Corporation of the City of Cambridge

Special Council Meeting

Agenda

Date: Tuesday, May 17, 2022, 10:00 a.m. (Statutory Public Meeting) and reconvening at 5:00 p.m. (Special Council)

Location: Virtual Meeting

Public Meeting Agenda Item(s) will be discussed at 10:00 a.m.

All other agenda items and consideration of reports will be discussed when Council reconvenes at 5:00 p.m.

COVID-19

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

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

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

1. Meeting Called to Order
2. Indigenous Territory Acknowledgement
3. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest
4. 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. Public Meeting Report 22-058-CD - Temporary Use Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd

6. **Delegations**


7. **Presentations**

8. **Closed Session**

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

- litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board (litigation update)

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

9. **Rise from Closed Session**

10. **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.

10.1. Special Council Minutes - April 19, 2022

10.2. Cambridge Accessibility Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes – February 28, 2022 and March 28, 2022

10.3. Cambridge Economic Development Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes - March 9, 2022

10.4. Council Information Package – April 22, 2022
10.5. Council Information Package - May 6, 2022 177 - 217
10.6. 22-032-CRS Inflationary Impact Strategy 218 - 224
10.7. 22-033-CRS T22-37 – Black Bridge Emergency Repair 225 - 229

Note: the complete by-law is included on pages 481-489 of the agenda

11. Consideration of Reports

11.1. Corporate Services

11.1.1. 22-028-CRS 2022-2026 Joint Compliance Audit Committee 246 - 260

11.2. Corporate Enterprise

11.3. Community Development


11.3.2. 22-026-CD Tiny Homes – City Staff’s Review of Growing Demand for Additional Secondary Dwelling Units 271 - 286

11.3.3. 22-046-CD Recreation Complex & Idea Exchange – Conceptual Design and Updates 287 - 449

11.3.4. 22-047-CD Recommendation Report – Zoning By-law Amendment – 40 Albert Street 450 - 473

11.4. Infrastructure Services

11.5. Office of the City Manager

11.5.1. 22-011-OCM 637 King Street East Property Acquisition 474 - 486

11.5.2. 22-012-OCM 4910 Townline Road Property Acquisition 487 - 498

12. Other Business

13. Motions

13.1. Motion - Councillor Hamilton re: Request to the Region of Waterloo to Consider Free Public Transportation on Election Days 499 - 499

13.2. Motion – Councillor Liggett re: Ontario Land Tribunal dissolution This Motion was deferred on March 1, 2022 to come forward to May 17, 2022 Special Council meeting.

14. Notices of Motion

14.1. Notice of Motion - Councillor Liggett re: Ontario Must Build it Right the First Time 502 - 503

15. Correspondence


15.15. Oliver Powell re: Public Meeting Report 22-058-CD - Temporary Use Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd


Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd

15.25. Donna Langman re: Public Meeting Report 22-058-CD - Temporary Use
Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd

Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd

15.27. Hong Chau re: Public Meeting Report 22-058-CD - Temporary Use
Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd

Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd

15.29. Matt Roberts re: Public Meeting Report 22-058-CD - Temporary Use
Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd

Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd

15.31. Scott Amis re: Public Meeting Report 22-058-CD - Temporary Use
Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd

15.32. Brenda MacDonald re: Public Meeting Report 22-058-CD - Temporary Use
Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd

15.33. Elizabeth Clare and Robin Floyd re: Public Meeting Report 22-058-CD - Temporary Use
Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd

15.34. Sean Arbuthnot re: Public Meeting Report 22-058-CD - Temporary Use
Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd

15.35. Ann and Mark Clare re: Public Meeting Report 22-058-CD - Temporary Use
Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd

Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd

15.37. Sue Alexander re: Public Meeting Report 22-058-CD - Temporary Use
Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd

15.38. Tristan Silva re: Public Meeting Report 22-058-CD - Temporary Use
Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd

Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd

Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd

15.41. Corey Kimpson re: Public Meeting Report 22-058-CD - Temporary Use
Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd

15.42. Warren Ibbotson re: Public Meeting Report 22-058-CD - Temporary Use
Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd

15.43. Andrew Norgate re: Public Meeting Report 22-058-CD - Temporary Use
Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd
15.44.  Cody Chong re: Public Meeting Report 22-058-CD - Temporary Use Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd 575 - 576
15.47.  Dave Allen re: Public Meeting Report 22-058-CD - Temporary Use Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd 582 - 583

16.  **Motion to Receive and File**

17.  **Consideration of By-laws**

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

  22-029  Being a by-law to amend Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended with respect to land municipally known as 40 Albert Street (R14/20)

  22-030  Being a by-law to designate the building at 1001 Franklin Boulevard as a Municipal Capital Facility (“MCF Building”)

18.  **Confirmatory By-law**

19.  **Adjournment**
RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 22-058-CD – Public Meeting Report – Temporary Use Zoning By-law Amendment – 1500 Kossuth Rd. be received;

AND THAT Council waive the Planning application fees in the amount $12,000 for this proposal;

AND FURTHER THAT file R02/22 for 1500 Kossuth Rd. be referred back to staff for a subsequent report and staff recommendation.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

- This report has been prepared for a statutory public meeting under the Planning Act to consider a City initiated temporary use zoning by-law amendment at 1500 Kossuth Rd. The statutory public meeting provides council and members of the public the opportunity to provide comment on the proposed use. The proposed use is a commercial-recreational use (outdoor paintball operation).

Key Findings

- On April 19, 2022, Council directed staff to hold a statutory public meeting to consider a temporary use zoning by-law amendment at 1500 Kossuth Rd.
- The proposed use is for a commercial-recreational use (outdoor paintball use) operated by Flag Raiders.
• 1500 Kossuth Rd. is zoned Agricultural (A1) and Open Space (OS1). The current zoning does not permit the proposed use.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action; or
☒ Core Service

Objective(s): Not Applicable

Strategic Action: Not Applicable

Program: Not Applicable

Since this initial public meeting report is a Council directed matter staff have not evaluated the proposal against the City’s strategic plan at this time.

Core Service: Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments

In order to consider a zoning by-law amendment, a statutory public meeting is required to be held. The purpose of the meeting is to introduce the proposed use and to receive public feedback. Following a complete review of the proposal staff will prepare a recommendation report for Council consideration.

BACKGROUND:

On April 19, 2022, Council directed staff to hold a statutory public meeting under the Planning Act to consider a temporary use zoning by-law amendment for 1500 Kossuth Rd. for a proposed outdoor paintball use operated by Flag Raiders. The subject property is zoned Agricultural (A1) and Open Space (OS1) in Zoning By-law 150-85. These zone classes do not permit commercial-recreational uses.

A portion of the subject property has historically been used for a paintball operation by Flag Raiders through a temporary use zoning by-law amendment in 2001 and 2004.

The following is a brief summary of information on the past establishment of this use:

• 2000-2001 – Initial application for a temporary use zoning by-law amendment. Staff recommendation report provided Council with the following options:

  1. Approval of the temporary use zoning by-law amendment for a period of three years, subject to certain conditions (site plan approval; entering into an agreement to terminate the use following expiration of the by-law) or;
  2. Refusal of the application.
Council approved this temporary use zoning by-law amendment until February 26, 2004.

- 2004 – Second application for a temporary use zoning by-law amendment. Staff recommended refusal or that Council interpret the use as being permitted as a temporary use under the Official Plan, subject to certain conditions including a site plan application. Council approved this temporary use until February 26, 2007.

- 2007 – Application for further extension of the temporary use for another three years. Staff recommended refusal. Council refused.

- 2008 - The owner of 1500 Kossuth appealed Council’s refusal to extend the temporary use to the Ontario Municipal Board (now Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT)). At the hearing the owner amended the extension request from three years to three months because an alternative location was found. Although the Tribunal allowed the appeal for a three month period, it noted that it would dismiss the appeal had it been for a three year period since the use was not in accordance with the City of Cambridge or Region of Waterloo Official Plans. Appendix E is a copy of the Tribunal decision for Council’s information.

- The operation was relocated to the City of Kitchener following the Tribunal decision. Staff understand that Flag Raiders is no longer operating in the City of Kitchener and is seeking to relocate to 1500 Kossuth Rd.

Appendix A is an aerial image of the subject property which shows the general location of the previous paintball operation on site. Staff understand this area is where the use would operate from if this application is eventually approved.

**Existing/Surrounding Land Uses:**

The subject lands are located on the south side of Kossuth Rd. The lands are approximately 24 hectares in area and are zoned Agricultural (A1) and Open Space (OS1) in Zoning By-law 150-85. Staff understand that the frontage of the property is farmed and that the paintball use would be located in the cleared western portion of the site, which is where the use formerly operated. The balance of the lands are environmental and traversed by tributaries of Chilligo/Ellis Creek, floodplain, and portions of the Ellis Creek Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) complex. As a result the lands fall within the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) regulatory limit.
North of the property is the Township of Woolwich. South of the subject property are lands zoned OS1. East and west of the subject property are lands zoned A1 and OS1.

An aerial of the property is shown below:

![Aerial view of property]

**ANALYSIS:**

City staff will complete an analysis of the proposed use and provide a staff recommendation report, following the statutory public meeting. The proposal has been circulated to internal and external agencies for comment. Consideration in review of this proposal will include (but not be limited to) the following:

- Consistency with the policies of the Provincial Policy Statement and conformity with the Provincial Growth Plan;
- Regional Official Plan and City of Cambridge Official Plan policies;
- Comments received from members of Council, public, City staff and agencies.

For this report, staff is providing the standard recommendation to refer the proposal back to staff for further evaluation.

**EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):**

**Planning Act:**

Section 39 of the Planning Act enables Council to enact a temporary use zoning by-law to authorize the temporary use of land, buildings or structures for any purpose otherwise prohibited by the zoning by-law for a period of three years. Despite this permission, as required by the Planning Act, any by-law passed by Council still must conform to the City’s Official Plan.
City of Cambridge Official Plan:

The subject lands are designated Prime Agricultural and Natural Open Space in the City of Cambridge Official Plan (Appendix B). The Prime Agricultural designation permits the following:

a) Agricultural uses – such as growing of crops, livestock etc.
b) Agriculture-related uses – including farm related commercial and farm related industrial uses.
c) Secondary Uses – uses that are secondary to the principal agricultural use such as a home occupation, bed and breakfast, home industries, and agri-tourism.

The Natural Open Space designation permits uses such as conservation and passive recreational activities (e.g. trails and outdoor education).

City of Cambridge Zoning By-law 150-85:

The subject lands are zoned Agricultural (A1) and Open Space (OS1) in Zoning By-law 150-85 (Appendix C). The A1 zone permits farming and limited other uses. The OS1 zone permits conservation uses and limited other uses. A commercial-recreational use such as an outdoor paintball operation is not permitted in the A1 and OS1 zones but is a permitted use in certain commercial zones.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Application fees in the amount $12,000 are normally required to be paid to the City to process a temporary use zoning by-law amendment application. Staff is recommending that Council waive this fee as the application is city initiated.

PUBLIC VALUE:

The intent of the statutory public meeting is to provide an opportunity to the public to comment on the application prior to a Council decision on the proposal. Participants are able to share their feedback, whether that be in support of the proposal or in opposition. The public meeting is a key milestone in the planning review process that introduces the proposal to the community and allows for further engagement and dialogue between stakeholders.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:

Not applicable

PUBLIC INPUT:

The statutory public meeting, under the Planning Act, is being held May 17, 2022 with official notification provided in the Cambridge Times. Notice was also provided to all
assessed property owners within a 120 metre (393.7 feet) radius of the subject lands. Any interested parties and members of the public will be provided with an opportunity to speak to this proposal at the May 17, 2022 public meeting. Information related to this application is available on the City of Cambridge Current Development website found here: https://www.cambridge.ca/en/build-invest-grow/current-development-applications.aspx

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

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:
The file has been circulated to the departments and commenting agencies listed in Appendix D.

CONCLUSION:
This report is for a statutory public meeting to consider a City initiated temporary use zoning by-law amendment at 1500 Kossuth Rd. The proposed temporary use is for an outdoor commercial-recreational use (paintball operation). No decisions on the proposal are being made at this time. Staff will prepare a recommendation report following an analysis of the proposal and comments received from the public meeting and circulation process.

REPORT IMPACTS:
Agreement: No
By-law: Yes
Budget Amendment: No
Policy: No

APPROVALS:
This report has been reviewed by the Chief Financial Officer and City Solicitor. It has been reviewed and approved by the City Planner, Deputy City Manager and City Manager.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Report Number 22-058-CD Appendix A – Aerial of Subject Property
2. Report Number 22-058-CD Appendix B – Existing Official Plan Map
3. Report Number 22-058-CD Appendix C – Existing Zoning Map
5. Report Number 22-058-CD Appendix E – Previous Ontario Municipal Board Decision
Appendix C – Existing Zoning Map

EXISTING ZONING

Map 3

- STE: Site
- Zoning Classification:
  - OPEN SPACE
  - LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
  - INSTITUTIONAL
  - COMMERCIAL
  - AGRICULTURAL

Page 16 of 646
Appendix D – Internal/External Consultation List

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;
- Grand River Conservation Authority;
- Region of Waterloo
- Township of Woolwich
Appendix E – Previous Ontario Municipal Board Decision
Joe Kimpson has appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board under subsection 34(11) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13 as amended, from Council’s refusal or neglect to enact a proposed amendment to Zoning By-law 150-85 of the City of Cambridge to rezone lands respecting 1500 Kossuth Rd to approve a temporary use by-law for a period of three years. (OMB File PL080074)

APPEARANCES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parties</th>
<th>Counsel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>John Cosman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flag Raiders Inc.</td>
<td>Harold Elston and D. Berney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td>D.Leggett</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEMORANDUM OF ORAL DECISION DELIVERED BY S. J. SUTHERLAND ON MAY 13, 2008 AND ORDER OF THE BOARD

Joe Kimpson (Applicant/Appellant) owns a property at 1500 Kossuth Road in the City of Cambridge (subject property). He is requesting an amendment to Zoning By-law 150-85 in the form of a Temporary Use By-law (TUB) to permit the continued use of approximately 4.3 ha (10.6a) of the 24.6 ha (60.8a) site for the purpose of operating commercial/recreational establishment for a period of three years. The existing commercial/recreational use (outdoor paintball games) was first permitted for a period of three years in a TUB in 2001, and for a further three years in 2004. The current application seeks to extend the temporary use for another three years. The application was denied by the Council of the City of Cambridge (City).

The Applicant/Appellant is appealing Council’s decision on the basis that:

- Council previously approved TUBs for the subject property.
The recreational/commercial use was site plan approved by the City.
The existing Agricultural use will be maintained except for the portion previously designated under the TUB as recreational/commercial.

At the commencement of the hearing, Mr. Elston, counsel for the applicant/appellant, told the Board that he was coming forward with an amended application requesting an extension of the TUB for a period of three months rather than three years because his client believed he had found a property to which he could relocate his operation. Mr. Elston requested a short adjournment for the purpose of discussing this amended application with the City and Region of Waterloo (Region). Counsel for the City replied that his instructions were to oppose any TUB for the subject property, and that the paintball operation had, in fact, been operating illegally on the property since February of 2007, when the second extension to the TUB expired and now will be closed down on May 24, 2008. That being the case, the Board found no purpose would be served by an adjournment.

David Aston gave expert land-use planning evidence on behalf of the applicant/appellant. The core of Mr. Aston’s testimony was that there is nothing different in the current application from the two previous applications, which were approved by Council. He pointed to Section 24(1) of the Planning Act, which requires all by-laws to conform to the Official Plan (OP). He also stated that a TUB may be passed under Sections 34 and 39 of the Planning Act. He maintained that the TUB being sought conforms to Sections 11.5.1 and 11.5.2 of the OP, and maintained that 11.5.2 of the OP authorizes Council to pass a temporary use by-law for any use in any District that is otherwise prohibited by law. He stated that approval of the requested TUB conformed to the City’s OP as it meets the intent of 11.5.2 of the OP.

Mr. Aston introduced a letter from lawyer David R. Sunday, of the firm of Gowling LaFleur Henderson, on the subject of whether Council has the authority to enact a TUB where there is debate as to whether the proposed use complies with the OP or the Regional Planning Policies (ROPP). In his reply, which stated that Council did indeed have such authority, Mr. Sunday stated “Council’s earlier decisions followed municipal staff’s advice that the proposed temporary use by-law was in conformity with the OP and ROPP by virtue of Policy 11.5.2” (Exhibit 10).
The open portions of the site are designated Class 1 (Prime) Agricultural in the Official Plan, which permits agricultural, and agricultural-related uses and recreation activities that existed when the OP was enacted. The paintball operation did not exist at that time. The woodlot and wetland portions of the property are designated Class 1 (Significant Natural Features) Open Space, which permits limited uses, including passive recreational activities and outdoor education and research. The wooded portions of the property include a wetland that is classified by the Ministry of Natural Resources as a Provincially Significant Wetland.

Janet Babcock, Commissioner of Planning Services for the City, gave expert testimony on behalf of the City. Ms Babcock stated that neither planning staff at the City nor the Region had ever supported a TUB for the site precisely because they did not believe that it was in conformity with the OP or the ROPP. She directed the Board’s attention to reports in Exhibit 11 dating back to 2000 which state categorically that the use does not comply with the OP. In her expert testimony on behalf of the Region, planner Brenna MacKinnon said the same applied to the ROPP.

Ms. Babcock told the Board that previous Councils had approved the TUB despite staff’s advice that the use did not comply with the OP, which it must under the Planning Act, but those decisions had never been challenged at the Board. This time, she said, Council refused the TUB on the basis that the use did not comply with the OP. She also stated that both 11.5.1 and 11.5.2 of the OP state that “by-laws may be passed in accordance with the Planning Act” and added, “that is where you have to start.” This does not, in her opinion, allow for “any use in any District that is otherwise prohibited by law.”

She also stated that the use does not conform to the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS).

It was her expert opinion that the application does not represent good planning, and is contrary to the Planning Act as it is not in conformity with the OP or the ROPP.

Ms MacKinnon also stated that the use is not in conformity with the PPS.

Corey Kimpson, sister of the Applicant/Appellant, told the Board that she and her brother have been trying very hard to find another site for the paintball operation and
believe they have found one. She said they have already taken measures to move Flag
Raiders Inc., although they may have to make an application to rezone the target
property. She said paintball is growing in popularity and that Flag Raiders Inc. will need
more space in any event. She said they have “absolutely no intention” of applying for
another TUB.

