service the following roads:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>New Bus Stop Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whitfield Road 230 m west of Honeys Beach Road</td>
<td>Indian Way and Whitfield Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Point Road/ Jack Rabbit Run (Caesarea)</td>
<td>Regional Road 57 and Williams Point Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacock Road</td>
<td>Regional Road 57 and Beacock Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The changes were the result of Section 7.2 of the DSTS Policy that states:

“Generally, school bus stops will not be located in areas such as cul-de-sacs or dead end streets. DSTS does not enter private property and roads, such as long rural driveways, gated communities and townhouse/apartment complexes.

DSTS reserves the right to determine if the roadway is suitable for travel, given road conditions and necessary space requirements factoring in turning radius of large school vehicles.”

Township staff and an adjacent property owner were successful in providing a solution to allow for ongoing use of the existing bus stop on Whitfield Road located 230 m west of Honeys Beach Road. There is currently a small loop on private property where school buses are able to safely turnaround. To meet the requirements of DSTS, a Permission to Enter Agreement was signed between the Township and the property owner in August 2020 for use of this turning loop.

However, on both Williams Point Road/ Jack Rabbit Run and Beacock Road, DSTS requires the construction of new turnarounds before they will return school buses to these roads.

2. Discussion:

2.1 Issues on Williams Point Road and Beacock Road

Williams Point Road/ Jack Rabbit Run runs northeast off of Regional Road 57 and is approximately 2.2 km in length. According to DSTS, 29 students on this road are eligible for school transportation. These students attend Port Perry High School, R.H. Cornish Public School and Cartwright Central Public School.
Beacock Road runs west off of Regional Road 57 and is approximately 2 km in length. There are 3 students eligible for school busing on this road that attend Port Perry High School and Cartwright Central Public School.

After receiving letters from DSTS about the changes to the bus routes, many parents on both these roads were upset and requested review of the transportation arrangements in accordance with Section 7.0 of the DSTS policy. The requests were reviewed by the DSTS Governance Committee in a meeting held on October 28, 2020 and changes to the decision were denied.

Many of the parents have expressed concerns about the school bus changes, including:

- The change in policy although bus stops have been in operation for 25+ years;
- The distance that some children will have to walk to the bus stop exceeds the maximum distance of 800 m in the DSTS Policy;
- The safety of children walking these distances on narrow roads that have no sidewalks or streetlights;
- The likelihood of congestion as the result of parents driving their children to the new bus stops, especially in the winter;
- The safety of children waiting for buses on RR 57; and
- The school bus service on the road was part of the decision making process to move to these locations.

2.2 Policy Change Requests

Despite considerable effort from Council, staff and parents, DSTS has held firm that they will not return the school buses to Williams Point Road/ Jack Rabbit Run or Beacock Road unless suitable turnarounds are available.

In an effort to change the DSTS Policy, at the April 26, 2021 Council meeting, Scugog Council passed the following resolution:

“*That Dead-End Road delegations be received: from parents, video, site www.durhamdeadendroadkids.ca and attached correspondence and;*

*Whereas* Dead-End Road kids (cul-de-sacs, private roads) busing being moved from long-time residential to highspeed (some 80km) common stop pickups; percentage of 830,000 Ontario bused students impacted as Student Transportation Services (STS) citing buses shouldn’t access private roads, do 3-point-turns, or back up; kids expected to walk 1-2km twice daily (caregivers 4x) in morning dark, on narrow road shoulders, with no “bus stop ahead” warning signage;

*Whereas* Parents report employment/housing at risk. Must leave work to drop off/pick up children to avoid safety hazards of kids walking on highways
unsupervised; secondary school youth reporting education at risk as missing class/affecting grades; children with disabilities not helped like double amputee who needs stop moved 160ft; parents told it’s their “responsibility to get kids to bus safely”;

Whereas Parents being told busing policy is schoolboard’s, but they say it’s STS’s, who say it’s Governance Committee or Ministry of Transportation, but Ministry of Education say it’s “transportation consortia who administer policy”; and trustee, governance say cannot change policies, so parents appealing to police, press, & councils re dangers then; oncoming car killed 12-yr-old Cormac and injured sister while waiting at newly relocated bus stop at the base of a hill;

Whereas STS have advised road improvements are responsibility of municipalities, yet municipalities don’t own needed land, nor have $ millions to create 77m bus turnarounds, meanwhile;

Whereas Ontario Transportation Funding is $1 billion; Jan 27/20 Ministry said they’d improve student transportation, review funding formula; and given STS gets their funding by scoring well in reviews, and given Ministry establishing “Student Transportation Advisory Group” to hear STS sector expertise, experience and ideas;

Now therefore be it resolved that the Municipality of Scugog requests:

That exceptions to allow 3-point turns or backing up where necessary, to provide safer service to dead-end and private road kids, that policies be amended to reflect; when not possible;

That exceptions to allow indemnification agreements to access private land for bus turnarounds to keep bus stops safer and closer to prescribed 800 m distance; when not possible;

That “Bus Stop Ahead” warning signage be required to notify oncoming traffic, prior to STS moving common stop to main roadway;

That STS be comprised of solutions like mini-buses, vans, taxis, or public transit, worked into funding formula so doesn’t negatively impact STS funding stats;

That Kid KPI “Key Performance Indicator” be included for Ministry “Effectiveness & Efficiency Follow Up Reviews”, establishing benchmarks for responsive-problem-solving for kids & parents’ busing concerns, and this be an STS factor to receive funding;
That Province provide “Parent Portal” for ongoing busing feedback of their STS, so families and kids can review/provide comments, especially during Ministry STS reviews and revisions to funding;

That Province have GPS tracking software to notify parents when children picked up/dropped off, and

That this motion be distributed to Premier Doug Ford, Honorable Stephen Lecce (Minister of Education), Honorable Caroline Mulroney (Minister of Transport), Durham MPP Lindsey Park, Haliburton-Kawartha Lakes-Brock MPP Laurie Scott, all Durham MPPs, Durham Region, all Ontario Municipalities, Rural Ontario Municipal Association (ROMA), Ontario Good Roads Association (OGRA), and Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO).”

To date, the Township has not received a response from any of these parties regarding the requests.

2.3 Turnaround Designs

In order to assist in returning the school buses to Williams Point Road/ Jack Rabbit Run or Beacock Road, Township staff reviewed options to construct turnarounds on these roads.

On Williams Point Road/ Jack Rabbit Run, DSTS requires a turnaround for the largest size (70 passenger) school bus which requires a 24.5 m (80 feet) diameter turnaround. DSTS indicated that a smaller size bus has difficulty making the sharp turn on Williams Point Road and immediately navigating the incline through snow. Further using a smaller bus would not guarantee service along the roadway during winter months.

The Township considered two locations for the turnaround. The first was at the Williams Point Cottagers Association park property and the second was at the corner where Williams Point Road and Jack Rabbit Run meet. The second location was considered preferable as it would not impact parkland and would shorten the walking distance for children on Jack Rabbit Run. In order to determine whether such a turnaround was feasible, the Township retained a consultant to undertake a survey of the area and prepare a preliminary design. The turnaround was able to be designed primarily within lands owned by the Township but will have require permission to enter for land on the southeast corner of the turnaround. As well, the turnaround will require some trees to be removed and a Bell pedestal to be relocated.

On Beacock Road, DSTS indicated that a smaller turnaround of 19 m (62 feet) m diameter turnaround would be sufficient as a smaller bus could be used for this location. The best location was determined to be the west end of Beacock Road and the adjacent landowner has indicated willingness to enter into a Permission to Enter agreement for this turnaround.
Figure 1: Proposed Location of Turnaround for Williams Point Road/ Jack Rabbit Run

Figure 2: Proposed Location of Beacock Road Turnaround
3. Financial Implications:

As the need for the turnarounds were not known at the time the 2021 Capital Budget was prepared, this work is unbudgeted. The total estimated cost for the design and construction are provided below:

- Planmac Engineering Inc. $15,000
- Williams Point Road Turnaround $90,000
- Beacock Road Turnaround $30,000
- Contingency $15,000

Total Estimated Cost $150,000

The estimated construction costs include:

- Clearing and grubbing
- Removal of bitumous surface, earth excavation (to 500 mm depth), grading
- Supply and place 300 mm of Granular ‘B’
- Supply and place 150 mm of Granular ‘A’
- New 450 mm culverts
- Ditching and removal of material
- Asphalt and line painting for Williams Point Road (50 mm HL8, 30 mm HL3)
- Restoration of driveways and grass areas
- Mobilization/ demobilization
- Traffic control

The turnaround on Williams Point Road will also require relocation of a Bell pedestal. The cost for this relocation is not yet known.

It is recommended that the above costs be funded from the Municipal Projects Reserve.

4. Communication Considerations:

Township staff will notify DSTS, affected residents and the Williams Point Cottagers Association regarding the timing of the works.

Information will also be provided on our website throughout the length of the project to provide the public with a means to keep updated on the progress of the project and to notify of any closures, detours, etc.
5. Conclusion:

At this time the construction of school bus turnarounds on Williams Point Road/ Jack Rabbit Run and Beacock Road appears to be the only solution to have the school buses return to these roads and provide a much needed service for the children on these roads. Township Council and staff will continue to work with the Province of Ontario and the local school boards to change their policies to allow 3-point turns or backing up where necessary, to provide safer service to dead-end and private road children and prevent the need for additional turnarounds to be constructed on Township of Scugog roads.

Respectfully Submitted by:  
Carol Coleman, P. Eng.  
Director of Public Works and Infrastructure

Reviewed By:  
Ken Nix,  
Chief Administrative Officer

Attachments:

N/A
To: COUNCIL

Meeting Date: 12/14/2021

Subject: Recommendation Report: Zoning By-law Amendment, 155 Equestrian Way, T. Johns Consulting (c/o Diana Morris)

Submitted By: Lisa Prime, MCIP, RPP, Chief Planner

Prepared By: Michael Campos, Intermediate Planner

Report No.: 21-214(CD)

File No.: R02/21

Recommendations

THAT Report 21-214(CD) - Recommendation Report: Zoning By-law Amendment, 155 Equestrian Way, T. Johns Consulting (c/o Diana Morris) - be received;

AND THAT Cambridge Council approves the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment to amend the zoning of the site to establish site-specific provisions for 155 Equestrian Way to permit the development of 183 residential units, in addition to two mixed used buildings containing a total of 338.2 square metres (3,640.35 square feet) of commercial space at grade and a 518.1 square metre (5,576.72 square feet) piazza;

AND THAT Cambridge Council is satisfied that a subsequent public meeting in accordance with subsection 34(17) of the Planning Act is not required.

AND FURTHER THAT the By-law(s) attached to this report be passed.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- The applicant is proposing the development of the subject lands for a mixed-use residential development consisting of 183 residential units and a minimum of 338 square metres (3,638 square feet) of Gross Leasable Commercial Floor Area, as well as a 518.1 square metre (5,576.72 square feet) public piazza.

- In order to facilitate the development of the subject lands, a Zoning By-law Amendment application is required to establish site-specific provisions for the lands, in addition to those established through the rezoning application processed in 2015.
Key Findings

- The proposed development is intended to provide residential options to the City’s housing market, providing housing types that support varying lifestyle needs. The proposed mixed-use development aligns with Provincial, Regional and City goals and objectives with respect to intensification in Greenfield areas. The lands are identified as being within the delineated built-up area and will be serviced with existing municipal water and wastewater systems.

- The proposed development will contribute to a complete community with logical and efficient development patterns that are suitable for a mix of housing types. The subject lands will be well connected to the existing road network, providing access to desired amenities. The subject lands are in proximity to a stable neighbourhood and a planned future community and proposes residential intensification that is compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood.

- The addition of residential and commercial uses in this location will eliminate underutilized vacant land and introduce housing to support the City’s growing population.

Financial Implications

- The City anticipates the following revenues associated with this proposal:
  - Application fees: $23,960
  - City and Regional Development Charges: $2,912,468 and $4,291,167, respectively
  - Potential tax revenue: $415,133
  - Detailed breakdown can be found in the Financial Impact section of this report.

- Any further costs associated with the development of the site are borne by the applicant.

Background

Property

The subject lands form part of the overall River Mill Community and are known as the Ridge at River Mill (Phase 3B). The lands are municipally addressed as 155 Equestrian Way, Cambridge and are legally described as Part of Lot 9, Concession 1, Beasley’s Lower Block (Former Township of Waterloo), City of Cambridge, Regional Municipality of Waterloo. The subject lands are irregular in shape and have a total area of 4.01
hectares (9.91 acres). The property has a total frontage of 321.08 metres (1053.41 feet) and a depth of 120.82 metres (396.39 feet). The subject lands are currently vacant with a significant south-easterly slope.

Location

The subject lands are located on the south side of Equestrian Way, east of Speedsville Road. The portion of lands subject to this application is situated west of the existing River Mill Community (Phases 1 and 2). The existing community provides for a variety of uses including residential, institutional and employment lands. To the north of the subject lands is the future River Mill West Community (Phases 3A, 4 and 5), which proposes a variety of uses including open space, neighbourhood parks, and a variety of residential uses and densities.

The image below provides an aerial view of the subject lands.

Existing/Surrounding Land Uses

The subject lands are currently vacant and consist of primarily exposed soil with limited existing vegetation. The lands to the north are also vacant, however, are proposed to be developed for residential and mixed-use. To the east, existing low and medium density residential uses exist, along with a park and a stormwater management pond. Lands to the south consist of employment lands, while the lands to the west remain vacant and are anticipated to be developed for future mixed use.

Proposal

The proposed Zoning By-law amendment application will facilitate the development of the lands for 183 residential units with a variety of residential built form and densities, in addition to two mixed use buildings with a total of 338.2 square metres (3,640.35 square feet) of commercial space at grade and a 518.1 square metre (5,576.78 square feet) piazza for public use. The proposed development is planned to provide for a mix of uses which includes 34 two-storey standard townhomes, 55 three-storey standard townhomes, and 40 double front townhomes located along Equestrian Way, 48 back-to-back townhomes, and six stacked townhomes in the mixed-use buildings. The proposed
development will be supported by primary and secondary trail connections, parkland and open space to be located within River Mill West (Phase 4) and an approved neighbourhood park and elementary school approved as part of the previous phases 1 and 2 within approved Plan of Subdivision 30T-12104.

On-site parking is provided via private parking garages, driveways and internal visitor parking areas. The mixed-use buildings and row houses are proposed to share access driveways. Overall, a total of 418 parking spaces (private and visitor) are being proposed on the subject lands, which meets and exceeds the Zoning By-law’s requirement of 292 total parking spaces. Please note that the original proposal submitted as part of this application and presented at the Public Meeting on March 30th, 2021 proposed a total of 427 parking spaces to accommodate 190 units. The applicant has since reduced the total number of units on the site to 183 units, thereby reducing the total number of parking spaces provided on site.

A Zoning By-law Amendment application is required to facilitate the proposed development of the subject lands (Phase 3B). The amendment seeks the following site-specific provisions for the subject lands:

- The applicant is proposing the development of the subject lands for a mixed-use residential development consisting of 183 residential units and a minimum of 338 square metres (3,638 square feet) of Gross Leasable Commercial Floor Area, as well as a 518.1 square metre (5,576.72 square feet) public piazza.

- Residential units proposed as part of this application include townhouses, back-to-back townhouses, and stacked townhouses in the mixed use building with building heights ranging between two and three storeys.

- In order to facilitate the development of the subject lands, a Zoning By-law Amendment application is required to establish site-specific provisions for the lands, in addition to those established through the rezoning application processed in 2015.

- A Zoning By-law Amendment is being requested as part of this application which seeks to permit site-specific provisions to facilitate the development of the subject lands. The following site-specific provisions are being requested:
  - To permit a minimum Gross Leasable Commercial Floor Area of 338 square metres (3,638 square feet) on this particular portion of lands within the draft plan of subdivision, whereas the By-law requires a minimum of 1,500 square metres (16,145 square feet) across all lands zoned RM3/CS5 (s.4.1.303B) and RM3/CS5 (s.4.1.420) within the approved draft plan of subdivision;
o To permit a minimum private amenity area of 25 square metres (269.10 square feet) per dwelling unit for row houses fronting along Equestrian Way, whereas the Zoning By-law requires a minimum of 35 square metres (376 square feet);

o To permit a minimum private amenity area of 4 square metres (43 square feet) per dwelling unit, provided on a balcony for stacked row houses fronting along Equestrian Way, whereas the Zoning By-law requires a minimum of 35 square metres (376 square feet);

o To permit an increase in the maximum density to 47 units per gross hectare for the entire development site, whereas the Zoning By-law requires a maximum of 40 units per gross hectare;

o To permit a minimum private amenity area of 4 square metres (43 square feet) per dwelling unit, provided on a balcony for back-to-back row houses, whereas the Zoning By-law requires a minimum of 7 square metres (75 square feet);

o To permit a maximum encroachment of eaves into a required yard of 0.75 metres (2.46 feet), whereas the Zoning By-law permits a maximum of 0.5 metres (1.6 feet);

o To permit a maximum encroachment of open or covered unenclosed patios, decks, or porches into front, exterior side and rear yards of 3 metres (9.8 feet), whereas the Zoning By-law permits a maximum of 2.5 metres (8.2 feet); and,

o To permit the distance between an access driveway, aisle, parking stall or parking lot in an RM-class zone to the window of a habitable room of a dwelling unit to be 3 metres (9.8 feet), whereas the Zoning By-law permits a minimum of 6 metres (19.6 feet).

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 2.1  Provide a wide range of ways that people can become involved in city decision making.
The proposal will permit the development of an existing vacant and underutilized property within the City of Cambridge, which is located in proximity to an existing stable residential neighbourhood and future communities. The development of the lands for a mixed-use development providing both residential and commercial uses will contribute to the City of Cambridge’s housing options while ensuring we are continuing to meet the Region’s minimum target for intensification on Greenfield lands (55 persons/jobs per hectare).

Comments

The overall proposed development of the subject lands is both permitted and compatible with the existing and planned uses within the River Mill Community. The subject lands will see an appropriate transition of heights from two-storey to three-storey amongst a variety of residential built forms. The design of the proposed development will ensure that housing proposed along and fronting Equestrian Way will have active facades and enhanced design and treatment for the residences. Internal streets will contain sidewalks connected to the public-rights-of-way and will provide easy and convenient access for all future residents to the commercial uses and public piazza located in the north western corner of the subject lands. Please note that the original submission that was presented at the Public Meeting on March 30 proposed a total of 190 units on the site. Since then, the applicant has revised the application by removing 7 units, for a total count of 183 dwelling units.

A Zoning By-law Amendment is being sought for the proposed development in order to establish site-specific provisions that will facilitate the development of the lands. Staff gave consideration to the agency comments that have been received, compatibility with the surrounding neighbourhood (particularly with respect to height and density), and the appropriateness of the site-specific provisions requested. Should the Zoning By-law Amendment application be approved, the applicant will proceed with the submission of a Site Plan Application.

The proposed amendment is consistent with the updated 2020 Provincial Policy Statement, which took effect on May 1, 2020 and conforms to the Provincial Growth Plan of 2020. The proposal will result in the efficient use of the land, resources, existing and planned infrastructure and municipal servicing. The proposal conforms to the Region of Waterloo’s Official Plan, which supports Greenfield growth for efficient land use patterns to support the City’s growing population. Finally, the proposed residential and mixed-use development for the subject lands is permitted by the City’s Official Plan and supports the City’s objectives to accommodate new growth until the year 2031.

The subject lands are currently zoned Mixed-Use "(H)RM3/CS5 (S.4.1.303B) by the City’s Zoning By-law No. 150-85. The requested amendment to the Zoning By-law is required to permit an increased density, as well as to recognize site specific provisions
that have previously been approved in other River Mill Development Phases. As the proposal is seeking to facilitate changes to the current permissions of this zone, an amendment is required to establish site-specific provisions on the lands for the following:

- To permit a minimum Gross Leasable Commercial Floor Area of 338 square metres (3,638 square feet) on this particular portion of lands within the draft plan of subdivision, whereas the By-law requires a minimum of 1,500 square metres (16,145 square feet) across all lands zoned RM3/CS5 (s.4.1.303B) within the approved draft plan of subdivision;

  - It is the intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law that the lands located along Equestrian Way serve as a community node, providing high-density mixed-use blocks with a combination of residential and commercial uses. The current site-specific by-law applicable to the subject lands requires that a minimum of 1,500 square metres (16,145 square feet) of gross leasable commercial floor area be required across all of the lands zoned RM3/CS5 (S.4.1.303B). These lands include the parcels highlighted in yellow. The subject lands are highlighted in red:

The subject lands alone are proposing a total of 338 square metres (3,638 square feet) of commercial space on the ground floor of mixed-use residential buildings. The required commercial space set out in the current By-law for lands zoned as RM3CS5 (subject lands and parcels highlighted
in yellow above) is intended to be reviewed in an overall context, rather than as individual blocks. As such, the request to permit a minimum gross leasable commercial space of 338 square metres of commercial space remains in keeping with the By-law and with the proposed neighbourhood context along Equestrian Way. The requirement to meet the minimum commercial space area (1,500 square metres) across the lands zoned RM3CS5, including the subject lands, shall be maintained.

As such, it is the opinion of staff that the proposed gross commercial leasable area for the subject lands is sufficient and would assist in meeting the overall minimum commercial requirement of the Zoning By-law with respect to the River Mill lands.

- To permit a minimum private amenity area of 25 square metres (269.10 square feet) per dwelling unit for row houses fronting along Equestrian Way, whereas the Zoning By-law requires a minimum of 35 square metres (376 square feet);
  - The applicant has requested that a minimum private amenity area of 25 square metres (269.10 square feet) be permitted per dwelling unit for townhouses fronting along Equestrian Way. The proposed reduction in amenity area has been requested for these townhomes in order to accommodate the proposed development as currently designed, and to ensure that the provided amenity area is consistent with the allowable amenity areas across other similar development blocks that comprise the River Mill lands. This site-specific provision has been approved through other development blocks within the community, including in townhouse blocks that comprise Phase 1 and 2 of the River Mill community.

  Each individual townhome fronting onto Equestrian Way proposes a rear yard amenity space with a deck to allow for personal use and enjoyment. Although the private amenity area proposed does not meet the current requirement of the Zoning By-law, it remains consistent with the sizes of other townhome development blocks in the community and remains compatible with the planned development surrounding the subject lands. The reduction in amenity area by 10 square metres (107 square feet) does not in Staff’s opinion, cause any adverse impacts on the enjoyment of the property by the future residents and continues to permit an enjoyable rear yard. In addition, the proposed townhomes along Equestrian Way continue to meet the required front, side and rear yard setbacks, further affirming that the proposed lot areas with the proposed individual private amenity areas
are efficient and allow for the applicant to further meet the residential intensification goals of the City.

Given that the proposed site-specific provision is consistent with existing permissions found in the same residential community (Phases 1 and 2), and that each individual townhouse is provided with sufficient space to accommodate a rear yard that meets setback requirements and provides for a deck, it is the opinion of staff that the proposed reduced private amenity space is considered good planning and is compatible with the planned future surrounding neighbourhood.

- To permit a minimum private amenity area of 4 square metres (43 square feet) per dwelling unit, provided on a balcony for stacked row houses fronting along Equestrian Way, whereas the Zoning By-law requires a minimum of 35 square metres (376 square feet);
  - The applicant has requested that a minimum private amenity area of 4 square metres (43 square feet) be permitted per dwelling unit for stacked townhouses fronting Equestrian Way. The By-law requires that stacked townhomes provide a minimum private amenity area of 35 square metres (376 square feet) per dwelling unit. The proposed site-specific provision is being requested for the stacked townhomes that are located adjacent to the public piazza in the northwestern corner of the subject lands.

The proposed stacked townhomes are backing onto the planned public piazza, which consists of an area of 581 square metres (6,253.83 square feet). Given the proposed public amenity area adjacent to the proposed stacked townhomes, as well as the commercial spaces on the ground floor, the ability to provide larger private amenity spaces for each individual townhome is hindered in this specific location on the subject lands. As such, in order to accommodate the mixed-use stacked townhomes and public amenity area in this corner of the subject lands, the applicant was required to minimize the total private amenity area available. Although the provided area is significantly reduced in comparison to the required private amenity area requirement outlined by the By-law, residents will continue to enjoy some form of private amenity space in addition to the adjacent public amenity space that can be conveniently accessed. Future residents will also have convenient access to the range of public amenity space available via the trail connections surrounding the subject lands to the north and south. Although the private amenity area is reduced in this proposed built form, the available public amenity area provided across
the subject lands and the entirety of the River Mill development area will help contribute to a complete community.

A similar site-specific provision requesting a reduction to 4 square metres (43 square feet) is permitted within other Blocks of the River Mill development for back-to-back townhomes (Phases 1 and 2). As such, the request to amend the By-law to permit a reduced private amenity area in the form of a balcony for the proposed mixed-use stacked townhomes would be compatible to other planned development in the same community and is considered comparable in character to the proposed neighbouring blocks. Given the similar balcony sizes in other blocks of the planned community and the location of the mixed-use stacked townhomes adjacent to the public amenity area as part of the subject lands, it is the opinion of staff that the reduction in private amenity area for individual balconies with respect to the stacked townhomes is appropriate as it is compatible with existing permissions already in place.

- To permit an increase in the maximum density to 47 units per net hectare for the entire development site, whereas the Zoning By-law permits a maximum of 40 units per net hectare;
  - The current site-specific By-law applied to the subject lands (S.4.1.303B) outlines the maximum permitted density for cluster row houses (townhouses) as being 40 units per hectare. The applicant is requesting that the subject lands be permitted to have a maximum density of 47 units per hectare, which equates to an increase of an additional 7 units per hectare.

The zoning that is currently applied to the subject lands permits a range of housing types, including townhouses, cluster townhouses and apartment buildings. The townhomes are permitted to have a maximum density of 40 units per hectare, whereas the apartment buildings are permitted to a maximum of 75 units per hectare. The proposed development on the subject lands is intended to provide a wide range of townhouse dwellings in an efficient land use pattern that is well connected to the surrounding planned and existing community. The availability of commercial uses within walking distance, as well as the multiple connections to other future commercial areas along Equestrian Way via trail connections, sidewalks, future public transit, and the local road network, results in an appropriate foundation to permit an increase in density.
With a total area of 4.01 hectares, the subject lands would be able to permit a total of 300 units, as-of-right, should an apartment building have been proposed instead of townhomes. The application subject to this report is requesting a total of 183 units. Therefore, given that the Official Plan designates the property as “High Density Residential”, and that a greater number of units would be permitted on the lands if within an apartment building, it is reasonable to interpret the lands as being appropriate for higher density. The proposed increase in density is appropriate for the lands, considering the available commercial uses and the public amenity areas within and surrounding the subject lands. It is the opinion of staff that the increase in density is appropriate for the subject lands and maintains compatibility with the surrounding proposed and existing development in the community.

- To permit a minimum private amenity area of 4 square metres (43 square feet) per dwelling unit, provided on a balcony for back-to-back row houses, whereas the Zoning By-law requires a minimum of 7 square metres (75 square feet);
  - The current permission of the Zoning By-law with regard to private amenity areas for back-to-back townhomes is that they provide a minimum of 7 square metres (75 square feet). The applicant is requesting a reduced private amenity space area of 4 square metres (43 square feet), which equates to a total reduction of 3 square metres (22 square feet). Block 190 of the River Mill development received a minor variance approval for a similar request that sought a minimum private amenity area of 4 square metres (43 square feet) for each back-to-back cluster row house. These private amenity areas were proposed as balconies, similar to the request for this application. As such, the requested site-specific provision is generally in keeping with the character of the surrounding neighbourhood as similar approvals have been granted in the community. The request is considered in Staff’s opinion to be a minor reduction and continues to meet the intent of the By-law, which is to provide a small area for residents to enjoy a private amenity space within their own unit. As such, it is the opinion of staff that the requested reduction is appropriate and compatible with the character of the surrounding community, while continuing to meet the intent of the By-law.

- To permit a maximum encroachment of eaves into a required yard of 0.75 metres (2.46 feet), whereas the Zoning By-law permits a maximum of 0.5 metres (1.6 feet);
• The request to permit a maximum encroachment of eaves into a required yard of 0.75 metres (2.46 feet), whereas the By-law permits a maximum encroachment of 0.5 metres (1.6 feet) is considered to be a minor request. The increase in the encroachment by 0.25 metres (0.82 feet) would have no adverse impacts on the streetscape of the proposed development, nor would it have impacts on surrounding residents. This request is being brought forward as an amendment to facilitate the design of the proposed townhomes. As such, it is the opinion of staff that the request is minor and appropriate for the subject lands.

• To permit a maximum encroachment of open or covered unenclosed patios, decks, or porches into front, exterior side and rear yards of 3 metres (9.8 feet), whereas the Zoning By-law permits a maximum of 2.5 metres (8.2 feet);

• The proposed site-specific provision to allow a maximum encroachment of open or covered unenclosed patios, decks or porches into the front, exterior side and rear yards of 3.0 metres, whereas a maximum encroachment of 2.5 metres is permitted to provide an enjoyable rear and front porch for residents. The proposed porch acts as a private amenity space, and the request to increase the encroachment by 0.5 metres (1.64 feet) is considered appropriate as it helps create a streetscape with a high standard of design. It is the opinion of staff that the request to permit an increase in the maximum encroachment of open or covered unenclosed patios, decks or porches will elevate the streetscape and will permit an appropriately sized private amenity space for future residents, both in the front and rear yards. It is not anticipated that this request will have any adverse impact on surrounding residents or on the character of the neighbourhood.

• To permit the distance between an access driveway, aisle, parking stall or parking lot in an RM-class zone to the window of a habitable room of a dwelling unit to be 3 metres (9.8 feet), whereas the Zoning By-law permits a minimum of 6 metres (19.6 feet).

• The intent of the Zoning By-law with respect to requiring a minimum distance of 6 metres (19.6 feet) between an access driveway, aisle, parking stall or parking lot to the window of a habitable room of a dwelling unit is to maintain a buffer to ensure the privacy of residents and to minimize or remove any potential negative impacts from car headlights on a living space. In order to permit a reduction in this requirement, such as the 3 metre (9.8 feet) reduction being requested as part of this application, it is important that the applicant is providing
a measure to ensure privacy and impacts from car headlights are minimized to the extent possible. As part of the application, the applicant has proposed to mitigate these potential negative impacts on the proposed development by installing 1.8-metre-high wood board privacy fences to ensure that any car headlights are screened from living spaces in proximity to the parking area, and that the privacy of residents are maintained.

As such, given the mitigation measures being taken to ensure future residents are not impacted by the reduced distance from an access driveway, aisle or parking stall, it is the opinion of staff that concerns regarding privacy and lighting from vehicles will be controlled and that minimal impacts will occur from the proposed reduction. Given the size of the subject lands and the proposed intensification, the permission for a reduced distance facilitates a more efficient design of the subject lands.

It is the opinion of staff that the proposed application is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, conforms with the policies of the Provincial Growth Plan 2020, conforms with the Regional Official Plan, the City of Cambridge Official Plan and meets the general intent and purpose of the City of Cambridge Zoning By-law No. 150-85. The proposal represents good planning. As such, staff recommend approval of the Zoning By-law Amendment.

If Council does not support the recommendation, the project as planned may not be able to proceed. If Council were to decide to not approve the Zoning By-law Amendment, the applicant or anyone else would be able to file an appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) and the decision to amend the Zoning By-law would rest with the OLT rather than Cambridge Council.