It is the Board’s opinion that there has been, from the first application for a TUB,
consistency in the opinion of successive professional planning staffs at both City and
the Region that the use does not conform with either the City’s OP or the Region’s
ROPP. The Board does not accept the position of Mr. Aston that Section 11.5.2 of the
City’s OP would permit “any use in any District that is otherwise permitted by law”. To
accept this argument would be ignoring the words “It is the policy of the City that by-law
may be passed in accordance with the Planning Act”. As Mr. Aston himself
acknowledged, Section 24.1 of the Planning Act requires conformity with the OP.

That previous Councils ignored the advice of staff that the use was not in
accordance with the OP is not the issue. Councils do not always take the professional
advice of their staffs, sometimes at Council’s peril. The current Council did take staff’s
advice and refused a further extension of the TUB.

When rendering the oral decision, the Board was working under the assumption
that what was being sought was a new TUB. Upon reviewing evidence and notes, the
Board now realizes that it is not a new TUB, but on extension of the current TUB that is
being asked for. Under the amended application, the extension is for three months, not
the three years of the original application. Were it for three years, the Board would
dismiss the appeal. The Board finds the expert testimony of Ms Babcock convincing
and compelling, and accepts that the use is not in accordance with either the OP or the
ROPP.

The Board, however, has no desire to close down Flag Raiders Inc. immediately
when there may be a possibility of it relocating in the near future. It does not, at this
point, seem reasonable to do so, given the undoubted importance of the summer
season to the operation. The Board reminds the Applicant/Appellant of Ms Kimpson’s
statement that Flag Raiders Inc. has “absolutely no intention” of seeking a further
extension to the TUB. In any event, the Board feels that such an extension would be, to say the least, difficult to come by given the evidence heard at this hearing.

The Board therefore Orders that the appeal is allowed and that Zoning By-law 150-85 be amended in the form of a Temporary Use By-law to expire on August 31, 2008, at which time the operation of Flag Raiders Inc. at its current location under By-law 150-85 shall cease.

The Board so Orders.

“S. J. Sutherland”

S. J. SUTHERLAND
MEMBER
MINUTES
Corporation of the City of Cambridge
Special Council Meeting - Statutory Public Meeting

Date: April 19, 2022, 10:00 a.m. (Statutory Public Meeting) and reconvening at 5:00 p.m. (Special Council)
Location: Virtual Meeting


Regrets: Councillor Devine - Ward 2, Councillor Adshade – Ward 6 (5 p.m. session only)

Staff Members in Attendance: David Calder - City Manager, Dave Bush - Deputy City Manager, Corporate Services, Hardy Bromberg - Deputy City Manager, Community Development, Yogesh Shah - Deputy City Manager, Infrastructure Services, Cheryl Zahnleiter - Deputy City Manager, Corporate Enterprise, Sheryl Ayres - Chief Financial Officer, Lisa Shields - City Solicitor, Jennifer Shaw - Deputy City Clerk, Mallory Greenough - Council Committee Services Coordinator, Rachel Latour - Administrative Assistant, Michael Oliveri - Council Committee Services Coordinator, Lisa Prime - Chief Planner, Kevin De Leebeeck - Director of Engineering and Greg Elgie, Business Systems Analyst

Others in Attendance: Michael Campos - Intermediate Planner, Development, Katie Fischer - Deputy Treasurer, Mike Parsons - Director of Environmental Services, Trevor McWilliams - Manager of Business Development

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.
Councillor Mike Mann, welcomes everyone present and calls the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

2. Indigenous Territory Acknowledgement

3. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest

None.

4. Public Meeting Notice

5. Public Meetings

5.1 22-041-CD Public Meeting Report – 11-13 Barrie Lane – 2748058 Ontario Inc. (c/o Hans Madan)

Motion: 22-109

Moved by Councillor Wolf
Seconded by Councillor Adshade

THAT Report 22-041-CD – Public Meeting Report – 11-13 Barrie Lane – 2748058 Ontario Inc. (c/o Hans Madan) be received;

AND THAT application R03/22 for 11-13 Barrie Lane be referred back to staff for a subsequent report and staff recommendation.

In Favour (7): Councillor Reid, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Adshade, Councillor Hamilton, and Councillor Ermeta

Absent (2): Councillor Devine and Mayor McGarry

Carried (7 to 0)

5.2 22-042-CD Public Meeting Report – 15-17 Barrie Lane – 122559056 Canada Inc. (c/o Hans Madan)

Motion: 22-110

Moved by Councillor Wolf
Seconded by Councillor Adshade

THAT Report 22-042-CD – Public Meeting Report – 15-17 Barrie Lane – 122559056 Canada Inc. (c/o Hans Madan) be received;

AND THAT application R04/22 for 15-17 Barrie Lane be referred back to staff for a subsequent report and staff recommendation.
In Favour (7): Councillor Reid, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Adshade, Councillor Hamilton, and Councillor Ermeta

Absent (2): Councillor Devine and Mayor McGarry

Carried (7 to 0)

6. Delegations

6.1 Babar Khan Mirza re: 22-019-CRS Development Charges Core Areas Exemption

6.2 Chris Pidgeon, Principal Planner, GSP Group re: 22-019-CRS Development Charges Core Areas Exemption

6.3 Paul de Haas, President, Haastown re: 22-019-CRS Development Charges Core Areas Exemption

6.4 John Egoff, Representative of Citizens for Cambridge re: 22-019-CRS Development Charges Core Areas Exemption

6.5 Brian Kennedy, Executive Director, Downtown Cambridge Business Improvement Area re: 22-019-CRS Development Charges Core Areas Exemption

7. Presentations


7.2 Hans Madan re: 22-041-CD Public Meeting Report – 11-13 Barrie Lane – 2748058 Ontario Inc. (c/o Hans Madan)


7.4 Hans Madan re: 22-042-CD Public Meeting Report – 15-17 Barrie Lane – 122559056 Canada Inc. (c/o Hans Madan)

7.5 Katie Fischer, Deputy Treasurer re: 22-019-CRS Development Charges Core Areas Exemption


8. **Closed Session**

Motion: 22-111

Moved by Councillor Hamilton  
Seconded by Councillor Ermeta

THAT in accordance with Section s.239 (e) and (f) of the Municipal Act, 2001, Council convene in Closed Session at 5:05 p.m. to consider the following subject matters:

- Litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality (Litigation update)
- Advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose (Litigation update and confidential legal advice)

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

Absent (1): Councillor Devine  

**Carried (8 to 0)**

9. **Rise from Closed Session**

Motion: 22-112

Moved by Councillor Mann  
Seconded by Councillor Wolf

THAT Council rise from Closed Session and reconvene in Open Session at 6:18 p.m.

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

Absent (1): Councillor Devine

**Carried (8 to 0)**
10. **Consent Agenda**

Motion: 22-113
Moved by Councillor Reid
Seconded by Councillor Hamilton

THAT all items listed under the heading of Consent Agenda for April 19, 2022 be adopted as recommended.

In Favour (7): Councillor Reid, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Absent (2): Councillor Devine, and Councillor Adshade

**Carried (7 to 0)**

10.1 Special Council Minutes March 22, 2022 and April 5, 2022
10.2 Council Information Package - April 8, 2022
10.3 Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes – January 20, 2022 and February 17, 2022
10.4 Arts and Culture Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes – March 23, 2022
10.5 22-024-CD Holding Removal - 647 Coronation Boulevard (Sanchez Holman Designs Ltd)
10.6 22-028-CD 2021 Growth and Staging of Development
10.7 22-009-CRS 2021 Year End Report on Investments
10.8 22-023-CRS 2022 Final Tax Levy
10.9 22-008-CRS Development Charges Statement for the Year Ended December 31, 2021
10.10 22-038-CD Linden Drive Park Development - Additional Funding

11. **Consideration of Reports**

11.1 Corporate Services

11.1.1 22-019-CRS Development Charges Core Areas Exemption

Moved by Councillor Mann
Seconded by Councillor Liggett
THAT report 22-019-CRS Development Charges Core Areas Exemption be received;

AND THAT the Development Charges Background Study Update dated February 1, 2022 be approved;

AND THAT it is determined that no further public meeting is required;

AND THAT the Chief Financial Officer be authorized to enter into an agreement with the owners of 55 Kerr Street under section 12.6 of By-Law 19-094, as amended by by-law 22-003, such that the development charges applicable on the proposed development are effective April 19, 2022, subject to the development proceeding to building permit within two years of approval of the current site plan application, with the agreement being substantially in accordance with the terms set out in this report and in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor;

AND THAT staff be directed to review the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund Implementation Policy with respect to the possible inclusion of a grant program to offset the cost of development charges on eligible affordable housing developments;

AND FURTHER THAT the Amending Development Charge By-law as set out in Appendix B to report 22-019-CRS be approved, eliminating the core areas development charge exemption effective April 20, 2022.

Amendment:
Motion: 22-114

Moved by Councillor Wolf
Seconded by Councillor Hamilton

AND THAT staff be directed to prepare a grant program and policy to waive Development Charges for affordable housing developments.

In Favour (7): Councillor Reid, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Absent (2): Councillor Devine, and Councillor Adshade
Carried (7 to 0)

**Amendment:**
Motion: 22-115

Moved by Councillor Reid
Seconded by Councillor Mann

AND THAT the Chief Financial Officer be authorized to enter into an early payment agreement with the owners of 102 - 110 Fountain Street and 199 Abraham Street under section 12.6 of By-Law 19-094, as amended by bylaw 22-003, such that the development charges applicable on the proposed development are effective April 19, 2022, subject to the complete Zoning By-law Amendment and Official Plan Amendment applications being submitted by October 31, 2022 and subject to the development proceeding to building permit within two years of approval of the site plan application, with the agreement being substantially in accordance with the terms set out in this report and in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor;

In Favour (6): Councillor Reid, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Hamilton, and Mayor McGarry

Opposed (1): Councillor Ermeta

Absent (2): Councillor Devine, and Councillor Adshade

Carried (6 to 1)

**Main Motion, as amended**
Motion: 22-116

Moved by Councillor Mann
Seconded by Councillor Liggett

THAT report 22-019-CRS Development Charges Core Areas Exemption be received;

AND THAT the Development Charges Background Study Update dated February 1, 2022 be approved;
AND THAT it is determined that no further public meeting is required;

AND THAT the Chief Financial Officer be authorized to enter into an agreement with the owners of 55 Kerr Street under section 12.6 of By-Law 19-094, as amended by by-law 22-003, such that the development charges applicable on the proposed development are effective April 19, 2022, subject to the development proceeding to building permit within two years of approval of the current site plan application, with the agreement being substantially in accordance with the terms set out in this report and in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor;

AND THAT the Chief Financial Officer be authorized to enter into an early payment agreement with the owners of 102 - 110 Fountain Street and 199 Abraham Street under section 12.6 of By-Law 19-094, as amended by bylaw 22-003, such that the development charges applicable on the proposed development are effective April 19, 2022, subject to the complete Zoning By-law Amendment and Official Plan Amendment applications being submitted by October 31, 2022 and subject to the development proceeding to building permit within two years of approval of the site plan application, with the agreement being substantially in accordance with the terms set out in this report and in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor;

AND THAT staff be directed to prepare a grant program and policy to waive Development Charges for affordable housing developments.

AND FURTHER THAT the Amending Development Charge By-law as set out in Appendix B to report 22-019-CRS be approved.

In Favour (7): Councillor Reid, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Absent (2): Councillor Devine, and Councillor Adshade

Carried (7 to 0)
11.1.2 22-006-CRS 2021 Year-End Operating Update

Moved by Councillor Wolf
Seconded by Councillor Hamilton

THAT Report 22-006-CRS 2021 Year-End Operating Update be received;

AND THAT the tax-supported and water utility operating budget variances for the December 2021 reporting period, reportable under the Budget Control By-Law and as outlined in report 22-006-CRS, be approved;

AND THAT the operating surplus resulting from the cost containment associated with the COVID-19 pandemic in the amount of $2,037,936 be transferred to the Rate Stabilization Reserve;

AND THAT the tax-supported operating surplus of $3,318,232 be transferred to the Rate Stabilization Reserve;

AND THAT a transfer of $180,307 be drawn from the Water Rate Stabilization Reserve Fund;

AND THAT the wastewater surplus of $3,494,199 be transferred to the Wastewater Rate Stabilization Reserve Fund and the Wastewater Capital Reserve Fund as outlined in report 22-006-CRS;

AND THAT the transfers to and from the reserve funds as outlined in Appendix A to report 22-006-CRS be approved;

AND FURTHER THAT the Contaminated Sites Grant Program Reserve be closed out with its balance being transferred to the Core Areas Transformation Fund.

Amendment:
Motion: 22-117

Moved by Councillor Wolf
Seconded by Councillor Hamilton

AND THAT the tax-supported operating surplus as a result of waived development charges being lower than budgeted in 2021 in the amount of $800,000 be transferred to the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund for the implementation of a
policy to waive Development Charges for affordable housing developments.

AND THAT the remaining tax-supported operating surplus of $2,518,232 be transferred to the Rate Stabilization Reserve;

In Favour (7): Councillor Reid, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Absent (2): Councillor Devine, and Councillor Adshade

Carried (7 to 0)

Main Motion, as Amended
Motion: 22-118

Moved by Councillor Wolf
Seconded by Councillor Hamilton

THAT Report 22-006-CRS 2021 Year-End Operating Update be received;

AND THAT the tax-supported and water utility operating budget variances for the December 2021 reporting period, reportable under the Budget Control By-Law and as outlined in report 22-006-CRS, be approved;

AND THAT the tax-supported operating surplus as a result of waived development charges being lower than budgeted in 2021 in the amount of $800,000 be transferred to the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund for the implementation of a policy to waive Development Charges for affordable housing developments.

AND THAT the remaining tax-supported operating surplus of $2,518,232 be transferred to the Rate Stabilization Reserve;

AND THAT the operating surplus resulting from the cost containment associated with the COVID-19 pandemic in the amount of $2,037,936 be transferred to the Rate Stabilization Reserve;

AND THAT a transfer of $180,307 be drawn from the Water Rate Stabilization Reserve Fund;
AND THAT the wastewater surplus of $3,494,199 be transferred to the Wastewater Rate Stabilization Reserve Fund and the Wastewater Capital Reserve Fund as outlined in report 22-006-CRS;

AND THAT the transfers to and from the reserve funds as outlined in Appendix A to report 22-006-CRS be approved;

AND FURTHER THAT the Contaminated Sites Grant Program Reserve be closed out with its balance being transferred to the Core Areas Transformation Fund.

In Favour (7): Councillor Reid, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Absent (2): Councillor Devine, and Councillor Adshade

Carried (7 to 0)

11.1.3 22-010-CRS Professional Services - Naming and Sponsorship Rights

Motion: 22-119

Moved by Councillor Wolf
Seconded by Councillor Ermeta

THAT Report 22-010-CRS Professional Services - Naming and Sponsorship Rights be received;

AND THAT the award of Request for Quotations (High Score) - Professional Services - Naming and Sponsorship Rights to Interkom Inc. of Burlington, Ontario, being the top-ranked respondent of the aforementioned solicitation process, for a fixed fee of $145,000 (plus HST), for program “Administration” services be approved;

AND FURTHER THAT all “Sales/Program Implementation” services provided by Interkom Inc., under the terms and conditions of the Agreement, shall be subject to Council Approval, including the proposed commission rate at a maximum 10% per contract payable to Interkom Inc. above and beyond the fixed fee.
In Favour (7): Councillor Reid, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Absent (2): Councillor Devine, and Councillor Adshade

Carried (7 to 0)

11.2 Corporate Enterprise

11.2.1 22-008-CRE Delegation of Authority for the Core Areas Community Improvement Plan (CIP)

Moved by Councillor Liggett
Seconded by Councillor Reid

THAT Report 22-008-CRE Delegation of Authority for the Core Areas CIP be received;

AND THAT the Director of Economic Development and Chief Financial Officer (or designates) be provided with delegated authority to approve funding applications made pursuant to the Core Areas Community Improvement Plan for financial incentives;

AND THAT a transfer of $1 million per year over four years be made from the Core Areas Transformation Fund (CATF) reserve fund to the Economic Development operating budget for the Core Areas Community Improvement Plan (CIP) Programs;

AND FURTHER THAT the by-law attached to Report No. 22-008-CRE be passed.

Deferral:
Motion: 22-120

Moved by Councillor Liggett
Seconded by Councillor Ermeta

THAT consideration of report 22-008-CRE Delegation of Authority for the Core Areas Community Improvement Plan (CIP) be deferred to the June 14th Special Council Meeting.

In Favour (2): Councillor Ligget, and Councillor Ermeta

Opposed (5): Councillor Reid, Councillor Mann, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Hamilton, and Mayor McGarry
Absent (2): Councillor Devine, and Councillor Adshade

Defeated (2 to 5)

Motion: 22-121

Moved by Councillor Liggett
Seconded by Councillor Reid

THAT Report 22-008-CRE Delegation of Authority for the Core Areas CIP be received;

AND THAT the Director of Economic Development and Chief Financial Officer (or designates) be provided with delegated authority to approve funding applications made pursuant to the Core Areas Community Improvement Plan for financial incentives;

AND THAT a transfer of $1 million per year over four years be made from the Core Areas Transformation Fund (CATF) reserve fund to the Economic Development operating budget for the Core Areas Community Improvement Plan (CIP) Programs;

AND FURTHER THAT the by-law attached to Report No. 22-008-CRE be passed.

In Favour (6): Councillor Reid, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Hamilton, and Mayor McGarry

Opposed (1): Councillor Ermeta

Absent (2): Councillor Devine, and Councillor Adshade

Carried (6 to 1)

11.3 Community Development

11.3.1 22-043-CD Recommendation Report – Zoning By-law Amendment – 285 Limerick Road

Motion: 22-122

Moved by Councillor Reid
Seconded by Councillor Liggett

THAT Report 22-043-CD (Recommendation Report – Zoning By-law Amendment – 285 Limerick Road) be received;
AND THAT the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment to amend the zoning of the site from the “Residential – R2” zone to the “Multiple Residential – RM4” zone and to establish site-specific provisions for the site to permit the development of seven street-fronting townhouse units be approved.

AND THAT that a subsequent public meeting in accordance with subsection 34(17) of the Planning Act is not required.

AND FURTHER THAT the by-law attached to Report 22-043-CD be passed.