Holding Provision

The subject lands are currently subject to a holding provision that requires, prior to site plan approval, the submission of a detailed Stationary Noise Study for this block to assess the noise impacts from the Arriscraft facility and confirm that the development will comply with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks Publication NPC-300. The Holding Provision is applied to the lands pursuant to Sections 34 and 36 of the Planning Act.

Existing Policy/By-Law

City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012):

The City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012) designates the subject lands as “Designated Greenfield Area” on Map 1A and “High Density Residential” on Map 2. Under these
designations and policy areas the Official Plan supports a variety of higher density residential development including multi-residential mixed-use development such as townhomes and apartment houses. The subject lands make up part of the City of Cambridge’s Designated Greenfield Area and is envisioned to accommodate residential growth, which will assist in contributing to the Region of Waterloo’s minimum density target of 55 residents and jobs combined per hectare.

The “High Density Residential” designation of the Official Plan permits a maximum Floor Space Index (“FSI”) of between 0.5 and 2.0. The proposed development of the subject lands will provide an FSI of approximately 0.8, which is in keeping with the policy of the Official Plan. As a result, no amendment to the Official Plan is required as part of the proposed development.

**Cambridge Zoning By-law No. 150-85:**

The subject lands are zoned (H)RM3/CS5 (S.4.1.303B) in the City of Cambridge Zoning By-law No. 150-85. The current zoning applied to the subject lands permits a range of uses including attached one-family dwellings (cluster row houses), apartment houses, a neighbourhood grocery store, retail commercial establishment in which not more than 300 square metres (3,229 square feet) of gross leasable commercial floor area is provided, and service commercial establishments.

The Zoning By-law requires that parking be provided for cluster row housing (townhomes) at a rate of 1 space for the first 4 bedrooms per dwelling unit; plus 1 space for each additional 2 bedrooms; plus 1 space for each 2 dwelling units for visitors only. As such, for a total of 183 dwelling units, a total of 275 parking spaces are required. The applicant has proposed a total of 354 parking spaces, which exceeds the By-laws requirement by 79 spaces. In addition, the By-law requires that a total of 46 visitor spaces be provided (the by-law requires 1 dedicated visitor parking space for each 4 dwelling units). The applicant is proposing a total of 47 visitor parking spaces, which meets and exceeds the By-laws requirements. Finally, the By-law requires that a total of 17 commercial parking spaces are required. The applicant is proposing 17 commercial parking spaces, thereby meeting the Zoning By-laws requirement.

As noted previously, the applicant has submitted a Zoning By-law Amendment to establish site-specific provisions to facilitate the development of the lands.

In staff’s opinion, the proposed zoning by-law amendment with the site-specific provisions proposed complies with the intent of the City of Cambridge Zoning By-law No.150-85.

A zoning map representing the current zoning of the subject lands has been included as Appendix 2.
Financial Impact

- A planning application fee for the Zoning By-law Amendment in the amount of $10,500 has been paid to the City to process this application.

- A future Site Plan Application will be required for the subject lands. A planning application fee for the Site Plan Application in the amount of $13,460 will be required as part of a complete application.

- City and Regional Development Charge fees for the proposed development is estimated at $2,912,468 and $4,291,167, respectively.

- The potential tax revenue from the proposed development is as follows:
  
  o The value for the two-storey standard, three-storey standard and double front townhouses for 129 units is estimated to be $69,000,000. This value is arrived at looking at current sale listings of freehold townhouse units. The potential tax revenue from this development is estimated at $295,895 using the 2021 City Tax portion rate.

  o The value of the back-to-back townhouses of 48 units is an estimated $24,720,000. This value is arrived at by looking at current sale listings of condo row townhouses. The potential tax revenue from this development is estimated at $106,000 using the 2021 City tax portion rate.

  o The value for the stacked townhouses of 6 units will be an estimated $2,225,000. This value is arrived at by looking at current sale listings of condo stacked townhouses. The potential tax revenue from this development is estimated at $9,475 using the City tax portion rate.

  o In addition to the residential units, the commercial space will be valued in the range of $450,000. An average rate per square metre for the commercial space was used to estimate the value. The potential tax revenue from the portion of the building is $3,763 using the 2021 City tax portion rate.

  o As such, the total estimated tax revenue for the proposed development on the subject lands would be $415,133. Please note, this is an estimate of recent sales of comparable properties and property taxes only.

- Any further costs associated with the development of the site are borne by the applicant.
Public Input

In accordance with the Planning Act, the City held a public meeting in order to formally consider the requested Zoning By-law Amendment and receive public and Councillors’ comments. There were a number of oral submissions made at the public meeting on March 30, 2021. Written submissions were also received. Comments were generally raised regarding density and traffic, and the need for a parkette with a play feature.

The excerpts from the public meeting minutes are in Appendix No. 5 below.

The public comments received are addressed in Appendix No. 7 below.

The statutory public meeting required under the Planning Act was held on March 30, 2021 and official notification was provided to the Cambridge Times. In addition, notice was provided to all assessed property owners within a 120 metre (393.7 feet) radius of the site and anyone else who requested notice.

Internal/External Consultation

The application and supporting information have been circulated to the departments and agencies listed in Appendix 6 and comments received are included in the appendix.

Staff has received comments from the applicable City departments and the following outside agencies in regards to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment. The staff comments have been addressed by the applicant and will be implemented through the site plan application.

Conclusion

City of Cambridge Development Planning Staff is recommending approval of a Zoning By-law Amendment application submitted for 155 Equestrian Way that seeks to facilitate the development of 183 residential dwelling units that consist of 34 two-storey townhomes, 55 three-storey townhomes, 40 double front townhomes located along Equestrian Way, 48 back-to-back townhomes, and six (6) stacked townhomes in the mixed-use buildings. Along with the residential dwellings proposed for the subject lands, a total of 338 square metres (3,638 square feet) of at-grade commercial floor area is proposed as part of the mixed-use stacked townhomes.

It is the opinion of staff that the proposed application is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, conforms with the policies of the Provincial Growth Plan 2020, conforms with the Regional Official Plan, the City of Cambridge Official Plan and meets the general intent and purpose of the City of Cambridge Zoning By-law 150-85. The proposal represents good planning as it provides for the development of greenfield land that with a desirable form of residential built form in an area that is planned to become a future complete community that incorporates high standards of design and that is
compatible with existing and planned uses. As such, staff recommend approval of the Zoning By-law Amendment.

**Signature**

**Division Approval**

Name: Lisa Prime  
Title: Chief Planner

**Departmental Approval**

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

**City Manager Approval**

Name: David Calder  
Title: City Manager

**Attachments**

- Appendix 1 – Proposed Site Plan
- Appendix 2 – Existing Zoning Map
- Appendix 3 – Existing Official Plan Map
- Appendix 4 – Public Meeting Minutes
- Appendix 5 – External/Internal Comments Received and List of Supporting Documents
- Appendix 6 – Public Comments Received
- Appendix 7 – Response to Public Comments Received
- Appendix 8 – Draft Zoning By-law Amendment
Appendix 4 – Public Meeting Minutes

Cambridge City Council
Tuesday, March 30, 2021
Page 2

Public Meetings

Statutory notice of today’s Public Meetings was given by publication in the Cambridge Times on
Friday, February 26, 2021 for Public Meeting A.

Public Meeting A - Public Meeting Report - 155 Equestrian Way - River Mill Development
Corporation – Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment

Presentations

    Corporation – Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment

    Using a PowerPoint presentation, Bryan Cooper is in attendance virtually to speak to
    Public Meeting Report - 155 Equestrian Way- River Mill Development Corporation –
    Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment.

2. Diana Morris, River Mill Development Corporation re: Public Meeting Report - 155
    Equestrian Way- River Mill Development Corporation – Proposed Zoning By-law
    Amendment

    Using a PowerPoint presentation, Diana Morris is in attendance virtually to speak to
    Public Meeting Report - 155 Equestrian Way- River Mill Development Corporation –
    Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment

Delegations

The Chair called for two recesses to allow additional members of the public attending virtually to
call in to speak regarding Public Meeting A.

There were no call ins to speak to Public Meeting A.

Resolution: 21-068
Moved by: Councillor Devine
Seconded by: Councillor Mann
Cambridge City Council  
Tuesday, March 30, 2021  
Page 3

THAT report 21-075(CD) – 155 Equestrian Way- River Mill Development Corporation – Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment be received;

AND THAT the application R02/21 be referred back to staff for a subsequent report and staff recommendation.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 8-0

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

Opposed: None

The Chair declared Public Meeting A closed at 10:58 a.m.

Council reconvened at 5:02 p.m.

Presentations

1. Mary-Jane Patterson, Reep Green Solutions re: 21-003(IFS) Reep Impact Report

   See item #1

2. Danielle Manton, City Clerk and Paul Kan, Manager of Realty Services re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

   See item #2

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

   See item #2

Delegations

2. Dan Clements on behalf of Dr Hank Nykamp re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
Appendix 5 – External/Internal Comments Received & List of Supporting Studies

This application has been circulated to the departments and agencies listed below. Their comments have been reviewed by staff and the applicant and have been addressed through the proposed amendments and the remaining items will be implemented through site plan control.

- Regional Municipality of Waterloo
- Energy + (Hydro)
- Public, Catholic & French School Boards
- City of Cambridge Engineering and Transportation Services Division
- City of Cambridge Parks, Recreation and Culture Division
- City of Cambridge Fire Department
- City of Cambridge Building Services Division
- City of Cambridge Accessibility Coordinator
- Grand River Conservation Authority
- Ministry of Transportation

List of Supporting Studies/Documents

- Planning Justification Report;
- Servicing Feasibility Brief;
- Retail Commercial Market Demand Study;
- Site Concept Plan and Elevations
Appendix No. 6 - Public Comments Received

Comment Received from Christian Aagaard:

Christian Aagaard
48 Hahn Ave,
Cambridge, Ont.
N3C 2X9
519-242-9077
rapidviking@gmail.com
5 March 2021

Bryan Cooper
Senior Planner,
City of Cambridge

Re: File R02/21, Rivermill Development Corp., 155 Equestrian Way

Dear sir,

I wish to comment on the proposed zoning bylaw amendment sought for the development at 155 Equestrian Way, (as per the notice of public meeting in the Cambridge Times, March 4, 2021).

I understand the need for dense development to get the most out of a given piece of land and control sprawl. And, judging by the artist’s concept on the T. Johns Consulting website, the units appear to be architecturally attractive.

But this a townhouse development of 190 homes, with little room set aside for individual yards. While it can be argued that adjacent developments feature substantial open space, there is, in my opinion, a need in this project for one or two parkettes equipped with play features that families can reach in a quick walk. I would suggest placing one in the middle of the proposed design.

It would mean the loss of several units at the expense of the developer. That’s a short-term setback. As the long-term partner in the development of healthy neighbourhoods, the city should consider the importance of providing even small spaces for people to meet and play in such tightly packed developments.

That’s the extent of my comments on this particular project. I would, however, like to say something of a more general nature pertaining to the area.

At some point, sooner rather than later, the fields north of Maple Grove Road opposite the Rivermill projects will open for development. It’s already happening with the industrial lands expansion closer to Fountain Street pushing out toward Middle Block Road.
Is this not the time for the city to firmly lock down open space for parkland using existing woodlands and wetlands that roughly stretch diagonally from Beaverdale and Maple Grove roads to Middle Block Road and Fountain Street?

It is reasonable to assume that future industrial and residential designs for whatever happens here will be no less intense than existing developments in the area. The need for wide, continuous parkland for passive and active enjoyment will be that much higher.

Sincerely,

Christian Aagaard
A written submission was received by Planning Staff in opposition to the proposed development with concerns relating to Density and overall private/public amenity areas on the subject lands.

Concerns were raised with respect to the proposed density on the subject lands and its impact on the availability of private and public amenity areas on the site. The comments suggested that the applicant could reduce the number of units proposed on the subject lands to accommodate additional private amenity areas for individual units and to provide for additional parkettes with play features.

The proposed development does not contemplate a playground feature; however, the applicant has proposed a large public amenity space located in the northwestern corner of the subject lands, adjacent to the mixed-use commercial area. This public amenity space acts as an entrance feature to the proposed development when entering the neighbourhood from Speedsville Road. This amenity area will be available to the public and is proposed to be landscaped with seating for the enjoyment of residents. A walkway will connect the neighbourhood with the intersection of Speedsville Road and Equestrian Way and will also provide a vibrant streetscape with the proposed commercial uses that front onto the piazza. In addition, multi-use paths are located surrounding the subject lands to the north and south that lead to additional public amenity areas within the River Mill community. Although reductions to private amenity areas are proposed, all proposed units will be provided with private amenity space to be enjoyed by future residents. The reductions that have been requested as part of the Zoning By-law Amendment are consistent with the permissions of other planned blocks in the River Mill Community and are compatible with the surrounding development.
Appendix No. 8 - Proposed Draft Zoning By-law

Purpose and Effect of By-law No. 21-XXX

155 Equestrian Way

The Purpose of the By-law is to amend the zoning for the lands legally described as Part of Lot 9, Concession 1, Beasley's Lower Block (Former Township of Waterloo), City of Cambridge in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, and municipally known as 155 Equestrian Way (“subject lands”). The proposed amendment will facilitate the development of a 183-unit mixed use residential development consisting of a range of townhouses (standard, double-front, back-to-back, and stacked townhomes). The proposed development also includes 338 square metres (3,638 square feet) of at grade commercial floor area and a total of 418 parking spaces. Additionally, a 518.1 square metre (5,576.78 square feet) public amenity area is proposed in the north western corner of the subject lands. In order to develop the subject lands with the above proposed development, site-specific provisions are required to permit the following:

- A minimum of 1,500 square metres of Gross Leasable Commercial Floor Area shall be constructed over the entire lands zoned RM3/CS5(s.4.1.303B) and RM3/CS5 (s.4.1.420).
- A reduction in the minimum private amenity area from 35 square metres (376 square feet) to 25 square metres (269 square feet) per dwelling unit for cluster row houses.
- A reduction in the minimum private amenity area from 35 square metres (376 square feet) to 4 square metres (43 square feet) per dwelling unit, provided on a balcony for stacked cluster row houses.
- An increase in the maximum density from 40 to 47 units per gross hectare for cluster row house.
- A reduction in the minimum private amenity area from 7 square metres (75 square feet) to 4 square metres (43 square feet) per dwelling unit, provided on a balcony for back-to-back row houses.
- An increase in the maximum encroachment of eaves into a required yard from 0.5 metres (1.6 feet) to 0.75 metres (2.46 feet).
- An increase in the maximum encroachment of open or covered unenclosed patios, decks or porches into front, exterior side and rear yards from 2.5 metres (8.2 feet) to 3.0 metres (9.8 feet).
- A reduction in the distance permitted between an access driveway, aisle, parking stall or parking lot in an RM-class zone to the window of a habitable room of a dwelling unit from 6 metres (19.6 feet) to 3 metres (9.8 feet).
The Effect of the By-law will permit the development of the subject lands for 183 residential dwelling units with 338 square metres (3,638 square feet) of at grade commercial floor area and a 518.1 square metre (5,576.78 square foot) public piazza.
BY-LAW 21-XXX

OF THE

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Being a By-law of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge to amend Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as Amended with respect to land municipally known as 155 Equestrian Way (R02/21)

WHEREAS Council of the City of Cambridge has the authority pursuant to Section 34 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended to pass this By-law;

AND WHEREAS this By-law conforms to the City of Cambridge Official Plan, as amended;

AND WHEREAS Council deems that adequate public notice of the public meeting was provided and adequate information regarding the Amendment was presented at the public meeting held March 30th, 2021, and that further public meeting is not considered necessary in order to proceed with this Amendment;

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

1. THAT this by-law shall apply to a portion of the lands described as Part of Lot 9, Concession 1, Beasley’s Lower Block (Former Township of Waterloo), City of Cambridge in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and is shown on Schedule ‘A’ attached hereto and forming part of this by-law;

2. THAT Schedule ‘A’ to By-law No. 150-85, as amended, is hereby further amended by deleting the zoning classification of the lands shown outlined in heavy black in the attached Schedule ‘A’ to this By-law from (H)RM3/CS5 (S.4.1.303B) and replace it with (H)RM3/CS5 (S.4.420) in accordance with the attached Schedule ‘A’ to this By-law;

3. THAT the aforesaid City of Cambridge Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding the following subsection to 4.1 thereof:
“4.1.420 – 155 Equestrian Way, legally described as Part of Lot 9, Concession 1, Beasley’s Lower Block (Former Township of Waterloo), City of Cambridge in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, the following regulations shall apply to the lands in the RM3/CS5 zone to which reference “s.4.1.420 is made on Schedule A and located at 155 Equestrian Way:

1. A minimum of 1,500 square metres of Gross Leasable Commercial Floor Area shall be constructed over all lands zoned RM3/CS5(s.4.1.303B) and RM3/CS5 (S.4.1.420).
2. A minimum private amenity area of 25 square metres (269 square feet) per dwelling unit for cluster row houses.
3. A minimum private amenity area of 4 square metres (43 square feet) per dwelling unit, provided on a balcony for stacked cluster row houses.
4. A maximum density of 47 units per gross hectare for cluster row house.
5. A minimum private amenity area of 4 square metres (43 square feet) per dwelling unit, provided on a balcony for back-to-back row houses.
6. A maximum encroachment of eaves into a required yard of 0.75 metres (2.46 feet).
7. A maximum encroachment of open or covered unenclosed patios, decks or porches into front, exterior side and rear yards of 3.0 metres (9.8 feet).
8. A reduction in the distance permitted between an access driveway, aisle, parking stall or parking lot in an RM-class zone to the window of a habitable room of a dwelling unit from 6.0 metres (19.6 feet) to 3.0 metres (9.8 feet).
9. Notwithstanding the creation of lot lines by registration of a condominium, the zoning regulations for cluster and mixed-use development in the RM3/CS5 zones, as set out herein, shall be applied to the entirety of the lands zoned RM3/CS5, not the individual lots created through condominium registration.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 3 above, the following regulations shall also apply to the lands in the RM3/CS5 zone to which parenthetical reference to “(S.4.1.420) is made on Schedule A attached to and forming part of this by-law:

a. The following uses shall be permitted in either a standalone building or a freestanding building or in a shopping centre:
   a) Any use permitted in the CS5 zone including a foodstore with a maximum Gross Leasable Commercial Floor Area of 3,000 square metres and a pharmacy having a maximum Gross Leasable Commercial Floor Area of 1,800 square metres;
   b) No commercial use permitted in the CS5 Zone shall have a Gross Leasable Commercial Floor Area that exceeds 1,000 square metres except for as provided in section 3.1 (a) above;
   c) Any use permitted in the RM3 Zone, except single detached and semi-detached dwellings;
d) Any combination of uses in the CS5 and RM3 within the same building.

5. Notwithstanding section 3.3.3.3, the following regulations shall apply to uses permitted by 4.1 (a) and (c) above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Provisions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Gross Leasable Commercial Floor Area</td>
<td>100 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Gross Leasable Commercial Floor Area</td>
<td>11,000 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum setback to Speedsville Road</td>
<td>4.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Front Yard (to Equestrian Way)</td>
<td>1.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Front Yard (to Equestrian Way)</td>
<td>6.0 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Interior Side Yard</td>
<td>1.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Exterior Side Yard</td>
<td>1.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Exterior Side Yard</td>
<td>4.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Rear Yard</td>
<td>3.0 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Interior Side Yard or Rear Yard abutting a R-class zone</td>
<td>7.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Building Height</td>
<td>6.0 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Façade Height for Buildings fronting Equestrian Way</td>
<td>7.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Height</td>
<td>13.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage</td>
<td>No Maximum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Where off-street parking is provided on private property alongside and directly accessed from Equestrian Way, the minimum and maximum front yard setbacks shall be measured from the edge of those parking spaces.

7. No drive thru lanes shall be permitted within a RM3/CS5 zone.

8. Notwithstanding section 3.3.3.3, the following regulations shall apply to any use permitted by 4.1 (b) above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Provisions</th>
<th>Linear Row Houses</th>
<th>Cluster Row Houses</th>
<th>Apartment Houses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area</td>
<td>165 square metres</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Frontage</td>
<td>5.5 metres</td>
<td>20 metres</td>
<td>30 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Front Yard</td>
<td>1.5 metres</td>
<td>1.5 metres</td>
<td>1.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Front Yard for garage</td>
<td>5.5 metres</td>
<td>5.5 metres</td>
<td>5.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Front Yard</td>
<td>4.5 metres</td>
<td>4.5 metres</td>
<td>4.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Interior Side Yard</td>
<td>1.5 metres</td>
<td>3 metres</td>
<td>4.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Exterior Side Yard</td>
<td>3 metres</td>
<td>3 metres</td>
<td>3 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Rear Yard</td>
<td>6 metres</td>
<td>6 metres</td>
<td>6 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Building Height</td>
<td>7.5 metres</td>
<td>7.5 metres</td>
<td>7.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Height</td>
<td>13.5 metres</td>
<td>13.5 metres</td>
<td>13.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Gross Floor Area per dwelling unit</td>
<td>70 square metres</td>
<td>70 square metres</td>
<td>50 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage</td>
<td>40 percent</td>
<td>40 percent</td>
<td>40 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Landscaped Open Space</td>
<td>30 percent</td>
<td>30 percent</td>
<td>30 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Number of Attached Units (non-stacked)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Private Amenity Area per unit</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>20 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density of units per gross hectare</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Distance between buildings on same lot side wall to side wall</td>
<td>3 metres</td>
<td>3 metres</td>
<td>3 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Distance between buildings on same lot between (1) a front wall and rear wall (2) a front wall and another front wall and (3) a rear wall and another rear wall</td>
<td>10 metres</td>
<td>10 metres</td>
<td>10 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum distance between buildings on same lot between front or rear wall and side wall</td>
<td>8 metres</td>
<td>8 metres</td>
<td>8 metres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 2.4.3 of the Zoning By-law, landscaping adjacent to street line shall not be required for the blocks with front yards onto Equestrian Way or exterior side yards on other public streets for building having a setback less than or equal to 4.5 metres.

10. THAT prior to the lifting of the Holding (“H”) provision, the following will be completed to the satisfaction of the City of Cambridge and the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:

a. For the lands to which Schedule ‘B’ of this By-law applies, the Applicant has provided a Stationary Noise Study prepared by a qualified engineer which assesses the noise impacts from the Arriscraft facility and confirms the proposed development will meet the performance limits in the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change, NPC-300 Guideline prior to site plan approval; and,

b. That a maximum Geodetic Elevation for Sensitive Land Uses of 322 mASL will be complied with as shown on Schedule B of By-law No. 213-15.
11. THAT this By-law shall come into force and effect on the date it is enacted pursuant to Subsection 24(2) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O., 1990, c. P. 13, as amended.

Read a First, Second and Third Time

PASSED AND ENACTED this 14th day of December 2021.

______________________
Mayor

______________________
Clerk
Schedule A – Proposed Zoning Map

This is Schedule A attached to and forming part of By-law ________

- Lands affected by the by-law
- Zoning Classification
- LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
- OPEN SPACE
- MEDIUM HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
- INDUSTRIAL
To: COUNCIL

Meeting Date: 12/14/2021

Subject: Recommendation Report: Zoning By-law Amendment, 355 Guelph Avenue & 11 Fletcher Circle, IBI Group (c/o Dave Galbraith)

Submitted By: Lisa Prime, MCIP, RPP, Chief Planner

Prepared By: Michael Campos, Intermediate Planner

Recommendations

THAT Report 21-296(CD) - Recommendation Report: Zoning By-law Amendment, 355 Guelph Avenue & 11 Fletcher Circle, IBI Group (c/o Dave Galbraith - be received;

AND THAT Cambridge Council approves the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment to amend the zoning of the site from R2 and R5 to RM4, and to establish site-specific provisions for 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle to permit the development of nine, two-storey street-fronting townhouses with site-specific zoning provisions that seek to permit a maximum of nine attached townhouse dwellings on the subject lands; a minimum lot area of 150 square metres; and, an exterior side yard setback of 5.08 metres.

AND THAT Cambridge Council is satisfied that a subsequent public meeting in accordance with subsection 34(17) of the Planning Act is not required.

AND FURTHER THAT the By-law(s) attached to this report be passed.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- The purpose of this report is to provide a recommendation on the proposed Zoning By-law amendment application that will facilitate the development of the lands for nine, two-storey street-fronting townhouse units.
Key Findings

- The proposed development is intended to provide residential options to the City’s housing market, providing a housing type that supports varying lifestyle needs. The proposed development facilitates intensification within the City’s Built-up Area, further supporting provincial, regional and local planning policies that seek to add to the range and mix of housing within the City.

- The proposed development will contribute to a complete community. The subject lands will be well connected to the existing road network, providing access to desired amenities. The subject lands are in proximity to a stable neighbourhood and proposes a future development that is considered to be compatible with the existing development of the surrounding area. The proximity of the development to the Hespeler Core Area will help achieve additional support to local businesses.

- The addition of residential uses in this location will eliminate underutilized and vacant residential land and introduce housing to support the City’s growing population.

Financial Implications

- The City anticipates the following revenues associated with this proposal:
  - Application fees: $20,460
  - City and Regional Development Charges: $143,604 + $211,041, respectively
  - Potential tax revenue: $17,368 - $18,525
  - Detailed breakdown can be found in the Financial Impact section of this report.

- Any further costs associated with the development of the site are borne by the applicant.

Background

Property

The applicant has submitted a Zoning By-law Amendment application to facilitate the development of the subject lands, comprised of two properties municipally known as 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle. The subject lands currently contain an existing single detached dwelling located at 355 Guelph Avenue, along with a small shed in the north east corner of the property. The existing structures are planned to be
demolished to accommodate the proposed street-fronting townhouses. 11 Fletcher Circle is currently a vacant residential property.

Location

The subject lands are municipally addressed as 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle and are legally described as Part of Lots 13, Concession 3, Beasley's Lower Block, Township of Waterloo as in 202482; and Block 70, Plan 58M-470, Cambridge. The subject lands are located towards the northern part of the City of Cambridge and is approximately one and a half (1.5) kilometers from the Hespeler Core Area. The subject lands have a combined total area of 2,392 square metres (0.239 hectares) and are located in the northeast corner of the intersection of Guelph Avenue and Fletcher Circle. Municipal water and sewer services are available to be connected to the proposed development.

The image below provides an aerial view of the subject lands.

![Aerial Map of the Subject Lands (355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle)](image)

Surrounding Land Uses

The existing surrounding area can be described as a low-density residential neighbourhood consisting primarily of single detached dwellings on large lots. Recent
townhouse developments have been constructed north of the subject lands and immediately north of the intersection of Guelph Avenue and Poplar Drive. Townhouse developments also exist on the eastern side of Guelph Avenue and north of Manhattan Circle.

Approximately 170 metres (557 feet) to the south of the subject lands is the St. Gabriel Catholic Elementary School. Approximately 400 metres (1,312 feet) southwest of the subject lands is Silverheights Public School. A network of parks and open space are located to the east of the subject lands and include Baldwin Drive Park and Michigan Avenue Park, which provide trail connections to the Hespeler Mill Pond natural area further south.

**Proposal**

The purpose of this report is to provide a recommendation on the proposed Zoning By-law amendment application that will facilitate the development of the lands for nine, two-storey street-fronting townhouse units. The applicant is proposing two blocks of townhomes, where four units are proposed to front off of Guelph Avenue and the remaining five units are proposed to front off of Fletcher Circle. The “Low/Medium Density Residential Designation” currently applied to the subject lands permits a maximum allowable density of 40 units per hectare. Given the combined lot area of 0.239 hectares, the proposed development provides for a total residential density of approximately 38 units per hectare, which conforms with the City’s Official Plan. No affordable housing is proposed as part of this application.

The townhouse units will include individual private garages (one per unit). Units five and nine (end units on the proposed townhouse block fronting Fletcher Circle) will accommodate two parking spaces within their respective garages, whereas the remaining units are proposed to contain a one-car garage. Each unit will also have individual driveway accesses with available parking spaces. The proposed parking is in compliance with the requirements of the Zoning By-law to provide one parking space for the first four bedrooms in the dwelling unit as per Section 2.2.1.1 (a) of the By-law. To the rear of each residential unit, a main storey deck and a backyard amenity space is proposed. The applicant intends to subdivide the existing properties into nine lots through severance applications, should an approval be granted by Council for the zoning amendment application.

A total of 27 trees currently exist on the subject lands. 18 of the existing trees are planned for removal to accommodate the nine proposed townhomes. The original application that was presented at the Public Meeting in March 2021 proposed the removal of 21 trees. 12 existing trees are planned to be maintained as part of this revised proposal. Should the application eventually be approved, the applicant is proposing the planting of an additional 11 trees on the subject lands, as provided in the submitted Landscape Plan.
The overall proposed development of the subject lands is compatible with the existing residential policies set out by the Official Plan for Low/Medium Density Residential Areas and fits the character of the existing residential community, which provides for a range of built forms including single detached residential dwellings and townhouse dwellings. In consideration of the comments received from both members of Council and of the public from the Public Meeting and Neighbourhood Meeting that occurred earlier this year, the applicant has revised the proposal by reducing the proposed height from three-storeys to two storeys to maintain a similar height to those residential dwellings immediately abutting the subject lands. Additionally, the applicant has shifted the townhouse block fronting onto Guelph Avenue closer to the street line to provide additional setback space from existing development to the rear of the proposed units. The original submission proposed a front yard setback of 16 metres, whereas the revised submission now proposes a front yard setback of 14 metres. The units located with frontage onto Fletcher Circle were also shifted further west a total of 1.02 metres to provide an additional buffer to existing homes to the east of 3.97 metres, in comparison to the 3.0 metres originally proposed. The proposed setbacks, with the exception of the exterior side yard setback, are in compliance with the City’s Zoning By-law No. 150-85.

In order to accommodate the proposed development, a Zoning By-law Amendment application is necessary to rezone the lands to allow for townhouse dwellings. The amendment seeks to rezone the lands from R2 and R5 (Single Detached Residential) to the RM4 (Multiple Residential) zone and seeks site-specific provisions to allow the following:

- Nine (9) attached townhouse dwelling units on the subject lands, whereas only six (6) attached units are permitted;
- A minimum lot area of 150 square metres (1,615 square feet), whereas a minimum lot area of 165 square metres (1,776 square feet) is required; and,
- A minimum exterior side yard of 5.08 metres (16.66 feet), whereas a minimum exterior side yard of 6 metres (19.68 feet) is required.

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 2.1 Provide a wide range of ways that people can become involved in city decision making.
The proposal will permit the intensification of an existing vacant and underutilized property within the City of Cambridge, which is located in proximity to an existing stable residential neighbourhood comprised of similar residential built form. The development of the lands for townhouse dwellings will contribute to the City of Cambridge’s housing options by providing for a mix and range of housing types. Future residents of the proposed development will live within walking distance to local amenities including green spaces, institutional uses, and commercial uses.

**Comments**

The subject lands are located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Guelph Avenue and Fletcher Circle and have a total site area of approximately 0.239 hectares. The site has a total lot frontage along Guelph Avenue of 40 metres, and a total frontage along Fletcher Circle of 50 metres. The lands are partially developed, with 355 Guelph Avenue containing an existing single detached dwelling and an accessory shed, which are proposed to be removed as part of this application. The southern portion of the subject lands known as 11 Fletcher Circle is currently a vacant residential property that has not been previously developed.

The applicant is proposing to construct nine, two-storey street-fronting townhouse units. Four of the proposed townhouse units are planned to front onto Guelph Avenue, and the remaining five units will front onto Fletcher Circle.

The street-fronting townhouse units are proposed to include individual private garages. The four units proposed to front onto Guelph Avenue are planned to provide one-car garages. The two end units for the townhouse block fronting onto Fletcher Circle will provide two-car garages, while the three units between the two end units will provide one-car garages. Each unit will also provide a driveway access with available parking spaces in addition to the garage spaces proposed. To the rear of each residential unit, a main floor deck and backyard amenity space is proposed.

The current zoning of the existing properties is R2 (355 Guelph Avenue) and R5 – S.4.1.227 (11 Fletcher Circle). The southern portion of the subject lands (11 Fletcher Circle) is subject to an existing site-specific exception that provides for additional development specifications for that portion of the land.

A Zoning By-law Amendment application is required that seeks to rezone the subject lands (both 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle) from the R2 and R5 – S.4.1.227 zones to the RM4 (Multiple Residential) zone. The following site-specific provisions are also being requested:

- To permit nine attached townhouse dwelling units on the subject lands, whereas only six attached units are permitted in the RM4 zone;
To permit a minimum lot area of 150 square metres (1,615 square feet), whereas a minimum lot area of 165 square metres (1,776 square feet) is required; and,

To permit a minimum exterior side yard of 5.08 metres (16.66 feet), whereas a minimum exterior side yard of 6 metres (19.68 feet) is required.

The applicant is proposing to develop the vacant and underutilized properties that are located within 1.5 km (1,500 metres) of the Hespeler Core Area into nine street-fronting townhouse units with parking that exceeds the minimum requirements of the City’s Zoning By-law.

A Zoning By-law Amendment is being sought for the proposed development in order to rezone the lands from their current zones (R2 and R5) which solely permit single-detached residential dwellings as the only form of residential development to the RM4 zone, which permits townhouse dwellings. In addition to rezoning the lands to the RM4 zone, the applicant is requesting to establish site-specific provisions that will facilitate its development. Staff gave consideration to the agency comments that have been received, compatibility with the surrounding neighbourhood (particularly with respect to height and density), the proposed tree management plan and removal of existing trees to accommodate the development and the appropriateness of the site-specific provisions requested. Should the Zoning By-law Amendment application be approved, the applicant will proceed with the submission of a Site Plan Application and Consent application.

The proposed zoning amendment is consistent with the updated 2020 Provincial Policy Statement, which took effect on May 1, 2020 and conforms to the Provincial Growth Plan of 2020. The proposal will result in the efficient use of the land, resources, existing infrastructure and municipal servicing. The proposal conforms to the Region of Waterloo’s Official Plan, which supports new residential development within the Built-Up Areas and helps satisfy the Region’s density target for infilling, which directs 45 percent of new development to Built-Up areas. Finally, the proposed residential development of the subject lands is permitted by the City’s Official Plan and supports the City’s objectives to accommodate new growth until the year 2031. It is the opinion of staff that the proposal meets the criteria outlined by the Official Plan with respect to Residential Infill Compatibility.

The proposal provides for residential development that is currently permitted by the Low/Medium Density Residential designation and conforms with the maximum density permitted on the lands. The proposal complements and respects the character of the surrounding neighbourhood by proposing development that is similar in height (two-storeys). In addition, townhouse developments are already located in the surrounding neighbourhood and as such, the proposed development is not introducing any new forms of development into the residential area that are not already experienced. The
The proposal is considered to be complementary to the scale and massing of the adjacent single detached dwellings.

As the proposal is seeking to facilitate changes to the current permissions of the requested RM4 zone, an amendment is required to establish site-specific provisions on the lands for the following:

- To permit nine attached townhouse dwelling units on the subject lands, whereas only six attached units are permitted in the RM4 zone;
  - It is the intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law to ensure that a maximum of six attached townhouse dwelling units be permitted on the subject lands to ensure that development is not overbearing on the lands. The proposed development, although proposing nine townhouse dwellings on the subject lands, are divided into two separate blocks consisting of a block of four units and a block of five units. In addition, each block will have frontage onto two separate streets being Guelph Avenue and Fletcher Circle. It is the opinion of staff that the site is capable of accommodating the proposed development of nine townhomes efficiently with sufficient space to accommodate the necessary parking and amenity areas required by the By-law.
  - The applicant has divided the townhouses into two blocks to separate the development and to provide a streetscape that is appropriate. The proposed development is considered to be complementary to the type of development currently experienced within the existing surrounding area. The proposed development provides sufficient setback space and provides for sufficient landscaped space across the entirety of the subject lands.
  - Based on the revised proposal submitted by the applicant, it is evident that the applicant has taken into consideration concerns from the neighbourhood with respect to compatibility with height by reducing the height of the proposed townhomes from three-storeys to two storeys. In addition, the applicant was able to preserve an additional three trees by providing additional setbacks from the eastern property line. The applicant has ensured that the site is capable of accommodating the required parking and does not exceed the maximum density permitted by the lands. The request to permit nine townhouse units on the subject lands is considered to be minor in nature given the size of the property and its ability to comply with the majority of the minimum requirements outlined by the RM4 zone.
  - As such, it is the opinion of staff that the proposed nine townhouse dwellings are appropriate in scale to surrounding residential development;
are compatible with respect to built form given that townhomes are considered a low/medium density built form and existing townhomes are located in the surrounding area. The applicant has considered the concerns of the public with respect to height, and has reduced the height to address transition from the abutting single-detached dwellings.

- To permit a minimum lot area of 150 square metres (1,615 square feet), whereas a minimum lot area of 165 square metres (1,776 square feet) is required;
  - The applicant has requested that a minimum lot area of 150 square metres be permitted on the subject lands, whereas the current requirement outlined in the By-law is that a minimum lot area of 165 square metres is provided. The proposed reduction in lot area is considered to be a minor change, particularly in considering that the applicant has been able to successfully comply with the majority of the minimum requirements set forth by the RM4 zone, primarily with respect to density, parking and amenity space.
  - The development proposes a density of 38 units per hectare. The maximum permitted density of the Low/Medium Density Residential designation is 40 units per hectare. As such, staff have no concerns with the proposed density on the subject lands.
  - Each individual lot will be capable of accommodating the required number of parking spaces, in addition to the required visitor parking. The requirement of the By-law is that one space is provided for the first four bedrooms per dwelling unit, plus one space for each two dwelling units for visitors only. As such, the applicant is required to provide a total of 14 spaces on the site. The units fronting onto Guelph Avenue are capable of accommodating a total of 3 parking spaces each (one space in the proposed garage and two spaces on each driveway). The two end units within the townhouse block fronting Fletcher Circle are capable of accommodating two spaces within the proposed garage and two spaces on each individual driveway. The three remaining units located between the two end units in the block fronting onto Fletcher Circle are capable of accommodating one space in the garage and one space in each driveway. As such, a maximum of 26 parking spaces can be accommodated, which exceeds the minimum parking requirement by 12 spaces.
  - The applicant has also provided outdoor amenity areas for each individual unit consisting of a backyard area with a deck that is located at grade. These areas will support the future residents on the subject lands and will provide them with a space for leisurely activities.
As such, it is the opinion of staff that the request for a reduced minimum lot area is considered minor given that the applicant was able to meet the majority of the minimum provisions required by the RM4 zone, while accommodating the required parking and providing for individual outdoor amenity spaces. The intensification of an underutilized parcel of land and the development of a vacant piece of residential land will contribute to the overall growth objectives set out by the Region’s and the City’s Official Plans, and will help achieve an attractive development in proximity to a variety of local amenities.

- To permit a minimum exterior side yard of 5.08 metres (16.66 feet), whereas a minimum exterior side yard of 6 metres (19.68 feet) is required.
  
  - The applicant is required to provide a minimum exterior side yard setback of 6 metres from Guelph Avenue, however, is only able to accommodate a minimum setback of 5.08 metres. The request to provide a minimum exterior side yard setback of 5.08 metres instead of the required 6 metres is considered minor. The applicant’s original submission considered a reduction of the required setback to 5.6 metres, however, as part of the revised proposal, the applicant shifted the townhouse block fronting onto Fletcher Circle further west to provide additional buffering from the existing residential development to the east. In doing so, the minimum requirement for an exterior side yard setback is now 5.08 metres and represents the distance between Unit 5 (end unit attached to the block fronting Fletcher Circle) and the exterior side yard property line. The applicant is proposing that the area located adjacent to Unit 5 be landscaped with grass and new trees. There will be appropriate screening proposed from Guelph Avenue to the townhouse blocks fronting on Fletcher Circle, and as a result, it is the opinion of staff that the proposed reduced exterior side yard setback will not result in any adverse impacts to the surrounding street.

  - The proposed zoning amendment will facilitate the development of a vacant residential property. If not developed, this portion of Fletcher Circle may remain vacant and underutilized for years to come. Instead, it is being proposed for its original purpose, which is to accommodate residential uses and to support the City’s growth objectives. The proposed setback reduction is considered to be minor. It is the opinion of staff that the requested reduction is appropriate given the vegetative screening that is proposed for that area. In addition, the reduced exterior side yard setback to the roadway permits additional buffering to be accommodated from the existing residential dwellings to the east, which was one of the main concerns raised at the Public Meeting in March 2021.
If Council does not support the recommendation, the project as planned may not be able to proceed. If Council were to decide to not approve the Zoning By-law Amendment, the applicant or anyone else would be able to file an appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) and the decision to amend the Zoning By-law would rest with the OLT rather than Cambridge Council.

**Existing Policy/By-Law**

**City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012):**

The City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012) designates the subject lands as “Built-Up Area” on Map 1A and “Low/Medium Density Residential” on Map 3 (included in this report as Appendix No.4). The Built-Up Area encourages the intensification of lands as part of the City’s growth management strategy and directs that “infill, intensification, and redevelopment within existing neighbourhoods will be minor in nature and will be designed to respect existing character and provide connections and linkages where possible”. The Low/Medium Density Residential designation permits a range of residential uses including single detached dwellings, townhouses and walk up apartments up to a maximum density of 40 units per hectare. With a proposed density of approximately 38 units per hectare, the proposed development is in conformity with the Official Plan in this regard.

The proposal conforms to the City of Cambridge Official Plan and an amendment is not required.

**Cambridge Zoning By-law No. 150-85:**

The subject lands are currently zoned R2 (355 Guelph Avenue) and R5 (11 Fletcher Circle) by the City of Cambridge Zoning By-law No. 150-85. The southern portion of the subject lands (11 Fletcher Circle) is also subject to site-specific exception S.4.1.227 that applies site-specific development specifications for that portion of land. The existing zoning solely permits the development of single detached dwellings and does not permit townhouse dwellings. Accordingly, a Zoning By-law Amendment is being proposed by the applicant to rezone the lands to the RM4 zone to permit the development of townhouses on the subject lands.

In addition to the requested rezoning of the lands to the RM4 zone, the applicant is requesting the following site-specific regulations:

- To permit nine (9) attached townhouse dwelling units;
- To permit a minimum lot area of 150 square metres (1,615 square feet); and,
- To permit a minimum exterior side yard of 5.08 metres (16.66 feet).
In staff’s opinion, the proposed zoning by-law amendment with the site-specific regulations complies with the intent of the City of Cambridge Zoning By-law No.150-85.

A zoning map representing the current zoning of the subject lands has been included as Appendix 2.

**Financial Impact**

- A planning application fee for the Zoning By-law Amendment in the amount of $7,000 has been paid to the City (2020) to process this application.

- A future Site Plan Application will be required for the subject lands. A planning application fee for the Site Plan Application in the amount of $13,460 will be required as part of a complete application.

- City and Regional Development Charge fees for the proposed development is estimated at $143,604 and $211,041, respectively.

- The potential tax revenue from the proposed development is as follows:
  - The assessed value of the nine, two-storey townhouses will be an estimated $4,050,000 to $4,320,000. The value is arrived at looking at current sale listings for condo townhouse units. The potential tax revenue from the development will fall between $17,368 to $18,525 using the 2021 City tax portion rate.

- Any further costs associated with the development of the site are borne by the applicant.

**Public Input**

In accordance with the Planning Act, the City held a public meeting in order to formally consider the requested Zoning By-law Amendment and receive public and Councillors’ comments. There were a number of oral submissions made at the public meeting on March 2nd, 2021. Written submissions were also received. Comments were generally raised regarding concerns about density, traffic, safety, and compatibility with existing character of the neighbourhood.

The excerpts from the public meeting minutes are in Appendix No. 5 below.

The public comments received are addressed in Appendix No. 7 below.

The statutory public meeting required under the Planning Act was held on March 2nd, 2021 and official notification was provided to the Cambridge Times. In addition, notice was provided to all assessed property owners within a 120 metre (393.7 feet) radius of the site and anyone else who requested notice.
Internal/External Consultation

The application and supporting information have been circulated to the departments and agencies listed in Appendix 6 and comments received are included in the appendix.

Staff has received comments from the applicable City departments and outside agencies with respect to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment. The staff comments have been addressed by the applicant and will be implemented through the site plan approval application.

Conclusion

City of Cambridge Development Planning Staff is recommending approval of a Zoning By-law Amendment application submitted for 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle that seeks to facilitate the development of nine, two-storey street-fronting townhouse units. Four units are planned to front onto Guelph Avenue, while the remaining five units are proposed to front onto Fletcher Circle. Each of the units will be provided with individual driveway accesses and private garages to accommodate the required parking needed to accompany the proposed units, as per the Zoning By-law. Each lot provides for the required setbacks set out by the By-law (with the exception of the minor reduction in the exterior side yard setback) and provides sufficient space to permit a private amenity space to the rear of each unit.

It is the opinion of staff that the proposed application is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, conforms with the policies of the Provincial Growth Plan 2020, conforms with the Regional Official Plan, the City of Cambridge Official Plan and meets the general intent and purpose of the City of Cambridge Zoning By-law No.150-85. The proposal represents good planning. As such, staff recommend approval of the Zoning By-law Amendment to allow the development of the nine townhouse units.

Signature

Division Approval

Reviewed by the CFO

Name: Lisa Prime, MCIP, RPP
Title: Chief Planner
Departmental Approval

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

City Manager Approval

Name: David Calder  
Title: City Manager

Attachments

- Appendix 1 – Proposed Site Plan
- Appendix 2 – Existing Zoning Map
- Appendix 3 – Existing Official Plan Map
- Appendix 4 – Public Meeting Minutes
- Appendix 5 – External/Internal Comments Received and List of Supporting Documents
- Appendix 6 – Public Comments Received
- Appendix 7 – Response to Public Comments Received
- Appendix 8 – Draft Zoning By-law Amendment
Appendix 4 – Public Meeting Minutes

MINUTES
Corporation of the City of Cambridge
Special Council Meeting
No. 06-21
Tuesday, March 2, 2021
Virtual Meeting

Council Members in Attendance: Councillors Reid (Ward 1); Devine (Ward 2) (Arrived at 5:00 p.m.); Mann (Ward 3); Liggett (Ward 4) (Arrived at 5:54 p.m.); 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; Kevin De Leebeeck, Director of Engineering; Elaine Brunn Shaw, Chief Planner; Danielle Manton, City Clerk; Jennifer Shaw, Deputy City Clerk; Briar Allison, Council Committee Services Coordinator; Greg Elgie, Business Systems Analyst; Michael Campos, Planning Technician; Matthew Belvins, Senior Planner; Julianna Petrovich, Transportation Engineering Technologist; Shannon Noonan, Manager of Transportation Engineering; Dennis Purcell, Chief Building Official; Lesley Head, Director of Recreation and Culture; Brian Arnold, Fire Chief.

Others in Attendance: Dave Galbraith, IBI Group; Victor Labrecque, Greengate Village Limited & LVH Developments (CM) Inc.; 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 10:02 a.m. and the meeting adjourns at 9:26 p.m.

Indigenous Territory Acknowledgement

Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest
There are no disclosures of pecuniary interest.

Public Meetings

Statutory notice of today’s Public Meetings was given by publication in the Cambridge Times on Thursday, February 4, 2021 for Public Meeting A and B.

Public Meeting A- Public Meeting Report – 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle, Zoning By-law Amendment – 2753144 Ontario Inc. (C/O IBI Group)

Presentations


Using a PowerPoint presentation, Michael Campos is in attendance virtually to speak to Public Meeting A- Public Meeting Report – 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle, Zoning By-law Amendment – 2753144 Ontario Inc. (C/O IBI Group)

Delegations

1. Craig Oliver re: Public Meeting Report – 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle, Zoning By-law Amendment – 2753144 Ontario Inc. (C/O IBI Group)

2. Irina Galarza re: Public Meeting Report – 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle, Zoning By-law Amendment – 2753144 Ontario Inc. (C/O IBI Group)


5. Markus Pantea, Fletcher Circle Residents re: Public Meeting Report – 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle, Zoning By-law Amendment – 2753144 Ontario Inc. (C/O

The Chair called for a recess to allow additional members of the public attending virtually to call in to speak regarding Public Meeting A.

The following delegations called in to speak:


A. Public Meeting Report – 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle, Zoning By-law Amendment – 2753144 Ontario Inc. (C/O IBI Group)

Resolution: 21-036
Moved by: Councillor Reid
Seconded by: Councillor Wolf

THAT report 21-017(CD) - 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle, Zoning By-law Amendment – 2753144 Ontario Inc. (C/O IBI Group), be received;

AND THAT application R14/20 for 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle be referred back to staff for a subsequent report and recommendation.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 7-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Ermeta, Hamilton, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry
Opposed: None

The Chair declared Public Meeting A closed.

Public Meeting B- Public Meeting Report - 1005, 1045,1085 & part of 955 Main St, Official Plan & Zoning By-law Amendments and Draft Plan of Subdivision – Greengate Village Limited & LVH Developments (CM)

Presentations


Delegations

The Chair called for a recess to allow additional members of the public attending virtually to call in to speak regarding Public Meeting B.

The following delegations called in to speak:


Appendix 5 – External/Internal Comments Received & List of Supporting Studies

This application has been circulated to the departments and agencies listed below. Their comments have been reviewed by staff and the applicant and have been addressed through the proposed amendments and the remaining items will be implemented through site plan control.

- Regional Municipality of Waterloo
- Energy + (Hydro)
- Public and Catholic School Boards
- City of Cambridge Engineering and Transportation Services Division
- City of Cambridge Fire Department
- City of Cambridge Senior Environmental Planner
- City of Cambridge Building Services Division
- City of Cambridge Accessibility Coordinator
- Grand River Conservation Authority
- Ministry of Transportation

List of Supporting Studies/Documents

- Planning Justification Report;
- Urban Design Brief;
- Site Plan;
- Stormwater Management Brief;
- Arborist Report;
- Tree Inventory;
- Landscaping Plan;
- Noise Impact Study;
- Existing Conditions Plan, Grading Plan and Servicing Plan; and,
- Floor Plans and Elevations
Hi David,

Thank you very much for speaking with me today concerning the proposed development of 355 Guelph Avs / 11 Flechters Circle. As discussed I own the neighboring property, 369 Guelph Ave, Cambridge, ON N3C 2V3 and I would like to receive information on this proposed change to the zoning bylaws, including any information related to building type, design, etc. most importantly the impact this development may have on the large existing fir trees that run along the property line separating the two properties.

While I understand that development of this property will be undertaken at some point; I question the proposed density, specifically the proximity to the property lines, the potential impact to old growth trees and the effect the proposed changes would have on adjacent properties.

Further to this, I would like to be present for any meetings on the subject (virtual or otherwise) so I can fully express my concerns and discuss alternatives to the proposed changes.
Thank you very much for your attention to this matter - I look forward to speaking with you in the future.

Sincerely,

--

KCCO!!
Good Morning Mr. Campos,

Attached are my speaking points from this morning's meeting - I want to stress that I am not opposed to development of this property, but I do not agree with the current plans. Removing twenty-one trees to construct nine units is simply not reasonable, especially given our newly minted status as a "Tree City". I strongly believe a seven unit development (3 units on Guelph Ave / 4 units on Fletcher Circle); wherein, each unit is made larger and a premium is placed on the end units (they would have a usable side yard) would potentially save fourteen additional trees and still maintain profitability. Further to this applying a two storey design with full basements would also increase the profitability of each individual unit, while eliminating the majority of the privacy issues.

If you have any questions or need further clarification of my comments please do not hesitate to call

Sincerely,
Good Morning Everyone – Thank you for the opportunity to speak this morning concerning the proposed development at 355 Guelph Ave & 11 Fletcher Circle. My name is Craig Oliver and I reside at 369 Guelph Ave, the property directly to the north of the proposed development.

It goes without saying that the idyllic solution would be 2-4 single family two story homes mirroring the properties surrounding this land, but I recognize that the ideal will most likely not happen, although I would argue that given todays current real estate market and recent sales in the neighbourhood the potential exists for the developer to recognize significant profit in doing so. That being said I, along with others that have spoken / will speak and with the support of over 200 petition signatures I oppose the development for the following reasons:

OVERALL DENSITY AND LOCATION OF THE BUILDINGS

- Nine units and their proximity to the permitter of the property will have a significant negative impact on the surrounding homes
- The proposed buildings will result in 21 trees including multiple old growth fir and pine trees (specifically those trees on the permitter of the property) will be removed
  - Please note: 2 of the trees (392 & 390 A) the developer claims to be saving are actually located on my property.
- Eliminating unit one / and or shifting this building to the South would save trees 400 / 398 / 397 / 396 / 395 / 393 (could simply be saved by trimming as it only impacts the deck) / 391 (I don’t understand why it is being removed as it doesn’t appear to impact the build site at all)
- Tree 400 & 398 could easily be saved by flipping the driveway of unit one or possibly just by trimming the lower branches
- The elimination of unit 9 and or a shift of the entire building to the west would save 384 / 383 and possibly 382 / 375 / 376
- As a side note if trees cant be saved can some of the smaller ones be moved either on the property or to neighboring homes (the added height will help with privacy)
- As a newly voted “Tree City” I would think this point carries even more importance

BUILDING HEIGHT AND PRIVACY / OVERALL ESTHETIC

- As a slab on grade development, wherein the garage occupies the first floor, the living space shifts to floors two and three. This equates to multiple if not all windows and the deck off of the “main floor” all being situated above the height of fencing and negating any privacy that would be gained by these structures. Furthermore, the proposed new trees will not elevate this situation as they too will be below this level.
  - Please refer to my previous point as to how the preservation of trees can solve many if not all of the privacy issues.
- Please note: the height issues are further problematic as the property in question sits some 4-5 ft above the grade of my property and 10+ feet above the grade of the homes behind

- Has the developer and or the city explored a two storey design so as to better fit into the community

- Construction of this project will equate to these buildings being the tallest in the area overshadowing all adjacent properties including those across the street, higher density has a place in urban development and planning but not on the corner of a residential neighbourhood consisting solely of single family homes.

It is for these reasons that I believe the city should oppose this development as currently designed and it is there that I choose to recognise the developer. I fully understand the need to operate a business at a profit and make good on your investment, but I also firmly believe that alteration of the current plans can maintain those profits. While I am not a developer by trade, I have renovated/constructed multiple homes including my home at 369 Guelph Ave, as such I will leave you with the following:

- Its easy to say eliminate two units and reduce density to 7 units, but that would equates to lower profits for the developer but the building dimensions only need to be reduced so as to preserve the old growth trees as such the remaining block of three and four units could be expanded to have larger square footage per unit recuperating some if not all of those lost profits

- Moving the garages forward of the proposed buildings would not only eliminate the third storey / main floor on the second floor issue, but it would also allow the developer to install full basements, again offsetting lost revenue from two less units

- Having larger side yards with mature trees on the four end units would also increase the “premium” nature of those units – more profit

- With the main floor on grade now each unit has a more desirable back yard with its own privacy. As much as the existing homes privacy will be impacted by this construction, the developers potential clients with the current plan will be presented with balconies on full display to their new neighbours – and again nicer back yard = more profit

- Finally having lived in a “new build” subdivision in the past I can speak from experience when I say that trees on a property are a selling point especially when are established.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak today if you have any questions now or in the future I am available.
RE: File R14/20 – 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle – Zoning Amendment

Dear Mr. Campos,

As a resident of Fletcher Circle, I would like to bring a few concerns to your attention regarding the proposed development of 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle. Both of these properties back onto my own. Please note I recognize that multiple residential dwellings will be built on these properties and that the project needs to be profitable for the developer. My points below are issues of possible concern that I would like to see addressed in future proposals from the developer for building on these properties.

1. Impact to privacy on the adjacent properties
   a. As a reference, my property (188 Fletcher Circle) is approximately 10 feet below the grade of the proposed development site. The current proposal shows 9 three storey townhomes with second storey decks. One of the proposed units will be 3 metres from my back fence and our new neighbours main floor/kitchen and back deck will be level with our bedrooms. The prospect of 40 foot tall buildings looming over our property, combined with the current 10 foot grade change will have a negative impact on any privacy we currently enjoy in our backyard and may also negatively impact the natural sunlight we receive throughout the day. I would like to see a shadow study done to determine how much of an impact the proposed buildings will have on our property and the other adjacent residences.
   b. If the developer could reduce the number of overall units and change the floor plans to allow a garage to be put further out front of the houses closer to Guelph Avenue and Fletcher Circle, I would hope this would allow for two storey houses with proper basements and alleviate some of our privacy concerns.

2. Removal of 21 trees, many of which are old growth fir and maple trees
   a. The tree management plan shows the retention of only 9 of the 30 large old growth trees on these two properties. None of the beautiful trees I enjoy from my backyard will be retained in the current plan.
   b. I would like to see an assessment regarding whether the majority of the large old growth trees on the perimeter of the two properties could be retained if the number of units was reduced. I recognize that all of the old growth trees on the interior of the properties would unfortunately have to be removed.

3. Potential exacerbation of drainage issues for the adjacent properties
   a. I would like to see a comprehensive plan regarding how drainage from the properties will be addressed by the developer.
   b. At 188 Fletcher Circle, where our backyard is significantly below the grade on two sides, we already experience drainage issues that are compounded by
water runoff from adjacent properties. I am apprehensive about the additional amount of runoff from multiple residences.

i. For example, the fence between our property and 355 Guelph Avenue has already failed due to poor drainage as runoff has rotted multiple fence posts.

4. **Potential exacerbation of traffic and parking issues on Fletcher Circle**
   a. Fletcher Circle has only one narrow way in and out located on a hill. The prospect of 5 additional homes, including driveways, along the north side of the road will make it even more difficult to get in and out of the street. People already park along that section during the day, especially during school drop off and pick up times at St. Gabriel Catholic Elementary School.
   b. I am also concerned about both safety and access to our street during the construction phase, given the additional volume of worker, machinery, and materials to our neighbourhood.

5. **General aesthetic of the currently proposed buildings is not in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood**
   a. This is a suburban community where people bought properties so that they wouldn’t feel crammed up next to their neighbours. One of the reasons we were attracted to 188 Fletcher is that it backed onto older residential houses with mature trees and larger yards. The proposed development completely changes this aesthetic.
   b. I also noticed on the current plans that the front door and numerous windows of the proposed Unit #9 would face the backyard of my neighbours at 192 Fletcher Circle. Not only is this not in keeping with the current character of the neighbourhood, it will also negatively impact my neighbours’ privacy in their home and backyard.

Please note I will be requesting to be a delegate at the Public Meeting being held at 10:00am on Tuesday, March 2, 2021. I would also like to be included on the list of individuals notified of any further meetings on this proposed development.

Respectfully submitted,

cc City Clerk clerks@cambridge.ca
Hello,

I want to submit our concerns about the proposed zoning by-law amendment that included increasing the number of units from 6-9.

Rational:
1- The new development location is on a street junction and will definitely create a crowded junction in a small community. Any additional car parking will end up across our property and will create more challenges and safety concerns going out and in the junction.

2- We already have concerns about cars parking across the street of our property, which creates obstacles for incoming and outgoing traffic, and for our cars to freely drive out of our driveway.

3- It is a school zone, and parents park in our area in order to walk their kids to the school and it is already crowded. I believe you should consider the safety of the kids as it will be even more crowded.

4- You are changing the nature of the Fletcher Circle from detached houses to an overcrowded compound and I don't see a reason or logic to this approach. I understand that you may change the zone type, but you are not considering a gradual zone change and jumping to a more crowded model. The proposed land for construction is not an empty space in a remote end, but in the middle of a community. The proposed development on a land that is coming from a property that has one detached house only.

Please consider our concerns in your final decision.

Best Regards,

Cambridge, Ontario
Attention to: Michael Campos

About File No R14/20

Subject: Objection to the proposed development on 11 Fletcher Circle

We would like to object to the proposed development for the following reasons:

1. Safety concerns. The proposed development on 11 Fletcher Circle can pose significant safety risks considering the nearby school. First, it's impossible to back up into the driveway due to the space restrictions for the proposed townhouses. All of the future residents will be forced to break the law when backing up from their driveway into the live traffic. The adjacent vehicles parked on a neighboring driveway can restrict the visibility for a car backing up from their driveway to a point that it can cause an accident. This can be caused either by an upcoming vehicle or by a child crossing the street near the school, with the potential to result in serious injury or death.

2. Population density concerns. With adding more residences in a small area, there would be more traffic in an already overly congested area. Because of the nearby school and kids crossing the street in this area, it can lead to accidents resulting in serious injuries and death for kids and/or their parents accompanying them. This will lead to delays in getting in and out of the area, as well as put more strain on an already underserved and limited parking space on our street. Keep in mind that Guelph Avenue is a major artery road for getting in and out of the neighborhood with no other alternative and therefore no parking is allowed on the street. There is a potential to have future developers ask for more and more building amendments and concessions, effectively destroying the architectural design of the community. Not to mention that there will be a major strain added to the old infrastructure which was initially designed for less than half of the existing population density. The city will be on the hook for a significant infrastructure overhaul to accommodate the increasing population density in the area.

3. Environmental concerns. To build the townhouses, the developer will need to cut down the existing trees on the property. Most of these trees are more than 100 years old and they will be irreplaceable. This will not only reduce the absorption of carbon emissions and subsequently reduce the clean air needed for a healthy community from the nearby traffic but also impact the bird population using those trees to shelter and survive. In particular, the endangered owls' population will not be able to return and prey on the rodents in the area, with the potential to increase the number of rodents in the area and potentially resulting in more damages done by those rodents, creating an unnecessary ecosystem disruption and an environmental imbalance with serious side-effects in the long run.

4. Water drainage concerns. There is a water drainage system built underneath the space on 11 Fletcher Circle. To build new townhouses, the whole drainage system will have to be removed. This can result in damage to the foundations of the nearby properties and potential flooding to the nearby structures. As a result, the City of Cambridge can be found to have legal liability for granting permission to build on that land and get sued by the insurance companies who might be
forced to cover the damages. Mattamy Homes were aware of the issue and choose not to build in that area for the same reasons when they build all the houses on Fletcher Circle.

5. Construction concerns. When building these structures, all the crew working there will have no space where to park their vehicle but on our street. They will be using the street parking which is already underserved having only a few parking spots available for the few hundred people living on the street. Once the construction will be over, it will take away more parking spaces since the spots adjacent to the building lot will no longer be available. There would be noise and dust during the construction, affecting the neighboring area. And with the construction activity going on near the school, some kids might be at risk for serious injury or death due to the heavy construction vehicles operating in such a small space.

6. Community concerns. With the nearby school, the community needs a park for the growing kids in the area. By not granting a zoning amendment for the proposed development on Fletcher Circle, this green space will be saved for our future generations to enjoy. The developer can still build on the residential lot facing Guelph Avenue. The large old trees will be saved and the ecosystem will be undisturbed. Most importantly, the city will not face the potential of costly legal challenges for approving a development that seriously impacts the existing neighborhood.