In Favour (7): Councillor Reid, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Absent (2): Councillor Devine, and Councillor Adshade

Carried (7 to 0)

11.4 Infrastructure Services

11.4.1 22-004-IFS Wastewater Disposal Stations – Update

Motion: 22-123

Moved by Councillor Ermeta
Seconded by Councillor Wolf

THAT Report 22-004-IFS – Wastewater Disposal Stations – Update be received;

AND THAT the Director of Environmental Services be directed to decommission Churchill Park’s Wastewater Disposal Station.

In Favour (4): Councillor Reid, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Hamilton, and Mayor McGarry

Opposed (3): Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, and Councillor Ermeta

Absent (2): Councillor Devine, and Councillor Adshade

Carried (4 to 3)
11.5 Office of the City Manager

12. Unfinished Business

13. Correspondence

13.1 Kristen Barisdale, Vice President, Planning, GSP Group Inc. re: 22-019-CRS Development Charges Core Areas Exemption

13.2 Brandon Flewwelling, Development Planning Manager, GSP Group re: 22-019-CRS Development Charges Core Areas Exemption

13.3 Paul de Haas, President, Haastown re: 22-019-CRS Development Charges Core Areas Exemption

13.4 Lori Dyck re: 22-041-CD Public Meeting Report – 11-13 Barrie Lane – 2748058 Ontario Inc. (c/o Hans Madan) and 22-042-CD Public Meeting Report – 15-17 Barrie Lane – 122559056 Canada Inc. (c/o Hans Madan)

14. Motion to Extend

Motion: 22-124

Moved by Councillor Hamilton
Seconded by Councillor Wolf

THAT the time limitations on the proceedings of Council set out in Section 16.27 of the Procedural By-law be waived to extend past the hour of 10:30 p.m. to 11 p.m.

In Favour (7): Councillor Reid, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Absent (2): Councillor Devine, and Councillor Adshade

Carried (7 to 0)

15. Notice of Motion

15.1 Notice of Motion - Councillor Hamilton re: Request to the Region of Waterloo to Consider Free Public Transportation on Election Days

15.2 Notice of Motion – Councillor Reid re: Request for Temporary Use By-law for Flag Raiders
16. **Motion to Waive Notice**

Councillor Reid withdrew her Notice of Motion which was subsequently brought forward by Councillor Wolf.

Motion: 22-125

Moved by Councillor Wolf
Seconded by Councillor Liggett

**THAT the notice requirements of the procedure by-law be waived to consider Councillor Wolf's Notice of Motion re: Request for Temporary Use By-law for Flag Raiders.**

In Favour (7): Councillor Reid, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Absent (2): Councillor Devine, and Councillor Adshade

Carried (7 to 0)

17. **Motion to Extend**

Motion: 22-126

**THAT the time limitations on the proceedings of Council set out in Section 16.27 of the Procedural By-law be waived to extend past the hour of 11:00 p.m. to 11:30 p.m.**

In Favour (7): Councillor Reid, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Absent (2): Councillor Devine, and Councillor Adshade

Carried (7 to 0)

18. **Motion**

18.1 **Councillor Wolf's Motion re: Request for Temporary Use By-law for Flag Raiders**

Motion: 22-127

Moved by Councillor Wolf
Seconded by Councillor Liggett
THAT staff be directed to schedule a Statutory Public Meeting under the Ontario Planning Act on May 17, 2022 and report back on the request for a Temporary Use by-law being established to permit Flag Raiders to operate at the property at 1500 Kossuth Road.

In Favour (6): Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Opposed (1): Councillor Reid

Absent (2): Councillor Devine, and Councillor Adshade

Carried (6 to 1)

19. Motion to Receive Correspondence and Presentations

Motion: 22-128

Moved by Councillor Hamilton
Seconded by Councillor Mann

THAT all presentations and correspondence from the April 19, 2022 Special Council Meeting be received.

In Favour (7): Councillor Reid, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Absent (2): Councillor Devine, and Councillor Adshade

Carried (7 to 0)

20. Introduction and Consideration of By-laws

Motion: 22-129

Moved by Councillor Hamilton
Seconded by Councillor Liggett
THAT the following by-laws listed under the heading of Introduction and Consideration of By-laws be enacted and passed:

22-023 Being a by-law to amend Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended, with respect to the land municipally known as 647 Coronation Boulevard

22-024 Being a by-law to establish 2022 Final Tax Rates for City purposes only, for the payment of 2022 Property Taxes and to repeal By-law 22-004

22-025 Being a by-law to amend By-law 19-094, as amended by By-law 22-003, respecting Development Charges pursuant to the Development Charges Act, S.O., 1997, c. 27, as amended

22-026 Being a by-law to amend Delegation of Authority By-law 19-186

22-027 Being a by-law to amend Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended, with respect to land municipally known as 285 Limerick Road (R07/20)

In Favour (7): Councillor Reid, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Absent (2): Councillor Devine, and Councillor Adshade

Carried (7 to 0)

21. Confirmatory By-law

Motion: 22-130

Moved by Councillor Reid
Seconded by Councillor Ermeta

THAT By-law 22-028 being a by-law to confirm the proceedings of the Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge be passed.

In Favour (7): Councillor Reid, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Absent (2): Councillor Devine, and Councillor Adshade

Carried (7 to 0)
22. **Adjournment**

Motion: 22-131

Moved by Councillor Wolf
Seconded by Councillor Hamilton

THAT the Council meeting does now adjourn at 11:17 p.m.

In Favour (7): Councillor Reid, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor McGarry

Absent (2): Councillor Devine, and Councillor Adshade

**Carried (7 to 0)**

_________________________
Mayor

_________________________
Clerk
Committee Members in Attendance: Joyce Barlow, Jaime Griffis, Sheri-Lyn Roberts, John Dunham, Dan Lajoie, Rob Rappolt, Simon Marmur, Erin Moerman, Barb Schutz, Councillor Devine and Councillor Adshade

Members Regrets: Nathan Packiya, Scott Lindsay

Staff Members in Attendance: Robyn Hyland, Accessibility Coordinator; Mallory Greenough, Council Committee Services Coordinator; John Mattocks, Manager of Municipal By-Law Compliance; Scott MacDonald, Project Engineer – Infrastructure/Capital Works

Meeting Called to Order

The meeting of the Accessibility Advisory Committee of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge was held in virtually via zoom. Committee Chair Dan Lajoie welcomed everyone present and called the meeting to order at 1:01 p.m. and the meeting adjourned at 2:19 p.m.

Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

There are no declarations of pecuniary interest.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Moved by: Sheri-Lyn Roberts

Seconded by: Joyce Barlow

THAT the minutes from the Accessibility Advisory Committee meeting held on January 24, 2022 be approved.
CARRIED

Agenda Items

6.1. Staff Introduction – John Mattocks, Manager of Municipal By-Law Compliance

John Mattocks provided an introduction regarding himself and his bylaw team.

Sheri-Lyn Roberts requested information on the current snow removal bylaw. John Maddocks informed that a new corridor by-law was recently passed by Council. There is a link on the City website that shows what is cleaned by the city and what is removed by business and home owners. Sheri-Lyn Roberts to send John Maddocks an invitation to next snow removal subcommittee meeting.

Councillor Devine brought forward concerns on curbed faced sidewalks and has recommended the removal of snow on all city sidewalks by city staff. John Maddocks noted the concerns.

Discussed exemptions to the timeline of ticketing with snow removal. John Maddocks informed that bylaw officers have some leeway when connecting to the property owners with disabilities and will figure out a timeline as to when the work can be complete.

John Dunham expressed his concern with proposing the city removal all snow from sidewalks. He believes it is a huge expense for the city and very difficult for sidewalks to be cleaned in a timely manner

Sheri-Lyn Roberts explained that Mike Hausser, Director of Operations, is bringing his draft ideas to the subcommittee to provide insight.

6.2. Dayton Street Reconstruction – Scott MacDonald, Project Engineer

Dan welcomed Scott MacDonald, Project Engineer and they began their presentation regarding the Dayton Street Reconstruction.

Scott explained that the project went to PIC and based on some residents’ comments, the alternative was not liked and city went back to reconsider.
Next steps will be to complete internal review and a consultant will refine the designs of options. Staff will then present the new, preferred alternative to residents and a decision will be made to move forward with design.

6.3. Snow Removal – Sheri Roberts, Cambridge Accessibility Advisory Committee Vice-Chair

Sheri provided an update that the subcommittee met last week with Mike Hausser; Director of Operations who is looking at snow removal policies and projects running through next year.

Sheri-Lyn Roberts will be meeting with Mike Hausser and the subcommittee on April 14th, 2022 and then will bring back to committee to discuss options.

6.4. NAAW Update – Dan Lajoie, Cambridge Accessibility Advisory Committee Chair

Dan Lajoie discussed that every year in our community during May 30 – June 3 there is a virtual series of webinars – theme this year accessibility in a changing world. Agenda item that will be discussed will be: new technology/ new accessibility/ new legislations. The City of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo is involved. This is open to the public.

7. Capital Project Sub-Committee Update

Dan Lajoie expressed that he spoke with staff and projects approved in 2016 by the committee cannot receive the go ahead from the current committee. If a project is approved more than 5 years ago, it should be brought back to the committee for review.

Robyn Hyland discussed that the subcommittee is talking to the city regarding shelf projects, all of the projects should come to them near the end of 2022, will review in 2023, and make changes when needed.

8. Other Business

8.1. Chair Report

No business to discuss.

8.2. Councillor’s Report
Councillor Devine discussed that snow removal is important and does not believe that residents should have to clear the snow that the snow put in front of driveways.

8.3. Staff Report Motion

Cambridge Sports Park will be coming to the March 28, 2022 meeting

Next Meeting:

Monday, March 28, 2022 1:00pm-3:00pm

Location: Zoom

Close of Meeting

Moved by: Councillor Devine

Seconded by: Councillor Adshade

THAT the Cambridge Accessibility Advisory Committee meeting of February 28, 2022 be adjourned at 2:19 pm.

CARRIED

If you require any accommodations to participate in this meeting, please let Robyn know at hylandr@cambridge.ca or 519 740-4680 ext 4292.

Close of Meeting

Chair
Dan Lajoie

Council Committee Services Coordinator
Mallory Greenough
Committee Members in Attendance: Joyce Barlow, Jaime Griffis, Sheri-Lyn Roberts, Dan Lajoie, Nathan Packiya, Erin Moerman, Barb Schutz, Councillor Devine and Councillor Adshade

Members Regrets: Scott Lindsay, Simon Marmur

Staff Members in Attendance: Michael Olivieri; Council Committee Services Coordinator Mallory Greenough, Council Committee Services Coordinator; Olga Vigil Letang; Supervisor of Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Accessibility Services.

Meeting Called to Order

The meeting of the Accessibility Advisory Committee of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge was held in virtually via zoom. Committee Chair Dan Lajoie welcomed everyone present and called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. and the meeting adjourned at 2:18 p.m.

Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

There are no declarations of pecuniary interest.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Moved by: Councillor Devine

Seconded by: Sheri-Lyn Roberts

THAT the minutes from the Accessibility Advisory Committee meeting held on February 24, 2022 be approved.
Defeated - Minutes will be adjusted and reapproved – brought back to the April 25, 2022 meeting for approval.

Agenda Items


Dan welcomed Olga to the meeting.

Olga provided an update on the City of Cambridge Action plan. The goal is to come back to the community in 2023 to strengthen their community outreach and to help include the community in the updates and feedback.

Sheri-Lyn was curious if there has been any discussions regarding maintaining action plan items such as virtual meetings to help with accessibility.

Dan Lajoie agreed that virtual meetings have assisted with meetings for people with disabilities.

Olga will look into the question regarding virtual meetings and bring back an update for Robyn to provide CAAC.

6.2. 1001 Franklin Blvd (Site Plan) – Richard Dabrus, WGD Architects Inc.

Dan welcomed Richard Dabrus, John Cook and Grace Hewton, and they began their presentation regarding 1001 Franklin Blvd.

Councillor Devine would like to know if there will be all-gender/universal changerooms available. Richard will take it under advisement and will look into it further.

Dan recommended comments discussed today be reviewed at the capital project sub-committee meeting and added into the second submission for site plan. Olga will have Robyn reach out to Richard to attend the subcommittee to further discuss and review if its needed.

6.3. Advisory Committee Membership – Mallory Greenough, Council Committee Service Coordinator

Mallory provided an update on the council terms, duration of appointments and membership on advisory committees.
Councillor Devine encouraged all who are interested to reapply to be a member.

7. Capital Project Sub-Committee Update

There were no projects to be discussed. Things will pick up closer to the summer. Robyn will provide further updates.

8. Other Business

No business to discuss.

8.1. Chair Report

No business to discuss.

8.2. Councillor’s Report

A citizen that lives in ward 1 on Compass Trail in the new Mattamy sub division is legally blind and would like a all-way stop at Compass Trail and Pointer Street. Transportation has denied his request. Tomorrow, March 29, 2022 at 10 a.m. the resident is having a vision specialist; Karen Watts, an orientation and mobility specialist and vision loss rehabilitation specialist to have an open house to discuss concerns. Councillor Devine and Councillor Adshade will be attending to hear the citizens concerns.

Dan was wondering if Robyn has been made aware of this situation? Olga believes that she has not, as they would have discussed at their weekly meeting. Dan would like to have Robyn involved to be able to discuss with staff. Robyn would be able to assist by connecting with staff. Councillor Devine will reach out to Olga and provide her the details and information on the meeting tomorrow at 10 am and will provide an update to the committee.

Sherry asked what procedure is to have signage or a cross walk put up.

Councillor Devine shared that City staff provide a survey and traffic study and then will give feedback and report that will come to council to vote on.

8.3. Staff Report Motion

No business to discuss.
Next Meeting:

Monday, April 25, 2022 1:00pm-3:00pm

Location: Zoom

Close of Meeting

Moved by: Councillor Devine

Seconded by: Sheri-Lyn Roberts

THAT the Cambridge Accessibility Advisory Committee meeting of March 28, 2022 be adjourned at 2:18 pm.

CARRIED

If you require any accommodations to participate in this meeting, please let Robyn know at hylandr@cambridge.ca or 519 740-4680 ext 4292.

Chair
Dan Lajoie

Council Committee Services Coordinator
Mallory Greenough
The regular meeting of the Economic Development Advisory Committee of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge was held via Zoom Video Conferencing. T. Sandor welcomed everyone present and called the meeting to order at 3:47 p.m. The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Notice of Regrets
Regrets were received from P. Brown, F. Ivanovski, D. Drouillard and M. Shanks

Declarations of Pecuniary Interest
There were no declarations of pecuniary interest from committee members.

Presentations
Tim Van Hinte, Region of Waterloo, re: Regional Official Plan Review – Draft Employment Policies

Using a PowerPoint presentation, T. Van Hinte discussed the following in detail:

Following the presentation discussion ensued re: Covid-19 and the impacts the pandemic has had on future planning. T. Van Hinte advised as part of the Regional Official Plan review a land needs assessment is currently underway to forecast the
requirements for the future into 2051. The Principal Planner described in detail some of the different aspects involved in the process and noted the consulting team anticipate delivering preliminary results in the Spring. J. Goodram explained accommodating population and employment growth is an integral part of good community planning. Some key considerations that employers are interested in include shovel ready land and a community with amenities available to attract talent and workforce.

The following items were discussed as group, the future of manufacturing, leveraging technology through product efficiency, the growing trend of skill sets in robotics, automation and engineering, improved public transit, and alternative ways of measuring success and employment in the region. The intent overall is to find a balance of jobs per hectare across the region and employment areas and to intensify where possible. J. Goodram to provide the jobs per hectare in the Boxwood Business Campus in Cambridge noting there are some higher and lower densities and a variety of uses.

**Confirmation of Minutes**

Moved by: Councillor Pam Wolf  
Seconded by: Brian Punambolam

THAT the minutes of the Economic Development Advisory Committee held on Wednesday, February 9, 2022, be considered for errors and/or omissions.

CARRIED

**Agenda Items**

a) Core Areas Financial Incentives

Economic Development staff will be bringing a report forward in April to request Council grant delegated authority over the financial incentive programs of the Core Areas Community Improvement Plan to the Chief Financial Officer and the Director of Economic Development for final approval. The change will accelerate application and approval times increasing customer satisfaction. Economic Development will be reporting the success of the programs to Council on a bi-annual basis.

b) GRT Transit Changes

The Region of Waterloo’s Transit Planner will be presenting to EDAC to review the proposed changes to the transit routes. The modifications are scheduled to take effect in September 2022. The first draft of the $2M investment in Cambridge has been
reviewed by city staff and a follow up meeting will be taking place to discuss route changes to ensure necessary connections are being provided while maintaining efficiency.

**Additions to the Agenda**
None

**Business Arising from the Minutes**
None

**Council Update**
It was advised that a number of high rise buildings are being proposed for development at the former Challenger site in Hespeler. There has been an increase in development applications coming forward.

It was noted that “Placemaking” continues to be a priority for the City.

**Other Business**
None

**City/Priority List Items for Updates**

a) **Patio Report**

On March 1st Council approved the budget to fund and implement the 2022 Temporary Patios and Temporary Road Closure project. Staff is facilitating the patios on public and private property and the City is waiving its “Sidewalk Terrace Application” fee for sidewalk patios until December 31, 2022. The closure of part of Main Street in Downtown Cambridge will take place from May 20, 2022 to October 10, 2022, and part of Queen Street in Hespeler Village on Friday afternoons to Sunday evenings only from May 27, 2022 to October 9, 2022. The BIA’s and City staff have received extremely positive feedback on the programs and will continue annually.

b) **Annual Film Report 2020/2021**

The 2020/2021 Annual Film Report was presented to Council as information on March 1st. Film continues to be an ongoing focus as staff is projecting positive growth in that area.
c) Downtown Development Charge Exemption Update

As a follow up to the February committee meeting regarding the Downtown Development Charge Exemption it was shared that a secondary report is tentatively scheduled for April 19th City Council with staff recommendations. Councillor Reid and Councillor Wolf explained that Council are taking many considerations into account before making a final decision. The intent is to be fair and find a balanced approach. J. Goodram reviewed the site plan application process to address some concerns/inquiries and group members provided their feedback for consideration.

Future Suggested Presentations for EDAC

a) Zoning By-Law (Manager of Development Planning)
b) Economic Development Strategic Plan (2022 Project)
c) Growth and Intensification Study (L. Prime)
d) Major developments
e) Affordable housing
f) Job creation/retention (what sectors? Can we be of assistance?)
g) Transportation and infrastructure improvements (401, GO Train)
h) Branding and marketing of the North Cambridge Business Park

Next Meeting

Wednesday, April 13, 2022
Virtual Meeting
Zoom Video Conferencing
3:45 to 5:30 p.m.