We ask the city council to consider our concerns and vote against the zoning amendment on Fletcher Circle. In case the city grants permission for the development of the lot on Fletcher Circle, we reserve the right to challenge the decision in court. We are looking forward to having our statement read by the city clerk at the public meeting and for the opportunity to bring further arguments supporting our case to the city council.

We intend to attend the public meeting and we are looking forward to having our written statement submission read at the meeting by a city clerk.

Respectfully,
Thank you for reaching out regarding your concerns around 355 Guelph Ave & 11 Fletcher Circle. Please note that I have forwarded your email to our Deputy City Manager and Chief Planner for their review.

Kind regards,

Jacki Langlois
Executive Assistant to Mayor and Council
P: 519-740-4517, ext 4271
City of Cambridge
www.cambridge.ca
langloisj@cambridge.ca

From: Katelyn Clayton <claytonk@cambridge.ca>
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 11:58 AM
To: Katelyn Clayton <claytonk@cambridge.ca>
Cc: Michael Campos <campom@cambridge.ca>; E_mayor <mayor@cambridge.ca>; Mike Mann <mannm@cambridge.ca>; Donna Reid <ReidD@cambridge.ca>; Mike Devine <devinem@cambridge.ca>; Jan Liggett <liggettj@cambridge.ca>; Pam Wolf <wolfp@cambridge.ca>; Shannon Adshade <adshades@cambridge.ca>; Scott Hamilton <hamiltons@cambridge.ca>; Nicholas Ermeta <ErmetaN@cambridge.ca>
Subject: [External] Re: City of Cambridge - 355 Guelph Ave & 11 Fletcher Circle Neighbourhood Meeting Notes

Good morning,

Thank you for sending the meeting notes. I just want to mention that something important, among others, was left out, probably accidentally, from the meeting notes. It refers to the request for more public consultations regarding the development before going to the city council for a vote.

Here is the reasoning behind it. When the builder representative verbally presented the revised concept, he did not provide a new plan with exact measurements so that the community can have a good understanding of the changes. That lack of preparedness from the builder can leave space for interpretation and misunderstanding. Also, the way the builder representative explained the proposed revisions, was quite unprofessional and lacked substance since lots of his remarks were "I believe" or "I think" or "I have to check". The builder had more than 5 weeks to prepare for this meeting and what was presented at the meeting was totally unacceptable due to the sloppy presentation and the lack of clear details.

The community shouldn't have "to guess" what the builder intends to do before going to the city council for a vote. The community feels that this past public consultation was done just to check the mark that it was completed. The builder didn't address the majority of the issues raised in the previous public meeting, did not properly prepare for the meeting, and didn't answer any of the questions raised by the community including myself, Bryan Gordon, Irina Galarza, Sam Grewal, and others. We request more public consultations to be done for this development proposal. A petition with 24 signatures of our community members was submitted today, requesting more public consultations on this matter.

Please don't silence our community and allow us the chance for more public consultations.

Thank you,
Hello Madam/Sir,

I am a resident of 8 Fletcher circle. As you know there is a construction scheduled for a townhome complex across the road from our residence.

There are a number of reasons that makes this building bad for our community as listed below:

1. The narrow entry road to the circle already prohibits road side parking and with the introduction of FIVE units that front onto the circle there would be far too much traffic on an already congested turn.

2. As you know our community is adjacent to St Gabriel's school and Silver Heights public school, many children living within this circle walks to school everyday. With these many units in a very small lot area with continuous cars pulling in and out, it would be a danger to our children.

3. The lot has beautiful tall trees that brightens our community which would be cut down for this expansion.

Please address these concerns on our virtual meeting scheduled on March 2nd 10:00am in case I am absent.

Regards
Hi Mr. Campos,

It was a pleasure speaking to you today. I am glad you and your family are doing well under the circumstances.

My name is ________________, directly behind the property of this application. I would like to participate in the public meetings regarding the property.

My concerns are:
- the grading of the property and the roof drainage of water - possible water damage/flooding on our property.
- the height of the building in regards our privacy - bedrooms and backyards
- if the trees along the property line will be cut down - financial impact on us in regards to higher electricity bills in summer time
- is the current retaining wall strong enough to support the proposed townhouse units?

Also;
-what will the purchase price be of the townhouses?

I look forward to meeting you at the virtual meeting.

Kind regards,
Hi Mr. Campos,

Another concern is cellular service. We currently have poor service in different parts of our home. The proposed tall townhomes behind us will definitely affect cellular service.

I will email you if other concerns arise.

Thank you,
Good day,

My name is [redacted]. The proposed homes to be built would be right behind my home. I would like to participate in the meeting set for March 2, 2021. Could you please advise what will be discussed?

I am concerned with impact of this new development with respect to:
- privacy with respect to our rooms as well as our back yard
- lack of sunlight with these homes directly behind our home as they will be tall
- disruption to nature if all the trees, about 20, will be cut down. These trees provide shade to homes in this neighborhood. It has alleviated the use of air conditioning for many years
- drainage issues that may arise and who will bear the cost to repair. Also the possibility and probability that this will be a continual problem. Will the city aid in the future? If not, this is an undue financial burden for us which affect our home insurance premiums and the value of our homes
- the cluster of homes in our neighborhood would be an eyesore and negatively affect the values of many homes in this neighborhood, would this allow for us to pay less in taxes??
- Guelph Ave is a busy road and with only one entrance and exit to Fletcher Circle this would add to traffic, especially for those living in the circle
- have you thought as to how construction would proceed as Guelph road is well used and it would be unfair and not acceptable for those living on Fletcher Circle to be inconvenienced with loud noise, dust and debris from construction work, trucks parked on Fletcher Circle and occupying half the road; making it difficult to get in and out and increasing the risk of accidents
- what would happen to the island and lamppost at the entrance of Fletcher circle? It currently provides light to the community as well as aid to coming in and out of the circle

Has this development been approved, accepted and a done deal, with this public meeting just being a courtesy for those who oppose to be heard? Or can this application be refused? Can the developers and city make their money elsewhere where a development like this would be a positive addition to a community and the public?

Regards,
Yesterday I drove to the area of Saginaw Parkway and Franklin Blvd to capture some visual comparative information regarding three storey structures off Saginaw Parkway which were built about 20+ years ago and which are in close proximity and overlook other townhouse residential structures below (the Rembrandt Condominiums).

Both developments are accessible from south directing entrance-and-exits to and from Saginaw Parkway.

The higher dwellings unfortunately have no name posted to identify the development, the lower dwellings are part of the next property off Saginaw Parkway, the Rembrandt Condominiums.

The balcony on the left of the first photo below would approximate the ground level height of the proposal by IBI for the four east facing units that would front onto Guelph Avenue (units 1-4). The proposed balconies off the second level of proposed units 1-4 would sit one storey higher up than the photo shows.

Certain concerns just heard on YouTube from Sparrow Avenue residents seem to be similar to those of Fletcher Circle and Guelph Avenue homeowners.

Respectfully submitted

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: 
Date: Tue, Mar 2, 2021
As spoke to, though the density requested by the client of IBI Group might comply as far as the permitted density and number of units per hectare, if it exceeds the allowable number of six units that has been shared with us by proposing nine units then this is nothing minor in nature.

Does an application to permit an increase by 50% the number of units on the site that currently is within the Official Plan and bylaws not setting a standard for how far developers can expect that they can push against limits?

Do Planning staff recommendations easily accede to developers’ pushing against the limits?

Or do they see their role as staff as being to support the Official Plan and bylaws and to consider accommodating minor and within reason exceptions to stated Official Plan and bylaw “restrictions”?

I will be honest with you that my experience has been that staff comments and recommendations to Council do not seem to reflect much real consideration to the interests of delegation input. After all Community members are the ones “paying the freight”.

I personally feel that the expression “represents good planning” in comments expressed by Planning staff to be nebulous and annoying. Are there firm standards that apply to “represents good planning” or is it intended to be nonspecific in its meaning?

Might I suggest that the specific reasons for that remark to Council be accompanied in all cases moving forward with a clarification statement that declares how “good planning” features are met by the specific matters of the application at hand.

Exceptions and exemptions provided for in staff recommendations would do well to be held up to a certain measurable standard for the benefit of the applicant, City Planning representatives and the community at large.

If this is not to be done perhaps a statement can accompany recommendations stating the reasons for not applying measurable criteria to the particular application.

Respectfully,
Appendix No. 7 - Response to Public Comments Received

A number of oral and written submissions were made for the proposal at 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle with respect to the development of nine street-fronting townhouses. The themes of the comments can generally be summarized as follows: height and density; privacy; traffic; compatibility; environmental concerns; drainage concerns; and safety concerns.

Height, Density and Privacy

Comments have been received in opposition to the proposed height and density of the development. Concerns were raised with respect to the original proposal that saw the townhomes having a total height of three-storeys. The concerns were primarily relating to the compatibility of the three-storey structures with the existing development surrounding the subject lands, which is comprised of primarily two-storey single detached dwellings. Although the subject lands are permitted to accommodate three-storey heights, the applicant has revised the heights of the proposed development to a maximum of two-storeys to complement the existing heights of the abutting residential development.

The original proposal, which contemplated three-storeys in height also raised concerns relating to privacy. The original proposal included second storey decks. Surrounding residents were concerned with lack of privacy as a result of these decks, as well as with the proposed windows on the third storey that may result in future residents having the ability to look into private rear yards of abutting properties. As a result of the reduced height to two storeys, and the increased setbacks proposed, the applicant has revised the application to minimize concerns over the overall height and privacy concerns raised by the community.

The proposed development proposes a maximum density of 38 units per hectare. The maximum allowable density for the subject lands is 40 units per hectare. As such, the proposal is in conformity with the maximum density permitted.

Traffic

The proposed development considers the development of nine street-fronting townhouses with individual driveway accesses. The proposed development would see four units fronting onto Guelph Avenue and five units fronting onto Fletcher Circle. Concerns were raised by residents of the community with respect to the potential traffic that would be created at the intersection of Fletcher Circle and Guelph Avenue as a result of the new development. Transportation Staff have reviewed the proposed development and are not concerned that the proposed addition of nine units would create any traffic impacts on the streets. It is not anticipated that the proposed development would generate a significant amount of traffic.
Compatibility

Concerns were raised by members of the community with respect to the compatibility of the proposed development with the surrounding area. Primarily, the concerns relating to compatibility had to do with the proposed height and the built form of the residential dwellings. As mentioned previously, the applicant has revised the proposal to reduce the height of the proposed townhomes to two-storeys from the original three-storey proposal. This will result in the proposed developments having a similar height with abutting lands to the east and the existing development surrounding the subject lands. With respect to the built-form, townhouse dwellings are considered to be a low density residential built form, similar to single-detached dwellings. Although the townhouse dwellings result in a higher number of units within a smaller area as opposed to single-detached dwellings, the proposed development has remained within the maximum allowable density of the site, which is 40 units per hectare. The number of dwelling units proposed for the subject lands are divided between two blocks and offer driveway access off of two separate street frontages. As such, it is the opinion of staff that the proposed built form is compatible in form, scale and massing with the existing neighbourhood. The applicant has provided each unit with its own individual garage and sufficient parking to accommodate both primary and visitor spaces for the future residents. Each lot will contain a rear yard amenity area, similarly to the surrounding residential properties.

Existing townhouse development has occurred in proximity to the site to the north. As such, the built-form is not new to the surrounding area and fits well with the character of the existing residential community. The subject lands are intended to provide for low/medium density residential built form and the proposal is aligned with that.

Environmental Concerns

The proposal considers the removal of 18 existing trees found on the subject lands to accommodate the development of the proposed townhouses. Based on the revised Landscaped Plan provided by the applicant, the majority of trees that are planned for removal include those on 11 Fletcher Circle. Approximately three trees area proposed to be removed along the norther property line of 355 Guelph Avenue. As part of the revised proposal, the applicant has proposed to plant an additional 11 trees as part of the proposed development, locating them around the entire site. Trees that are being maintained and those that are proposed to be planted will contribute to the overall screening and privacy between the proposed units and surrounding existing dwellings. Based on the Arborist report prepared and submitted as part of the application, it was noted that the trees that are intended to be preserved as part of this development will be appropriately protected. Unfortunately, in order to accommodate the development of the townhomes fronting onto Fletcher Circle, as well as the unit furthest north which fronts onto Guelph Avenue, trees are required to be removed. These trees are considered to be in good condition, however, due to the proposed location of the units, they cannot be preserved on site.

As a result of the revisions to the original application submitted, the applicant was successful in preserving an additional three trees then originally proposed. Originally,
trees were proposed to be removed, however, with the shifting of setbacks on site, only 18 existing trees are planned to be removed.

**Drainage Concerns**

Concerns were raised by residents of the community, primarily those residents located abutting the subject lands to the east and south with respect to drainage concerns as a result of the proposed development. The proposed engineering plans were provided to City staff for review. There were no concerns with respect to the proposed grading and stormwater management measures associated with the development, and as a result, drainage should not be a concern on these lands.

**Safety Concerns**

Safety concerns were raised by surrounding residents with respect to the existing St. Gabriel Catholic School that is located in proximity to the subject lands to the south. According to community comments received, many students use these streets for walking to and from school. It is a concern that vehicles entering and exiting the subject lands may be dangerous for pedestrians in the area. Additionally, there was concern that future residents of the subject lands may not be able to see vehicles coming down Fletcher Circle as they pull out of their driveways. Transportation staff have reviewing the proposed development and maintain that there are no concerns with the proposal. Appropriate pedestrian sidewalks will be provided that will allow future pedestrians to travel safely adjacent to the proposed development.

Other concerns with respect to safety were raised relating to the construction of these townhomes. There is concern that the construction activity may cause injury to pedestrians. It is important to note that those who are working on site are responsible for implementing and using safety measures during construction to stop any potential harmful occurrences from taking place.
Appendix No. 8 - Proposed Draft Zoning By-law

Purpose and Effect of By-law No. 21-XXX
355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle

The Purpose of the By-law is to amend the zoning for the lands legally described as Part of Lots 13, Concession 3, Beasley’s Lower Block, Township of Waterloo as in 202482; and Block 70, Plan 58M-470, City of Cambridge in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo (“subject lands”). The proposed amendment will facilitate the development of nine, two-storey street-fronting townhouse units, where four units will front onto Guelph Avenue and five units will front onto Fletcher Circle. The townhouse units will each provide a private garage and access driveway to be used to accommodate the required parking. A private rear yard amenity space is also planned for each individual unit. In order to develop the subject lands with the above proposed development, site-specific provisions are required to permit the following:

- To permit nine attached townhouse dwelling units on the subject lands, whereas only six attached units are permitted in the RM4 zone;
- To permit a minimum lot area of 150 square metres (1,615 square feet), whereas a minimum lot area of 165 square metres (1,776 square feet) is required; and,
- To permit a minimum exterior side yard of 5.08 metres (16.66 feet), whereas a minimum exterior side yard of 6 metres (19.68 feet) is required.

The Effect of the By-law will permit the development of the subject lands for nine, two-storey street-fronting townhouses.
BY-LAW 21-XXX

OF THE

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Being a By-law of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge to amend Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as Amended with respect to land municipally known as 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle (R14/20)

WHEREAS Council of the City of Cambridge has the authority pursuant to Section 34 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended to pass this By-law;

AND WHEREAS this By-law conforms to the City of Cambridge Official Plan, as amended;

AND WHEREAS Council deems that adequate public notice of the public meeting was provided and adequate information regarding the Amendment was presented at the public meeting held March 2nd, 2021, and that further public meeting is not considered necessary in order to proceed with this Amendment;

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

1. THAT this by-law shall apply to a portion of the lands described as Part of Lots 13, Concession 3, Beasley’s Lower Block, Township of Waterloo as in 202482; and Block 70, Plan 58M-470, City of Cambridge in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and is shown on Schedule ‘A’ attached hereto and forming part of this by-law;

2. THAT Schedule ‘A’ to By-law No. 150-85, as amended, is hereby further amended by changing the zoning classification of the lands shown outlined in heavy black in the attached Schedule ‘A’ to this By-law from R2 (355 Guelph Avenue) and R5 – S.4.1.227 (11 Fletcher Circle) to RM4 – 4.1.421 in accordance with the attached Schedule ‘A’ to this By-law;

3. THAT the aforesaid City of Cambridge Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding the following subsection to 4.1 thereof:
4.1.421 – 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle, legally described as Part of Lots 13, Concession 3, Beasley’s Lower Block, Township of Waterloo as in 202482; and Block 70, Plan 58M-470, City of Cambridge in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, the following regulations shall apply to the lands in the RM4 zone to which reference “s.4.1.421 is made on Schedule A and located at 155 Equestrian Way:

- To permit nine attached townhouse dwelling units on the subject lands;
- To permit a minimum lot area of 150 square metres (1,615 square feet); and,
- To permit a minimum exterior side yard of 5.08 metres (16.66 feet).

4. THAT this By-law shall come into force and effect on the date it is enacted and passed by Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge, subject to notice hereof being circulated in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act and Ontario Regulation 545/06.

Read a First, Second and Third Time

PASSED AND ENACTED this 14th day of December 2021.

______________________
Mayor

______________________
Clerk
Recommendations

THAT Report 21-301(CD) - Request to Demolish a Part IV Designated Property, 4800 Fountain Street - be received;

AND THAT Council approve the request to demolish the main structure on the designated property municipally known as 4800 Fountain Street North in accordance with Section 34 of the Ontario Heritage Act as outlined in Report 21-301(CD), subject to the following conditions:

a) That the owner ensures that the fieldstone, of which the exterior walls of the circa 1870 school structure are composed, is salvaged during demolition and is protected on site for use in future commemoration;

b) And that the owner retains a qualified heritage professional to make recommendations on the appropriate method for demolition to ensure conservation of the stonework for reuse and avoid unnecessary loss or damage to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner;

c) And further that the owner ensures that the demolition is carried out using these recommended heritage methods.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- Council approval is required to permit the demolition of a building or structure on Part IV designated property. The main structure on the property municipally...
known as 4800 Fountain Street has been severely damaged by fire and requires immediate demolition.

**Key Findings**

- The property municipally known as 4800 Fountain Street was designated in 1980 under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act by City of Cambridge by-law 1769.

- The property includes a one-storey fieldstone former school building constructed in approximately 1870 with a rear addition constructed in 1964.

- On August 24, 2021 the structure was severely damaged by fire.

- Engineering reports submitted by the applicant and commissioned by the City of Cambridge have identified that the structure is unstable and recommend that it must be demolished immediately.

- The remaining building materials are compromised by the heat and cannot be used in a new structure.

- The owner has agreed to salvage the fieldstone used in constructing the walls for use in future commemoration at such time as a plan comes forward for a replacement structure.

- After the structure is demolished, Council will determine if the designating by-law should be amended or repealed.

**Financial Implications**

All costs are the responsibility of the applicant.

**Background**

The subject property was designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act in 1980 by City of Cambridge by-law 1769. The subject property contains a one-storey fieldstone former school building constructed in approximately 1870. A concrete block addition clad in granite veneer was constructed in approximately 1969. The property is located adjacent to the Grand River in north-west Cambridge and is primarily surrounded by rural lands.
The designating by-law describes that the property is significant for both its design value and its associative value. It describes that the structure is notable as a rare example of a rural, stone school and highlights the multi-coloured granite construction, twelve-paned double sash windows surmounted by an elliptical fan lite and red brick radiating voussoirs as attributes.
The existing structure served as a rural school from approximately 1870 to 1962. The existing structure replaced an earlier wood-frame school built in approximately 1865. The property had previously been used as a school site since approximately 1832. It had recently been adapted for residential use.

Prior to August 2021, previous owners had made unapproved alterations to the property including creating a large opening in the foundation through which to drive vehicles and removing a load-bearing interior wall.

In January 2021 the current owner received a property standard order to repair the exterior walls to prevent entry of moisture into the building.

On March 24, 2021 an updated property standards order was issued requesting that the owner repair the roof and shore the walls of the rear addition to stabilize them.

On August 24, 2021 the subject property was severely damaged by fire.

The roof of the structure was completely consumed by fire, leaving the fieldstone walls unsupported. Many of the windows were broken and the stone comprising the walls was

---

Figure 3: Unauthorized alterations, 4800 Fountain Street North, December 2020.
compromised by high heat. The existing damage to the foundation has been exacerbated by loss of the roof framing (Figures 4-6).

The owner submitted a structural assessment report completed by Caskanette Udall and dated August 31st which evaluated the extent of damage. The report concluded that “the structure cannot be salvaged and should be demolished completely, including the foundation” (Attachment 1).

The City of Cambridge retained Strik Baldinelli Moniz to complete a structural review of the existing building to determine if the structure could be salvaged. The engineers initially visited the site on August 24, 2021 to the condition of the building. A second site visit was conducted on September 8, 2021 to further assess the extent of fire damage, observe any changes, and explore options for shoring if possible. The report identified that the exterior walls are unsupported and the foundation is undermined, meaning that there is high risk for the walls to collapse. The report recommended that the structure be demolished immediately. (Attachment 2).

At the request of staff, the owner submitted a memorandum regarding potential salvage and reuse of materials. This was prepared by David Thompson Architects Ltd. and dated September 17, 2021. The report outlined that the windows had been damaged beyond repair with broken frames, sashes, and muntins and were inoperable.

The memorandum further outlined that the fieldstones comprising the exterior wall could not be salvaged for reuse in new construction due to their structural stability being compromised by high levels of heat (Attachment 3).

On September 27, 2021 the owner submitted an application to demolish the remaining structure.

On 18 November 2021, the Municipal Heritage Advisory was consulted regarding the proposed demolition and passed the following resolution:

THAT Report 21-301(CD) be received;

AND FURTHER THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommend that Council approve the request to demolish the main structure on the designated property municipally known as 4800 Fountain Street North in accordance with Section 34 of the Ontario Heritage Act as outlined in Report 21-301(CD), subject to the following conditions:

a) That the owner ensures that the fieldstone, of which the exterior walls of the circa 1870 school structure are composed, is salvaged during demolition and is protected on site for use in future commemoration.
Figure 4: 4800 Fountain Street North East Elevation, August 25, 2021.

Figure 5: 4800 Fountain Street North interior from west entrance, August 25, 2021.
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.

Demolition of the remaining walls of the former school at 4800 Fountain Street is required to ensure public safety. The walls are unstable and may collapse imminently.

Comments

The subject property contains a one-storey fieldstone structure that was constructed as a school in approximately 1870 and a concrete block addition clad in stone veneer that was previously used as a gymnasium space. The structure has been recently converted for residential use. The property was designated in 1980 by the City of Cambridge as a property of heritage value or interest. The property is notable as a rare example of a rural schoolhouse of fieldstone construction in the Region of Waterloo.

On August 24, 2021 the structure was severely damaged by fire.
Structural Assessment

The City has received two assessments by structural engineers regarding the extent of the fire damage and possibility of restoration or salvage. Both reports concluded that the structure was damaged beyond repair and at risk of collapse and recommended immediate demolition of both the remaining walls and the foundation.

The report prepared by Caskanette Udall consulting engineers and dated August 31, 2021 noted that the roof had been entirely consumed by the fire and that the remaining walls had been compromised by fire and also by long-term deterioration of the mortar between the fieldstones. The authors noted that there was no reasonable method to preserve the structure.

The report by Strik Baldinelli Moniz and dated August 31, 2021 (revised September 10, 2021) also concluded that the structural stability of the remaining walls had been compromised by the fire and noted that the remaining walls would not meet CSA standards if they were to be reused. The author also recommended complete demolition of the remaining walls and foundation.

Heritage staff accept the professional engineers' assessments that the structure cannot be repaired and must be demolished.

Commemoration and Salvage

Heritage staff requested that the owner provide salvage and commemoration plans prior to demolishing the structure. The owner submitted a memorandum regarding potential salvage of 4800 Fountain Street prepared by David Thompson Architect on 17 September, 2021. The author concluded that there were no remaining heritage attributes that could be salvaged. The remaining windows had been broken and the mechanisms seized and the stone comprising the walls had been potentially structurally compromised by high temperatures and so could not be certified for use in new construction.

The owner has not yet determined future plans for redeveloping the property. The owner has indicated that they intend to create a commemorative feature on the property using stone from the walls, such as a garden or accessory building. The particulars of this feature are to be determined at such time as an application is submitted to re-build on the property.

In order to ensure that all possibilities for commemoration remain open, the owner has agreed to salvage as much fieldstone as possible from the remaining walls during demolition. Until such time as it is to be used, this stone is to be stored on site at the rear of the property, covered by plastic, and protected by fencing to avoid theft or damage.
Heritage staff is satisfied that options to repair the existing structure and to salvage key materials have been adequately explored and repair is not a viable option. For this reason, staff are recommending that Council approve the request to demolish the remaining walls and foundation entirely.

Although heritage staff have been advised that the distinctive fieldstone used in the building’s construction cannot be salvaged for new construction due to heat damage, staff is recommending that the stone be salvaged during demolition and retained for future commemorative use. Staff is recommending that demolition be carried out using appropriate heritage methods to ensure that the stonework is conserved for reuse and not unnecessary lost or damaged.

If Council does not provide a decision or does not approve the request to demolish, the structure is at serious risk of collapse and cannot be safely shored up. The applicant may appeal the decision to the Ontario Lands Tribunal.

After the building is demolished or removed, Council must review the existing designating by-law to determine if the by-law should be amended or repealed.

**Existing Policy/By-Law**

**Ontario Heritage Act**

Section 34 of the Ontario Heritage Act outlines that an owner may not demolish a designated structure unless they receive consent in writing to the demolition. It states,

No owner of property designated under section 29 shall do either of the following, unless the owner applies to the council of the municipality in which the property is situate and receives consent in writing to the demolition or removal:

1. Demolish or remove, or permit the demolition or removal of, any of the property’s heritage attributes, as set out in the description of the property’s heritage attributes in the by-law that was required to be registered under clause 29 (12) (b) or subsection 29 (19), as the case may be.

2. Demolish or remove a building or structure on the property or permit the demolition or removal of a building or structure on the property, whether or not the demolition or removal would affect the property’s heritage attributes, as set out in the description of the property’s heritage attributes in the by-law that was required to be registered under clause 29 (12) (b) or subsection 29 (19), as the case may be. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 12.
City of Cambridge Official Plan (2018)

Section 4.6 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan states that;

The City will regulate as fully as possible the demolition, removal or inappropriate alteration of buildings of cultural heritage value or interest included in the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources referred to in Section 4.3.

Financial Impact

All costs are the responsibility of the owner.

Public Input

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

Internal/External Consultation

Heritage staff consulted with the owner of the property and with the Chief Building Official.

Conclusion

Two structural assessments completed by professional engineers have agreed that the structure at 4800 Fountain Street cannot be repaired and must be demolished entirely. The owner has explored re-using materials in new construction or salvaging key attribute such as windows. The high heat of the fire has left the remaining materials damaged to such an extent that they cannot be certified for re-use structurally. The owner has agreed to retain as much as possible the distinctive fieldstone that currently comprises the walls of the circa 1870 school structure to be re-used non-structurally in a future commemorative feature. These fieldstones will be retained on site until such time as plans are submitted to re-develop the property. Staff is recommending that the demolition be carried out using methods recommended by a qualified heritage professional to ensure that the remaining stonework is not unnecessarily lost or damaged.

Heritage staff is satisfied that possibilities to repair or salvage the existing structure have been explored. For this reason, staff recommends that Council approve the application to demolish the remaining structure at 4800 Fountain Street with the condition that the owner agrees to retain as much of the fieldstone comprising the remaining walls as possible to be used in a future commemorative feature.
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- Appendix 1 Structural Assessment, Caskanette Udall Consulting Engineers, August 31, 2021
- Appendix 2 Structural Assessment Strik Baldinelli Moniz, August 31, 2021 (revised September 10, 2021)
- Appendix 3 Architectural and Historic Assessment After Fire, David Thompson Architect Ltd. September 17, 2021
August 31, 2021

John Parr
TD Insurance
9th Floor 3650 Victoria Park Ave
North York, ON M2H 3P7

Dear Mr. Parr,

Re: Structural Assessment after Fire
Address: 4800 Fountain St., Cambridge
Insured: Ahmad Zeitoun
Date of Loss: August 24, 2021
Your file No: 033012866
Our File No: 21-263TJ

Caskanette Udall Consulting Engineers was retained on August 25, 2021 to assess the damage to the insured building after a fire and determine if the remaining structure is salvageable.

The house is an older wood, stone, and concrete block framed structure. The section on the north side was originally a school house. The south side of the building has been added on at some time in the past, and covered with stone to match the school house. The original section was constructed with stone walls and wood floors and roof. The newer section used concrete block walls and stone veneer, with wood floors and roof. The house has been classified as a heritage building.

Photo 1: Overhead image of house at 4800 Fountain St. N, Cambridge (Google)
The fire destroyed the entire newer south section, including the floor and roof. The floor of the north section was heavily damaged but remained in place. The roof was completely consumed.

The remaining walls on both sections are damaged and unstable and cannot be salvaged. The concrete block walls on the south side have been compromised from the fire and cannot be saved. The stone walls on the north side have also been compromised from the fire, but also suffer from long term deterioration of the mortar between the stones. There is no reasonable method to preserve the remaining structure.

The foundation of the original section was likely built with rubble stone. A small area at the rear that is visible was reinforced with brick. The overall condition of the foundation is likely that it cannot be re-used for new construction without significant repairs and upgrades.

Prior to the fire, the insured stated that the roof was leaking near the fireplace. The roof was tarped to prevent further moisture ingress. He indicated that he was working with the city and heritage association to have the roof repaired.

The insured also stated that there was an interior wall in the north section that was in disrepair from the previous owners after incomplete renovations. He was in the process of applying for a permit to remove the wall and have a beam installed. The permit was still outstanding at the time.

There were no other pre-existing deficiencies reported by the insured.

Based on my inspection of this property after the fire, the remaining structure cannot be salvaged and should be demolished completely, including the foundation. The walls remain in an unsafe condition and temporary shoring is not feasible.

This completes my assessment. Please contact our office if you have any further questions.

Yours very truly,

Jeff Udall, P.Eng

Aug 31, 2021
Photo 2: Fire damaged house at 4800 Fountain St N, Cambridge

Photo 3: Remains of interior on south side (newer addition)
Photo 4: Remains of interior on north side (original section)

Photo 5: Original stone wall on north section
Photo 6: Rebuilt foundation corner at rear of house

Photo 7: Wall construction at rear of south section
Limitations

1. The work performed in the preparation of this report and the conclusions presented are subject to the following:
   (a) The Scope of Services, and time and budgetary limitations discussed at the time of our retainer; and, 
   (b) The Limitations stated herein.

2. No other warranties or representations, either expressed or implied, are made as to the professional services 
   provided, or the conclusions presented.

3. The opinions presented in this report were based, in part, on visual observations of the site and attendant 
   structures. Our conclusions cannot and are not extended to include those portions of the site or structures 
   which were not reasonably available, in our opinion, for direct observation.

4. In so far as the investigation included obtaining information from third parties and employees or agents of the 
   owner, no attempt has been made to verify the accuracy of any information provided, unless specifically noted 
   in our report.

5. Because of the limitations referred to above, different building conditions from those stated in our report may 
   exist. Should such different conditions be encountered, we must be notified in order that we may determine 
   if modifications to the conclusions in the report are necessary.

6. The utilization of our services during the implementation of any remedial measures will allow us to observe 
   compliance with the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report. Our involvement will also 
   allow for changes to be made as necessary to suit field conditions as they are encountered.

7. This report is for the sole use of the party to whom it is addressed unless expressly stated otherwise in the 
   report. Any use which any third party makes of the report, in whole or in part, or any reliance thereon, or 
   decisions made based on any information of conclusions in the report, is the sole responsibility of such third 
   party. We accept no responsibility whatsoever for damages or loss of any nature or kind suffered by any such 
   third party as a result of actions taken or not taken or decisions made in reliance on the report or anything set 
   out therein.

8. **Waiver of Consequential Damages**

    Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, and to the fullest extent permitted by law, neither the 
    Client or the Consultant, their respective officers, directors, partners, employees, contractors or 
    subconsultants shall be liable to the other or shall make any claim for any incidental, indirect or consequential 
    damages arising out of or connected in any way to the project or this assignment. This mutual waiver of 
    consequential damages shall include, but is not limited to, loss of use, loss of profit, loss of business, loss of 
    income, loss of reputation and any other consequential damages that either party may have incurred from any 
    cause of action including negligence, strict liability, breach of contract and breach of strict or implied warranty. 
    Both the Client and the Consultant shall require similar waivers of consequential damages protecting all the 
    entities or persons named herein in all contracts and subcontracts with others involved in this project.

9. **Limitation of Liability**

    To the maximum extent permitted by law, the Client agrees to limit the Consultant’s liability for the Client’s 
    damages to the sum of the Consultant’s fee or the available proceeds of insurance at the time a claim is made, 
    whichever is greater. This limitation shall apply regardless of the cause of action.

10. **Corporate Protection Provision**

    It is intended by the parties to this Agreement that the Consultant’s services in connection with the Project 
    shall not subject the Consultant’s individual employees, officers or directors to any personal legal exposure 
    for the risks associated with this Project. Therefore, and notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained 
    herein, the Client agrees that as the Client’s sole and exclusive remedy, any claim, demand or suit shall be 
    directed and/or asserted only against the Consultant, Caskanette Udall Consulting Engineers, and not against 
    any of the Consultant’s individual employees, officers or directors.
City of Cambridge  
Attention: Mr. Ralph Schmidt  

4800 Fountain Street North  
Cambridge, Ontario  

Ralph;  

At your request, Garrett Nicholson, P.Eng of Strik Baldinelli Moniz attended site on the afternoon of August 24, 2021 to complete a structural review of the existing building. The purpose of review was to assess the fire damage and reported safety concerns regarding the structure of the schoolhouse and gymnasium. An additional site visit was performed on September 8, 2021 with Darryl Cowan, P.Eng of SBM to further assess the extent of the fire damage, observe any changes since the previous inspection and determine if warranted, options for safely installing shoring.

It was reported that the fire occurred sometime during the morning of August 24, 2021. Emergency services were called and extinguished the fire during the morning. On the afternoon of August 24 portions of the schoolhouse roof framing had failed and fallen on to the ground floor framing. The roof structure of the gymnasium had failed and fallen into the structure. Below is a summary of our observations, conclusions, and recommendations. This report is based on a visual review from the outside of the building only. Due to safety concerns the building was not entered.

**OBSERVATIONS:**

The building is a 1-storey schoolhouse with a full basement. The schoolhouse appears to have been used as storage for some years. There is a gymnasium addition which had been modified for use as a vehicle workshop by removing most of the floor joists, excavating down 4’ to suit the surrounding grade, and a large door opening was created in the rear (west) elevation. The building is listed by the City of Cambridge as a designated heritage structure. The original building was constructed in 1870 and is known as the Riverbank School.

The schoolhouse appears to be the original building as it is constructed with mass round field stone load bearing walls. The interior was mostly covered with plaster at the time of review. The floor framing is rough sawn wood floor joists. The roof framing is mostly missing but was previously framed with rough sawn rafters with raised ceiling joists to create a vaulted ceiling.

The gymnasium appears to be an addition to the original building as it is constructed with 8” thick concrete block walls with a field stone veneer supported on 12” concrete block foundation walls. The roof framing is completely missing but was previously wood roof joists.

At the time of review, the roof framing of both the schoolhouse and gymnasium has failed, leaving all walls of both structures laterally unsupported at the top.

Prior to the fire, the gymnasium floor framing had been removed and the interior had been excavated down to match the low grade at the rear (west) elevation, leaving the walls unbraced from the strip footing to the underside of roof elevation. A large section of the gymnasium’s rear (west) elevation had been removed to create a large door opening.(see photo 8). The
excavated interior creates a walk-in condition, but also exposed the interior and exterior face of the strip footing (see photo 12) thereby leaving insufficient frost cover to the footings which are now susceptible to heave.

At the south-west corner of the schoolhouse, the field stone foundation had failed prior to the fire. It appears the wall was damaged or undermined and the foundation wall had been reconstructed/reinforced with clay brick masonry (see photo 11) directly on grade. During the second inspection, shear cracks were observed in the field stone wall above window and door openings near this area (see photo 13 and 14). It is unclear if the cracking occurred prior to or after the fire.

In the schoolhouse, the underside of the ground floor framing was not easily viewed from the north basement window but appeared to be in fair condition. The top of the ground floor interior was obstructed due to the failed roof framing and was not visible for inspection. The interior partition framing in the basement was partially visible and showed no visible signs of fire damage. The basement floor was flooded as a result of the fire fighting efforts.

The gymnasium interior was observed from both the front (east) elevation, left (south) elevation as well as the rear (west) elevation. Near the front elevation, some floor joists remained in place and showed signs of fire damage. In the remainder of the gymnasium interior, the floor framing had been previously removed exposing the joist pockets in the wall thus creating a taller wall than originally intended. At the rear (west) elevation, the large door opening does not have a proper lintel installed and triangular cracking is visible in both the concrete blocks and stone veneer extending from just above the opening to the peak of the wall, indicating some blocks may be in danger of falling out of the wall. This may have been present prior to the fire, however during the second inspection, the cracks were observed to have widened directly above the opening. The front wall elevation was observed to have been extensively undermined, leaving large sections unsupported (see photo 15). This condition would have been present prior to the fire. The front and south side elevations were also observed to have small diagonal shear cracks at the window openings (see photo 16 and 17).

CONCLUSIONS

Due to the extent to the fire damage to the roof, all concrete block and field stone load bearing walls are unsupported at the top and thus are structurally unstable and unsafe. Further, due to the pre-existing damage or undermining to the foundation walls, the stability of the gymnasium walls and rear corner of the school house are further reduced.

The small diagonal cracking over the windows and doors is typical for older masonry structures where lintels are not present and are not necessarily indicative of structural failure. However, the pattern and size of cracking over the large rear gymnasium door is indicative that potential partial failure may occur.

The gymnasium foundations and part of the school house foundations have insufficient frost cover leaving them susceptible to heave during freezing weather. Additionally, without a roof the building cannot control the temperature leaving the founding soil on the inside of the building further susceptible to frost heave during freezing weather.

The schoolhouse ground floor framing and foundation appear to be in fair condition based on the conditions observed on-site.

The original mass round field stone walls of the schoolhouse were constructed using a method of construction that is no longer employed in modern construction. Field stone wall framing is not recognized by the Ontario Building Code or for quantitative design under CSA S304.1 “Masonry Design for Buildings.” The empirical slenderness ratios provided in the CSA appear to be exceeded thereby making it difficult to provide any engineered repair details or to certify the walls for re-use.

Due to the unsupported condition of the exterior masonry walls, the risk for partial failure of some walls and the undermined foundation walls, it is our opinion that the existing schoolhouse and gymnasium structure are unsafe for occupancy. Further, because of the unsafe conditions described above, it is our opinion that attempting to temporarily shore the walls of the schoolhouse and gymnasium is also unsafe.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The schoolhouse and the gymnasium buildings are structurally unstable and unsafe for occupancy or for temporary shoring. In the interest of public safety, it is our opinion that the schoolhouse and gymnasium structure be fully demolished.

It is further recommended that additional construction fencing, or hoarding be installed around the property to completely block public access to the building. We recommend that no person enter the building for any reason until the unstable portions of the structure are demolished under a valid demolition permit.

LIMITATIONS:

- This report is intended exclusively for the Client(s) named in the report. The material in it reflects our best judgment in light of the information reviewed by Strik Baldinelli Moniz at the time of preparation. No portion of this report may be used as a separate entity, it is written to be read in its entirety.

- Any use which a third party makes of this report, or any reliance on or decisions to be made based on it, are the responsibility of such third parties.

- Only the specific information identified has been reviewed. The consultant is not obligated to identify mistakes or insufficiencies in the information obtained from the various sources or to verify the accuracy of the information. The Consultant may use such specific information obtained in performing its services and is entitled to rely upon the accuracy and completeness thereof.

- This assessment does not wholly eliminate uncertainty regarding the potential for existing or future costs, hazards or losses in connection with a property. No site inspections, physical or destructive testing and no design calculations have been performed unless specifically recorded. Conditions existing but not recorded were not apparent given the level of study undertaken. We can perform further investigation on items of concern if so required.

- We accept no responsibility for any decisions made or actions taken as a result of this report unless we are specifically advised of and participate in such action, in which case our responsibility will be as agreed to at that time. Any user of this report specifically denies any right to claims against the Consultant, Sub-Consultants, their Officers, Agents and Employees in excess of the fee paid for professional services.

We trust this report meets your satisfaction. If you need further clarification, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Respectfully submitted,

Strik, Baldinelli, Moniz Ltd.
Planning • Civil • Structural • Mechanical • Electrical

Prepared By

Garrett Nicholson, P.Eng. Darryl Cowan, P.Eng
Associate II

Cc: Dennis Purcell, Chief Building Official – City of Cambridge
Photo 1: Front (east) elevation of schoolhouse.

Photo 2: Rear (west) elevation of schoolhouse.
Photo 3: Ground floor interior from rear door.

Note: The roof framing has failed inwards on to the ground floor framing. The furniture and interior partitions showed little to no fire damage.

Photo 4: Basement and ground floor framing visible from side window on north elevation.

Note: The basement is flooded with water at the time of the first and second inspection due to the fire fighting efforts.
Photo 5: South-west corner at rear elevation.

Note: The field stone foundation has failed and been reinforced with brick masonry on grade. Surrounding grade slopes steeply away from the schoolhouse towards the large unsupported opening of the gymnasium’s rear (west) wall.

Photo 6: South elevation of gymnasium.

Note: The roof framing has failed inwards and the concrete masonry walls are unbraced.
Photo 7: Gymnasium interior from the front door, looking towards the south elevation.  
Note: The roof framing has failed inwards and the concrete masonry walls are unbraced.
Photo 8: Gymnasium interior from the front door, looking towards the west elevation.

Note: The roof framing has failed inwards and the concrete masonry walls are unbraced. Unsupported wall openings are present throughout the west elevation. Cracking is visible in the concrete masonry wall above the large unsupported opening.
Photo 9: West elevation of gymnasium, above large unsupported opening. 
Note: Cracking is visible in the stone veneer above the large unsupported opening.
Photo 10: West elevation of gymnasium, at large unsupported opening.

Note: Concrete masonry foundation wall has been excavated and exposed on both interior and exterior face at the west elevation. With the space now being unheated, there is no frost protection for the gymnasium walls.

Photo 11: South-west corner at rear elevation.

Note: The field stone foundation has failed and been reinforced with brick masonry. Field stone wall above does not have solid bearing on to the masonry. Surrounding grade slopes steeply away from the schoolhouse towards the gymnasium's rear (west) wall.
Photo 12: West elevation of gymnasium, at large unsupported opening.

Note: Concrete masonry foundation wall has been excavated and exposed on both interior and exterior face at the west elevation. Strip footing is visible. With the space now being unheated, there is no frost protection for the gymnasium walls.
Photo 13: Rear (west) elevation of schoolhouse at door opening.
Note: Cracking is visible at the corners above door opening and extend to roof.

Photo 14: Rear (west) elevation of schoolhouse at window opening.
Note: Cracking is visible above the large window opening and extend to roof. This cracking is typical at the window opening on the front (east) elevation as well.
**Photo 15:** Gymnasium interior from the rear large unsupported opening, looking towards the east elevation.  
*Note:* The wall is undermined and unsupported at multiple locations.

**Photo 16:** Front (east) elevation of gymnasium at window openings.  
*Note:* Cracking is visible at the corners and extend to roof.
Photo 17: Side (south) elevation of gymnasium at window opening.

Note: Cracking is visible at the corner of window opening.
David Thompson Architect Ltd.

RE: ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORIC ASSESSMENT AFTER FIRE
4800 FOUNTAIN STREET, CAMBRIDGE, ON
ARCHITECT’S COMMENTS

September 17, 2021

Owner: Ahmad Zeitoun
Date of Fire: August 24, 2021
Location: 4800 Fountain Street, Cambridge, ON
Formerly Riverbank School
Being of Architectural and Historic Significance
Cambridge By-Law 1769

David Thompson Architect Ltd was retained in September of 2021 to assess the condition of Architectural and Historic elements at 4800 Fountain Street, after they were exposed to a significant fire in August of the same year.

Formerly known as Riverbank School, the building was deemed to be of Architectural value and Historical interest in November of 1980, see Cambridge By-Law 1769. It was one of the few remaining stone rural schools in the area and was deemed an aesthetic example of the type. The windows were not typical of the time, but noted as ‘unusual’ in the 1980 report, the two large front windows each twelve paneled and double sashed complete with elliptical fan above and radiating brick voussoirs. The multi-coloured granite was laid up in a typical rural manner, with thick flat mortar joints. The building functioned as a school for more than ninety years from 1870 to 1962, and then as a library from 1962-1973. The following year after it served as Headquarters for the Waterloo Regional Library.

After its use as a Library, the building became privately owned and used as a single family dwelling for about twenty years. The owner of the house let the building fall into disrepair and much of the structure was seriously compromised, a result of ongoing renovations he took on himself without the consent of Structural Engineers and the local Building Department.

As Riverbank Drive was closed off over the years, a large manufacturing plant built just south of the property and Waterloo Regional Airport expanded its services, traffic levels increased on Fountain Street and the property became more isolated from the community which it had served for so many years.

Prior to the fire in August 2021, we were called in to give an opinion on the integrity of the building. We felt it was unfit for habitation and went so far as to comment it was structurally unsafe to renovate, and recommended temporary shoring to be designed by a Professional Engineer and installed prior to undertaking any renovations.
The current owner had engaged a local Structural Engineering firm, Witzel Dyce Engineering Inc, and was in the process of working with the Municipality and Historical boards to renovate the building. It was their intent to create a single-family home on the property which would become their principal residence.

It is our understanding the Owner was in the process of securing a grant to restore elements of the building.

The fire destroyed much of the building, generating intense amounts of heat and smoke, both of which severely compromised the existing historic stone and windows referred to in By-law 1769, previously mentioned.

The Structural report by Caskenette and Udall Consulting Engineers recommends the remnants of the building left standing and the associated concrete and rubble foundations be demolished immediately, as their structural integrity has been compromised. The granite walls had not been maintained and the report added the loss of grout in the joints between the stones allowed water to penetrate and damage the assembly.

The windows have been damaged beyond repair with broken frames, sashes, muntins and so on. The hardware has long been seized and is not operable.

While we unfortunately recommend demolition as well, we do suggest any stone that could be salvaged for outdoor structures, fences, landscape walls, columns or other landscaping elements on the property should be done so.

This completes my assessment. Should you have any further questions, please contact me directly any time.

Regards,

DAVID THOMPSON ARCHITECT LTD.

David Thompson, Principal
OAA, MRAIC, Dipl. Arch., BA, LEED Green Associate
RE: ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORIC ASSESSMENT AFTER FIRE
4800 FOUNTAIN STREET, CAMBRIDGE, ON
ARCHITECT’S COMMENTS

ADDENDUM

September 27, 2021

Owner: Ahmad Zeitoun
Date of Fire: August 24, 2021
Location: 4800 Fountain Street, Cambridge, ON
Formerly Riverbank School
Being of Architectural and Historic Significance
Cambridge By-Law 1769

As requested, see attached Personal CV. I also attached Testimonials and a brief Firm Description for your reference.

I am an Architect with close to 30 years experience in Toronto, Vancouver and Toronto, and while the majority of my work is new builds, I do a number of renovations to buildings in scale of the subject building and I do work in an historical style. The Balsillie house on Malabar in Waterloo is an example of late 1900’s Shingle Style, for example, and I have many other examples over the years. I also worked on the Wellington County Museum and Archives restoring their front steps and entrance way.

As for structural stability of stone after a fire, I will cite ‘Fire Damaged Stone Structures in Historical Monuments. Laboratory Analyses of Changes in Natural Stones by Heat Effect’, by M Hajpal:

‘Although natural stones are non-combustible materials, the fire and heat effect can cause irreversible changes in their structure and mechanical properties, which influence the strength and static behaviour of the stone structures. These changes risk the stability of the entire building. Some fires at the end of 20th century brought attention to the importance of this research topic, since understanding the changes in mechanical properties of natural stones by heat provide additional information for the reconstruction and restoration work of fire damaged historic buildings. The typical forms of alteration of stones exposed to fire are: changes of colour, rounding off corners, spalling and cracking.’
As for the question about structural stability of stone after a fire, the best one to comment is a Professional Engineer and a Fire Specialist. Often Building Codes require new material. I did offer a solution that the stone could be used on site in Landscape projects such as walls, columns and so on, where any fire damage would not affect the building envelope.

The idea of recalling the existing building and its historical significance in the area is a very good one.

Regards,

DAVID THOMPSON ARCHITECT LTD.

David Thompson, Principal
OAA, MRAIC, Dipl. Arch., BA, LEED Green Associate
Recommendation(s)

THAT Report 21-322(CRE), re: Core Areas Financial Incentives – December 14, 2021 Applications be received;

AND THAT Council approve the application for 18 Tannery and the transfer from the Core Area Transformation Fund (CATF) of $45,269 as outlined in report 21-322 (CRE);

AND THAT staff be authorized to execute a Commitment Letter and any required documentation in order to administer this funding;

AND THAT Council delegate authority to Director of Economic Development and Chief Financial Officer (or designates) to increase the funding to the maximum amount within the parameters of the specific program(s), if necessary;

AND FURTHER THAT the work approved under these enhanced incentives be completed within one (1) year of the date on the Approval Letters.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- To request Council to authorize the following grant application for the subject property under the City’s new Community Improvement Plan (CIP) as follows:
  - a Commercial Property Improvement Grant (CPIG) of $25,524 and a Commercial Building Restoration, Renovation and Improvement Grant (CBRRIG) of $19,745 from the CATF Reserve Fund for the redevelopment of the building located at 18 Tannery Street East in Hespeler Village.
Key Findings

- For 18 Tannery Street, the following chart outlines the application:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grant Available CPIG</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Expenses CPIG</td>
<td>$51,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Amount CPIG</td>
<td>$25,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Funding Amount CPIG</td>
<td>$4,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grant Available CBRRIG</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Expenses CBRRIG</td>
<td>$39,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Amount CBRRIG</td>
<td>$19,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Funding Amount CBRRIG</td>
<td>$35,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grant Funding</td>
<td>$45,269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Implications

- The CPIG of $25,524 and CBRRIG grant of $19,745 will be funded from the CATF reserve.
- The total fundable amount of this request for the property at 18 Tannery Street East is $45,269.
- The total value of the redevelopment project at 18 Tannery Street East is over $100,000. If the funds are not used, they will still be available in the account for possible future projects.

Background

The CIP provides the basis for financial incentive programs within the three relevant designated CIP Project Areas in the City of Cambridge. It focuses mainly on Cambridge’s three (3) Core Areas as designated in the Official Plan and Community Improvement Project Area By-law.

These new financial initiatives will facilitate the planning and financing of development activities that effectively use, reuse and revitalize lands, buildings and infrastructure. They prioritize municipal investment and are intended to stimulate private sector investment, property maintenance and revitalization within the project areas. These new
incentives were contemplated under the Council approved Core Areas Transformation Fund (CATF) and will be financed from said fund.

Since the effective date of the programs of August 3, 2021, there has been significant interest in the available grants. Economic Development Staff is pleased to present these requests as part of the new Financial Incentives to Cambridge Council for approval.

The subject application is under the following grant programs:

- **Commercial Property Improvement Grant (CPIG):** The Commercial Property Improvement Grant Program is intended to provide financial assistance for commercial property owners & tenants who aim to improve upon the exterior appearance of commercial properties.

- **Commercial Building Restoration, Renovation and Improvement Grant (CBRRIG):** The Commercial Building Restoration, Renovation and Improvement Grant works to leverage significant private sector investment in interior building renovations and improvements for commercial properties that are in need of renovation or vacant in the core areas.

Under these programs, grants are available to property owners, who typically have one year to complete the renovations. City Staff will issue an approval letter outlining the scope of work and funding. The next step in this process is the owner or tenant will complete the work as specified on the application. City Staff will inspect the work to make sure it is complete and meets all necessary Municipal codes. The applicant will then submit paid invoices for all work complete which is matched to the work submitted in the application process. If all of the invoices comply with the program regulations, Staff will issue a funding request for the calculated amount of funding.

**Property Information – 18 Tannery Street East**

18 Tannery Street East sits across the street from the Idea Exchange in Hespeler Village. It was purchased by the new owners in the summer of 2021 and they are completing renovations on the building. The work proposed is a complete renovation of the exterior of the building and an interior renovation of the main floor to office use. The new space will house a real estate office once renovated.

**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 6.2 Promote vibrant and inviting downtown cores by encouraging partnerships and creating a wide range of unique, exciting destinations and activities.

The Financial Incentive Programs leverages both public and private dollars to improve the public realm and create a pedestrian friendly and interesting core area.

Comments

Application – 18 Tannery Street East

The subject property is the former Salvation Army church located at 18 Tannery Street East and sits in the heart of Hespeler Village. The work proposed is a complete renovation of the exterior of the building and an interior renovation of the vacant church to a commercial office location. This will house staff members and increase the working population of Hespeler Village.

The applicant has applied for the Commercial Property Improvement Grant (CPIG) and the Commercial Building Restoration, Renovation and Improvement Grant Program (CBRRIG) for funding assistance. The total fundable amount of this request for the property is $45,269. The applicant is investing over $100,000 into this project.

Staff are supportive of the application to Commercial Property Improvement Grant programs because it will beautify the existing building. The Commercial Building Restoration, Renovation and Improvement Grant Program will also be used to convert currently vacant institutional space to a commercial opportunity which will increase the tax base of the core areas. This will also increase the working population of Hespeler Village and increase traffic to the downtown area. With more people working in the area it will create an economic spin off to the surrounding businesses and is supported by Staff.

Existing Policy/By-Law

As this property is located in one of the Community Improvement Project Areas (CIPA) in Cambridge, the applicants are eligible for the Financial Incentives Programs 2021 which provides matching funding for certain improvements to the buildings. The City can provide grant funding for up to 50% of eligible costs under the CPIG & CBRRIG.

Financial Impact

- This funding request is for:
  - $25,524 under the Commercial Property Improvement Grant Program
  - $19,745 under the Commercial Building Restoration, Renovation and Improvement Grant Program
• The total funding amount of $45,269 will be taken from the CATF Reserve Fund. If the funds are not used, they will still be available in the accounts for possible future projects.

• The balance of the CATF reserve is $18,867,550 as of November 15, 2021. A portion of this reserve is intended to support private sector stimulus, in addition to the fund’s other pillars.

Public Input

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

Internal/External Consultation

Financial Services Department – As part of the new staff process, Financial Services was consulted on the calculation of amounts of each program, in addition to the tax status of the property. For Council’s information, in order to be eligible for financial incentives there can be no taxes owing on a property.

Community Development Department – Planning Services Division and Building Department were consulted in the development of this request for funding.

Conclusion

In conclusion, staff respectfully recommends that Cambridge Council approve the total funding of $45,269 in a grant for the Core Areas CIP Financial Incentive programs. This will support a private investment of over $100,000 spread across the two buildings. These planned developments will help support the City of Cambridge’s effort to revitalize the core areas and have more people working and living in the downtowns.

Signature

Division Approval

Reviewed by the CFO
Reviewed by Legal Services

Name: James Goodram
Title: Director of Economic Development

Departmental Approval
Name: Brooke Lambert  
Title: Acting Deputy City Manager Corporate Enterprise

City Manager Approval

Name: David Calder  
Title: City Manager

Attachments

- Appendix A – Funding Calculations for 18 Tannery Street East
### CPIG & CBRRIG Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grant Available CPIG</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Expenses CPIG</td>
<td>$51,048.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Amount CPIG</td>
<td>$25,524.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Funding Amount CPIG</td>
<td>$4,476.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grant Available CBRRIG</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Expenses CBRRIG</td>
<td>$39,489.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Amount CBRRIG</td>
<td>$19,745.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Funding Amount CBRRIG</td>
<td>$35,255.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grant Funding</td>
<td>$45,269.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: COUNCIL

Meeting Date: 12/14/2021

Subject: Alternative Voting Methods Update – 2022 Municipal & School Board Election

Submitted By: Danielle Manton, City Clerk

Prepared By: Jennifer Shaw, Deputy City Clerk

Report No.: 21-319(CRS)

File No.: C1101

Recommendation(s)

THAT report 21-319(CRS) Alternative Voting Methods Update – 2022 Municipal & School Board Election be received for information; and

THAT the City of Cambridge adopts Paper Ballot Tabulation and Internet Voting for the 2022 Municipal Election scheduled on Monday, October 24, 2022;

AND FURTHER THAT the by-law to support the use of vote tabulators and internet voting as an alternative voting method in the 2022 Municipal and School Board Election attached as Appendix B to Report 21-319(CRS) be passed.

Executive Summary

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with an overview of the proposed voting systems and alternative voting method options for the 2022 Municipal and School Board Election and to share the feedback from the recent Election method survey in preparation for 2022.

Key Findings

- The next municipal election will take place on October 24, 2022.

- Bill 218, Supporting Ontario’s Recovery and Municipal Elections Act, 2020, has removed the option for Ontario municipalities to consider a ranked ballot election for 2022 and has adjusted some timelines as it relates to preparing for the 2022 Municipal Election.
• A survey was conducted in summer of 2021 to review various voting methods and assist in setting the direction for 2022 planning.

• This report provides an overview of the various voting methods available and the recommendations from staff for the continued use of vote tabulators with paper ballots at in-person voting locations, and that the advance period for the 2022 Municipal Election be held through a Curbside in person model and internet voting.

• Staff are also recommending a change to vote anywhere in your Ward for election day.

Financial Implications

• The total cost to run the Ward 7 By-Election in 2020 was $83,990, which came in under budget by $151,100. The approved budget for the By-Election was $235,000 of which $185,000 was to be funded through the Election Reserve Fund.

• The budget for the 2018 Municipal and School Board Election was approved at $390,000 with $220,000 funded through the Election Reserve Fund. The actual cost to run the election was $345,503.

• Staff anticipate the cost to run the 2022 Municipal and School Board Election will be similar to that of the 2018 election with all vote counting equipment and alternative voting methods costs funded through the Election Reserve Fund requiring no additional funds.

• The Election Reserve Fund currently has a balance of $424,650.

Background

In accordance with the Municipal Elections Act, 1996 ("MEA"); municipal elections are held every four years. The MEA requires the City Clerk to prepare a report about the identification, removal and prevention of barriers affecting electors and candidates with disabilities and to make the report available to the public.

The MEA authorizes the Clerk to determine the method of voting for Municipal Elections and requires that Council pass a by-law for any alternative methods recommended for the election including internet, and use of tabulators for vote counting equipment.

Prior to each municipal election, Section 42 (1) of the MEA requires that:

The council of a local municipality may pass by-laws:
(a) authorizing the use of voting and vote-counting equipment such as voting machines, voting recorders or optical scanning vote tabulators;

(b) authorizing electors to use an alternative voting method, such as voting by mail or by telephone, that does not require electors to attend at a voting place in order to vote. 1996, c. 32, Sched., s. 42 (1).

On October 20, 2020, Bill 218, Supporting Ontario’s Recovery and Municipal Elections Act was introduced to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. Bill 218 proposed several amendments to the MEA, the most significant being the removal of sections that permit municipalities to offer a ranked ballot election.

The City Clerk’s Office monitored the quick progress of the Bill from first reading to its referral to the Standing Committee on Justice Policy on October 27, 2020 and made the decision to pause a planned update to Council on voting systems.

The bill proceeded through the legislature and received Royal Assent on November 20, 2020.

As such, no City Council decision on voting systems is possible for the 2022 Municipal Election. Should ranked ballots be made available for municipal elections in the future staff will ensure that report is brought to Council outlining any legislated changes and options.

Bill 218 also amended the MEA to require that the decision on vote-counting equipment and alternative voting methods be made by May 1 in the year of the election rather than May 1 in the year prior to the election.

Given that there is additional planning that is anticipated as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and to ensure that staff have sufficient time to effectively plan for the election (including the ability to facilitate a competitive procurement process), it is staff’s recommendation that Council decide on vote counting equipment and alternative voting methods this year.

The City Clerk, as the Returning Officer for the City of Cambridge has several criteria to consider before making a recommendation on vote-counting equipment and alternative voting methods.

The first is whether an option upholds the principles of the MEA and its regulations. These principles, while not established as part of legislation, are generally recognized based on case law as:

(a) the secrecy and confidentiality of the voting process is paramount;

(b) the election shall be fair and non-biased;

(c) the election shall be accessible to the voters;
(d) the integrity of the voting process shall be maintained throughout the election;
(e) there is to be certainty that the results of the election reflect the votes cast;
(f) voters and candidates shall be treated fairly and consistently; and
(g) the proper majority vote governs by ensuring that valid votes are counted and invalid votes are rejected so far as reasonably possible.

Other criteria include community engagement feedback, the ability to effectively administer and support an option, as well as what trends we are seeing in municipal, provincial, national and international elections.

**Election Methods**

In 2018, there were 85,731 eligible electors in the City of Cambridge, the 2018 Municipal Election resulted in a voter turn out of 32.24% (up from approximately 30% in 2014)

- 8,677 voted using internet voting
- 2,071 voted at advance polls
- 485 voted at travelling polls
- 17,059 voted on Election Day at physical polls

Cambridge saw a large uptake in internet voting from 2014 to 2018. In 2014 there were roughly 5,000 voters who utilized internet voting, representing an increase of over 3,000 voters in 2018. This has the added benefit of lessening the strain on election resources on Election Day.

In the 2018 Cambridge Municipal Election there was a referendum on the ballot related to the use of ranked ballots for the municipal election. 13,488 voted “yes” to moving to a ranked ballot voting system in 2022, while 10,449 voted “no”; however, it required 50% voter turnout to be binding.

Four third party advertisers registered with the City of Cambridge in 2018.

**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 2.1 Provide a wide range of ways that people can become involved in city decision making.

The planning and execution of a Municipal Election is a major undertaking for the organization. The election is lead by the City Clerk, but supported by many City staff. Planning for the 2022 Municipal and School Board Election will maintain an element of emergency procedures to ensure that the safety of electors remains paramount throughout the planning process.

Elections are, by their very nature, exercises in direct public engagement. The City will ensure that ongoing communication occurs throughout the planning process of the election with electors, candidates, staff and Council to deliver a safe and inclusive election in 2022.

Comments

Voting Methods

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with information on a variety of voting methods used in Ontario municipal elections and recommend a course of action for the 2022 Municipal and School Board Elections.