Close of Meeting

Moved by: Scott MacKenzie
Seconded by: Neil Morgan

THAT the Wednesday, March 9, 2022 meeting of the Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC) does now adjourn at 4:55 p.m.

CARRIED
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April 06, 2022

Office of the Prime Minister
80 Wellington Street
Ottawa, ON
K1A 0A2

Dear Mr. Trudeau:

Re: Resolution # 2022-241 – HST rebate on new homes in Ontario

Please be advised that the following resolution was passed at the April 06, 2022 meeting of the Council of the Municipality of Grey Highlands.

2022-241
Paul Allen, Dane Nielsen

Whereas attainable housing has been a concern of hopeful homeowners for many years; and
Whereas attainable housing is a priority of all levels of government; and
Whereas the Government of Ontario will rebate a portion of the provincial part of HST paid for a house to a maximum of $24,000 if HST was paid on the land, or $16,080 if HST was not paid on the land regardless of the fair market value of the house; and
Whereas the Government of Canada will rebate a portion of the federal part of HST paid for a house only if the fair market value is under $450,000; and
Whereas the average fair market value of a new home in Ontario is well above the $450,000 threshold; now
Therefore be it resolved that the Municipality of Grey Highlands requests that the Federal government remove or increase the $450,000 fair market value threshold to reflect today’s housing costs; and
That council direct staff to circulate this resolution to Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, Premier Doug Ford, MP Alex Ruff, MPP Bill Walker, Provincial and Federal Finance Ministers, The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, AMO, Grey Bruce Home Builders and Trades Association, Ontario Home Builders Association and all Municipalities in Ontario.
CARRIED.
If you require anything further, please contact this office.

Sincerely,

Amanda Fines-VanAlstine
Council & Committee Coordinator
Municipality of Grey Highlands

cc. Premier, Doug Ford
    MP, Alex Ruff
    MPP, Bill Walker
    Federal Minister of Finance, Chrystia Freeland
    Provincial Minister of Finance, Peter Bethlenfalvy
    Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
    Association of Municipalities Ontario
    Grey Bruce Home Builders’ Association
    Ontario Home Builders’ Association
    All Municipalities in Ontario
April 11, 2022

BY EMAIL ONLY TO: clerk@township.limerick.on.ca

THE TOWNSHIP OF LIMERICK
89 Limerick Lake Road
Gilmour, On K0L 1W0

ATTENTION: Mayor Carl Stefanski

Dear Sir:

At the regular meeting of council held on March 01, 2022, members reviewed your Resolution dated January 17, 2022. The following resolution was adopted:

MOTION NO.: 2022-066

MOVED BY: BOB BRIDGER

SECONDED BY: ROY REEDS

RESOLVED, THAT Council supports Limerick Township request for increased consideration and more accurate reporting methods in the interpretation of the geographic areas that will be benefiting from spraying to combat Gypsy moth infestations as populations for reporting are not as dense in some areas although the devastation is severe.

Carried: LIBBY CLARKE, Head of Council

Sincerely,

Nancy Carrol
Clerk-Treasurer
Enclosure
April 13th, 2022

The Corporation of the City of Cambridge
Corporate Services Department
50 Dickinson Street, P.O. Box 669
Cambridge, ON
N1R 5W8

e-mail: mantond@cambridge.ca

Your correspondence dated March 31, 2022 was received by Harley Township Council at their meeting of April 12th, 2022 and the following resolution was passed:

Resolution No. 2022-046
That we, the Council of the Township of Harley do hereby, acknowledge receipt of the City of Cambridge's resolution requesting the provincial government impose a moratorium on all new gravel applications, including expansions to existing licensed sites, pending a board consultation process that would include First Nations, affected communities, independent experts and scientists, to chart a new path forward for the extraction and processing of aggregates in southern Ontario which:

i. Proposes criteria and processes for determining the need for new aggregate licenses (including the expansion to existing licenses);

ii. Recommends updated policies and restrictions for aggregate extraction below the water table to reflect current groundwater sciences; including quarterly water monitoring reports;

ii. Assess the cumulative impacts of aggregate operations in terms of off-site impacts to environmental systems. the groundwater regime and baseflow contributions to area watercourses, wetlands, etc.; area habitat including corridors; traffic along haul routes; and, dust and noise emissions;

iii. Develops new guidelines for reprocessing/recycling concrete and asphalt products in order to ensure sustainable aggregate supplies;

v. Recommends a fair levy for aggregate extraction that includes compensation for the full environmental and infrastructure maintenance costs to the local community of extraction and distribution of aggregate;
vi. Provides greater weight to the input by local municipalities to lessen the social impacts from aggregate extraction and truck haul routes through their communities; and

Direct municipal staff to issue a letter of support to the City of Cambridge.
“CARRIED”

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Jordan Kemp
Clerk-Treasurer
Township of Harley

JMKlp
April 12, 2022

City of Cambridge
50 Dickson Street P.O. Box 669
Cambridge ON N1R 5W8

SENT TO: mantond@cambridge.ca

Attention: Danielle Manton City Clerk

Dear Ms Manton:

Re: Request to impose a moratorium on all new gravel applications, including expansions to existing licensed sites

At its regular meeting of Council held on April 6, 2022, the Township of Amarnath Council wished to show support to the City of Cambridge in the motion concerning a moratorium on all new gravel applications. Accordingly, the following motion was carried:

Resolution #7
Moved by: G. Little – Seconded by: H. Foster
BE IT RESOLVED THAT:
Council support the Township of North Dumfries and City of Cambridge in their call for a moratorium on all new gravel applications.
CARRIED.

Please do not hesitate to contact the office if you require any further information in this matter.

Yours truly,

Nicole Martin, Dipl. M.A.
CAO/Clerk – Acting Treasurer
Re: Item for Discussion – Request for AMO to Review Challenges to Development in Relation to the Ontario Land Tribunal

At its meeting of March 30, 2022, the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Bracebridge ratified motions 22-PD-040, regarding the Item for Discussion – Request for AMO to Review Challenges to Development in Relation to the Ontario Land Tribunal, as follows:

“That WHEREAS the appeals to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) are often delayed as a result of significant administrative challenges despite statutory timeframes for decision making at the municipal level;

AND WHEREAS the OLT hears and decides appeals and matters related to land use planning, environmental and natural features and heritage protection, land valuation, land compensation, municipal finance, and related matters;

AND WHEREAS the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO), through its mandate, provides a mechanism to develop policy positions and reports on issues of general interest to municipal governments; and conducts ongoing liaison with provincial government elected and non-elected representatives, among other activities;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT The Corporation of the Town of Bracebridge requests the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) to review the administrative processes of the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) and advocate for all Ontario Municipalities to resolve the challenges to development in Ontario related to the OLT mandate;

AND FURTHER THAT a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, and all Ontario municipalities.”

In accordance with Council’s direction I am forwarding you a copy of the resolution for your 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
April 20, 2022

VIA EMAIL ONLY

The Honourable Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building
Queen's Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1
premier@ontario.ca

Attention: Premier Ford

Re: Funding Support for Infrastructure Projects - Bridge and Culvert Replacements in Rural Municipalities

Please be advised that on April 20, 2022, The Council of the Municipality of Hastings Highlands resolved the following:

(139-2022) Consent Agenda Item
That Council for the Municipality of Hastings Highlands accept for information the February 9, 2022 correspondence from Township of Clearview regarding their letter to Premier Ford for funding support for infrastructure projects, bridge and culvert replacements in rural municipalities; and
That Council support the Township of Clearview February 7, 2022 resolution requesting that Federal and Provincial Governments to provide more funding to rural municipalities to support infrastructure projects related to major bridge and culvert replacements; and
That Council direct that this resolution be forwarded to Ontario municipalities, AMO, Premier of Ontario, Provincial Minister of Finance, Federal Finance Minister and ROMA for support.

Please accept this for your consideration and any necessary action.

Regards,

Suzanne Huschilt
Municipal Clerk

cc:
Hon. Peter Bethenfalvy, Ontario Minister of Finance minister.fin@ontario.ca
Hon. Chrystia Freeland, Federal Minister of Finance chrystia.freeland@fin.gc.ca
ROMA roma@roma.on.ca
AMO amo@amo.on.ca
All Ontario Municipalities
April 20, 2022

Honourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Via Email

Re: Build it Right the First Time

Please be advised that Council for the Town of Halton Hills at its meeting of Monday, April 11, 2022, adopted the following Resolution:

Resolution No. 2022-0077

WHEREAS The Town of Halton Hills made a commitment through its Climate Change Emergency Resolution adopted in May 2019 to reach net-zero GHG emissions by the year 2030, which is consistent with the current scientific data indicating that this is required by all jurisdictions if we are to avoid catastrophic climate-related events;

AND WHEREAS Residential and commercial buildings account for 33% of the GHG emissions in Halton Hills;

AND WHEREAS The Town of Halton Hills is actively implementing its Low Carbon Transition Strategy and has committed millions of dollars in the current budget to upgrade energy efficiency in its corporate building stock;

AND WHEREAS The Town of Halton Hills has adopted its third upgraded iteration of its Green Development Standards to ensure that all new buildings are built above the current Ontario Building Code mandatory requirements;

AND WHEREAS the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing is consulting on changes for the next edition of the Ontario Building Code (ERO #019-4974) that generally aligns with the draft National Model Building Code except it does not propose adopting energy performance tiers, it does not propose timelines for increasing minimum energy performance standards step-by-step to the highest energy performance tier, and according to Efficiency Canada and The Atmospheric Fund, it proposes adopting minimum energy performance standards that do not materially improve on the requirements in the current Ontario Building Code;

AND WHEREAS The greenhouse gas reduction targets set out in municipal climate Change strategies across the province will not be achievable without a commitment by the Provincial government to use this opportunity with respect to updates to Ontario Building Code to upgrade the energy efficiency of all new builds in line with other Provinces and the National Standards;

AND WHEREAS ensuring that all new buildings in the Province of Ontario are built to the highest energy efficiency means that they will not need expensive retrofits in the future and the cost of heating and cooling these buildings will be reduced from the moment they are first occupied;
AND WHEREAS the lack of strong energy efficiency standards in the current and proposed OBC have resulted in the costly development of local green development standards as individual municipalities are forced to negotiate energy upgrades as they strive to meet their GHG reduction goals (Halton Hills, Toronto, Whitby, Pickering, City of Waterloo);

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council request the Province of Ontario to include energy performance tiers and timelines for increasing minimum energy performance standards step-by-step to the highest energy performance tier in the next edition of the Ontario Building Code, consistent with the intent of the draft National Model Building code and the necessity of bold and immediate provincial action on climate change;

AND FURTHER THAT if the OBC is not upgraded to the National Model Building Code that municipalities be given the authority to adopt a higher level of energy efficiency consistent with the National Building Code;

AND FURTHER THAT this resolution be provided to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, to Halton MPP’s to the leaders of all Provincial political parties and to all Ontario Municipalities.

Attached for your information is a copy of Resolution No. 2022-0077.

If you have any questions, please contact Valerie Petryniak, Town Clerk for the Town of Halton Hills at valeriep@haltonhills.ca.

Sincerely,

Melissa Lawr
Deputy Clerk – Legislation

cc. Halton MPP’s
    leaders of all Provincial political parties
    all Ontario municipalities
WHEREAS The Town of Halton Hills made a commitment through its Climate Change Emergency Resolution adopted in May 2019 to reach net-zero GHG emissions by the year 2030, which is consistent with the current scientific data indicating that this is required by all jurisdictions if we are to avoid catastrophic climate-related events;

AND WHEREAS Residential and commercial buildings account for 33% of the GHG emissions in Halton Hills;

AND WHEREAS The Town of Halton Hills is actively implementing its Low Carbon Transition Strategy and has committed millions of dollars in the current budget to upgrade energy efficiency in its corporate building stock;

AND WHEREAS The Town of Halton Hills has adopted its third upgraded iteration of its Green Development Standards to ensure that all new buildings are built above the current Ontario Building Code mandatory requirements;

AND WHEREAS the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing is consulting on changes for the next edition of the Ontario Building Code (ERO #019-4974) that generally aligns with the draft National Model Building Code except it does not propose adopting energy performance tiers, it does not propose timelines for increasing minimum energy performance standards step-by-step to the highest energy performance tier, and according to Efficiency Canada and The Atmospheric Fund, it proposes adopting minimum energy performance standards that do not materially improve on the requirements in the current Ontario Building Code;
AND WHEREAS The greenhouse gas reduction targets set out in municipal climate Change strategies across the province will not be achievable without a commitment by the Provincial government to use this opportunity with respect to updates to Ontario Building Code to upgrade the energy efficiency of all new builds in line with other Provinces and the National Standards;

AND WHEREAS ensuring that all new buildings in the Province of Ontario are built to the highest energy efficiency means that they will not need expensive retrofits in the future and the cost of heating and cooling these buildings will be reduced from the moment they are first occupied;

AND WHEREAS the lack of strong energy efficiency standards in the current and proposed OBC have resulted in the costly development of local green development standards as individual municipalities are forced to negotiate energy upgrades as they strive to meet their GHG reduction goals (Halton Hills, Toronto, Whitby, Pickering, City of Waterloo);

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council request the Province of Ontario to include energy performance tiers and timelines for increasing minimum energy performance standards step-by-step to the highest energy performance tier in the next edition of the Ontario Building Code, consistent with the intent of the draft National Model Building code and the necessity of bold and immediate provincial action on climate change;

AND FURTHER THAT if the OBC is not upgraded to the National Model Building Code that municipalities be given the authority to adopt a higher level of energy efficiency consistent with the National Building Code;

AND FURTHER THAT this resolution be provided to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, to Halton MPP’s to the leaders of all Provincial political parties and to all Ontario Municipalities.

________________________
Mayor Rick Bonnette
April 19, 2022

RE: TOWN OF GRAVENHURST RESOLUTION – YEAR OF THE GARDEN

At the Town of Gravenhurst Committee of the Whole meeting held on April 12, 2022 the following resolution was passed:

WHEREAS the Year of the Garden 2022 celebrates the Centennial of Canada’s horticulture sector;

AND WHEREAS gardens and gardening contribute to the quality of life of our municipality and create safe and healthy places where people can come together;

AND WHEREAS the Year of the Garden 2022 highlights and celebrates the important contribution of gardeners, our local gardening organizations, horticultural professionals and local horticultural;

AND WHEREAS gardens and gardening have helped us face the challenges of the COVID-19 Pandemic;

AND WHEREAS Communities in Bloom, in collaboration with the Canadian Garden Council, invites all municipalities to celebrate the Year of the Garden;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the correspondence from the City of Port Colborne be received for information;

AND THAT the Town of Gravenhurst, along with other communities across Canada, celebrate 2022 as the Year of the Garden and recognizes the contribution of gardens and gardening to the development of our country, our Town and the lives of our citizens in terms of health, quality of life and environmental challenges;

AND FINALLY THAT a copy of this resolution be provided to all municipalities in Ontario.
Sincerely,

J.G.

Jacob Galvao
Administrative Clerk II – Legislative Services
Town of Gravenhurst
April 19, 2022

RE: TOWN OF GRAVENHURST RESOLUTION – RUSSIAN SANCTIONS

At the Town of Gravenhurst Committee of the Whole meeting held on April 12, 2022 the following resolution was passed:

WHEREAS the country of Ukraine has experienced a premeditated and unprovoked invasion by Russia;

AND WHEREAS silence is complicity;

AND WHEREAS Canada imports hundreds of millions of dollars’ worth of goods from Russia each year;

AND WHEREAS negative financial impacts upon a country can be used as a means to deter further conflict;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT the Correspondence from the Town of Georgina regarding sanctions on Russia be received for information;

AND THAT The Town of Gravenhurst unequivocally denounces Russia's unjustifiable war against Ukraine;

AND THAT the Town of Gravenhurst supports the sanctions which the Federal government of Canada has thus far imposed on Russia;

AND THAT effective immediately and until a time when the sovereignty of Ukraine is once again unchallenged, the Town of Gravenhurst will:
  1) Not purchase any products (ie plywood, fertilizer, steel, furniture or machinery) which can be easily traced to have originated from Russia; and
  2) Insist that any future contracts for services for the Town of Gravenhurst abide by these same limitations within our municipality;

AND THAT upon confirmation that the Belarusian military is engaged within Ukraine that the Town of Gravenhurst apply these limitations upon goods from that country as well;
AND THAT this decision of Gravenhurst Council be forwarded to all other municipalities within Ontario requesting they enact similar measures so that as a united front we can make a noticeable difference.

Sincerely,

J.G.

Jacob Galvao
Administrative Clerk II – Legislative Services
Town of Gravenhurst
Sent via Email

April 19, 2022

RE: TOWN OF GRAVENHURST RESOLUTION – FLOATING ACCOMMODATIONS

At the Town of Gravenhurst Committee of the Whole meeting held on April 12, 2022 the following resolution was passed:

WHEREAS the Province is currently consulting with municipalities on the use of floating accommodations;

AND WHEREAS public feedback is required to be submitted to the NDMNRF by April 19, 2022;

 THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Administration be directed to submit comments on behalf of the Town of Gravenhurst to include, not limited to:

• qualifications of a “vessel”,
• length (number of days) of time permitted for camping on Crown Land,
• wastewater management; and
• lack of infrastructure (ie pumping stations, hygiene amenities) to support floating accommodations within the Town of Gravenhurst;

AND THAT Administration be directed to Report to Council on what measures can be implemented to restrict the use of Floating Accommodations within the Town of Gravenhurst;

AND FINALLY THAT this motion be circulated to municipalities within the Province of Ontario.

Sincerely,

J.G.

Jacob Galvao
Administrative Clerk II – Legislative Services
Town of Gravenhurst
Staff Report

Meeting Date: April 6, 2022
To: County Council
Report Number: PPW 2022-12
Title: Provincial Request for Comments on Floating Accommodations
Author: Bryan Weir, Director of Planning & Public Works
Approval: Sheridan Graham, CAO
Recommendation: That Report PPW 2022-12 “Provincial Request for Comments on Floating Accommodations” be received, and,
That the report be forwarded to the Province as Peterborough County’s response.

Overview
This report has been prepared in order to provide Council with some background information on Floating Accommodations and to present a set of comments for endorsement to be sent to the Province.