The recommendations in the report have been formulated with the principles of the MEA in mind, as these principles serve as a benchmark and guide for the conduct of municipal elections:

- secrecy and confidentiality of the voting process;
- fair and non-biased;
- accessible to voters;
- integrity of the voting process;
- results of the election reflect votes cast;
- voters and candidates shall be treated fairly and consistently;

The following provide an overview on the voting methods considered and recommended for Cambridge in 2022.

Paper Ballot with Vote Tabulators

A vote tabulator (optical scan unit) reads and records how ballots are marked. A ballot is marked by indicating the voter’s choice(s). The ballot is then inserted into the vote tabulating unit. The tabulator reads and stores the information in the unit. At the close of voting on Election Day, the vote tabulator will produce cumulative totals of all votes cast and the totals will be compiled to produce the final election results.

The use of vote tabulators has become a generally accepted vote counting method in Ontario municipal elections over the last several years and has been used at the
provincial level of government. Cambridge has used vote tabulators for a number of Elections and most recently at the 2020 Ward 7 By-election.

As a result, there are established and recognized best practices for municipalities to use for effective implementation, including those already created at the City of Cambridge in previous elections.

The use of vote-counting equipment, such as vote tabulators, allows for:

- efficient vote counting - making it possible to report unofficial election results on election night.
- secret and confidential voting process - ballots and voters cannot be connected.
- accurate and non-biased vote count - automated counting processes ensure that determination of voter intent and what is counted is consistent.
- the integration of accessible technology, which allows for independent marking of a ballot which is indistinguishable from any other ballot once cast in the tabulator.
- certainty and integrity of the process - results reflect votes cast.

The system is precise, easy to use for voters, and capable of generating final election results very quickly following the close of voting. Moreover, manual counting of ballots is not required.

**Vote by Mail**

Vote-by-mail is generally used in rural municipalities where electors would otherwise be required to travel some distance to vote at a polling station. This system requires significant printing and mailing costs, as each qualified elector is mailed a voting kit including instructions, a voter declaration form, a ballot, a secrecy folder, and a postage-paid return envelope.

Once ballots are returned to the municipality's designated return point, ballots must either be counted manually or using an optical scan vote tabulator.

To ensure all eligible electors receive a kit, a series of deadlines must be established, and voting kits may be sent in batches. In the first batch, voting kits would be mailed by the service provider to all eligible electors on the Voter’s List. Following this mail out, a second period would be established wherein electors revising the list would receive a mailed voting kit sent by the municipality.

Due to the time it takes to mail a kit out to an elector and allow time for the completed ballot to be returned, this process can only take place up until approximately two weeks before Voting Day. For electors revising the list less than approximately 14 days before Voting Day, voting kits would be provided when they make their revision. It is important to note that these revisions would require electors to come to City Hall in person in order to receive the voting kit.
To complete their ballot, voters must mark the ballot, place it in the secrecy envelope and seal that envelope. They will then sign the declaration form and place it and their sealed secrecy envelope inside the return envelope to be returned to the municipality. These envelopes may be returned via Canada Post or dropped off at a secure location as designated in the election procedures established by the City Clerk. In order to allow adequate time for mailed ballots to be processed by Canada Post and delivered to the municipality, voters are provided an appropriate deadline by which they must place the return envelope in the mail in order to ensure it is delivered to the municipality by Voting Day. After this deadline, voters would be required to go to the designated drop off location in person.

To protect the integrity and security of the vote, designated drop off locations would need to be appropriately staffed and secured but still allow scrutineers to view processes. As such, a limited number of drop off locations could be provided, requiring some voters to drive well outside of their respective voting subdivisions to access a return centre if they are unable to meet the timelines required due to Canada Post processing.

Specific procedures may vary, but generally, as return envelopes are received after a certain date, the municipality will open the return envelopes to ensure that there is both a declaration form and secrecy envelope. Voters will be marked off the Voter’s List based on the declaration form, and the secrecy envelope will be placed in a secure ballot box until Voting Day. This process, like any other on Voting Day, must be subject to scrutineer viewing.

On Voting Day, the secrecy envelopes will be opened and counted at a designated vote processing centre, generally through an optical scan tabulator, and the results processed in a similar manner to other paper ballot systems.

This could take considerably longer than systems used by the City in the past, as fewer tabulators would be used to process all of the ballots, resulting in later results reporting.

Vote-by-mail systems may leave opportunity for a number of votes to not be counted should a voter not follow the instructions completely or accurately. Ballots that are not accompanied by a signed voter declaration form, ballots that are loose inside the return envelope, secrecy envelopes that identify the voter or ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on Voting Day are rejected cannot be counted. When a voter attends a voting place and the tabulator rejects the ballot, the voter is present and may have the opportunity to correct their ballot. In a vote-by-mail system, the voter is not present so if the tabulator cannot read the ballot, that vote is not cast. While information and messaging would be distributed, vote-by-mail systems may leave significant room for voter error resulting in an unintentional loss of their vote.
As noted, all eligible electors in the municipality are provided with a voting kit regardless if the elector intends to use it or not. A vote-by-mail system prints significantly more ballots and incurs substantively larger postage costs than other systems.

Given the size and resource demands of this option, voting by mail is not a recommended option due to the potential inconvenience for voters, the results are not immediate and some votes may not be counted if the ballots are inadvertently spoiled or received after the established deadline.

While the other options include some printing and the use of an optical scan tabulators, vote by mail kits would require an entirely different system of processes which will require additional resources for security, staffing as well as additional postage and printing costs.

In anticipation of possible continued COVID-19 restrictions, this option is being employed by municipalities like the City of Toronto, the City of Ottawa, and the City of Guelph to provide an accessible method of voting for individuals who may not be able to attend a voting location in person.

Cambridge has provided a variety of methods to ensure accessible and safe voting methods are available in 2022.

**Telephone Voting**

The service provider that the City of Cambridge has on contract for the 2022 Municipal Election has advised that they are no longer supporting the telephone voting method.

They have advised that with very few exceptions, most municipalities in Ontario who used telephone voting in 2018 experienced issues using the telephone voting option. Among these issues was confusion by the voters due to long lists of candidates and the need to do multiple confirmations. On average the telephone voting system was used by a very small number of voters, in most jurisdictions less than 5%, but these voters were responsible for the largest number of complaints, and many required additional steps to be taken to assist them during the telephone voting process. As a result, voting time was increased along with general voter disenfranchisement.

**Internet Voting**

Internet voting has proven to be easy, simple, straight forward, convenient and private. The primary benefits offered by internet voting are convenience and accessibility, with the potential for minimal to moderate increase in voter turnout. Internet voting project showed that internet voting is associated with a 3% increase in voter participation in Ontario.

Based on research, voters over 50 years of age are the most likely to vote by internet. 97 municipalities utilized internet voting in the 2014 municipal election. 59 of the 97
municipalities ran fully electronic election, offering electors either internet voting only or a combination of internet and telephone voting.

In 2018, a number of municipalities using the same Internet Voting Provider experienced issues on Voting Day, Cambridge was one of the municipalities that experienced these issues.

The 2018 issues were caused by a limit placed on incoming online traffic by the Internet Voting Provider’s third-party server that was approximately 1/10th of the Internet Voting Provider’s system designated bandwidth. As a result, voting was not available for 90 minutes on Voting Day causing some municipalities to extend voting for up to an additional 24 hours to accommodate and provide the opportunity for electors to cast their vote while maintaining the integrity of the process. Although these municipalities experienced technical issues, there was no evidence of voter fraud, security breaches or other issues that could give cause for a controverted election.

Following the election, the affected vendor stated that the issues were related to a specific bandwidth issue, which has since been rectified. The vendor has also confirmed that it did not affect the security or accuracy of the elections in those municipalities. It is also important to note that these technological issues occurred only occurred on Voting Day, and 17 of the 51 municipalities used internet and telephone voting for the advance voting period only and did not experience these issues.

Internet voting offers benefits such as the integration of accessible technology and enables the voter to identify errors in the ballot selections prior to casting a ballot. This voting method also allows for automated election processes like ballot processing, striking names off the voters list, and an effective and rapid count of the votes at the close of voting.

Technological advances in protective measures such as firewalling and user authentication techniques all decrease the likelihood and effectiveness of these threats.

Proper testing and auditing throughout the various implementation phases also serve to protect the voting system from external threats. As part of the testing phases, Municipal Clerks, in addition to the vendors, conduct thorough logic and accuracy testing prior to the election to test the system. During the logic and accuracy testing phase, the Clerk can test the system by running a mock election, and may investigate the feasibility of including candidates and scrutineers in this process to help electors gain confidence in a new voting method. The Clerk may also establish partnerships with other municipalities who are conducting internet voting and participate in a joint audit of the internet voting system.

It is important to note that although there have been documented attempts designed to compromise an online voting system, there are no known disputed or challenged elections resulting from the use of an internet voting system.
There have been concerns raised that internet voting may violate privacy concerns, such as voter coercion, including family members exercising illegitimate and unlawful authority over another compelling them to vote a certain way. This kind of concern is also relevant with all voting methods.

Some voters may not have full confidence in an internet voting system and may be concerned with the security of the internet including voter fraud, security breaches or other challenges or issues to controvert an election.

Section 49(2) of the MEA provides that no person shall:

a) interfere or attempt to interfere with an elector who is marking their ballot;

b) obtain or attempt to obtain, at a voting place, information about how an elector intends to vote or who has voted;

c) communicate any information obtained at a voting place about how an elector intends to vote or has voted.

The City Clerk is responsible to ensure that security and internal processes are established regardless of the method of election chosen to ensure that the integrity of the election process is upheld and the secrecy of the vote is maintained.

With internet voting, there are two basic models to use: one step and two step voting.

In one step internet voting, an eligible elector on the voters list receives a Voter Identification Information Letter in the mail. The voter identification letter will include a PIN, and other unique voter identification information (ID number) that the voter will use to access a website and vote. As noted above, the voter may also be requested to enter their birth date or other information as an additional security step, as determined by the municipality.

With the step two internet voting, the voter will first receive a Voter Information Letter in the mail. They will then register online and receive, through a separate email, a unique PIN and voter ID.

Ontario municipalities that have used internet voting in the past have developed their own processes to address security risks, voter verification, auditing and testing of the system, and internet and connectivity issues.

Academic studies and municipal statistics do not definitively indicate that internet voting has a significant impact on voter turnout; however, internet voting has been a successful customer service initiative that can lessen wait times and congestion at voting stations and has made voting more convenient and accessible. Internet voting provides a method of voting that may encourage participation from voters who may have previously faced barriers to voting such as mobility and time constraints.
Recommendations for 2022 Voting Methods

For 2022 the Clerk is recommending the following methods for the City of Cambridge:

**Advance Voting Options:**

*Curbside in-person voting*

The curbside in person voting method was recently used for the 2020 Ward 7 By-election and received positive feedback from electors. Staff will be implementing one curbside location within each Ward during Advance Voting Days and provide the opportunity for voters to experience a drive through voting experience.

*Internet voting*

Staff are recommending internet voting for Cambridge in 2022, however rather than voting via internet up until election day it is recommended to mitigate any disruptions that internet voting is only offered during the advance period and will conclude a few days prior to voting day. Staff are also recommending a joint audit of the internet voting be pursued with other municipalities who are using internet voting in 2022.

**Election Day Voting Options:**

*In person voting*

Staff recommend implementation of vote anywhere in your Ward on election day and establishing larger polling stations that will use paper ballots with vote tabulators.

*Accessible voting*

While curbside and internet voting provide accessible voting options, staff will also be providing a polling station at City Hall throughout the advance period and on election day that will provide fully accessibly voting opportunities for the public with the use of accessible vote features such as paddle voting or sip/puff voting.

*Planning in a Pandemic*

It is important to note that any election model has an inherent risk. Therefore, regardless of the voting method selected, adequate back-up systems would still need to be provided to ensure emergency plans are in place should technology fail during the voting periods, whether that technology is an optical scan vote tabulator or an internet connection.

Regardless of the method selected, Municipal and School Board Elections also place an increased demand on the City’s resources and Clerks and Technology Service divisions with respect the planning, and execution of the various methods and delivery.
Staff are recommending that the impact of COVID-19 be considered and that the City build off of recent successes proven through the 2020 Ward 7 By-Election. It is still unknown how long the safety and emergency measures which have been implemented will be in place. It is possible that there may be another wave of COVID-19 or another pandemic which may limit the ability for the public to gather in groups, impacting the method of voting selected for the 2022 Municipal Elections.

The City of Cambridge delivered a successful By-election shortly after the pandemic began, many safety precautions were implemented in the 2020 By-election to ensure elector, candidate and staff safety. Plexi glass barriers were installed, single use pens were provided to all voters, new staff roles at the poll were developed to ensure cleaning was frequent and capacity was managed. The City held Curbside voting outside of City Hall so electors could safely cast their ballot from the convenience of their vehicle.

The City of Cambridge was the recipient of the E.A. Danby Award in 2021 for planning and execution of the Ward 7 By-election. The City of Cambridge collaborated with 3 other municipalities, Ottawa, Windsor and Pelham who also planned and held By-elections. Each of the four municipalities ran unique and successful by-elections amidst the chaos of the pandemic. Through this, the City of Cambridge is fortunate to have pandemic procedures for municipal elections already established and tried and tested practices to exercise in 2022.

The City of Cambridge was also one of the first municipalities in history to apply Section 53 of the Municipal Election Act, exercising the authority of the Clerk to postpone an election.

Section 53 of the MEA authorizes the City Clerk to declare an emergency when circumstances have arisen that are likely to prevent the election from being conducted in accordance with the MEA, and allows the City Clerk to make arrangements that she considers advisable for the conduct of the election, as follows:

**Clerk’s Powers re: Emergency**

**Emergency**

53 (1) *The clerk may declare an emergency if he or she is of the opinion that circumstances have arisen that are likely to prevent the election being conducted in accordance with this Act.*

**Arrangements**

(2) *On declaring an emergency, the clerk shall make such arrangements as he or she considers advisable for the conduct of the election.*

**Conflict**
(3) The arrangements made by the clerk, if they are consistent with the principles of this Act, prevail over anything in this Act and the regulations made under it.

Time

(4) The emergency continues until the clerk declares that it has ended.

No review or setting aside

(5) If made in good faith, the clerk’s declaration of emergency and arrangements shall not be reviewed or set aside on account of unreasonableness or supposed unreasonableness.

As detailed in section 53 it is understood that the City Clerk is responsible both for declaring and lifting the declaration of emergency under the MEA. The Declaration of Emergency declared for the 2020 By-Election for Ward 7 is not to be confused with the Declaration of Emergency declared by the Mayor currently in place under the Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act.

On October 22, 2021 the Clerk declared that all 2020 Ward 7 By-Election timelines had passed, and the Declaration of Emergency was lifted.

Given the changing environment of the pandemic, and through the extensive planning of the 2022 Election, the Clerk will be prepared to adapt and if necessary implement the same authority that Section 53 provides, should there be risk to the safety of electors and the process of the 2022 Municipal and School Board Election.

Voters List:

The municipal voters list, as provided by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC), has been criticized across the municipal sector for its lack of accuracy, resulting in election administrators needing to devote considerable resources to correct substantial amounts of errors to enable voters to vote. Having an inaccurate voters list, despite efforts to correct it, pose enhanced barriers to voters and make the administration of the election process more difficult.

The province has recognized the need for an accurate and centralized voters list and has tasked Elections Ontario with this objective through Bill 204, Helping Tenants and Small Businesses Act, which received Royal Assent on October 1, 2020. Particularly, schedule 3 outlines that:

“The Election Act is amended to extend the Chief Electoral Officer’s responsibilities with respect to the permanent register of electors to include persons entitled to be electors in municipal elections, beginning in 2024.”
Given the imminent progress in this regard, staff are optimistic that this change will better facilitate the administration of internet voting in 2026.

**Existing Policy/By-Law**

The MEA provides the rules and guidelines for the administration of the Municipal and School Board Election.

**Financial Impact**

Staff believe that each option can be managed within the existing budget plus internal staff costs. The choice of option should not require any change to how the budget has typically been allocated for past elections as internet voting has been used by Cambridge since 2014.

**Public Input**

**2022 Municipal Election Voting Method Survey – Have Your Say!**

**Election Survey**

In August of 2021 eligible Cambridge voters were asked to provide input into the October 2022 Municipal and School Board Election through a survey which was designed to inform the subject report. The survey was available to complete beginning the second week of August through to the first week of September on the EngageCambridge platform and asked voters for their feedback on various election matters, including:

- Voting history and eligibility;
- General Ward and demographic information;
- When electors are most likely to vote (advance period or Voting Day);
- Comfort level and preferences around voting methods (in person paper ballot voting, mail in, internet voting and curbside/drive thru voting);
- How electors would like to hear about the 2022 candidates (all candidate meeting, door to door, website, newspaper, other);
- Accessibility and potential barriers to voting;
- Voting during a pandemic.

The survey received 128 responses, with ninety-five (95) per cent of respondents indicating they typically voted in the City of Cambridge Municipal and School Board
elections. Among survey respondents, ninety-eight (98) per cent indicated they were resident electors who live in Cambridge.

The Wards with the greatest response rates were Ward 4 (21.1 per cent), Ward 1 (17.2 per cent), and Ward 6 (14.1 per cent). The age groups most represented by the survey were 60-69 years (25.8 per cent), 50-59 years (21.1 per cent) 30-39 years (19.5 per cent), and 40-49 years (17.2 per cent).

When asked about their level of comfort with the methods to cast their vote, respondents ranked traditional paper ballot at a polling station and internet voting highest at seventy-seven (77) and sixty-four (64) per cent respectively, followed by curbside - in person voting at forty-two (42) per cent and mail-in voting at thirty-eight (38) per cent.

Sixty-one (61) per cent of survey participants indicated that they would be more likely to vote remotely via internet voting or mail-in ballots if pandemic restrictions are still in place for the 2022 Election.

A summary of the survey results and feedback received is included as Appendix A to this report.

**2022 Outreach and Education**

Planning for the 2022 Municipal and School Board Election will include outreach and education for the public on Advance and Voting Day options available. Similar to years past, a media campaign using print, social media and the City’s website will be undertaken working with Communications staff.

**Internal/External Consultation**

Early in 2022, consultation with City’s Tech Services, Purchasing and Communications Divisions will begin around the various technology planning, equipment/supply purchases and promotional work to be undertaken as part of preparations for the election.

Clerk’s staff will attend each Citizen Advisory Committee to share the 2022 Election Plans and, with the exception of legislated committees, will communicate expectations around the pause in advisory committee activity between the period of September 1 – December 31 of an Election year as approved by Council in the Advisory Committee Preliminary Review Report 21-197(CRS) in July of this year.

**Conclusion**

Based on the uptake of internet voting in the 2014 and 2018 elections and responses from the voting methods survey, staff are recommending a hybrid option of in-person and internet voting for the 2022 election year. The use of curbside in-person voting and
internet voting during the Advance Voting period will help to lessen some of the strain on Election Day and allows for wider coverage, while also considering individual voter preferences and potential barriers some voters may face with a traditional in-person paper ballot vote.

**Signature**

**Division Approval**

Reviewed by the CFO
Reviewed by Legal Services

Name: Danielle Manton
Title: City Clerk

**Departmental Approval**

Name: Dave Bush
Title: Deputy City Manager, Corporate Services

**City Manager Approval**

Name: David Calder
Title: City Manager

**Attachments**

- Appendix A – EngageCambridge Election Survey Results
- Appendix B – Draft by-law to authorize the use of alternative voting methods and vote counting equipment in the 2022 Municipal and School Board Election
EngageWR
Municipal Voting: Have Your Say

Visitors Summary

Highlights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL VISITS</th>
<th>MAX VISITORS PER DAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW REGISTRATIONS</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGAGED VISITORS</th>
<th>INFORMED VISITORS</th>
<th>AWARE VISITORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aware Participants</th>
<th>498</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aware Actions Performed</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited a Project or Tool Page</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informed Participants</th>
<th>267</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informed Actions Performed</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewed a video</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewed a photo</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downloaded a document</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited the Key Dates page</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited an FAQ list Page</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited Instagram Page</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited Multiple Project Pages</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to a tool (engaged)</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engaged Participants</th>
<th>128</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaged Actions Performed</td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed on Forums</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Surveys</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to Newsfeeds</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Quick Polls</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted on Guestbooks</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to Stories</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked Questions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placed Pins on Places</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to Ideas</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ENGAGEMENT TOOLS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool Type</th>
<th>Engagement Tool Name</th>
<th>Tool Status</th>
<th>Visitors</th>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>Unverified</th>
<th>Anonymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Tool</td>
<td>Voting survey</td>
<td>Archived</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INFORMATION WIDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Widget Type</th>
<th>Engagement Tool Name</th>
<th>Visitors</th>
<th>Views/Downloads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Description of Voting Methods.pdf</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above summarizes the engagement metrics for the EngageWR tool from 15 August 2018 to 11 October 2021. It highlights that there is 1 document with 15 visitors and 22 views/downloads.
ENGAGEMENT TOOL: SURVEY TOOL

Voting survey

| Visitors | 259 | Contributors | 128 | CONTRIBUTIONS | 128 |

Do you typically vote in City of Cambridge Municipal and School Board elections?

- Yes: 122 (95.3%)
- No: 6 (4.7%)

Question options
- Yes
- No

Mandatory Question (128 response(s))

Question type: Radio Button Question
Which of the above criteria best describes you:

- I am a resident elector: 125 (97.7%)
- I am a non-resident elector: 3 (2.3%)

**Question options**

- I am a resident elector
- I am a non-resident elector

Mandatory Question (128 response(s))

Question type: Radio Button Question
To assist us in planning voting locations and methods please select the Ward that best describes you. If you are unsure of which Ward best describes you, check the City’s Interactive Ward Map.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward 1</th>
<th>Ward 2</th>
<th>Ward 3</th>
<th>Ward 4</th>
<th>Ward 5</th>
<th>Ward 6</th>
<th>Ward 7</th>
<th>Ward 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 (21.1%)</td>
<td>22 (17.2%)</td>
<td>18 (14.1%)</td>
<td>15 (11.7%)</td>
<td>13 (10.2%)</td>
<td>13 (10.2%)</td>
<td>12 (9.4%)</td>
<td>8 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mandatory Question (128 response(s))
Question type: Dropdown Question
Now please select the Age Group that best describes you.

Question options
- 18-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-59
- 60-69
- 70-79
- Prefer not to say

Mandatory Question (128 response(s))

Question type: Dropdown Question
Municipal and School Board Elections provide voters with options to vote during an advance voting period or on Election Day. When are you most likely to vote?

**Question options**
- During the advance voting period
- On Election Day
- Don't know
- Prefer not to say

*Mandatory Question (128 response(s))*

*Question type: Radio Button Question*
Considering the methods to cast your vote described above, please rate your level of comfort with the following:

**Question options**
- Very uncomfortable
- Somewhat uncomfortable
- Somewhat comfortable
- Very comfortable

**Paper ballots at a polling station with tabul...**
- Very uncomfortable: 35
- Somewhat uncomfortable: 21
- Somewhat comfortable: 99
- Very comfortable: 

**Internet voting**
- Very uncomfortable: 12
- Somewhat uncomfortable: 12
- Somewhat comfortable: 22
- Very comfortable: 82

**Mail-in ballots**
- Very uncomfortable: 26
- Somewhat uncomfortable: 23
- Somewhat comfortable: 30
- Very comfortable: 49

**Curbside/Drive-thru voting**
- Very uncomfortable: 10
- Somewhat uncomfortable: 21
- Somewhat comfortable: 43
- Very comfortable: 54

*Mandatory Question (128 response(s))
Question type: Likert Question*
Please rank in order of your preference, each of the following voting methods. 1 being the most likely that you would use and 4 being the least likely that you would use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTIONS</th>
<th>AVG. RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet Voting</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Ballot at a polling station with tabulator</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbside/Drive thru voting</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail-in ballot</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mandatory Question (128 response(s))

*Question type: Ranking Question
How you would like to hear about the 2022 Municipal Election and School Board Candidates?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mandatory Question (128 response(s))

Question type: Checkbox Question
Disabilities, both visible and invisible, include physical, hearing, seeing, developmental learning or mental health conditions, chronic illness, and addictions. Disabilities may be from birth, caused by injury or accident, developed over time, or ...

Question options
- Prefer not to say
- No
- Yes

Mandatory Question (128 response(s))
Question type: Radio Button Question
Are there any barriers that have prevented you from taking part in past Municipal and School Board Elections in Cambridge?

**Question options**

- **Not applicable**
- **Unsure**
- **No**
- **Yes**

*Mandatory Question (128 response(s))

*Question type: Radio Button Question*
Do you foresee these barriers preventing you from taking part in the 2022 election?

- Not applicable: 86 (67.2%)
- Unsure: 10 (7.8%)
- No: 27 (21.1%)
- Yes: 5 (3.9%)

**Question options**

- Not applicable
- Unsure
- No
- Yes

*Mandatory Question (128 response(s))*

*Question type: Radio Button Question*
If you have indicated "yes" to either of the above questions, is there a voting method that would best accommodate you? (Please select all that apply)

**Question options**
- Curbside/Drive thru voting
- Mail-in ballot
- Internet voting
- Paper ballot at a polling station with tabulator

*Optional question (36 response(s), 92 skipped)*
*Question type: Checkbox Question*
Considering the COVID-19 pandemic, would you be more likely to vote remotely in the 2022 Municipal Election if the option was available? (i.e. via mail-in ballot or internet voting)

- 78 (60.9%) Yes
- 40 (31.3%) No
- 10 (7.8%) Unsure

*Question options*
- Unsure
- No
- Yes

*Mandatory Question (128 response(s))*

*Question type: Radio Button Question*
If you would not be likely to vote remotely, would you prefer to vote by paper ballot at a polling station with a tabulator or curbside/drive thru?

**Question options**

- Curbside/drive thru
- Paper ballot at a polling station with a tabulator

*Mandatory Question (128 response(s))

Question type: Radio Button Question*
Appendix B – Draft Alternative Voting Methods By-law

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

By-law 21-XXX

Being a by-law to authorize the use of alternative voting methods and vote counting equipment for the 2022 Municipal and School Board Election

WHEREAS Section 42 of the Municipal Elections Act, 1996, S.O. 1996, c. 32, as amended, provides that the council of a local municipality may, by by-law, authorize the use of optical scanning vote tabulators and alternative voting methods;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the City of Cambridge deems it appropriate and in the public interest to utilize optical scanning vote tabulators and vote by internet as the methods of conducting the 2022 Municipal and School Board Election,

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

1. THAT the use of optical scanning vote tabulators for the purpose of counting votes in the 2022 City of Cambridge Municipal and School Board Election be hereby authorized.
2. THAT internet voting be hereby authorized as an alternative voting method in the 2022 City of Cambridge Municipal and School Board Election.
3. THAT By-law 63-17 is hereby repealed.
4. AND THAT this by-law shall come into force and full effect on the date of passing.

Enacted and Passed this X day of month, 20XX.

______________________________
MAYOR

______________________________
CLERK
To: COUNCIL

Meeting Date: 12/14/2020

Subject: Proposed Schedule for 2022 Meetings of Council

Submitted By: Danielle Manton, City Clerk

Prepared By: Danielle Manton, City Clerk

Report No.: 21-331(CRS)

File No.: C1101

Recommendation(s)

THAT the report 21-331(CRS) Proposed Schedule for 2022 Meetings of Council be received; and

THAT Council approve a proposed schedule of meetings for 2022 as set out in Appendix “A” of Report 21-331(CRS); and

THAT the City Clerk be directed to report back in the first quarter of 2022 with a hybrid meeting policy as well as a plan to resume in person meetings of Council.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a draft calendar of meetings for 2022 and a summary of the plans for the return to in-person Council meetings as the City transitions to hybrid meetings in mid 2022.

- The City of Cambridge Council Chambers is in the process of a technology update to facilitate hybrid meetings. The technology update was anticipated to be completed by the end of 2021, as a result of technology supply shortages globally, the project will require an extension to the first quarter of 2021.

- To assist in transitioning from virtual to hybrid meetings, staff recommend that Council approve remaining as Special Council for the first half of 2022 and direct the City Clerk to report back with a hybrid meeting policy and plan to return to in person following the Chamber technology update.
Key Findings


- On August 11, 2020 Council further amended the Procedure By-law 18-15 as a result of Bill 197, the *COVID-19 Economic Recovery Act*. The change in legislation permitted Ontario municipalities to conduct meetings electronically permanently regardless of an emergency pursuant to the *Municipal Act, 2001*.

- On July 27, 2021 Council approved report 21-224(CRS) Council Chamber Audio and Video System replacement, due to end of life technology an update of technical equipment in the Council Chambers was necessary and provided the opportunity for new voting technology, enhanced ability to host virtual and in person meetings and increased accessibility of Council meetings.

- Ontario Public Health has confirmed that the Province of Ontario is expected to see a rise in COVID-19 cases throughout the fall and winter months. The City of Cambridge continues to take steps to control the spread across the City and adapts to legislative changes impacting City facilities and programs. The return to in person meetings mid 2022 will include capacity limits in Council Chambers as well as physical distancing measures.

Financial Implications

- Additional financial implications are not anticipated as a result of establishing a Schedule of Special Council Meetings for 2022.

- Report 21-224 (CRS) Council Chamber Audio and Video System Replacement outlined the need to replace the technical meeting equipment in Council Chambers as a result of equipment not being able to facilitate hybrid meetings or integrate with the City’s new electronic meeting management system. The technology replacement project includes capital project A/00794-10 with a plan budget of $264,000 to be funded from the Rate Stabilization Reserve Fund - Safe Restart Agreement funding received from the Province.

- Council Chambers will also include an adjustment to seating to ensure capacity limits based on public health directives are being made, and that acrylic dividers are in place for the Council and staff seating. These changes have been funded from the Rate Stabilization Reserve Fund – Safe Restart Agreement funding from the Province.
Background

Cambridge Council has been meeting virtually since March 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. On July 21, 2020, the COVID-19 Economic Recovery Act, 2020 (“Bill 197”) received Royal Assent, which allowed for Municipal Council’s to continue to meet electronically with no requirement for a state of emergency. Cambridge Council updated the Procedure By-law to allow for continued virtual participation at Council meetings beyond the Provincial and Municipal Emergency.

As the Province of Ontario’s reopening plan continues to progress, the City of Cambridge has reopened its facilities to the public. The City will continue to follow this phased approach and following the update to the Council Chambers technology and the testing period for successful hybrid meetings, in-person meetings of Council, staff and members of the public is expected to resume.

Further enhancements include Council meeting videos being located on the City’s meeting calendar and each report on the agenda for Council’s consideration being time stamped so member of the public may go to specific sections of the meeting.

The structure of Standing Committees prior to March 2020 was on a three week cycle and included the following committees comprised of all members of Council:

General Committee – Tuesday’s 7:00 p.m.
Planning and Development Committee – Tuesday’s 7:00 p.m.

*Budget and Audit Committee – As required – Tuesday’s 9:30 a.m.*

Council Meetings – Tuesday 7:00 p.m.

All Members of Council sit on the Standing Committees of Council and although the standing committees are recommended to remain suspended for the time being, staff will consider a slow return of standing committees once the hybrid meeting practices have been underway for the first half of 2022.

The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC), the Committee of Adjustment, as well as the Accessibility Advisory Committee were the first committees to meet virtually in the summer of 2020. Since then, the remaining Citizen Committees have been meeting regularly and have been successful in offering the meetings through live streaming to the public and virtual participation of all members.

Council, staff and members of the public have adapted well throughout the pandemic and shown flexibility during these unprecedented times. Staff has been very pleased to be able to continue to bring engagement forward to the community in unique ways.
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 2.1 Provide a wide range of ways that people can become involved in city decision making.

The 2022 Schedule of Council meetings and the plan to introduce hybrid meetings aligns with the City of Cambridge’s Governance and Leadership goals to ensure effective and efficient meeting management and ensure the business of the City can move forward during the current pandemic and beyond. The Introduction of hybrid meetings will lead to additional public participation opportunities and increased accessibility.

Comments

The City of Cambridge Council Chambers is currently in the process of being updated with enhanced technology to support in person and virtual meeting participation. The existing technology has met its end of life and to support increased participation.

The anticipated timeline for this project was that it be concluded by the end of 2021, however as a result of the current challenges with supply this is now anticipated to move the project date to conclude in the first quarter of 2022. Throughout the 2021 calendar year, headlines have been dominated by the ongoing global microchip shortage, which has impacted production of a variety of products and continues to impact supply. The City, through the procurement process, communicated the impact of delays for this project and requested an accelerated timeline; however, this global shortage is difficult to predict for vendors and will postpone the return to Council Chambers for the first part of 2022.

Once the project has been completed, staff are required to complete testing and training of new equipment and ensure that all systems have integrated as planned to successfully deliver virtual and in person participation for Council meetings in the Chambers.

The following provides an outline of the timeline expected for each phase of this work to be completed. Should staff be able to move the workplan ahead to occur faster, staff will provide an update to Council.
**Phase One** (September - November, 2021)

- Complete the procurement process for technology in the Council Chambers
- Assess the Council Chambers for capacity and physical distancing requirements for the return of in person meetings
- Establish goals for the hybrid meeting policy and review municipal best practices to develop procedures for hybrid meetings.

**Phase Two** (December - March, 2021/2022)

- Implement technology updates to Council Chambers
- Establish a registration process for in person public participation at meetings of Council
- Develop options for Citizen Committees and Local Boards to facilitate hybrid meetings
- Update and develop new online forms and guidelines for public participation at meetings
- Establish a communication plans for public participation at hybrid meetings

**Phase Three** (March - April, 2022)

- Complete testing of all systems, video webcasting, camara operations, vote technology and audio and video systems in the updated Council Chambers
- Complete training of all staff and Council on new systems
- Report back to Council on the hybrid meeting policy and provide next steps for returning to in person hybrid meetings

**Phase Four** (May - June, 2022)

- Hold the first Hybrid meeting of Council

**Phase Five** (July - September 2022)

- Re-introduction of Standing Committees of Council beginning with Planning and Development Committee.
Hybrid Meetings

There are a number of principles being developed to support effective hybrid meetings throughout the transition from fully virtual meetings during the COVID-19 pandemic to hybrid meetings with participants who join virtually and in-person.

Hybrid meetings are meetings that provide the opportunity for participation in person or virtually for all attendees.

**Meeting participants should be able to participate using multiple methods:**

The ability to participate in a meeting through multiple methods, such as by attending Council Chambers in-person or by joining virtually, is the key to effective hybrid meetings.

The ability for the participant to choose their method of participation is important to ensure that their needs are met, which encourages participation and increases accessibility. Staff are looking to offer in-person attendance which may be restricted to begin with based on room capacity and public health directives, participants will also be offered attendance through Zoom and telephone.

**Meeting participants should have an equitable experience regardless of their method of participation:**

Hybrid meetings will be set up to ensure that participants are treated equitably regardless of which method they use to join. The audiovisual technology will be used to help the in-person and virtual options provide as similar an experience as possible for both the participants and members of the public.

**Meeting participation should be in alignment with prevailing public health guidance:**

As the City transitions through the COVID-19 pandemic period and continues to reopen its facilities, the hybrid meeting approach will allow for the most flexible response to the changing public health guidelines. Hybrid meetings allow for future public health measures to be addressed quickly and responsively.

**Future changes should be based on best practices:**

Hybrid meetings represent a new approach to municipal Council meetings in Ontario. All municipalities have the opportunity to learn from the experience gained throughout the pandemic and develop best practices on hybrid meetings going forward. The hybrid meeting approach will continue to evolve and be reviewed as best practices are developed.
Council Participation

Virtual participation allows for Councillors to join the Council meeting, even if they are not able to attend the meeting in-person in Council Chambers. While in-person attendance is expected to remain the most common type of participation for Council, the option to join virtually allows for flexibility. Council Members who may not be able to attend meetings for periods of time due to illness, injury or recovery from surgery, for example, may be able to attend from home and not miss extended periods of meetings. Similarly, Council Members suffering from minor illnesses may attend the meeting if they are feeling well enough, but may stay home to avoid spreading an illness to other people. The COVID-19 pandemic has illustrated the importance of preventing the spread of illness through physical distancing. Virtual participation also allows for Council Members to join meetings from outside of Cambridge, such as during travel.

The flexibility provided by virtual participation allows Council Members to avoid missing meetings due to other commitments. For example, a Councillor who must attend a personal medical appointment during a meeting may have been unable to attend the entire meeting in-person. However, it may be possible for the Councillor to join for the remainder of the meeting through virtual participation. While Councillors are encouraged to avoid scheduling other commitments during meetings, Council Members may be able to attend more meetings that would ordinarily have been missed in their entirety.

Previously, virtual participation was limited in the Municipal Act, as Members of Council participating virtually did not count towards quorum and could not join closed session meetings through virtual participation. As these legislated restrictions no longer remain in effect, there is no longer a legal distinction between in-person and virtual participation.

One of the Hybrid meeting goals is to ensure that all Members of Council are treated equally within a meeting, regardless of the method in which they join the meeting. As staff are drafting the policy for Hybrid meetings, staff will not be recommending setting limits regarding Members of Council virtual participation, such as a minimum number of Members physically present or a maximum number of times per year a Member may join virtually. Such restrictions place an administrative burden on staff to track for all meetings and Members and set virtual participation apart from in-person participation, which encourages a perception that virtual participation is not equivalent to in-person participation. Further circumstances may change for a Member of Council and limiting the number of meetings a member may attend virtually may be perceived as non-inclusive.

Greater Accessibility of Meetings

Virtual participation also allows for greater accessibility for Council meetings. For members of the public, staff or Council Members with mobility or other accessibility needs, being able to attend a Council meeting virtually improves the ability to
participate. Virtual participation may also increase the ability for members to participate in the case of long-term illnesses or recoveries. It also gives flexibility for members who may be expecting or planning to take parental leave, or who have young children, to be able to attend meetings more frequently and fit around their schedule.

The upcoming 2022 Municipal and School Board Election also underscores the importance of increasing accessibility of meetings. Potentially increasing the number of local residents who wish to participate in municipal government provides strong support for hybrid meetings. In-person meetings may present an accessibility barrier that hybrid meetings can help to reduce.

Public Participation

Throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, virtual Special Council meetings have seen continued public participation. Residents have the ability to provide comments through written correspondence, or by joining the meeting live by telephone or in some cases through Zoom. Staff added additional measures to ensure residents would be able to join successfully. Due to these options, public participation remained high during the pandemic and virtual participation even allowed for deputants to join from outside the Cambridge area.

In 2020, the City heard from 127 public delegations at virtual Special Council Meetings, to date in 2021, the City has heard from 240 public delegations at Special Council Meetings, written correspondence has also seen an increase. Appendix B outlines the number of meetings, delegations and video views since 2020.

Moving forward the option to participate virtually will provide additional engagement opportunities for public participation. Delegations will have an option to attend meetings in person or by participating virtually through Zoom or by telephone. The City is excited to see meetings move to a hybrid model and will ensure there is increased awareness when this practice begins. Virtual participation also allows for residents to join a meeting without the same time commitment as attending in person. For example, residents who may commute for work outside Cambridge may be able to provide their delegation from their work location, without the need to take time off work and travel back to Cambridge to attend in person. This increases options for public participation and ensures inclusivity of our community.

Citizen Advisory Committees and Local Boards

The City looks forward to resuming all in person meetings in 2022 however staff are recommending that Citizen Advisory Committees continue to meet virtually for the first half of 2022. Clerk’s will provide guidance on advisory committees and local boards resuming to in person following Council Meetings resuming to in person and then it is expected that Citizen Committee Meetings will have the option to continue to meet fully virtually or in person. Hybrid meetings may prove to be challenging for Citizen Advisory
Committee meetings as there are limited locations where the technology can support a mixture of in person and virtual participation.

Many municipalities across Ontario are meeting under similar circumstances and have had to make changes to calendars and meeting structures throughout the last couple of years as a result of the pandemic. In Waterloo Region, the City’s of Kitchener and Waterloo will remain as virtual Council until their respective Chambers also transition through technology updates.

**Meeting Times**

Special Council has been meeting at 5:00 p.m. for Special Council Meetings and 10:00 a.m. for Special Council Meetings that include Statutory Public Meetings under the Ontario Planning Act.

There have been Joint Meetings with the Township of North Dumfries and the City of Cambridge Councils where the meetings have been scheduled at 6:00 p.m.

To plan for each Special Council Meeting the Corporate Leadership Team meets weekly to prioritize all upcoming reports and ensure reports are on track to meet deadlines. The use of virtual meeting technology has been an effective means of conducting the Special Council meetings throughout this time.

The length of meetings has varied depending on the matters being discussed. When there is a Statutory Public Meeting there are several logistics involved in planning for the meeting. Additional staff are required to support the meeting, as well there is a great amount of preparation required to work with anyone calling into the meeting or wishing to present at the meeting. Connectivity can also prove to be a challenge and often delegations calling in require multiple calls to ensure they are connected to the meeting.

Staff are recommending that the current approved meeting times continue while Special Council is in place and return to regular meeting times as prescribed in the Procedure By-law with the introduction of hybrid meetings mid 2022.

The technology update to Council Chambers will require testing to establish practices that ensure efficient meetings and successful experiences for virtual participation. Training will be provided to staff and Members of Council, and new delegation procedures will be provided to members of the public. Staff are currently considering a registration process for in person meeting participation due to capacity limitations and physical distancing requirements. The City Clerk will report back to Council in the first quarter of 2022 with the plans to return to in person meetings and a policy for Council’s review.
Existing Policy/By-Law

- Procedure By-law #18-15, as amended, is in effect.

- The *Municipal Act, 2001* requires that, subject to the provisions in Section 239, all meetings be open in order for members of the public to observe the meetings. In order to comply with these provisions, members of the public may still view open meetings online through the City’s calendar and through YouTube, following the meeting all Council meetings are archived on the City’s website. The City has recently implemented an electronic meeting management cloud solution that enhances the accessibility of meeting materials and now includes the posting of a pdf copy of all meeting materials as well as an HTML copy of meeting materials.

Financial Impact

- The City currently has access to video conferencing software and has supported Special Council meetings virtually since March 2020. There are no financial impacts associated with establishing the Schedule of Council Meetings for 2022, staff will ensure that the calendar is printed and posted for public access. Costs associated with the technology update to Council Chambers are projected as outlined in Report 21-224 (CRS) Council Chamber Audio and Video System Replacement with a plan budget of $264,000 to be funded from the Rate Stabilization Reserve Fund - Safe Restart Agreement funding received from the Province.

- Council Chambers will require an adjustment to seating to ensure capacity limits based on public health directives are being made, to accommodate physical distancing around the Council horseshoe acrylic dividers have been acquired and have been funded through the Rate Stabilization Reserve Fund – Safe Restart Agreement funding from the Province.

Public Input

The public continues to play an integral part in the Council meeting process with Special Council meeting virtually. There is ongoing engagement in virtual meetings, through delegations and written submissions, with the addition of hybrid meetings the public will have the opportunity to participate in Council meetings in person and virtually.
The Municipal Act, 2001 requires that, subject to the provisions in Section 239, all meetings be open to the public with the exception of those matters permitted to be closed in order for members of the public to observe the meetings.

Section 13.1 of Council’s Procedure By-law 18-15, establishes the rules of procedure for public participation. It further outlines how members of the public can participate in the decision making process by submitting correspondence to be placed before a Committee or Council or by submitting a request in writing to address a Committee or Council regarding an item on the agenda.

To further support delegations during this time additional resources have been established and are available on the City’s website to provide steps to ensure delegates are successful in their experience.

Early into the pandemic the Clerk’s division launched a delegation survey that each delegation receives following their virtual delegation to Special Council meetings. The survey will run until in-person meetings resume and then will be updated to incorporate hybrid meetings. Upon returning to in person meetings, staff will provide a summary of the survey results to provide Council with delegate’s experiences of virtual meetings and provide insight and opportunity for process review.

Enhanced accessibility and communication remains an important aspect of virtual meetings. Staff are in touch with delegations a number of times prior to speaking time, there is enhanced information on the City’s website for delegates to inform themselves with, the City has been required to increase staff support during virtual meetings to assist with meeting management as a result of delegates calling in. It is anticipated that increased staff resources will be required for hybrid meeting management.

**Internal/External Consultation**

Upon Council approval of the 2022 Schedule for Special Council Meetings staff will update all current calendars online and will ensure the public is made aware going forward through online web updates as well as communication via social media.

**Conclusion**

Public Health directives have been vital to ensuring the safety of Council, staff and the public and remain at the forefront when staff is making recommendations to Council.

The 2022 Schedule of Council meetings will be amended as additional meetings and standing committees are reintroduced. Staff recognize that many wish to return to inperson meetings and will ensure that following completion of the Council Chamber technology updates that this is a priority. Staff recommend that Council remain as Special Council until the hybrid meeting practice has been implemented and Council,
staff and the public have had time to experience all that is anticipated with in person and virtual participation at Council meetings.

Staff recommend that Council adopt the 2022 Schedule attached as Appendix A.

---

**Signature**

**Division Approval**

[Signature]

Name: Danielle Manton  
Title: City Clerk

**Departmental Approval**

[Signature]

Name: Dave Bush  
Title: Deputy City Manager

**City Manager Approval**

[Signature]

Name: David Calder  
Title: City Manager

**Attachments**

- Appendix A: Schedule for 2022 Meetings of Council
- Appendix B: 2020/2021 Council Meeting Statistics
Schedule for 2022 Meetings of Council

- **Special Council Meeting**
- **Special Council Meeting – Statutory Public Meeting**
- **Statutory Holiday**
- **Municipal and School Board Election Day**
- **Inaugural Council (2022-2026)**

### January

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### February

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### March

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### July

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### August

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### September

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Additional meetings may be added and meeting dates are subject to change)
## Appendix B

### Statistics for 2020 and 2021 Meetings of Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Closed Meeting</th>
<th>Meeting Date 1</th>
<th>Meeting Date 2</th>
<th>Length of Meeting</th>
<th>Number of delegations</th>
<th>Number of YouTube Views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 7, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>1:16:01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Development Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 14, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>47:05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>January 21, 2020</td>
<td>January 21, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>1:19:24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 28, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>2:09:31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>February 3, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>5:49:12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council</td>
<td>February 4, 2020</td>
<td>February 4, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>48:02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Committee</td>
<td>February 4, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48:02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Development Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>February 11, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>2:49:40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>February 18, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>2:16:25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Committee</td>
<td>March 3, 2020</td>
<td>March 4, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>1:09:07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Council Meeting with</td>
<td>March 4, 2020</td>
<td>March 4, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>1:09:07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Type</td>
<td>Closed Meeting</td>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>Length of Meeting</td>
<td>Number of delegations</td>
<td>Number of YouTube Views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Township of North Dumfries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 9, 2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Development Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 10, 2020</td>
<td>1:43:56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>March 17, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>POSTPONED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Emergency Council Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 25, 2020</td>
<td>51:27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Emergency Council Meeting</td>
<td>April 1, 2020</td>
<td>April 1, 2020</td>
<td>7:34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Emergency Council Meeting</td>
<td>April 16, 2020</td>
<td>April 16, 2020</td>
<td>2:44:02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Emergency Council Meeting</td>
<td>April 26, 2020</td>
<td>April 26, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Emergency Council Meeting</td>
<td>May 7, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>1:14:47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Emergency Council Meeting</td>
<td>May 19, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>1:42:46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Type</td>
<td>Closed Meeting</td>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>Length of Meeting</td>
<td>Number of delegations</td>
<td>Number of YouTube Views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Emergency Council Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2, 2020</td>
<td>2:49:13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Emergency Council Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 16, 2020</td>
<td>1:54:43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Council Meeting with the Township</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 18, 2020</td>
<td>10:09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of North Dumfries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Emergency Council Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 23, 2020</td>
<td>3:13:45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>July 7, 2020</td>
<td>4:17:53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>July 14, 2020</td>
<td>3:06:37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>July 28, 2020</td>
<td>8:45:24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>August 11, 2020</td>
<td>3:33:01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Type</td>
<td>Closed Meeting</td>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>Length of Meeting</td>
<td>Number of delegations</td>
<td>Number of YouTube Views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Public Meeting and Special Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td>September 8, 2020</td>
<td>September 8, 2020</td>
<td>1:16:13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td>September 22, 2020</td>
<td>September 22, 2020</td>
<td>2:54:46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td>October 6, 2020</td>
<td>October 6, 2020</td>
<td>54:14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Council Meeting with the Township of North Dumfries</td>
<td>October 7, 2020</td>
<td>October 7, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td>October 20, 2020</td>
<td>October 20, 2020</td>
<td>9:39:20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Workshop Strategic Plan</td>
<td>October 26, 2020</td>
<td>October 26, 2020</td>
<td>1:51:30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td>November 3, 2020</td>
<td>November 3, 2020</td>
<td>2:38:10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td>November 18, 2020</td>
<td>November 18, 2020</td>
<td>10:20:36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council</td>
<td>November 24, 2020</td>
<td>November 24, 2020</td>
<td>51:25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Type</td>
<td>Closed Meeting</td>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>Length of Meeting</td>
<td>Number of delegations</td>
<td>Number of YouTube Views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting - Budget Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting – Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>November 26, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council - Budget Meeting, Delegation Night</td>
<td></td>
<td>November 30, 2020</td>
<td>4:15:05</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td>December 1, 2020</td>
<td>December 1, 2020</td>
<td>3:20:36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Budget Meeting</td>
<td>December 2, 2020</td>
<td>December 2, 2020</td>
<td>27:45:00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td>December 15, 2020</td>
<td>December 15, 2020</td>
<td>6:01:00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td>December 23, 2020</td>
<td>December 23, 2020</td>
<td>9:07</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2020 Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>127</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting - Workshop</td>
<td>January 7, 2021</td>
<td>January 7, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council</td>
<td>January 12, 2021</td>
<td>January 12, 2021</td>
<td>1:43:46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Type</td>
<td>Closed Meeting</td>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>Length of Meeting</td>
<td>Number of delegations</td>
<td>Number of YouTube Views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council-Statutory Public Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td>February 2, 2021</td>
<td>February 2, 2021</td>
<td>45:30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td>February 16, 2021</td>
<td>February 16, 2021</td>
<td>1:27:25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td>February 18, 2021</td>
<td>February 18, 2021</td>
<td>2:37:41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting-Workshop</td>
<td>February 22, 2021</td>
<td>February 22, 2021</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council – Statutory Public Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td>March 2, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>7:37:31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>723</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td>March 16, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>4:40:16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Workshop Strategic Plan</td>
<td>March 23, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>1:25:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council-Statutory</td>
<td>March 30, 2021</td>
<td>March 30, 2021</td>
<td>1:30:36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Type</td>
<td>Closed Meeting</td>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>Length of Meeting</td>
<td>Number of delegations</td>
<td>Number of YouTube Views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 6, 2021</td>
<td>2:46:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 6, 2021</td>
<td>4:22:15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 13, 2021</td>
<td>4:30:01</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 20, 2021</td>
<td>1:37:53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council - Statutory Public Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 27, 2021</td>
<td>4:17:23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 29, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>May 11, 2021</td>
<td>5:18:54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council - Statutory Public Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>May 25, 2021</td>
<td>5:46:36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 8, 2021</td>
<td>4:47:25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Type</td>
<td>Closed Meeting</td>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>Length of Meeting</td>
<td>Number of delegations</td>
<td>Number of YouTube Views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Council Meeting with the Township of North Dumfries</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 23, 2021</td>
<td>12:19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council - Statutory Public Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 29, 2021</td>
<td>7:04:54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>July 13, 2021</td>
<td>5:49:42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council - Statutory Public Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>August 10, 2021</td>
<td>9:18:10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Council Meeting with the Township of North Dumfries</td>
<td></td>
<td>August 30, 2021</td>
<td>1:26:13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>September 14, 2021</td>
<td>2:27:52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council - September</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>6:35:21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Type</td>
<td>Closed Meeting</td>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>Length of Meeting</td>
<td>Number of delegations</td>
<td>Number of YouTube Views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Public Meeting</td>
<td>28, 2021</td>
<td>28, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td>October 5, 2021</td>
<td>2:59:45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td>October 12, 2021</td>
<td>5:25:36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td>October 19, 2021</td>
<td>6:16:14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Workshop</td>
<td>November 2, 2021</td>
<td>November 2, 2021</td>
<td>56:54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council Meeting</td>
<td>November 9, 2021</td>
<td>November 9, 2021</td>
<td>5:11:07</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals for 2021 to date</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation(s)

THAT Report 21-294(IFS) Winter Level of Service and Update be received for information.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- To provide information regarding the current level of service for winter maintenance of municipal roads, sidewalks, multi-use trails.

- To provide an update on improvements to road and sidewalk winter maintenance service delivery.

- To inform Council that proposed updates to winter maintenance level of service standards will be presented to Council in the coming months for consideration.

Key Findings

Several improvements to Cambridge’s winter control program include:

- Reduced number of plow routes by six over the past five years that optimize existing resources to support current infrastructure and minimize impact to other services.

- Negotiated a five-year contract renewal term with the Regional Municipality of Waterloo to continue to provide winter maintenance services on selected Regional Roads within the City of Cambridge.
• Contracted cul-de-sacs and dogleg portions of the roadway to meet snow clearing timelines in those areas.

Financial Implications

Financial impacts associated with recent changes and improvements to our winter control program include:

• Reducing number of plow routes by six. Efficiencies are primarily associated with number of individual staff members required to do this service minimizing service level reductions in other service areas during winter event response. Savings in reduced staffing and equipment are offset by increased length of time operating other units and staffing time. It is anticipated some savings will result, but, difficult to estimate.

• The value of the Regional Road Maintenance Agreement increased by an additional $697,264 above its current value of $1,817,236 after completing a comprehensive review which recognizes costs of resources including supervision and some overhead associated with delivering services to the Region with municipal resources. The agreement also requires Cambridge to meet the current MMS service levels.

Background

Winter road, sidewalk, and multi-use trails are performed by in-house staff with contract services responding to cul-de-sac winter maintenance needs. Some contract services are also used to supplement staff supported sidewalk and walkway winter maintenance services.

The following outlines current practices for winter maintenance of roads and sidewalk:

Road Winter Maintenance - Priority Routes

Ten priority routes are each serviced by a combination plow/salt truck equipped with two-way plows. These priority routes include all arterial and collector roads in Cambridge comprised of Regional and City Roads. The priority routes also include school zones, many of the GRT routes, as well as other select city streets having steeper inclines and/or curves.

Roads are plowed and salted as-needed to address road conditions following industry standards and advanced salt spreading and tracking technology.

Salt is applied only when needed to mitigate winter road conditions recognizing the need for source water protection.

Road Winter Maintenance - Plow Routes
When 8 cm of snow or more has accumulated during an event, 20 two-way plow trucks are deployed on 20 routes covering all streets not in the priority routes. At this time, plow trucks do not have sand/salt spreading capability.

Sand/Salt is applied to roads when and where appropriate to address freezing/ice conditions.

**Anti-Icing**

Under certain circumstances, salt or liquid de-icer is applied to a paved surface prior to a winter event to prevent early ice conditions and improve removal of snow pack by plows on subsequent plowing efforts.

**Cul-de-sac Contract**

The City has partnered with a third-party company to clear snow on cul-de-sacs and dogleg portions of the roadway as of winter 2017/18. This enables consistent snow removal level of service on cul-de-sacs and doglegs with local road service levels being provided by city forces without having a large capital investment in fleet that is needed for this particular operation.

**Sidewalk Maintenance and Routes**

All City sidewalks are winter maintained by either the abutting property owner or occupant or by one of the City’s 14 sidewalk routes covering over 210 km of sidewalks, walkways, and multi-use trails. Staff from Park Operations perform winter maintenance operations between 7am and 3pm Monday to Friday with working overtime as-needed for extended hours after hours including weekends. Sand and/or salt is applied as required.

This includes the following:

- Crosswalk curb-cuts
- Pedestrian refuge islands
- Accessible street parking ramps
- Curb-faced sidewalks (less than 25cm of boulevard)
- Back-lotted sidewalks
- Sidewalks adjacent to properties owned and managed by the City of Cambridge
- Sidewalks along Regional Roads (except in BIA areas)
- Multi-Use Trails
- Street to Street Walkways
- Street to Park Walkways that connect to park pathways that are open in the winter months.

**Snow Event Declaration**

The declaration of a Snow Event parking suspension depends on credible weather forecasts of substantial snowfalls or freezing rain events. Parking is prohibited on any
City street at any time (day or night) when the City of Cambridge declares a Snow Event.

Vehicles parked on-street during a Snow Event can be ticketed and possibly towed. Snow Events are not limited to certain months. For example, if forecasts predict a winter storm in May, the City could declare a Snow Event.

Snow Event declarations are coordinated with the Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo to provide consistent public messaging to residents throughout the Region.

A Snow Event Declaration can start at 5 p.m. or midnight and remain in effect until the posted end time or until a cancellation is issued.

Not all snowfalls that result in plowing warrant a Snow Event.

Enforcement through by-law officers is done both proactively and in conjunction with clearing operations. The fine amount for parking on-street during a snow event is $80.

Towing will only occur to the degree necessary to allow the snow clearing equipment access to the street to perform required duties. As such, it is possible that some cars will be towed from a street while others are not, even though all the cars are in violation of the by-law. Vehicle owners are responsible for all fees associated with towing in addition to the fine amount.

Snow Lifting

Cambridge is responsible for snow removal from the roadway in the three BIAs in Galt, Preston, and Hespeler when required.

Snow removal is generally conducted by staff with the assistance of contractors.

Winter Level of Service Standards

Ontario Regulation 239/02 Minimum Maintenance Standards (MMS), under the Municipal Act, 2001, established the expected minimum maintenance standards for municipalities in Ontario for specific maintenance activities of roads, bridges, and sidewalks under the municipality’s jurisdiction.

A municipality can choose to adopt the Provincial MMS standard under the regulation or choose to adopt other standards.

The current Cambridge Level of Service 2009 document adopted by Council contains winter service standards on roads and is based on the expectations outlined in the 2006 MMS.

Sidewalk and multi-use trail service levels were established operationally in 2015.

In 2019, the MMS was updated to include active transportation facilities (bike lanes, sidewalks, and multi-use trails) and are similar to service levels for roads.

The sidewalk and multi-use trail service levels being provided by Cambridge is similar to the current MMS.
The AMA contract includes enhanced service delivery levels for roads as required under the current MMS.

**Winter Operations Program Delivery Improvements**

A number of operational improvements and optimizations have been reviewed, implemented, or in-progress and are outlined in the comments section of this report.

**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 7.4 Continue to improve the accessibility of all built infrastructure.

Several of the changes and improvements in the winter maintenance program have improved the efficiency and effectiveness of winter maintenance services on municipally owned sidewalks, multi-use trails, roads, and facility parking lots.

**Comments**

Recent Changes and Improvements to Road Winter Maintenance Program Delivery:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter Maintenance Update</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Level Updates</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1 Reduced number of plow routes from 26 to 20 over the past five years. | Plow route were reduced from 26 to 25 in 2016 prior to the 2016/17/winter.  
The following year the plow routes were reduced by three more to 22 routes due to decreased service times from contracting cul-de-sac snow clearing.  
Another reduction of two routes for the 2021/22 winter season are expected to result in route completion times of 10 to 12 hours.  
This change now aligns routes and equipment with the staff compliment. Previously, a full plow operation relied on support of staff in other functional areas (water, sewer, fleet). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter Maintenance Update</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This practice would reduce service levels on other functional areas for the duration of</td>
<td>the snow event. At this time, support of staff from other functional areas are minimized needing to only cover road position vacancies and absences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Renewed a five-year agreement with the Region of Waterloo for Winter Maintenance</td>
<td>Negotiated a five-year contract renewal term of the “Area Maintenance Agreement” (AMA) with the Regional Municipality of Waterloo to continue to provide winter maintenance services on selected Regional Roads within the City of Cambridge. Term runs from January 1, 2022 to January 1, 2026.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Hiring an additional Roads Supervisor effective January 2022.</td>
<td>Incorporated a higher level of supervision, including the winter night shift, under the AMA, to ensure all work provided on the Region’s behalf is well organized, monitored, and invoiced accordingly under the Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Hiring two additional Roads Staff effective January 2022.</td>
<td>Increased road staff by two Full Time positions funded through the AMA to meet requirements of snow removal along bike lanes and curb-faced sidewalks along regional roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Contracted cul-de-sacs snow clearing</td>
<td>Contracted cul-de-sacs and dogleg portions of the roadway to meet snow clearing timelines in those areas starting in the 2017/18 winter season. This change has resulted in positive feedback from staff and the public as it has provided a consistent service level to residents on cul-de-sacs and doglegs with residents on other roadways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Outfitted Lead Hand trucks with plows and salter/sander hopper and spinner</td>
<td>Lead hand trucks outfitted with plows and sand/salt hopper and spinner in the fall of 2018 to clear laneways and respond to small service requests. This has resulted in a faster snow clearing response to laneways then what was</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Winter Maintenance Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter Maintenance Update</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Created Plow Map to show plowing and salting progress to public</td>
<td>The Cambridge Plow Map was launched during the 2017/18 winter season providing residents and staff with the ability to see which roads have been salted and plowed within the city limits in real-time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Winter Road Maintenance

Plow routes on roads have now been optimized to the extent possible matching the current FTE compliment with routes and equipment and align with level of service standards. A full plow operation is anticipated to, on average, require 10-12 hours of service which is approaching the maximum allowable working time of CVOR vehicle operators under the Highway Traffic Act. As additional roads are constructed in Cambridge through growth, additional staffing, equipment, and contracted services will be needed corresponding to the growth in infrastructure.

### Winter Maintenance of Bike Lanes

Updated Provincial regulation 239/02 (Minimum Maintenance Standard – MMS) contains increased winter maintenance of all on-street bike lanes.

Additional staffing through the Regional Contract will support increased expectations for maintenance of bike lanes along Regional roads. Snow lifts will begin during regular day shifts once additional staff are hired in January of 2022 in alignment with the new agreement with the Region.

Operations will be working toward increased bike-lane winter maintenance on city roads to the extent possible with existing resources. As the active transportation network is expanded, additional contract services and/or staff and equipment will be required to support these facilities.

### Winter Level of Service Standards

Staff are working on a proposed by-law to formally update the service level standards for winter maintenance of roads, bike lanes, sidewalks, and multi-use trails and will be presented to Council for consideration in the coming months.

This will consider the current Provincial MMS, other municipal practices, as well as other standards that have been operationally applied through other City by-laws or Council Reports and discussions.

Estimated impacts to budgets, staffing, and equipment will also be presented.
Existing Policy/By-Law

There is no existing policy/by-law.

Financial Impact

There is no financial impact.

Public Input

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

Internal/External Consultation

There was no internal/external consultation undertaken.