Background
On March 16th, County Council assed the following Resolution:

Resolution No. 115-2022

Moved by Councillor Moher
Seconded by Councillor Clarkson
That staff be directed to review the suggestions outlined by the Province in Correspondence item 6 (Appendix A), gather more details and follow along with the process to avoid any issues in the future.

Carried

In the preparation of this report, the Provincial Posting on the Environmental Registry was reviewed (https://ero.ontario.ca/notice/019-5119 ) as well as O. Reg. 161/17: Occupation of Public Lands under Section 21.1 of the (Public Lands) Act.
The Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry (MNDMNRF) is aware that the occupation of floating accommodations has raised a number of concerns. “Floating Accommodations” are not necessarily limited to houseboats or cabin cruisers but also include other such structures as small cabins that can be used for accommodating people, some with motors or those without motors that are towed out to a location on water and then anchored.

MNDMNRF is not so much concerned with navigation as they are about other matters that have been raised. These include:

- wastewater management
- application of building permits
- duration of use
- advertisings that suggest a range of options for the use of floating accommodations on water
- increasing human pressures on waterways
- impeding access to public land and waterways
- lack of payment of property taxes

While floating accommodations have been viewed by some to represent an economic development and tourism activity, others see the use of floating accommodations as problematic and one which requires further attention.

O.Reg. 161/17 defines “camping unit” as a structure or vehicle that may be used for camping purposes or as an outdoor accommodation and includes a tent, trailer, tent-
trailer, recreational vehicle, camper-back and any watercraft equipped for overnight accommodation.

The ERO posting contains the following explanation:

“A boater may always exercise their right of navigation, which includes reasonable moorage. If a person is not using a “camping unit” or navigating, then occupational authority or other permission is required from our ministry.

We are seeing a change on Ontario’s waterways. Over the years, the use of provincial waterways by watercraft has expanded to include floating accommodations, which are designed primarily to provide accommodation for longer stays (i.e., similar to a cottage) and not for navigation or for camping purposes.”

Analysis
On the previous page, the Province has identified a number of issues related to floating accommodations. However, there are other issues that may deserve some attention as well. These include noise and zoning. Noise By-laws are generally enforced by the local municipality and are usually complaint-driven. By-law enforcement staff will visit the property in question and take appropriate action. However, if the noise originates from a point on the water, does the By-law apply? This legal matter should be investigated by the Province.

With respect to land use planning tools, zoning under The Planning Act is a means to control the indiscriminate use of land. Some local municipalities have taken the position to zone not only lands within their jurisdiction, but also the water bodies. Zoning will specify uses that may occur on the water. They also may trigger a Building Permit for compliance. For those municipalities that have zoning on water, there is a significant challenge in trying to enforce the by-law for floating accommodations whether they be transient or located in one spot for an extended period of time.

It is believed that the Province should review the definition of “camping unit” to narrow the scope of use to account for floating accommodations. Currently, the definition leaves much to interpretation. The other alternative is to define the term “watercraft” in a way that succinctly describes it to exclude floating accommodations like the ones being addressed.

It is also believed that, if floating accommodations of this nature are to be permitted, there needs to be a permit and location registry system together with a fee structure that is robust enough to finance the administration and on-water enforcement of such activities. Similar to land camping in Provincial Parks, the responsibility should rest with the Province.
With respect to actual house boats and their use on the water, it is strongly suggested that operators have completed and successfully passed certification to obtain a boating licence.

The Province, at this time, is merely seeking ideas and approaches to addressing the issue of floating accommodations. Regulatory changes, if proposed, will be posted on the Environmental Registry for public consultation.

Financial Impact
Not applicable.

Anticipated Impacts on Local and/or First Nations Communities
Not applicable as a result of the report.

Alignment to County of Peterborough Strategic Plan Priorities
To provide high quality services to residents, businesses and Townships:

Communications – To elevate the County of Peterborough’s profile, enhance community engagement, and communicate proactively.

Communication Completed/required: Provide Council comments to the Province

Attachments
Appendix A – MNDMNRF correspondence Dated March 3, 2022

Respectfully Submitted,

Bryan Weir
Director of Planning & Public Works

For more information, please contact:
Bryan Weir, Director of Planning & Public Works
bweir@ptbocounty.ca
705-743-0380
April 19, 2022

The Honourable Doug Ford, M.P.P.
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building
Queen's Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1

The Honourable Steve Clark, M.P.P
Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
17th Floor
777 Bay St.
Toronto, ON M5G 2E5

Sent via email: premier@ontario.ca and steve.clark@pc.ola.org

Re: St. Catharines Response to Ontario Housing Affordability Task Force Recommendations
Our File 35.31.18 & 60.73.5

Dear Premier Ford and Minister Clark,

At its meeting held on April 7, 2022, St. Catharines City Council approved the following motion and requested that Minister Clark consider the staff recommendations starting on page 7 of the enclosed report (Report PBS-059-2022):

That Council, via the Mayor’s Office, advise the Premier that the Housing Affordability Task Force recommendations require further evaluation and analysis, including feedback from AMO, ROMA, OPPI, MFOA, and OBCM, prior to implementation; and

That Council strongly recommends that substantial Provincial investment be provided to support municipalities to fund anticipated infrastructure upgrades to accommodate new intensification goals outlined in the Task Force’s recommendations; and

That Council requests the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to consider the staff recommendations starting on page 7 of Report PBS-059-2022; and

That staff forward Report PBS-059-2022 and its Appendices to the Premier, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and local Members of Provincial Parliament; and
That Council recommends the Province remove appeal rights to individuals and parties who appeal affordable housing developments to the OLT; and

Further, that Council’s resolution be shared with Ontario Municipalities for their endorsement.

If you have any questions, please contact the Office of the City Clerk at extension 1524.

Bonnie Nistico-Dunk, City Clerk
Legal and Clerks Services, Office of the City Clerk

cc: Jennifer Stevens, MPP - St. Catharines
    Jeff Burch, MPP - Niagara Centre
    Wayne Gates, MPP - Niagara Falls
    Sam Oosterhoff, MPP - Niagara West-Glanbrook
    Tami Kitay, Director of Planning and Building Services
    Brian York, Director of Economic Development and Government Relations
    Melissa Wenzler, Government Relations Advisor
    Scott Rosts, Chief of Staff, Mayor Sendzik’s Office
    Ontario Municipalities

Encl. Report PBS-059-2022
Report from: Planning and Building Services, Director

Report Date: February 14, 2022

Meeting Date: April 7, 2022

Report Number: PBS-059-2022

File: 35.31.18 & 60.73.5

Subject: St. Catharines Response to Ontario Housing Affordability Task Force Recommendations

Strategic Pillar:

This report aligns with the following St. Catharines Strategic Plan pillars: economic, social, environmental, and cultural.

Recommendation

That Council, via the Mayor’s Office, advise the Premier that the Housing Affordability Task Force recommendations require further evaluation and analysis, including feedback from AMO, ROMA, OPPI, MFOA, and OBCM, prior to implementation; and

That Council strongly recommends that substantial Provincial investment be provided to support municipalities to fund anticipated infrastructure upgrades to accommodate new intensification goals outlined in the Task Force’s recommendations; and

That Council requests the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to consider the staff recommendations starting on page 7 of Report PBS-059-2022; and

That staff forward Report PBS-059-2022 and its Appendices to the Premier, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and local Members of Provincial Parliament; and

Further, that Council’s resolution be shared with Ontario Municipalities for their endorsement.
Summary
On December 6, 2021, the Province appointed a Housing Affordability Task Force to assess how a lack of housing supply bares responsibility for the housing affordability crisis. The Task Force, consisting primarily of private sector development industry representatives, crafted 55 recommendations aimed at supporting market housing affordability. The Task Force is focused on bringing 1.5 million new homes to market in the next 10 years. The recommendations impact many areas of land use planning, municipal financing, cultural heritage assets and public participation. The purpose of this report is to provide a high-level assessment of the recommendations for Council’s information.

Relationship to Strategic Plan
The Provincial Housing Affordability Task Force recommendations, if implemented as currently intended, will negatively impact all four pillars of the City’s Strategic Plan:

- Economic Prosperity: Support the City’s commitment to building and growing a diverse and resilient economy through fiscal responsibility, urban regeneration, and collaborative partnerships.
- Social Well-Being: Build and support strong, inclusive neighbourhoods, that provide high quality of life for residents of all ages.
- Environmental Stewardship: Adopt innovative approaches and continue responsible community planning and decision-making that balances growth, enhances quality of life, manages emergencies, and minimized the environmental impacts of climate change.
- Cultural Renaissance: Celebrate the City’s rich history, diversity, arts and cultural assets through leadership, promotion and investments that support measurable, sustainable creative growth.

Background
Since 2000, Canadian property price increases have significantly outpaced those of wages. The average home price in Canada has quadrupled from 2000 to 2020, whereas the average Canadian family’s income has only increased 37% in the same time period (Statistics Canada). Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation data indicates that in 2020, Toronto was the sixth most expensive city in the world in which to live. Furthermore, the Canadian government has targeted immigration levels of 411,000 new residents in 2022 and 421,000 new residents in 2023. Many of these new residents will settle in major cities and their surrounding areas to contribute to skilled workforce opportunities. In the Greater Golden Horseshoe, a surplus of housing does not exist, which further contributes to a lack of affordable options for new and existing residents.

On December 6, 2021, nine persons were appointed to a Provincial Housing Affordability Task Force to provide the government with recommendations to address market housing supply and affordability.
Specifically, their mandate was to explore housing affordability by:

- Increasing the supply of market rate rental and ownership housing;
- Building housing supply in complete communities;
- Reducing red tape and accelerating timelines;
- Encouraging innovation and digital modernization, such as in the planning processes;
- Supporting economic recovery and job creation; and
- Balancing housing needs with protecting the environment.

The Task Force was chaired by Jake Lawrence, CEO of Global Banking and Markets at Scotiabank. The other appointments included:

1. Lalit Aggarwal, President of Manor Park Holdings
2. David Amborski, Professor at Ryerson’s University’s School of Planning
3. Julie Di Lorenzo, President of Diamante Urban Corp
4. Andrew Garrett, Senior Principal of Real Estate, Investment, and Management Corporation of Ontario
5. Tim Hudak, CEO of the Ontario Real Estate Association
6. Justin Marchand, CEO of Ontario Aboriginal Housing Services
7. Ene Underwood, CEO of Habitat for Humanity GTA
8. David Wilkes, CEO of Building Industry and Land Development Association

On February 8, 2022, the Ontario Housing Affordability Task Force released their report (linked above and attached as Appendix 1) and their 55 recommendations. To date, the Minister has not indicated which of the recommendations will be implemented, nor has a timeline been published.

The recommendations have significant implications for the future of land use planning, city building, heritage preservation, and municipal finance. As such, staff from Planning and Building Services and Financial Management Services have reviewed the Task Force’s recommendations and contributed to the comments in Appendix 2 to this report. The purpose of this report is to share staff’s assessment of the recommendations for Council’s information.

It is recommended that Council advise the Province of their position on these recommendations, despite not being solicited for feedback.

**Report**

The Provincial Housing Affordability Task Force has predicated their recommendations entirely on increasing supply as the primary factor in market housing affordability. It is worth noting that it was not within the Task Force’s mandate to evaluate true affordable housing objectives or actions. The Task Force places a significant portion of culpability on the housing crisis to municipal zoning and slow approvals; costs of development process, including fees, charges, and securities; public consultation, and political influence in decision making.
Of the Task Force’s 62 recommendations (55 core recommendations, 7 sub-recommendations), staff have identified the recommendations that can be supported, those that are neutral or require additional information to provide a determination, and those recommendations that are opposed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations that St. Catharines Staff</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neutral/More Information Needed</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Housing Affordability Task Force’s recommendations and the accompanying staff comments are listed in Appendix 2 of this report.

**Overview of Task Force’s Themes**

The Housing Affordability’s Task Force report, attached as Appendix 1 to this report, identifies 5 themes:

1. Make the creation of housing a greater planning priority, require greater density and broadly expand development rights.
2. Reduce, shorten, and streamline planning application processes and implement province-wide zoning and urban design standards.
3. Depoliticize the planning process by eliminating restrictive zoning and removing neighbourhood character considerations.
4. Fix the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) and prevent abuse of the appeals system.
5. Support municipalities that commit to transforming the system.

**Theme 1:** The City of St. Catharines agrees that increased density and choice in housing supply is necessary to accommodate growing population needs. However, by broadly expanding development rights to the extent identified in the recommendations will result in substandard development, extensive taxpayer burden, infrastructure deficits, and a loss of cultural heritage and parkland attributes that make communities desirable and livable. Furthermore, the Task Force has not demonstrated how any savings attributed to expanded development rights will increase affordability.

**Theme 2:** The City of St. Catharines supports any efforts by the Province to review Provincial ministry and agency development review processes for efficiencies, including adequate resources to ensure quicker turnaround for approvals. Staff do not support shortening Planning Act timeframes further as many delays in the development application review process can be attributed to developers, consultants and external consulting agencies. Province-wide zoning standards can not be supported as they do not consider community context and would be counter productive as it would increase the number of minor variance and zoning by-law amendment applications. Staff also do not support Province-wide urban design standards as different communities have different identities and character and harmonizing the built form of 444 municipalities would destroy the aspects that make cities livable.
**Theme 3:** Staff could support efforts to depoliticize the decision-making process. However, the Task Force recommendations on how to undertake this action are unclear in how they would be screened and administered and furthermore, are borderline undemocratic. The Task Force assumes that public consultation only adds delay and not value to the development process. In staff’s opinion, meaningful public consultation results in better development and less acrimonious appeal processes.

**Theme 4:** Staff are supportive of a comprehensive review of Planning Act appeal rights and Ontario Land Tribunal processes. However, the Task Force recommendations with regards to “preventing abuse of the appeals system” are unclear in how appeals would be screened for abuse (beyond methods the Tribunal currently employs) and seemed to be crafted in a manner to prevent participation by the general public.

**Theme 5:** Staff are appreciative of Provincial support to improve the development approvals process. However, the Task Force’s recommendations in this manner are punitive of municipalities striving for quality development and livable cities and otherwise incentivize insufficient process and substandard development.

**St. Catharines Efforts that Support the Task Force’s Mandate**
The Planning and Building Services Department supports Provincial goals to create additional housing and has undertaken many efforts to remove process barriers to expedite development.

**Incentivization**
The City of St. Catharines incentivizes private development investment through its Community Improvement Plan (CIP) which prioritizes brownfield remediation, affordable housing, heritage preservation and intensification areas. The City’s Development Charges by-law has DC grant programs for downtown development, affordable housing and industrial uses.

**Process Improvement**
The City of St. Catharines is a recipient of the Province’s Streamline Development Fund and has committed to undertaking a process improvement review with a perspective of ensuring an efficient review and evaluation process. In addition, staff are implementing an e-permitting system and online portal for development applications in an effort to simplify the application process and reduce costs incurred by the applicant for mileage, copies of drawings, etc.

**Permissive Official Plan and Zoning By-law**
The City’s Garden City Official is fully implemented by the City’s Zoning By-law leading to the majority of development applications going straight to site plan – including a 30-storey mixed-use tower in the downtown. The City’s lowest density residential zone permits a variety of ground-oriented housing, as of right, including single and semi-detached dwellings, accessory dwelling units, quadplexes, and townhouses removing opportunities for NIMBY (Not In My Backyard) appeals and creating opportunity for gentle density in established neighbourhoods. Furthermore, the downtown enjoys a policy environment with no density cap, no height cap and no parking minimums.
Appeals
The City maintains a very low development application appeal rate. This achievement can be attributed to constructive dialogue with applicants, the public and commenting agencies, focusing on an outcome-based approach. In fact, there are only four matters currently in front of the OLT – three of which are for one development proposal and one on a city-wide Official Plan Amendment meant to implement the Province’s Growth Plan. All four appeals were filed by developers and not the general public.

St. Catharines Housing Action Plan
The City of St. Catharines anticipated the rising cost of housing in 2017 and responded with Council’s approval of a Housing Action Plan. Among other recommendations, the report proposed the following actions:

• Amend the Official Plan’s condominium conversion policies;
• Amend the Zoning By-law to address accessory dwelling units;
• Streamline affordable housing development applications;
• Amend the Zoning By-law to incorporate the possibility of inclusionary zoning;
• Amend the Community Improvement Plan to include an affordable housing program;
• Participate in the Regional Development Charge Review; and
• Advocate for the development of affordable housing projects and related funding programs.

The City has implemented all of the above actions; save and except for an inclusionary zoning practice which is currently under development.

Surplus Lands Task Force
City Council has created a Surplus Lands Task Force dedicated to the review of surplus municipal lands and positioning of the lands to be developed for affordable, supportive, and/or rent geared to income housing. The City has declared two properties surplus so far and have entertained proposals to develop housing that supports a range of affordable, rent geared to income, and market housing at 6-8 Academy Street and 320 Geneva Street. The City has entered into an agreement with Penn Terra Group Ltd., Bethlehem Housing, and Habitat for Humanity to see the development of a former City property to 43% affordable housing, 14% social housing and 43% market rate housing. Furthermore, there will be 180 rental units and 32 townhomes, 19,000 sq.ft. of commercial space and three community gardens.

Staff Response to Task Force Recommendations
Staff question the Task Force’s fundamental premise that broadly increasing development rights while decimating a municipality’s ability to collect payment for growth related infrastructure, recreational and park improvements will translate to the development of market affordable housing. It is generally understood that the market will pay for what the market can bare and the recommendations do not guarantee that any financial savings enjoyed by the developer through the stripping of the land use planning system will be passed on to the end user.
The City of St. Catharines has an in-effect policy environment that permits, as of right, the development of 14,390 dwelling units to accommodate an additional population of 31,390 (STC Land Needs Assessment, adopted by Council November 2020. Approved by Niagara Region Council March 2021. Appealed by developer April 2021 and currently awaiting Ontario Land Tribunal decision). The City has no authority or ability to force the development of those units. In addition to a permissive Official Plan and Zoning By-Law framework discussed above, staff can advise that unlimited development rights have not resulted in a measurable increase in housing supply or contribution to housing affordability.