Conclusion

The City has various levels of service for winter maintaining bike lanes, sidewalks, multi-use trails, and roads that establish specific response times before and after winter weather is expected. Current Road service levels are based on the 2006 Provincial Minimum Maintenance Standards (MMS). Sidewalk and multi-use trail service levels were updated in 2015 and align closely with current MMS standards.

Several improvements recent to Cambridge’s winter control program delivery optimize available resources and provide residents more consistent response to services through coordinated response by city staff and contracted services.

A report will be presented to Council in the coming months with a proposed by-law for Council consideration to formally consolidate and adopt updated level of service standards for winter maintenance of roads, sidewalks, bike lanes, and multi-use trails.
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- Current Sidewalk Winter Maintenance Level of Service, 2015
WINTER SIDEWALK OPERATIONS

Objective

The major objectives for Winter Sidewalk Operations are:

- To reduce the hazards of icy/snow covered sidewalk conditions to the community.
- To maintain safe, passable routes for pedestrians.
- To maintain paved routes to winter recreation areas.
- To comply with all applicable legislation.
- To reduce economic losses to the community and industry caused by delays to the community during icy/snow covered sidewalk conditions.
- To reduce the impacts to the environment and the drinking water supply through the proper storage, use and disposal of road salt and associated deicing/anti-icing chemicals.

City Responsibility Criteria

Except sidewalks located in one of the four BIA districts, the City of Cambridge is responsible to clear sidewalks when they meet one of the following criteria:

a. “Curb-faced sidewalks” - meaning a sidewalk that is adjacent to the curb face or which is located not more than 0.25m from the curb face.

b. “Back-lotted sidewalks” - meaning a sidewalk that is located adjacent to the rear lot line of a property.

c. In front of properties owned and managed by the City of Cambridge (done by city forces or by a contractor on the city’s behalf).

d. All sidewalks along regional roads.

e. “Street to street walkways” - meaning easements that lead to and connect from one street or neighborhood to another; done by TPW.

f. “Street to park walkways” – meaning easements that lead to and connect from the street to a park with paved pathways connected within it; done by CSD.
TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC WORKS AND COMMUNITY SERVICES OPERATIONS

Level of Service

Summary

Base level services of Winter Sidewalk Operations are undertaken in accordance with city operations staff hours of Monday-Friday 7 a.m. – 3 p.m. Additional staff hours may be required on Saturday’s, Sunday’s or Statutory Holidays, during continuous back to back snow falls or when timing of events preclude operations from meeting the 36 hour time-line.

The standard level of service for City responsible sidewalks is as follows:

1- For Snow Accumulations

   The minimum standard for clearing snow accumulations is:

   a. Upon becoming aware that snow accumulation on a sidewalk is greater than 5cm, snow clearing resources are deployed as soon as practicable.

   b. After snow accumulation has ended to clear the snow within the 36 hour time-line set out in the City of Cambridge Sidewalk Snow Removal By-law 168-08

   c. To provide a minimum passable width of 36” or the actual sidewalk width; whichever is less

   d. Open cross walks where they are in the direct path of travel on a City responsible sidewalk route that carries on from one side of the street to the other.

   e. Open cross walks where the City responsible route travels from one street and then continues around the corner on the next street.

2- For Ice Accretion

   The minimum standard for treating icy sidewalks is:

   a. Upon becoming aware that sidewalks may be icy, to deploy resources to treat all icy sidewalks with either sand or salt within the By-law’s time frame.
TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC WORKS AND COMMUNITY SERVICES OPERATIONS

Level of Service

3- Additional Protocol

1. A 24 hour emergency answering service shall be maintained year round. Calls shall be forwarded to competent personnel experienced in winter operations, and who are also able to arrange for and deploy, the necessary maintenance forces required.

2. All calls shall be logged. Logs shall indicate the time of call, who the call is from, and the action taken.

3. All calls received from Regional Police shall be investigated and appropriate action shall be taken.

4. All sidewalk snow machines are equipped with GPS tracking units.

5. Sidewalk plowing and sanding/salting routes shall be established, reviewed and/or revised annually for the most current and efficient coverage.

6. Snow banks may be removed or pushed back in the core areas as resources become available and time permits. Additionally, other restricted areas of passage may also receive the same service if deemed necessary.
   a. To provide for the safe movement of pedestrian traffic when the sidewalk width is constricted by snow windrows.
   b. To minimize the hazards of high snow banks in locations such as intersection crossings
   c. To provide room for continued equipment access
   d. To facilitate drainage wherever possible
   e. To remove snow that has been plowed onto sidewalks where no boulevard area exists between the roadway and sidewalk to allow for further storage of snow.

7. Sand boxes shall be placed prior to the winter season on problematic hills for use by pedestrians. Sand boxes shall be inspected and refilled as needed.
TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC WORKS AND COMMUNITY SERVICES OPERATIONS

Level of Service

Sidewalk Classifications

To ensure the appropriate allocation of resources and to promote consistency throughout the City, the City of Cambridge sidewalk network has been classified into two levels of service; “Priority One” and “Priority Two”.

- **“Priority One”** – takes into consideration sidewalks which serve higher volume pedestrian traffic, and/or have been designated as an “Area of Concern” to ensure an appropriate winter response.

- **“Priority Two”** – addresses all other sidewalks the city is responsible for.

Public Inquiries

Inquiries/complaints regarding areas maintained by City of Cambridge forces are investigated by the appropriate City Operations Divisions within 24 hours from when they are received.

Private sidewalk complaints are addressed through By-Law Enforcement.
WHEREAS, at a Joint Council Meeting held on August 30, 2021 the City of Cambridge and the Township of North Dumfries approved terms and conditions of the Merger Participation Agreement between the Corporation of the City of Brantford ("Brantford"), the Corporation of the City of Cambridge ("Cambridge"), the Township of North Dumfries ("North Dumfries"), Brantford Energy Corporation, Cambridge and North Dumfries Energy Plus Inc., Brantford Power Inc., Energy+ Inc., Cambridge and North Dumfries Energy Solution Inc. and Brantford Hydro Inc. (the "MPA"), and the Unanimous Shareholder's Agreement between Brantford, Cambridge, North Dumfries, Mergeco Holding Company and LDC Amalco (the "USA");

AND WHEREAS the USA provides for the composition of the Mergeco Holding Company board for an Initial Period comprised of the Mayors of Brantford, Cambridge and North Dumfries, or their delegates, and the following independent directors: Anita Davis, Scott Saint, Lynn Woeller and Craig Mann (the "Nomination Committee");

AND WHEREAS the USA authorizes the Nomination Committee to search, evaluate and provide recommendations for three additional independent director nominees for the Mergeco Holding Company board to Brantford, Cambridge and North Dumfries for their consideration;

AND WHEREAS the Nomination Committee has now completed its process and recommends Peter Ferraro, Gerry Remers and Terry Smith as the three additional independent directors for the Mergeco Holding Company board (the "Additional Independent Directors");
AND WHEREAS the Cambridge and North Dumfries Energy Plus Inc. board and the Brantford Power Inc. board both support the Nomination Committee’s recommendation of the additional Independent Directors;

AND WHEREAS the Mergeco Holding Company board of directors has the power and authority to appoint directors to all subsidiary boards once incorporated, pursuant to the USA.

NOW THEREFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE HEREBY ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. The City of Cambridge hereby approves the recommendations of the Nomination Committee and appoints Peter Ferraro, Gerry Remers and Terry Smith as directors of the Mergeco Holding Company board, once established.

2. The City of Cambridge confirms that the Nomination Committee must forthwith begin its recruitment, evaluation and selection process with respect to appointing directors to all Mergeco Holding Company subsidiary boards in order for these subsidiaries to have presumptive directors identified, ready and willing to be serve on these subsidiary boards effective once established.

---

Executive Summary

Purpose

- To appoint directors to the Mergeco Holding Company Board in accordance with the Universal Shareholders Agreement (USA) as recommended by the Nomination Committee.

Key Findings

As part of the process to merge Cambridge and North Dumfries Energy Plus and Brantford Power, the Board of each utility is supporting the recommendation of the Nomination Committee, pursuant to the USA, to appoint 3 additional independent directors to the Mergeco Holding Company board. The Nomination Committee is recommending to the shareholders (Brantford, Cambridge and North Dumfries) the appointment of Peter Ferraro, Gerry Remers and Terry Smith. A copy of the nominees’ biographies is attached as Appendix “A” to this report.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications for the City of Cambridge as a shareholder of the merged entity. The Mergeco Holding Company will be responsible for providing any director fees or expenses.
Council will recall that at a Joint Council Meeting held on August 30, 2021 the City of Cambridge and the Township of North Dumfries approved terms and conditions of the Merger Participation Agreement between the Corporation of the City of Brantford (“Brantford”), the Corporation of the City of Cambridge (“Cambridge”), the Township of North Dumfries (“North Dumfries”), Brantford Energy Corporation, Cambridge and North Dumfries Energy Plus Inc., Brantford Power Inc., Energy+ Inc., Cambridge and North Dumfries Energy Solution Inc. and Brantford Hydro Inc. (the “MPA”), and the Unanimous Shareholder’s Agreement between Brantford, Cambridge, North Dumfries, Mergeco Holding Company and LDC Amalco (the “USA”);

As noted, the USA provides for the composition of the Mergeco Holding Company board for an Initial Period comprised of the Mayors of Brantford, Cambridge and North Dumfries, or their delegates, and the following independent directors: Anita Davis, Scott Saint, Lynn Woeller and Craig Mann (the “Nomination Committee”);

In addition, the USA authorizes the Nomination Committee to search, evaluate and provide recommendations for three additional independent director nominees for the Mergeco Holding Company board to Brantford, Cambridge and North Dumfries for their consideration.

The Joint Board Committee appointed a Nominating Committee comprised of the Chair of Brantford Energy Corporation (BCE), the Chair of Brantford Power Inc. (BPI) and the Chair and Vice-Chair of Cambridge and North Dumfries Energy Plus Inc. (Energy +).

The Nominating Committee determined that the three additional Independent Directors would be selected from the existing Boards of BEC, BPI and Energy +. The rationale for this decision as provided by the Nominating Committee is as follows:

Institutional knowledge of the LDC’s;

Current directors have strong, diverse backgrounds;

Timing – have the Corporate board in place expeditiously to help oversee the merger process and the optimal achievement of financial synergies.

The City Manager has been advised that current BEC, BPI and Energy + Board members were given the opportunity to apply for the Corporation Board. Each candidate assessed themselves against the definition of Independent as per the USA. Candidates also completed a skills and competencies assessment. The Nominating Committee also interviewed all candidates and subsequently reach consensus on the recommendation as presented in this report.

In terms of diversity, the Nominating Committee notes that the Corporation Board will have reasonable gender diversity as 40% of the board members are female. In addition,
the Nominating Committee has made a commitment to the three Mayors to perform both an internal and an external search for the six additional Independent LDC and Affiliate company Directors with an emphasis on further diversity being both gender and other equity deserving groups.

As a result of the work of the Nomination Committee, the committee is recommending to the Shareholders the appointment of Peter Ferraro, Gerry Remers and Terry Smith as additional independent directors to the Mergeco Holding Company board.

The full composition of the Mergeco Holding Company Board will be as follows:

- Mayor of Brantford – Kevin Davis
- Mayor of Cambridge – Kathryn McGarry
- Mayor of North Dumfries – Susan Foxton
- Chair of Brantford Energy Corporation - Scott Saint
- Chair of Brantford Power Inc. – Craig Mann
- Chair of Cambridge and North Dumfries Energy Plus Inc. – Anita Davis
- Vice-Chair of Cambridge and North Dumfries Energy Plus Inc. – Lynn Woeller

Plus, the 3 additional Independent Directors being:

- Peter Ferraro
- Gerry Remers
- Terry Smith

If Council does not appoint the 3 recommended nominees being put forward by the Nominating Committee, the City would have the right to appoint 2 directors of its choice. Brantford would then have the ability to appoint a 3rd director. Any appointees by the City would be required to meet the definition of independence in accordance with the USA. Staff is recommending Council support the recommendations of the Nominating Committee to appoint the 3 independent directors as identified in this report.

Analysis

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

Goal #2 - Governance and Leadership

Objective 2.5 Focus on the responsible management of financial resources, ensuring transparency and accountability.
Existing Policy/By-Law

The appointments being recommended are in accordance with the Unanimous Shareholders Agreement (USA) which the City of Cambridge is a signatory.

Financial Impact

There are no financial impacts to the City of Cambridge in supporting the recommendation of the Nominating Committee. Any director fees and expenses will be the responsibility of the Mergeco Holding Company.

Public Input

Opportunity for public input was provided as part of the open Joint Council Meeting which approved the USA and the MPA on August 30, 2021. This report has also been part of the public posting of the December 14, 2021 Council meeting agenda.

Internal/External Consultation

The recommendation as provided in this report has been provided by the solicitor for the Joint Board Committee (not to be confused with the Shareholders Strategic Advisory Committee (SSAC)). There has been no additional consultation as the USA and the MPA were previously reviewed by the City’s outside legal council as part of the approved merger process and the appointments being recommended are in accordance with the approved and executed MPA and USA. In addition, the Cambridge and North Dumfries Energy Plus Board of Directors support the recommendation of the Nomination Committee to the Cambridge Shareholder.

Conclusion

The City Manager is recommending that Council as a shareholder support the recommendation of the both the Board of Directors of Cambridge and North Dumfries Energy Plus and the Nomination Committee to appoint three additional independent directors to the Mergeco Holding Company board as outlined in this report.

Signature

Division Approval

N/A

Reviewed by the CFO

Reviewed by Legal Services
Name:
Title:

Departmental Approval
N/A

Name:
Title:

City Manager Approval

Name: David Calder
Title: City Manager-City of Cambridge

Attachments

Appendix “A” - Independent Director Nominees Biographies
Appendix “A”

Independent Director Nominees Biographies

PETER L. FERRARO, B.A., LLB. C. Dir.

Peter L. Ferraro is an Ontario lawyer whose career has consisted of a combination of business management, corporate governance, and legal practice.

Peter has had more than thirty years of working "in-house" in senior executive legal roles with industry leading North American companies.

• Corporate Counsel with John Labatt Limited (successfully concluded, countless North American and International business transactions).

• Senior Vice-President, General Counsel & Secretary for Parmalat North America (management of all legal matters and management of public company Board of Directors, compliance and related matters).

• At present, General Counsel with Commissioning & Technical Services (N.A.) / Morson International Inc. (a specialized technical recruitment company supplying Bruce Power LP, and Ontario Power Generation Inc. and other companies with engineering, technical, and training staff).

Board Roles include:

• EFI Technologies Inc.- Board Member
• Bioenterprise Corporation, (a bio-technology business development corporation) - Board Member
• Guelph General Hospital. - Board Member, 11 years including 5 years as Chair of the Board
• Energy +. - Board Member and Chair - Governance, Human Resources & Nominating Committee

Other:

• Member- Law Society of Ontario
• Management Certification Program – Rutgers University
• Chartered Director Designation – Directors’ College
GERRY REMERS

Gerry is the former President and COO of Christie Digital Systems Canada and has served in leadership roles for more than 20 years. He has taken an active role in the economic development of Waterloo Region for many years and brings extensive Board, Advisory Board, Leadership Council and consulting experience, having served in these capacities for the University of Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier University, Communitech, the Perimeter Institute, Shad Valley, the KW Community Foundation and more. After he retired from Christie, Gerry chaired the Ontario Government's Expert Review Panel assessing the effectiveness of the ONE (Ontario Networks of Excellence). He became an inaugural board member of NGen (the Supercluster for Advanced Manufacturing) and was also the inaugural Chair of the Waterloo Region Economic Development Corporation. He has served as the Energy+ representative on the Grand River Energy Board since 2018, and continues to work as a consultant to business and government.

TERRY SMITH

Terry is a seasoned senior executive with more than 40 years in the electrical power generation sector whose extensive global experience includes operations, co-operative ventures, major project development and finance, acquisitions, mergers, business start-ups, executive management, corporate governance and consulting services.

Terry’s experience encompasses working and living for extended periods in a wide range of diverse and varied cultures throughout the world and was a key member of the Combustion Engineering team that won the Canadian Export Award.

Terry has held executive leadership positions with a number of Kitchener - Cambridge area companies and served on the Board of Lurgi Lentjes Bichoff, E.ON Engineering, O2Z Corporation and, since 2012, the Board of Brantford Power Inc. He continues to provide consulting and project development services to international clients in the energy sector, particularly in renewable energy technologies and emerging storage systems.
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

BY-LAW 21-090

Being a by-law to amend Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended, with respect to land municipally known as 155 Equestrian Way (R02/21)

WHEREAS Council of the City of Cambridge has the authority pursuant to Section 34 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended, to pass this by-law;

WHEREAS this by-law conforms to the City of Cambridge Official Plan, as amended;

AND WHEREAS Council deems that adequate public notice of the public meeting was provided and adequate information regarding the amendment was presented at the public meeting held March 30th, 2021, and that further public meeting is not considered necessary in order to proceed with this amendment,

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

1. THAT this by-law shall apply to a portion of the lands described as Part of Lot 9, Concession 1, Beasley’s Lower Block (Former Township of Waterloo), City of Cambridge in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and is shown on Schedule ‘A’ attached hereto and forming part of this by-law;

2. THAT Schedule ‘A’ to By-law No. 150-85, as amended, is hereby further amended by deleting the zoning classification of the lands shown outlined in heavy black in the attached Schedule ‘A’ to this By-law from (H)RM3/CS5 (S.4.1.303B) and replace it with (H)RM3/CS5 (S.4.420) in accordance with the attached Schedule ‘A’ to this By-law;

3. THAT the aforesaid City of Cambridge Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding the following subsection to 4.1 thereof:

   “4.1.420 – 155 Equestrian Way, legally described as Part of Lot 9, Concession 1, Beasley’s Lower Block (Former Township of Waterloo), City of Cambridge in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, the following regulations shall apply to the lands in the RM3/CS5 zone to which reference “s.4.1.420 is made on Schedule A and located at 155 Equestrian Way:

   1. A minimum of 1,500 square metres of Gross Leasable Commercial Floor Area shall be constructed over all lands zoned RM3/CS5(s.4.1.303B) and RM3/CS5 (S.4.1.420).

   2. A minimum private amenity area of 25 square metres (269 square feet) per dwelling unit for cluster row houses.
3. A minimum private amenity area of 4 square metres (43 square feet) per dwelling unit, provided on a balcony for stacked cluster row houses.

4. A maximum density of 47 units per gross hectare for cluster row house.

5. A minimum private amenity area of 4 square metres (43 square feet) per dwelling unit, provided on a balcony for back-to-back row houses.

6. A maximum encroachment of eaves into a required yard of 0.75 metres (2.46 feet).

7. A maximum encroachment of open or covered unenclosed patios, decks or porches into front, exterior side and rear yards of 3.0 metres (9.8 feet).

8. A reduction in the distance permitted between an access driveway, aisle, parking stall or parking lot in an RM-class zone to the window of a habitable room of a dwelling unit from 6.0 metres (19.6 feet) to 3.0 metres (9.8 feet).

9. Notwithstanding the creation of lot lines by registration of a condominium, the zoning regulations for cluster and mixed-use development in the RM3/CS5 zones, as set out herein, shall be applied to the entirety of the lands zoned RM3/CS5, not the individual lots created through condominium registration.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 3 above, the following regulations shall also apply to the lands in the RM3/CS5 zone to which parenthetical reference to “(S.4.1.420) is made on Schedule A attached to and forming part of this by-law:

a. The following uses shall be permitted in either a standalone building or a freestanding building or in a shopping centre:

   a) Any use permitted in the CS5 zone including a foodstore with a maximum Gross Leasable Commercial Floor Area of 3,000 square metres and a pharmacy having a maximum Gross Leasable Commercial Floor Area of 1,800 square metres;

   b) No commercial use permitted in the CS5 Zone shall have a Gross Leasable Commercial Floor Area that exceeds 1,000 square metres except for as provided in section 3.1 (a) above;

   c) Any use permitted in the RM3 Zone, except single detached and semi-detached dwellings;
d) Any combination of uses in the CS5 and RM3 within the same building.

5. Notwithstanding section 3.3.3.3, the following regulations shall apply to uses permitted by 4.1 (a) and (c) above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Provisions</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Gross Leasable Commercial Floor Area</td>
<td>100 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Gross Leasable Commercial Floor Area</td>
<td>11,000 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum setback to Speedsville Road</td>
<td>4.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Front Yard (to Equestrian Way)</td>
<td>1.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Front Yard (to Equestrian Way)</td>
<td>6.0 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Interior Side Yard</td>
<td>1.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Exterior Side Yard</td>
<td>1.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Exterior Side Yard</td>
<td>4.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Rear Yard</td>
<td>3.0 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Interior Side Yard or Rear Yard abutting a R-class zone</td>
<td>7.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Building Height</td>
<td>6.0 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Façade Height for Buildings fronting Equestrian Way</td>
<td>7.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Height</td>
<td>13.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage</td>
<td>No Maximum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Where off-street parking is provided on private property alongside and directly accessed from Equestrian Way, the minimum and maximum front yard setbacks shall be measured from the edge of those parking spaces.

7. No drive thru lanes shall be permitted within a RM3/CS5 zone.

8. Notwithstanding section 3.3.3.3, the following regulations shall apply to any use permitted by 4.1 (b) above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Provisions</th>
<th>Linear Row Houses</th>
<th>Cluster Row Houses</th>
<th>Apartment Houses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area</td>
<td>165 square metres</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Frontage</td>
<td>5.5 metres</td>
<td>20 metres</td>
<td>30 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Front Yard</td>
<td>1.5 metres</td>
<td>1.5 metres</td>
<td>1.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Front Yard for garage</td>
<td>5.5 metres</td>
<td>5.5 metres</td>
<td>5.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Front Yard</td>
<td>4.5 metres</td>
<td>4.5 metres</td>
<td>4.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Interior Side Yard</td>
<td>1.5 metres</td>
<td>3 metres</td>
<td>4.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Exterior Side Yard</td>
<td>3 metres</td>
<td>3 metres</td>
<td>3 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Rear Yard</td>
<td>6 metres</td>
<td>6 metres</td>
<td>6 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Building Height</td>
<td>7.5 metres</td>
<td>7.5 metres</td>
<td>7.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Height</td>
<td>13.5 metres</td>
<td>13.5 metres</td>
<td>13.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Gross Floor Area per dwelling unit</td>
<td>70 square metres</td>
<td>70 square metres</td>
<td>50 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage</td>
<td>40 percent</td>
<td>40 percent</td>
<td>40 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Landscaped Open Space</td>
<td>30 percent</td>
<td>30 percent</td>
<td>30 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Number of Attached Units (non-stacked)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Private Amenity Area per unit</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>20 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density of units per gross hectare</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Distance between buildings on same lot side wall to side wall</td>
<td>3 metres</td>
<td>3 metres</td>
<td>3 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Distance between buildings on same lot between (1) a front wall and rear wall (2) a front wall and another front wall and (3) a rear wall and another rear wall</td>
<td>10 metres</td>
<td>10 metres</td>
<td>10 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum distance between buildings on same lot between front or rear wall and side wall</td>
<td>8 metres</td>
<td>8 metres</td>
<td>8 metres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 2.4.3 of the Zoning By-law, landscaping adjacent to street line shall not be required for the blocks with front yards onto Equestrian Way or exterior side yards on other public streets for building having a setback less than or equal to 4.5 metres.

10. THAT prior to the lifting of the Holding (“H”) provision, the following will be completed to the satisfaction of the City of Cambridge and the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:

a. For the lands to which Schedule ‘B’ of this By-law applies, the Applicant has provided a Stationary Noise Study prepared by a qualified engineer which assesses the noise impacts from the Arriscraft facility and confirms the proposed development will meet the performance limits in the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change, NPC-300 Guideline prior to site plan approval; and,
b. That a maximum Geodetic Elevation for Sensitive Land Uses of 322 mASL will be complied with as shown on Schedule B of By-law No. 213-15.

11. THAT this by-law shall come into force and effect on the date it is enacted pursuant to Subsection 24(2) of the Planning Act, R.S.O., 1990, c. P. 13, as amended.

ENACTED AND PASSED this 14th day of December, 2021.

_________________________________
MAYOR

_________________________________
CLERK
Schedule A – Proposed Zoning Map

This is Schedule A attached to and forming part of By-law ________

Lands affected by the by-law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Classification</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEN SPACE</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purpose and Effect of By-law No. 21-XXX

155 Equestrian Way

The Purpose of the by-law is to amend the zoning for the lands legally described as Part of Lot 9, Concession 1, Beasley’s Lower Block (Former Township of Waterloo), City of Cambridge in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, and municipally known as 155 Equestrian Way (“subject lands”). The proposed amendment will facilitate the development of a 183-unit mixed use residential development consisting of a range of townhouses (standard, double-front, back-to-back, and stacked townhomes). The proposed development also includes 338 square metres (3,638 square feet) of at grade commercial floor area and a total of 418 parking spaces. Additionally, a 518.1 square metre (5,576.78 square feet) public amenity area is proposed in the north western corner of the subject lands. In order to develop the subject lands with the above proposed development, site-specific provisions are required to permit the following:

- A minimum of 1,500 square metres of Gross Leasable Commercial Floor Area shall be constructed over the entire lands zoned RM3/CS5 (s.4.1.303B) and RM3/CS5 (s.4.1.420).
- A reduction in the minimum private amenity area from 35 square metres (376 square feet) to 25 square metres (269 square feet) per dwelling unit for cluster row houses.
- A reduction in the minimum private amenity area from 35 square metres (376 square feet) to 4 square metres (43 square feet) per dwelling unit, provided on a balcony for stacked cluster row houses.
- An increase in the maximum density from 40 to 47 units per gross hectare for cluster row house.
- A reduction in the minimum private amenity area from 7 square metres (75 square feet) to 4 square metres (43 square feet) per dwelling unit, provided on a balcony for back-to-back row houses.
- An increase in the maximum encroachment of eaves into a required yard from 0.5 metres (1.6 feet) to 0.75 metres (2.46 feet).
- An increase in the maximum encroachment of open or covered unenclosed patios, decks or porches into front, exterior side and rear yards from 2.5 metres (8.2 feet) to 3.0 metres (9.8 feet).
- A reduction in the distance permitted between an access driveway, aisle, parking stall or parking lot in an RM-class zone to the window of a habitable room of a dwelling unit from 6 metres (19.6 feet) to 3 metres (9.8 feet).
The Effect of the by-law will permit the development of the subject lands for 183 residential dwelling units with 338 square metres (3,638 square feet) of at grade commercial floor area and a 518.1 square metre (5,576.78 square foot) public piazza.
BY-LAW 21-091

Being a by-law to amend Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended, with respect to land municipally known as 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle (R14/20)

WHEREAS Council of the City of Cambridge has the authority pursuant to Section 34 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended to pass this by-law;

WHEREAS this by-law conforms to the City of Cambridge Official Plan, as amended;

AND WHEREAS Council deems that adequate public notice of the public meeting was provided and adequate information regarding the amendment was presented at the public meeting held March 2nd, 2021, and that further public meeting is not considered necessary in order to proceed with this amendment,

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

1. THAT this by-law shall apply to a portion of the lands described as Part of Lots 13, Concession 3, Beasley’s Lower Block, Township of Waterloo as in 202482; and Block 70, Plan 58M-470, City of Cambridge in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and is shown on Schedule ‘A’ attached hereto and forming part of this by-law;

2. THAT Schedule ‘A’ to By-law No. 150-85, as amended, is hereby further amended by changing the zoning classification of the lands shown outlined in heavy black in the attached Schedule ‘A’ to this By-law from R2 (355 Guelph Avenue) and R5 – S.4.1.227 (11 Fletcher Circle) to RM4 – 4.1.421 in accordance with the attached Schedule ‘A’ to this by-law;

3. THAT the aforesaid City of Cambridge Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding the following subsection to 4.1 thereof:

“4.1.421 – 355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle, legally described as Part of Lots 13, Concession 3, Beasley’s Lower Block, Township of Waterloo as in 202482; and Block 70, Plan 58M-470, City of Cambridge in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, the following regulations shall apply to the lands in the RM4 zone to which reference “s.4.1.421 is made on Schedule A and located at 155 Equestrian Way:

- To permit nine attached townhouse dwelling units on the subject lands;
- To permit a minimum lot area of 150 square metres (1,615 square feet); and,
• To permit a minimum exterior side yard of 5.08 metres (16.66 feet).

4. THAT this by-law shall come into force and effect on the date it is enacted and passed by Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge, subject to notice hereof being circulated in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act and Ontario Regulation 545/06.

ENACTED AND PASSED this 14th day of December, 2021.

_________________________________
MAYOR

_________________________________
CLERK
Schedule A – Proposed Zoning Map

This is Schedule A attached to and forming part of By-law

By-law

[Map with zoning classifications]

Lands affected by the by-law

Zoning Classification

LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

INSTITUTIONAL

OPEN SPACE

1:1,500
Purpose and Effect of By-law No. 21-XXX

355 Guelph Avenue and 11 Fletcher Circle

The Purpose of the by-law is to amend the zoning for the lands legally described as Part of Lots 13, Concession 3, Beasley’s Lower Block, Township of Waterloo as in 202482; and Block 70, Plan 58M-470, City of Cambridge in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo (“subject lands”). The proposed amendment will facilitate the development of nine, two-storey street-fronting townhouse units, where four units will front onto Guelph Avenue and five units will front onto Fletcher Circle. The townhouse units will each provide a private garage and access driveway to be used to accommodate the required parking. A private rear yard amenity space is also planned for each individual unit. In order to develop the subject lands with the above proposed development, site-specific provisions are required to permit the following:

- To permit nine attached townhouse dwelling units on the subject lands, whereas only six attached units are permitted in the RM4 zone;
- To permit a minimum lot area of 150 square metres (1,615 square feet), whereas a minimum lot area of 165 square metres (1,776 square feet) is required; and,
- To permit a minimum exterior side yard of 5.08 metres (16.66 feet), whereas a minimum exterior side yard of 6 metres (19.68 feet) is required.

The Effect of the by-law will permit the development of the subject lands for nine, two-storey street-fronting townhouses.
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

By-law 21-092

Being a by-law to authorize the use of alternative voting methods and vote counting equipment for the 2022 Municipal and School Board Election

WHEREAS Section 42 of the Municipal Elections Act, 1996, S.O. 1996, c. 32, as amended, provides that the council of a local municipality may, by by-law, authorize the use of optical scanning vote tabulators and alternative voting methods;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the City of Cambridge deems it appropriate and in the public interest to utilize optical scanning vote tabulators and vote by internet as the methods of conducting the 2022 Municipal and School Board Election,

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

1. THAT the use of optical scanning vote tabulators for the purpose of counting votes in the 2022 City of Cambridge Municipal and School Board Election be hereby authorized.

2. THAT internet voting be hereby authorized as an alternative voting method in the 2022 City of Cambridge Municipal and School Board Election.

3. THAT By-law 63-17 is hereby repealed.

4. AND THAT this by-law shall come into force and full effect on the date of passing.

Enacted and Passed this 14th day of December, 2021.

________________________________
MAYOR

________________________________
CLERK
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

BY-LAW 21-093

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 14th day of December, 2021, 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 of The Corporation of the City of Cambridge.
4. **AND THAT** this by-law shall come into full force on the day it is passed.

ENACTED AND PASSED this 14th day of December, 2021.

_________________________________
MAYOR

_________________________________
CLERK