The Housing Affordability Task Force is especially dismissive of the value that heritage conservation brings to the community, ignores opportunities for adaptive reuse and expansion and ignores that many heritage assets can be reused for multiple residential unit conversions. In the City of St. Catharines, there are several examples of heritage schools being converted to residential dwelling units, heritage homes being converted from a single unit to multiple dwellings and heritage industrial buildings being converted to residential dwellings. The City supports two heritage advisory committees and responsibly utilizes the tools of the Ontario Heritage Act to designate and list buildings of interest. The City is mindful of property rights and works to achieve balance, collaboration and cooperation with property owners.

The City of St. Catharines relies on municipal taxes, fees and development charges to forecast, budget and plan for community service investment, maintenance and replacement for the infrastructure that residents rely on. Should the municipality's ability to collect growth related fees from development be significantly reduced, as recommended by the Task Force, the City will have to make the decision to drastically reduce service levels or raise property taxes to fund growth related costs. While staff can understand how the reduction of these fees would benefit the applicant, there is no guarantee provided that demonstrates the cost savings being passed to the occupant. Furthermore, there is nothing to suggest that these recommendations would create additional housing supply and diversity.

The City of St. Catharines prides itself on supporting the tender fruit lands and its thriving grape growing capabilities. Niagara prides itself on its wine making innovations and is known around the world for the quality of its wines, its festivals and the many industries that thrive from this specialty crop area. The City and staff do not support the expansion of urban boundaries or municipal boundaries to permit development on these lands. The Task Force’s recommendation in this regard is directly contrary to the Province’s Greenbelt Plan and would be detrimental to the highest quality food producing soil and microclimate in the Province.

**Staff Recommendations to the Task Force**

Staff suggest that the Minister could consider the following items to achieve additional housing affordability:

- Regulate the Ontario Real Estate Association to discourage blind bidding, unethical pricing practices and realtor hoarding of residential units.
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• Disincentivize house flipping for profit through capital gains tax for any property bought, improved and sold within 12 months.
• Assess, evaluate and leverage all Provincially owned land for residential suitability and make available for true affordable housing providers, where suitable.
• Empower municipalities to zone for residential tenure to ensure multi-residential developments have a mix of rental and ownership tenures at strategic intensification areas such as downtown, MTSA and intensification corridors.
• Modify taxation systems to encourage and incentivize the construction and operation of purpose built rental, cooperative living, truly affordable housing and housing to support racialized communities.
• Undertake a Planning Act reform process, with an advisory committee of municipal planners and lawyers, to instill consistency, clarity, and intent of the Act. Pre-submission consultations must be considered a development application. Furthermore, loopholes routinely exploited for substandard applications must be closed to provide integrity to the process (i.e. the clock must stop when an application is deemed incomplete).
• Reinstate the intent of the Bill 139 Planning Act amendments that saw the elimination of “de novo” hearings, consider decisions made by municipal Councils and to adjudicate only on contested matters of land use planning.
• Redirect any ministry budget surpluses to a fund that directly creates truly affordable housing units.

Consultation
It is noted that the Task Force did not seek or include feedback from the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO), Rural Ontario Municipalities Association (ROMA), Ontario Professional Planners Institute (OPPI), Ontario Big City Mayors (OBCM), or numerous other organizations, agencies or Provincial Ministries whose mandates would be impacted by these recommendations. The composition of the Housing Affordability Task Force represents a perspective of supporting the building industry’s desire for expedited approvals while sacrificing many of the aspects that make cities livable. Prior to the implementation of any of the Task Force’s recommendations, the City strongly recommends that a comprehensive review and consultation take place with the aforementioned agencies, municipalities, and bodies.

Financial Implications
There are no financial implications associated with this report. However, if these recommendations are implemented as currently worded there will be significant impacts to municipal finances. These would represent a shift from “growth pays for growth” to the taxpayer subsidizing development to the benefit of the developer. Should the Task Force’s recommendations be implemented there is no evidence to suggest that the costs savings to be realized by the developer would be transferred to the end user.
Environmental Sustainability Implications
There are no environmental sustainability implications associated with this report. However, if these recommendations are implemented as currently worded there will be a significant decrease in the municipality’s ability to invest in resilient infrastructure and parkland development.

Conclusion
The City of St. Catharines has undertaken numerous proactive policy and regulatory approaches to expedite development that implements the vision set out in the Garden City Official Plan, which has been brought into conformity with the Province’s Growth Plan population targets. The City has demonstrated commitment to Provincial goals of creating more housing, providing a greater mix of housing types, and expediting approvals, where under municipal control. However, staff have concerns with the fundamental premise of the Task Force’s recommendations that by reducing “barriers” to development in favour of developers that the market will flood with supply and housing costs will substantially decrease.

The City has championed unlimited development rights in the downtown since 2010 (no height cap, no density cap, no required parking) and until 2021, little attempt was made to capitalize on these benefits. The development industry will always phase development to reduce downward pressure on price, full well knowing that the purchase price will always be set by what the market can bare. Staff remain concerned that many of the Task Force’s recommendations will negatively impact public consultation, municipal revenues, municipal autonomy and many aspects of city building that improve livability. None of the recommendations are guaranteed to reduce the cost of housing to the end user.

Overall, staff are not confident that the implementation of the Task Force’s recommendations will succeed at improving housing affordability.

Notifications
It would be prudent to notify the following individuals of Council’s recommendation:

- Niagara Regional Council
- Grape Growers Association
- Rural Ontario Municipalities Association
- Association of Municipalities of Ontario
- Ontario Professional Planners Institute
- Office of the Premier
- Steve Clarke, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
- Jennie Stevens, MPP
- Sam Oosterhoff, MPP
- Jeff Burch, MPP
- Niagara Home Builders Association
- Niagara Construction Association
- Ontario Federation of Agriculture
Prepared and Submitted by
Tami Kitay, MPA MCIP RPP
Director of Planning and Building Services

Approved by
Dave Oakes, MPA
Chief Administrative Officer
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Dear Minister Clark,

Hard-working Ontarians are facing a housing crisis. For many years, the province has not built enough housing to meet the needs of our growing population. While the affordability crisis began in our large cities, it has now spread to smaller towns and rural communities.

Efforts to cool the housing market have only provided temporary relief to home buyers. The long-term trend is clear: house prices are increasing much faster than Ontarian’s incomes. The time for action is now.

When striking the Housing Affordability Task Force, you and Premier Ford were clear: you wanted actionable, concrete solutions to help Ontarians and there was no time to waste. You asked us to be bold and gave us the freedom and independence to develop our recommendations.

In the past two months, we have met municipal leaders, planners, unions, developers and builders, the financial sector, academics, think tanks and housing advocates. Time was short, but solutions emerged consistently around these themes:

- More housing density across the province
- End exclusionary municipal rules that block or delay new housing
- Depoliticize the housing approvals process
- Prevent abuse of the housing appeals system
- Financial support to municipalities that build more housing

We present this report to you not as an “all or nothing” proposal, but rather as a list of options that the government has at its disposal to help address housing affordability for Ontarians and get more homes built. We propose an ambitious but achievable target: 1.5 million new homes built in the next ten years.

Parents and grandparents are worried that their children will not be able to afford a home when they start working or decide to start a family. Too many Ontarians are unable to live in their preferred city or town because they cannot afford to buy or rent.

The way housing is approved and built was designed for a different era when the province was less constrained by space and had fewer people. But it no longer meets the needs of Ontarians. The balance has swung too far in favour of lengthy consultations, bureaucratic red tape, and costly appeals. It is too easy to oppose new housing and too costly to build. We are in a housing crisis and that demands immediate and sweeping reforms.

It has been an honour to serve as Chair, and I am proud to submit this report on behalf of the entire Task Force.

Jake Lawrence
Chair, Housing Affordability Task Force
Chief Executive Officer and Group Head, Global Banking and Markets, Scotiabank
Executive summary and recommendations

House prices in Ontario have almost tripled in the past 10 years, growing much faster than incomes. This has home ownership beyond the reach of most first-time buyers across the province, even those with well-paying jobs. Housing has become too expensive for rental units and it has become too expensive in rural communities and small towns. The system is not working as it should.

For too long, we have focused on solutions to “cool” the housing market. It is now clear that we do not have enough homes to meet the needs of Ontarians today, and we are not building enough to meet the needs of our growing population. If this problem is not fixed – by creating more housing to meet the growing demand – housing prices will continue to rise. We need to build more housing in Ontario.

This report sets out recommendations that would set a bold goal and clear direction for the province, increase density, remove exclusionary rules that prevent housing growth, prevent abuse of the appeals process, and make sure municipalities are treated as partners in this process by incentivizing success.

Setting bold targets and making new housing the planning priority

Recommendations 1 and 2 urge Ontario to set a bold goal of adding 1.5 million homes over the next 10 years and update planning guidance to make this a priority.

The task force then recommends actions in five main areas to increase supply:

Require greater density

Land is not being used efficiently across Ontario. In too many neighbourhoods, municipal rules only allow single-family homes – not even a granny suite. Taxpayers have invested heavily in subway, light rail, bus and rail lines and highways, and the streets nearby are ideally suited for more mid- and high-rise housing. Underused or redundant commercial and industrial buildings are ripe to be redeveloped into housing or mixed commercial and residential use. New housing on undeveloped land should also be higher density than traditional suburbs, especially close to highways.

Adding density in all these locations makes better use of infrastructure and helps to save land outside urban boundaries. Implementing these recommendations will provide Ontarians with many more options for housing.

Recommendations 3 through 11 address how Ontario can quickly create more housing supply by allowing more housing in more locations “as of right” (without the need for municipal approval) and make better use of transportation investments.

Reduce and streamline urban design rules

Municipalities require numerous studies and set all kinds of rules for adding housing, many of which go well beyond the requirements of the provincial Planning Act. While some of this guidance has value for urban design, some rules appear to be arbitrary and not supported by evidence – for example, requiring condo buildings to include costly parking stalls even though many go unsold. These rules and requirements result in delays and extra costs that make housing either impossible to build or very expensive for the eventual home buyer or renter.

Recommendation 12 would set uniform provincial standards for urban design, including building shadows and setbacks, do away with rules that prioritize preservation of neighbourhood physical character over new housing, no longer require municipal approval of design matters like a building’s colour, texture, type of material or window details, and remove or reduce parking requirements in cities over 50,000 in population.
Depoliticize the process and cut red tape

NIMBYism (not in my backyard) is a major obstacle to building housing. It drags out the approval process, pushes up costs, and keeps out new residents. Because local councillors depend on the votes of residents who want to keep the status quo, the planning process has become politicized. Municipalities allow far more public consultation than is required, often using formats that make it hard for working people and families with young children to take part. Too few technical decisions are delegated to municipal staff. Pressure to designate buildings with little or no heritage value as “heritage” if development is proposed and bulk listings of properties with “heritage potential” are also standing in the way of getting homes built. Dysfunction throughout the system, risk aversion and needless bureaucracy have resulted in a situation where Ontario lags the rest of Canada and the developed world in approval times. Ontarians have waited long enough.

Recommendations 13 through 25 would require municipalities to limit consultations to the legislated maximum, ensure people can take part digitally, mandate the delegation of technical decisions, prevent abuse of the heritage process and see property owners compensated for financial loss resulting from designation, restore the right of developers to appeal Official Plans and Municipal Comprehensive Reviews, legislate timelines for approvals and enact several other common sense changes that would allow housing to be built more quickly and affordably.

Fix the Ontario Land Tribunal

Largely because of the politicization of the planning process, many proponents look to the Tribunal, a quasi-judicial body, to give the go-ahead to projects that should have been approved by the municipality. Even when there is municipal approval, however, opponents appeal to the Tribunal – paying only a $400 fee – knowing that this may well succeed in delaying a project to the point where it might no longer make economic sense. As a result, the Tribunal faces a backlog of more than 1,000 cases and is seriously under-resourced.

Recommendations 26 through 31 seek to weed out or prevent appeals aimed purely at delaying projects, allow adjudicators to award costs to proponents in more cases, including instances where a municipality has refused an approval to avoid missing a legislated deadline, reduce the time to issue decisions, increase funding, and encourage the Tribunal to prioritize cases that would increase housing supply quickly as it tackles the backlog.

Support municipalities that commit to transforming the system

Fixing the housing crisis needs everyone working together. Delivering 1.5 million homes will require the provincial and federal governments to invest in change. Municipalities that make the difficult but necessary choices to grow housing supply should be rewarded, and those that resist new housing should see funding reductions.

Recommendations 49 and 50 call for Ontario government to create a large “Ontario Housing Delivery Fund” and encourage the federal government to match funding, and suggest how the province should reward municipalities that support change and reduce funding for municipalities that do not.

This executive summary focuses on the actions that will get the most housing units approved and built in the shortest time. Other recommendations in the report deal with issues that are important but may take more time to resolve or may not directly increase supply (recommendation numbers are indicated in brackets): improving tax and municipal financing (32-37, 39, 42-44); encouraging new pathways to home ownership (38, 40, 41); and addressing labour shortages in the construction industry (45-47).

This is not the first attempt to “fix the housing system”. There have been efforts for years to tackle increasing housing prices and find solutions. This time must be different. Recommendations 50-55 set out ways of helping to ensure real and concrete progress on providing the homes Ontarians need.
Introduction

Ontario is in a housing crisis. Prices are skyrocketing: the average price for a house across Ontario was $923,000 at the end of 2021. Ten years ago, the average price was $329,000. Over that period, average house prices have climbed 180% while average incomes have grown roughly 38%.

Not long ago, hard-working Ontarians – teachers, construction workers, small business owners – could afford the home they wanted. In small towns, it was reasonable to expect that you could afford a home in the neighbourhood you grew up in. Today, home ownership or finding a quality rental is now out of reach for too many Ontarians. The system is not working as it should be.

Housing has become too expensive for rental units and it has become too expensive in rural communities and small towns.

While people who were able to buy a home a decade or more ago have built considerable personal equity, the benefits of having a home aren’t just financial. Having a place to call home connects people to their community, creates a gathering place for friends and family, and becomes a source of pride.

Today, the reality for an ever-increasing number of Ontarians is quite different. Everyone in Ontario knows people who are living with the personal and financial stress of not being able to find housing they can afford. The young family who can’t buy a house within two hours of where they work. The tenant with a good job who worries about where she’ll find a new apartment she can afford if the owner decides to sell. The recent graduate who will have to stay at home for a few more years before he can afford to rent or buy.

While the crisis is widespread, it weighs more heavily on some groups than on others. Young people starting a family who need a larger home find themselves priced out of the market. Black, Indigenous and marginalized people face even greater challenges. As Ontarians, we have only recently begun to understand and address the reality of decades of systemic racism that has resulted in lower household incomes, making the housing affordability gap wider than average.

The high cost of housing has pushed minorities and lower income Ontarians further and further away from job markets. Black and Indigenous homeownership rates are less than half of the provincial average. And homelessness rates among Indigenous Peoples are 11 times the national average. When housing prevents an individual from reaching their full potential, this represents a loss to every Ontarian: lost creativity, productivity, and revenue. Lost prosperity for individuals and for the entire Ontario economy.
As much as we read about housing affordability being a challenge in major cities around the world, the depth of the challenge has become greater in Ontario and Canada than almost anywhere in the developed world.

Canada has the lowest amount of housing per population of any G7 country.

**How did we get here? Why do we have this problem?**

A major factor is that there just isn’t enough housing. A 2021 Scotiabank study showed that Canada has the fewest housing units per population of any G7 country – and, our per capita housing supply has dropped in the past five years. An update to that study released in January 2022 found that two thirds of Canada's housing shortage is in Ontario. Today, Ontario is 1.2 million homes – rental or owned – short of the G7 average. With projected population growth, that huge gap is widening, and bridging it will take immediate, bold and purposeful effort. And to support population growth in the next decade, we will need one million more homes.

While governments across Canada have taken steps to “cool down” the housing market or provide help to first-time buyers, these demand-side solutions only work if there is enough supply. Shortages of supply in any market have a direct impact on affordability. Scarcity breeds price increases. Simply put, if we want more Ontarians to have housing, we need to build more housing in Ontario.

**Ontario must build 1.5 million homes over the next 10 years to address the supply shortage**

The housing crisis impacts all Ontarians. The ripple effect of the crisis also holds back Ontario reaching its full potential.

**Economy**

Businesses of all sizes are facing problems finding and retaining workers. Even high-paying jobs in technology and manufacturing are hard to fill because there’s not enough housing nearby. This doesn’t just dampen the economic growth of cities, it makes them less vibrant, diverse, and creative, and strains their ability to provide essential services.

**Public services**

Hospitals, school boards and other public service providers across Ontario report challenges attracting and retaining staff because of housing costs. One town told us that it could no longer maintain a volunteer fire department, because volunteers couldn’t afford to live within 10 minutes drive of the firehall.

**Environment**

Long commutes contribute to air pollution and carbon emissions. An international survey of 74 cities in 16 countries found that Toronto, at 96 minutes both ways, had the longest commute times in North America and was essentially tied with Bogota, Colombia, for the longest commute time worldwide. Increasing density in our cities and around major transit hubs helps reduce emissions to the benefit of everyone.

**Our mandate and approach**

Ontario’s Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing tasked us with recommending ways to accelerate our progress in closing the housing supply gap to improve housing affordability.

Time is of the essence. Building housing now is exactly what our post-pandemic economy needs. Housing construction creates good-paying jobs that cannot be outsourced to other countries. Moreover, the pandemic gave rise to unprecedented levels of available capital that can be invested in housing – if we can just put it to work.

We represent a wide range of experience and perspectives that includes developing, financing and building homes, delivering affordable housing, and researching housing market trends, challenges and solutions. Our detailed biographies appear as [Appendix A](#).

We acknowledge that every house in Ontario is built on the traditional territory of Indigenous Peoples.
People in households that spend 30% or more of total household income on shelter expenses are defined as having a “housing affordability” problem. Shelter expenses include electricity, oil, gas, coal, wood or other fuels, water and other municipal services, monthly mortgage payments, property taxes, condominium fees, and rent.

Our mandate was to focus on how to increase market housing supply and affordability. By market housing, we are referring to homes that can be purchased or rented without government support.

**Affordable housing (units provided at below-market rates with government support) was not part of our mandate.**

The Minister and his cabinet colleagues are working on that issue. Nonetheless, almost every stakeholder we spoke with had ideas that will help deliver market housing and also make it easier to deliver affordable housing. However, affordable housing is a societal responsibility and will require intentional investments and strategies to bridge the significant affordable housing gap in this province. We have included a number of recommendations aimed at affordable housing in the body of this report, but have also included further thoughts in Appendix B.

We note that government-owned land was also outside our mandate. Many stakeholders, however, stressed the value of surplus or underused public land and land associated with major transit investments in finding housing solutions. We agree and have set out some thoughts on that issue in Appendix C.

**How we did our work**

Our Task Force was struck in December 2021 and mandated to deliver a final report to the Minister by the end of January 2022. We were able to work to that tight timeline because, in almost all cases, viewpoints and feasible solutions are well known. In addition, we benefited from insights gleaned from recent work to solve the problem in other jurisdictions.

During our deliberations, we met with and talked to over 140 organizations and individuals, including industry associations representing builders and developers, planners, architects, realtors and others; labour unions; social justice advocates; elected officials at the municipal level; academics and research groups; and municipal planners. We also received written submissions from many of these participants. In addition, we drew on the myriad public reports and papers listed in the References.

We thank everyone who took part in sessions that were uniformly helpful in giving us a deeper understanding of the housing crisis and the way out of it. We also thank the staff of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing who provided logistical and other support, including technical briefings and background.

**The way forward**

The single unifying theme across all participants over the course of the Task Force’s work has been the urgency to take decisive action. Today’s housing challenges are incredibly complex. Moreover, developing land, obtaining approvals, and building homes takes years.

Some recommendations will produce immediate benefits, others will take years for the full impact.

This is why there is no time to waste. We urge the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and his cabinet colleagues to continue measures they have already taken to accelerate housing supply and to move quickly in turning the recommendations in this report into decisive new actions.

**The province must set an ambitious and bold goal to build 1.5 million homes over the next 10 years.** If we build 1.5 million new homes over the next ten years, Ontario can fill the housing gap with more affordable choices, catch up to the rest of Canada and keep up with population growth.

By working together, we can resolve Ontario’s housing crisis. In so doing, we can build a more prosperous future for everyone.

The balance of this report lays out our recommendations.
Focus on getting more homes built

Resolving a crisis requires intense focus and a clear goal. The province is responsible for the legislation and policy that establishes the planning, land use, and home building goals, which guide municipalities, land tribunals, and courts. Municipalities are then responsible for implementing provincial policy in a way that works for their communities. The province is uniquely positioned to lead by shining a spotlight on this issue, setting the tone, and creating a single, galvanizing goal around which federal support, provincial legislation, municipal policy, and the housing market can be aligned.

In 2020, Ontario built about 75,000 housing units. For this report, we define a housing unit (home) as a single dwelling (detached, semi-detached, or attached), apartment, suite, condominium or mobile home. Since 2018, housing completions have grown every year as a result of positive measures that the province and some municipalities have implemented to encourage more home building. But we are still 1.2 million homes short when compared to other G7 countries and our population is growing. The goal of 1.5 million homes feels daunting – but reflects both the need and what is possible. In fact, throughout the 1970s Ontario built more housing units each year than we do today.\[10\]

The second recommendation is designed to address the growing complexity and volume of rules in the legislation, policy, plans and by-laws, and their competing priorities, by providing clear direction to provincial agencies, municipalities, tribunals, and courts on the overriding priorities for housing.

1. Set a goal of building 1.5 million new homes in ten years.

2. Amend the Planning Act, Provincial Policy Statement, and Growth Plans to set “growth in the full spectrum of housing supply” and “intensification within existing built-up areas” of municipalities as the most important residential housing priorities in the mandate and purpose.

The “missing middle” is often cited as an important part of the housing solution. We define the missing middle as mid-rise condo or rental housing, smaller houses on subdivided lots or in laneways and other additional units in existing houses.
Making land available to build

The Greater Toronto Area is bordered on one side by Lake Ontario and on the other by the protected Greenbelt. Similarly, the Ottawa River and another Greenbelt constrain land supply in Ottawa, the province’s second-largest city.

But a shortage of land isn’t the cause of the problem. Land is available, both inside the existing built-up areas and on undeveloped land outside greenbelts.

We need to make better use of land. Zoning defines what we can build and where we can build. If we want to make better use of land to create more housing, then we need to modernize our zoning rules. We heard from planners, municipal councillors, and developers that “as of right” zoning – the ability to by-pass long, drawn out consultations and zoning by-law amendments – is the most effective tool in the provincial toolkit. We agree.

Stop using exclusionary zoning that restricts more housing

Too much land inside cities is tied up by outdated rules. For example, it’s estimated that 70% of land zoned for housing in Toronto is restricted to single-detached or semi-detached homes.[11] This type of zoning prevents homeowners from adding additional suites to create housing for Ontarians and income for themselves. As one person said, “my neighbour can tear down what was there to build a monster home, but I’m not allowed to add a basement suite to my home.”

While less analysis has been done in other Ontario communities, it’s estimated that about half of all residential land in Ottawa is zoned for single-detached housing, meaning nothing else may be built on a lot without public consultation and an amendment to the zoning by-law. In some suburbs around Toronto, single unit zoning dominates residential land use, even close to GO Transit stations and major highways.

One result is that more growth is pushing past urban boundaries and turning farmland into housing. Undeveloped land inside and outside existing municipal boundaries must be part of the solution, particularly in northern and rural communities, but isn’t nearly enough on its own. Most of the solution must come from densification. Greenbelts and other environmentally sensitive areas must be protected, and farms provide food and food security. Relying too heavily on undeveloped land would whittle away too much of the already small share of land devoted to agriculture.

Modernizing zoning would also open the door to more rental housing, which in turn would make communities more inclusive.

Allowing more gentle density also makes better use of roads, water and wastewater systems, transit and other public services that are already in place and have capacity, instead of having to be built in new areas.

The Ontario government took a positive step by allowing secondary suites (e.g., basement apartments) across the province in 2019. However, too many municipalities still place too many restrictions on implementation. For the last three years, the total number of secondary suites in Toronto has actually declined each year, as few units get permitted and owners convert two units into one.[12]

These are the types of renovations and home construction performed by small businesses and local trades, providing them with a boost.
Underused and vacant commercial and industrial properties are another potential source of land for housing. It was suggested to us that one area ripe for redevelopment into a mix of commercial and residential uses is the strip mall, a leftover from the 1950s that runs along major suburban streets in most large Ontario cities.

“As of right” zoning allows more kinds of housing that are accessible to more kinds of people. It makes neighbourhoods stronger, richer, and fairer. And it will get more housing built in existing neighbourhoods more quickly than any other measure.

3. Limit exclusionary zoning in municipalities through binding provincial action:
   a) Allow “as of right” residential housing up to four units and up to four storeys on a single residential lot.
   b) Modernize the Building Code and other policies to remove any barriers to affordable construction and to ensure meaningful implementation (e.g., allow single-staircase construction for up to four storeys, allow single egress, etc.).

4. Permit “as of right” conversion of underutilized or redundant commercial properties to residential or mixed residential and commercial use.

5. Permit “as of right” secondary suites, garden suites, and laneway houses province-wide.

6. Permit “as of right” multi-tenant housing (renting rooms within a dwelling) province-wide.

7. Encourage and incentivize municipalities to increase density in areas with excess school capacity to benefit families with children.

Access to transit is linked to making housing more affordable: when reliable transit options are nearby, people can get to work more easily. They can live further from the centre of the city in less expensive areas without the added cost of car ownership.

The impacts of expanding public transit go far beyond serving riders. These investments also spur economic growth and reduce traffic congestion and emissions. We all pay for the cost of transit spending, and we should all share in the benefits.

If municipalities achieve the right development near transit – a mix of housing at high- and medium-density, office space and retail – this would open the door to better ways of funding the costs. Other cities, like London, UK and Hong Kong, have captured the impacts of increased land value and business activity along new transit routes to help with their financing.

Ontario recently created requirements (residents/hectare) for municipalities to zone for higher density in transit corridors and “major transit station areas”[13] These are areas surrounding subway and other rapid transit stations and hubs. However, we heard troubling reports that local opposition is blocking access to these neighbourhoods and to critical public transit stations. City staff, councillors, and the province need to stand up to these tactics and speak up for the Ontarians who need housing.

The Province is also building new highways in the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and it’s important to plan thoughtfully for the communities that will follow from these investments, to make sure they are compact and liveable.

### Population density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Density (people per km²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Align investments in roads and transit with growth

Governments have invested billions of dollars in highways, light rail, buses, subways and trains in Ontario. But without ensuring more people can live close to those transit routes, we’re not getting the best return on those infrastructure investments.
8. Allow “as of right” zoning up to unlimited height and unlimited density in the immediate proximity of individual major transit stations within two years if municipal zoning remains insufficient to meet provincial density targets.

9. Allow “as of right” zoning of six to 11 storeys with no minimum parking requirements on any streets utilized by public transit (including streets on bus and streetcar routes).

10. Designate or rezone as mixed commercial and residential use all land along transit corridors and redesignate all Residential Apartment to mixed commercial and residential zoning in Toronto.

11. Support responsible housing growth on undeveloped land, including outside existing municipal boundaries, by building necessary infrastructure to support higher density housing and complete communities and applying the recommendations of this report to all undeveloped land.

Start saying “yes in my backyard”

Even where higher density is allowed in theory, the official plans of most cities in Ontario contain conflicting goals like maintaining “prevailing neighbourhood character”. This bias is reinforced by detailed guidance that often follows from the official plan. Although requirements are presented as “guidelines”, they are often treated as rules.

Examples include:

- Angular plane rules that require successively higher floors to be stepped further back, cutting the number of units that can be built by up to half and making many projects uneconomic
- Detailed rules around the shadows a building casts
- Guidelines around finishes, colours and other design details

One resident’s desire to prevent a shadow being cast in their backyard or a local park frequently prevails over concrete proposals to build more housing for multiple families. By-laws and guidelines that preserve “neighbourhood character” often prevent simple renovations to add new suites to existing homes. The people who suffer are mostly young, visible minorities, and marginalized people. It is the perfect example of a policy that appears neutral on its surface but is discriminatory in its application.¹⁴

Far too much time and money are spent reviewing and holding consultations for large projects which conform with the official plan or zoning by-law and small projects which would cause minimal disruption. The cost of needless delays is passed on to new home buyers and tenants.

Minimum parking requirements for each new unit are another example of outdated municipal requirements that increase the cost of housing and are increasingly less relevant with public transit and ride share services. Minimum parking requirements add as much as $165,000 to the cost of a new housing unit, even as demand for parking spaces is falling: data from the Residential Construction Council of Ontario shows that in new condo projects, one in three parking stalls goes unsold. We applaud the recent vote by Toronto City Council to scrap most minimum parking requirements. We believe other cities should follow suit.

While true heritage sites are important, heritage preservation has also become a tool to block more housing. For example, some municipalities add thousands of properties at a time to a heritage register because they have “potential” heritage value. Even where a building isn’t heritage designated or registered, neighbours increasingly demand it be as soon as a development is proposed.

This brings us to the role of the “not in my backyard” or NIMBY sentiment in delaying or stopping more homes from being built.

---

New housing is often the last priority

A proposed building with market and affordable housing units would have increased the midday shadow by 6.5% on a nearby park at the fall and spring equinox, with no impact during the summer months. To conform to a policy that does not permit “new net shadow on specific parks”, seven floors of housing, including 26 affordable housing units, were sacrificed.

Multiple dry cleaners along a transit route were designated as heritage sites to prevent new housing being built. It is hard not to feel outrage when our laws are being used to prevent families from moving into neighbourhoods and into homes they can afford along transit routes.
NIMBY versus YIMBY

NIMBYism (not in my backyard) is a large and constant obstacle to providing housing everywhere. Neighbourhood pushback drags out the approval process, pushes up costs and discourages investment in housing. It also keeps out new residents. While building housing is very costly, opposing new housing costs almost nothing.

Unfortunately, there is a strong incentive for individual municipal councillors to fall in behind community opposition – it’s existing residents who elect them, not future ones. The outcry of even a handful of constituents (helped by the rise of social media) has been enough, in far too many cases, to persuade their local councillor to vote against development even while admitting its merits in private. There is a sense among some that it’s better to let the Ontario Land Tribunal approve the development on appeal, even if it causes long delays and large cost increases, then to take the political heat.

Mayors and councillors across the province are fed up and many have called for limits on public consultations and more “as of right” zoning. In fact, some have created a new term for NIMBYism: BANANAs – Build Absolutely Nothing Anywhere Near Anything, causing one mayor to comment “NIMBYism has gone BANANAs”. We agree. In a growing, thriving society, that approach is not just bad policy, it is exclusionary and wrong.

As a result, technical planning decisions have become politicized. One major city has delegated many decisions to senior staff, but an individual councillor can withdraw the delegation when there is local opposition and force a vote at Council. We heard that this situation is common across the province, creating an electoral incentive for a councillor to delay or stop a housing proposal, or forcing a councillor to pay the electoral cost of supporting it. Approvals of individual housing applications should be the role of professional staff, free from political interference.

The pressure to stop any development is now so intense that it has given rise to a counter-movement – YIMBYism, or “yes in my backyard,” led by millennials who recognize entrenched opposition to change as a huge obstacle to finding a home. They provide a voice at public consultations for young people, new immigrants and refugees, minority groups, and Ontarians struggling to access housing by connecting our ideals to the reality of housing. People who welcome immigrants to Canada should welcome them to the neighbourhood, fighting climate change means supporting higher-density housing, and “keeping the neighbourhood the way it is” means keeping it off-limits. While anti-housing voices can be loud, a member of More Neighbours Toronto, a YIMBY group that regularly attends public consultations, has said that the most vocal opponents usually don’t represent the majority in a neighbourhood. Survey data from the Ontario Real Estate Association backs that up, with almost 80% of Ontarians saying they are in favour of zoning in urban areas that would encourage more homes.

Ontarians want a solution to the housing crisis. We cannot allow opposition and politicization of individual housing projects to prevent us from meeting the needs of all Ontarians.

12. Create a more permissive land use, planning, and approvals system:
   a) Repeal or override municipal policies, zoning, or plans that prioritize the preservation of physical character of neighbourhood
   b) Exempt from site plan approval and public consultation all projects of 10 units or less that conform to the Official Plan and require only minor variances
   c) Establish province-wide zoning standards, or prohibitions, for minimum lot sizes, maximum building setbacks, minimum heights, angular planes, shadow rules, front doors, building depth, landscaping, floor space index, and heritage view cones, and planes; restore pre-2006 site plan exclusions (colour, texture, and type of materials, window details, etc.) to the Planning Act and reduce or eliminate minimum parking requirements; and
   d) Remove any floorplate restrictions to allow larger, more efficient high-density towers.

13. Limit municipalities from requesting or hosting additional public meetings beyond those that are required under the Planning Act.

14. Require that public consultations provide digital participation options.

15. Require mandatory delegation of site plan approvals and minor variances to staff or pre-approved qualified third-party technical consultants through a simplified review and approval process, without the ability to withdraw Council’s delegation.
16. Prevent abuse of the heritage preservation and designation process by:
   a) Prohibiting the use of bulk listing on municipal heritage registers
   b) Prohibiting reactive heritage designations after a Planning Act development application has been filed

17. Requiring municipalities to compensate property owners for loss of property value as a result of heritage designations, based on the principle of best economic use of land.


We have heard mixed feedback on Committees of Adjustment. While they are seen to be working well in some cities, in others they are seen to simply add another lengthy step in the process. We would urge the government to first implement our recommendation to delegate minor variances and site plan approvals to municipal staff and then assess whether Committees of Adjustment are necessary and an improvement over staff-level decision making.
Cut the red tape so we can build faster and reduce costs

One of the strongest signs that our approval process is not working: of 35 OECD countries, only the Slovak Republic takes longer than Canada to approve a building project. The UK and the US approve projects three times faster without sacrificing quality or safety. And they save home buyers and tenants money as a result, making housing more affordable.[15]

A 2020 survey of development approval times in 23 Canadian cities shows Ontario seriously lagging: Hamilton (15th), Toronto (17th), Ottawa (21st) with approval times averaging between 20-24 months. These timelines do not include building permits, which take about two years for an apartment building in Toronto. Nor did they count the time it takes for undeveloped land to be designated for housing, which the study notes can take five to ten years.[16]

Despite the good intentions of many people involved in the approvals and home-building process, decades of dysfunction in the system and needless bureaucracy have made it too difficult for housing approvals to keep up with the needs of Ontarians. There appear to be numerous reasons why Ontario performs so poorly against other Canadian cities and the rest of the developed world. We believe that the major problems can be summed up as:

• Too much complexity in the planning process, with the page count in legislation, regulation, policies, plans, and by-laws growing every year
• Too many studies, guidelines, meetings and other requirements of the type we outlined in the previous section, including many that go well beyond the scope of Ontario’s Planning Act
• Reviews within municipalities and with outside agencies that are piecemeal, duplicative (although often with conflicting outcomes) and poorly coordinated
• Process flaws that include reliance on paper
• Some provincial policies that are more relevant to urban development but result in burdensome, irrelevant requirements when applied in some rural and northern communities.

All of this has contributed to widespread failure on the part of municipalities to meet required timelines. The provincial Planning Act sets out deadlines of 90 days for decisions on zoning by-law amendments, 120 days for plans of subdivision, and 30 days for site plan approval, but municipalities routinely miss these without penalty. For other processes, like site plan approval or provincial approvals, there are no timelines and delays drag on. The cost of delay falls on the ultimate homeowner or tenant. The consequences for homeowners and renters are enormous. Ultimately, whatever cost a builder pays gets passed on to the buyer or renter. As one person said: “Process is the biggest project killer in Toronto because developers have to carry timeline risk.”

Site plan control was often brought up as a frustration. Under the Planning Act, this is meant to be a technical review of the external features of a building. In practice, municipalities often expand on what is required and take too long to respond.
Then: In 1966, a draft plan of subdivision in a town in southwestern Ontario to provide 529 low-rise and mid-rise housing units, a school site, a shopping centre and parks was approved by way of a two-page letter setting out 10 conditions. It took seven months to clear conditions for final approval.

And now: In 2013, a builder started the approval process to build on a piece of serviced residential land in a seasonal resort town. Over the next seven years, 18 professional consultant reports were required, culminating in draft plan approval containing 50 clearance conditions. The second approval, issued by the Local Planning Appeals Board in 2020, ran to 23 pages. The developer estimates it will be almost 10 years before final approval is received.

An Ontario Association of Architects study calculating the cost of delays between site plan application and approval concluded that for a 100-unit condominium apartment building, each additional month of delay costs the applicant an estimated $193,000, or $1,930 a month for each unit.[17]

A 2020 study done for the Building Industry and Land Development Association (BILD) looked at impacts of delay on low-rise construction, including single-detached homes. It estimated that every month an approval is delayed adds, on average, $1.46 per square foot to the cost of a single home. A two-year delay, which is not unusual for this housing type, adds more than $70,000 to the cost of a 2,000-square-foot house in the GTA.[16]

Getting rid of so much unnecessary and unproductive additional work would significantly reduce the burden on staff. It would help address the widespread shortages of planners and building officials. It would also bring a stronger sense among municipal staff that they are part of the housing solution and can take pride in helping cut approval times and lower the costs of delivering homes.

**Adopt common sense approaches that save construction costs**

Wood using “mass timber” – an engineer compressed wood, made for strength and weight-bearing – can provide a lower-cost alternative to reinforced concrete in many mid-rise projects, but Ontario’s Building Code is hampering its use. Building taller with wood offers advantages beyond cost:

- Using wood supports Ontario’s forestry sector and creates jobs, including for Indigenous people

British Columbia’s and Quebec’s building codes allow woodframe construction up to 12 storeys, but Ontario limits it to six. By amending the Building Code to allow 12-storey woodframe construction, Ontario would encourage increased use of forestry products and reduce building costs.

Finally, we were told that a shift in how builders are required to guarantee their performance would free up billions of dollars to build more housing. Pay on demand surety bonds are a much less onerous option than letters or credit, and are already accepted in Hamilton, Pickering, Innisfil, Whitchurch-Stouffville and other Ontario municipalities. We outline the technical details in Appendix D.

19. Legislature timelines at each stage of the provincial and municipal review process, including site plan, minor variance, and provincial reviews, and deem an application approved if the legislated response time is exceeded.

20. Fund the creation of “approvals facilitators” with the authority to quickly resolve conflicts among municipal and/or provincial authorities and ensure timelines are met.

21. Require a pre-consultation with all relevant parties at which the municipality sets out a binding list that defines what constitutes a complete application; confirms the number of consultations established in the previous recommendations; and clarifies that if a member of a regulated profession such as a professional engineer has stamped an application, the municipality has no liability and no additional stamp is needed.

22. Simplify planning legislation and policy documents.

23. Create a common, province-wide definition of plan of subdivision and standard set of conditions which clarify which may be included; require the use of standard province-wide legal agreements and, where feasible, plans of subdivision.


25. Require municipalities to provide the option of pay on demand surety bonds and letters of credit.
Prevent abuse of the appeal process

Part of the challenge with housing approvals is that, by the time a project has been appealed to the Ontario Land Tribunal (the Tribunal), it has usually already faced delay and compromises have been made to reduce the size and scope of the proposal. When an approved project is appealed, the appellant – which could just be a single individual – may pay $400 and tie up new housing for years.

The most recent published report showed 1,300 unresolved cases. While under-resourcing does contribute to delays, this caseload also reflects the low barrier to launching an appeal and the minimal risks if an appeal is unsuccessful:

- After a builder has spent time and money to ensure a proposal conforms with a municipality’s requirements, the municipal council can still reject it – even if its own planning staff has given its support. Very often this is to appease local opponents.
- Unlike a court, costs are not automatically awarded to the successful party at the Tribunal. The winning side must bring a motion and prove that the party bringing the appeal was unreasonable, clearly trying to delay the project, and/or being vexatious or frivolous. Because the bar is set so high, the winning side seldom asks for costs in residential cases.

This has resulted in abuse of the Tribunal to delay new housing. Throughout our consultations, we heard from municipalities, not-for-profits, and developers that affordable housing was a particular target for appeals which, even if unsuccessful, can make projects too costly to build.

Clearly the Tribunal needs more resources to clear its backlog. But the bigger issue is the need for so many appeals: we believe it would better to have well-defined goals and rules for municipalities and builders to avoid this costly and time-consuming quasi-judicial process. Those who bring appeals aimed at stopping development that meets established criteria should pay the legal costs of the successful party and face the risk of a larger project being approved.

The solution is not more appeals, it’s fixing the system. We have proposed a series of reforms that would ensure only meritorious appeals proceeded, that every participant faces some risk and cost of losing, and that abuse of the Tribunal will be penalized. We believe that if Ontario accepts our recommendations, the Tribunal will not face the same volume of appeals. But getting to that point will take time, and the Tribunal needs more resources and better tools now.

Recommendation 1 will provide legislative direction to adjudicators that they must prioritize housing growth and intensification over competing priorities contained in provincial and municipal policies. We further recommend the following:

26. Require appellants to promptly seek permission (“leave to appeal”) of the Tribunal and demonstrate that an appeal has merit, relying on evidence and expert reports, before it is accepted.

27. Prevent abuse of process:
   a) Remove right of appeal for projects with at least 30% affordable housing in which units are guaranteed affordable for at least 40 years.
   b) Require a $10,000 filing fee for third-party appeals.
   c) Provide discretion to adjudicators to award full costs to the successful party in any appeal brought by a third party or by a municipality where its council has overridden a recommended staff approval.

28. Encourage greater use of oral decisions issued the day of the hearing, with written reasons to follow, and allow those decisions to become binding the day that they are issued.

29. Where it is found that a municipality has refused an application simply to avoid a deemed approval for lack of decision, allow the Tribunal to award punitive damages.

30. Provide funding to increase staffing (adjudicators and case managers), provide market-competitive salaries, outsource more matters to mediators, and set shorter time targets.

31. In clearing the existing backlog, encourage the Tribunal to prioritize projects close to the finish line that will support housing growth and intensification, as well as regional water or utility infrastructure decisions that will unlock significant housing capacity.
Reduce the costs to build, buy and rent

The price you pay to buy or rent a home is driven directly by how much it costs to build a home. In Ontario, costs to build homes have dramatically increased at an unprecedented pace over the past decade. In most of our cities and towns, materials and labour only account for about half of the costs. The rest comes from land, which we have addressed in the previous section, and government fees.

A careful balance is required on government fees because, as much as we would like to see them lowered, governments need revenues from fees and taxes to build critically needed infrastructure and pay for all the other services that make Ontario work. So, it is a question of balance and of ensuring that our approach to government fees encourages rather than discourages developers to build the full range of housing we need in our Ontario communities.

**Align government fees and charges with the goal of building more housing**

**Improve the municipal funding model**

Housing requires more than just the land it is built on. It requires roads, sewers, parks, utilities and other infrastructure. The provincial government provides municipalities with a way to secure funding for this infrastructure through development charges, community benefit charges and parkland dedication (providing 5% of land for public parks or the cash equivalent).

These charges are founded on the belief that growth – not current taxpayers – should pay for growth. As a concept, it is compelling. In practice, it means that new home buyers pay the entire cost of sewers, parks, affordable housing, or colleges that will be around for generations and may not be located in their neighbourhood. And, although building affordable housing is a societal responsibility, because affordable units pay all the same charges as a market unit, the cost is passed to new home buyers in the same building or the not-for-profit organization supporting the project. We do not believe that government fees should create a disincentive to affordable housing.

If you ask any developer of homes – whether they are for-profit or non-profit – they will tell you that development charges are a special pain point. In Ontario, they can be as much as $135,000 per home. In some municipalities, development charges have increased as much as 900% in less than 20 years. As development charges go up, the prices of homes go up. And development charges on a modest semi-detached home are the same as on a luxury 6,000 square foot home, resulting in a disincentive to build housing that is more affordable. Timing is also a challenge as development charges have to be paid up front, before a shovel even goes into the ground.

To help relieve the pressure, the Ontario government passed recent legislation allowing builders to determine development charges earlier in the building process. But they must pay interest on the assessed development charge to the municipality until a building permit is issued, and there is no cap on the rate, which in one major city is 13% annually.

Cash payments to satisfy parkland dedication also significantly boost the costs of higher-density projects, adding on average $17,000 to the cost of a high-rise condo across the GTA. We heard concerns not just about the amount of cash collected, but also about the money not being spent in the neighbourhood or possibly not being spent on parks at all. As an example, in 2019 the City of Toronto held $644 million in parkland cash-in-lieu payments. Everyone can agree that we need to invest in parks as our communities grow, but if the funds are not being spent, perhaps it means that more money is being collected for parklands than is needed and we could lower the cost of housing if we adjusted these parkland fees.

---

A 2019 study carried out for BILD showed that in the Greater Toronto Area, development charges for low-rise housing are on average more than three times higher per unit than in six comparable US metropolitan areas, and roughly 1.75-times higher than in the other Canadian cities.

For high-rise developments the average per unit charges in the GTA are roughly 50% higher than in the US areas, and roughly 30% higher than in the other Canadian urban areas.
Modernizing HST Thresholds
Harmonized sales tax (HST) applies to all new housing – including purpose-built rental. Today, the federal component is 5% and provincial component is 8%. The federal and provincial government provide a partial HST rebate. Two decades ago, the maximum home price eligible for a rebate was set at $450,000 federally and $400,000 provincially, resulting in a maximum rebate of $6,300 federally and $24,000 provincially, less than half of today’s average home price. Buyers of new homes above this ceiling face a significant clawback. Indexing the rebate would immediately reduce the cost of building new homes, savings that can be passed on to Ontarians. When both levels of government agree that we are facing a housing crisis, they should not be adding over 10% to the cost of almost all new homes.

32. Waive development charges and parkland cash-in-lieu and charge only modest connection fees for all infill residential projects up to 10 units or for any development where no new material infrastructure will be required.

33. Waive development charges on all forms of affordable housing guaranteed to be affordable for 40 years.

34. Prohibit interest rates on development charges higher than a municipality’s borrowing rate.

35. Regarding cash in lieu of parkland, s.37, Community Benefit Charges, and development charges:
   a) Provincial review of reserve levels, collections and drawdowns annually to ensure funds are being used in a timely fashion and for the intended purpose, and, where review points to a significant concern, do not allow further collection until the situation has been corrected.
   b) Except where allocated towards municipality-wide infrastructure projects, require municipalities to spend funds in the neighbourhoods where they were collected. However, where there’s a significant community need in a priority area of the City, allow for specific ward-to-ward allocation of unspent and unallocated reserves.

36. Recommend that the federal government and provincial governments update HST rebate to reflect current home prices and begin indexing the thresholds to housing prices, and that the federal government match the provincial 75% rebate and remove any clawback.

Government charges on a new single-detached home averaged roughly $186,300, or almost 22% of the price, across six municipalities in southcentral Ontario. For a new condominium apartment, the average was almost $123,000, or roughly 24% of a unit’s price.

Make it easier to build rental
In cities and towns across Ontario, it is increasingly hard to find a vacant rental unit, let alone a vacant rental unit at an affordable price. Today, 66% of all purpose-built rental units in the City of Toronto were built between 1960 and 1979. Less than 15% of Toronto’s purpose-built rentals were constructed over the ensuing 40 years in spite of the significant population growth during that time. In fact, between 2006 and 2016, growth in condo apartments increased by 186% while purpose-built rental only grew by 0.6%. In 2018, the Ontario government introduced positive changes that have created growth in purpose-built rental units – with last year seeing 18,000 units under construction and 93,000 proposed against a 5-year average prior to 2020 of 3,400 annually.

Long-term renters often now feel trapped in apartments that don’t make sense for them as their needs change. And because they can’t or don’t want to move up the housing ladder, many of the people coming up behind them who would gladly take those apartments are instead living in crowded spaces with family members or roommates. Others feel forced to commit to rental units at prices way beyond what they can afford. Others are trying their luck in getting on the wait list for an affordable unit or housing co-op – wait lists that are years long. Others are leaving Ontario altogether.

66% of all purpose-built rental units in the City of Toronto were built between 1960 and 1979.
A pattern in every community, and particularly large cities, is that the apartments and rented rooms that we do have are disappearing. Apartment buildings are being converted to condos or upgraded to much more expensive rental units. Duplexes get purchased and turned into larger single-family homes.

A major challenge in bridging the gap of rental supply is that, more often than not, purpose-built rental projects don’t make economic sense for builders and investors. Ironically, there is no shortage of Canadian investor capital seeking housing investments, particularly large pension funds – but the economics of investing in purpose-built rental in Ontario just don’t make sense. So, investments get made in apartment projects in other provinces or countries, or in condo projects that have a better and safer return-on-investment. What can governments do to get that investor capital pointed in the right direction so we can create jobs and get more of the housing we need built?

Some of our earlier recommendations will help, particularly indexing the HST rebate. So will actions by government to require purpose-built rental on surplus government land that is made available for sale. (Appendix C)

Municipal property taxes on purpose-built rental can be as much as 2.5 times greater than property taxes for condominium or other ownership housing.\footnote{24} The Task Force recommends:

37. Align property taxes for purpose-built rental with those of condos and low-rise homes.

Make homeownership possible for hardworking Ontarians who want it

Home ownership has always been part of the Canadian dream. You don’t have to look far back to find a time when the housing landscape was very different. The norm was for young people to rent an apartment in their twenties, work hard and save for a down payment, then buy their first home in their late twenties or early thirties. It was the same for many new Canadians: arrive, rent, work hard and buy. The house might be modest, but it brought a sense of ownership, stability and security. And after that first step onto the ownership ladder, there was always the possibility of selling and moving up. Home ownership felt like a real possibility for anyone who wanted it.

That’s not how it works now. Too many young people who would like their own place are living with one or both parents well into adulthood.

The escalation of housing prices over the last decade has put the dream of homeownership out of reach of a growing number of aspiring first-time home buyers. While 73% of Canadians are homeowners, that drops to 48% for Black people, 47% for LGBTQ people\footnote{StatsCan is studying rates for other populations, including Indigenous People who are severely underhoused}. This is also an issue for younger adults: a 2021 study showed only 24% of Torontonians aged 30 to 39 are homeowners.\footnote{25}

In Canada, responsibility for Indigenous housing programs has historically been a shared between the federal and provincial governments. The federal government works closely with its provincial and territorial counterparts to improve access to housing for Indigenous peoples both on and off reserve. More than 85% of Indigenous people live in urban and rural areas, are 11 times more likely to experience homelessness and have incidence of housing need that is 52% greater than all Canadians. The Murdered and Missing Indigenous Women and Girls report mentions housing 299 times – the lack of which being a significant, contributing cause to violence and the provision of which as a significant, contributing solution. The Province of Ontario has made significant investments in Urban Indigenous Housing, but we need the Federal Government to re-engage as an active partner.

While measures to address supply will have an impact on housing prices, many aspiring homeowners will continue to face a gap that is simply too great to bridge through traditional methods.

The Task Force recognizes the need for caution about measures that would spur demand for housing before the supply bottleneck is fixed. At the same time, a growing number of organizations – both non-profit and for-profit are proposing a range of unique home equity models. Some of these organizations are aiming at households who have sufficient income to pay the mortgage but lack a sufficient down payment. Others are aiming at households who fall short in both income and down payment requirements for current market housing.
The Task Force heard about a range of models to help aspiring first-time home buyers, including:

- Shared equity models with a government, non-profit or for-profit lender holding a second “shared equity mortgage” payable at time of sale of the home
- Land lease models that allow residents to own their home but lease the land, reducing costs
- Rent-to-own approaches in which a portion of an occupant’s rent is used to build equity, which can be used as a down payment on their current unit or another market unit in the future
- Models where the equity gain is shared between the homeowner and the non-profit provider, such that the non-profit will always be able to buy the home back and sell it to another qualified buyer, thus retaining the home’s affordability from one homeowner to the next.

Proponents of these models identified barriers that thwart progress in implementing new solutions.

- The Planning Act limits land leases to a maximum of 21 years. This provision prevents home buyers from accessing the same type of mortgages from a bank or credit union that are available to them when they buy through traditional homeownership.
- The Perpetuities Act has a similar 21-year limit on any options placed on land. This limits innovative non-profit models from using equity formulas for re-sale and repurchase of homes.
- Land Transfer Tax (LTT) is charged each time a home is sold and is collected by the province; and in Toronto, this tax is also collected by the City. This creates a double-tax in rent-to-own/equity building models where LTT ends up being paid first by the home equity organization and then by the occupant when they are able to buy the unit.
- HST is charged based on the market value of the home. In shared equity models where the homeowner neither owns nor gains from the shared equity portion of their home, HST on the shared equity portion of the home simply reduces affordability.
- Residential mortgages are highly regulated by the federal government and reflective of traditional homeownership. Modifications in regulations may be required to adapt to new co-ownership and other models.

The Task Force encourages the Ontario government to devote further attention to avenues to support new homeownership options. As a starting point, the Task Force offers the following recommendations:

38. Amend the Planning Act and Perpetuities Act to extend the maximum period for land leases and restrictive covenants on land to 40 or more years.
39. Eliminate or reduce tax disincentives to housing growth.
41. Funding for pilot projects that create innovative pathways to homeownership, for Black, Indigenous, and marginalized people and first-generation homeowners.
42. Provide provincial and federal loan guarantees for purpose-built rental, affordable rental and affordable ownership projects.
Support and incentivize scaling up housing supply

Our goal of building 1.5 million homes in ten years means doubling how many homes Ontario creates each year. As much as the Task Force’s recommendations will remove barriers to realizing this ambitious goal, we also need to ensure we have the capacity across Ontario’s communities to deliver this new housing supply. This includes capacity of our housing infrastructure, capacity within our municipal planning teams, and boots on the ground with the skills to build new homes.

There is much to be done and the price of failure for the people of Ontario is high. This is why the provincial government must make an unwavering commitment to keeping the spotlight on housing supply. This is also why the province must be dogged in its determination to galvanize and align efforts and incentives across all levels of government so that working together, we all can get the job done.

Our final set of recommendations turns to these issues of capacity to deliver, and the role the provincial government can play in putting the incentives and alignment in place to achieve the 1.5 million home goal.

Invest in municipal infrastructure

Housing can’t get built without water, sewage, and other infrastructure

When the Task Force met with municipal leaders, they emphasized how much future housing supply relies on having the water, storm water and wastewater systems, roads, sidewalks, fire stations, and all the other parts of community infrastructure to support new homes and new residents.

Infrastructure is essential where housing is being built for the first time. And, it can be a factor in intensification when added density exceeds the capacity of existing infrastructure, one of the reasons we urge new infrastructure in new developments to be designed for future capacity. In Ontario, there are multiple municipalities where the number one barrier to approving new housing projects is a lack of infrastructure to support them.

Municipalities face a myriad of challenges in getting this infrastructure in place. Often, infrastructure investments are required long before new projects are approved and funding must be secured. Notwithstanding the burden development charges place on the price of new housing, most municipalities report that development charges are still not enough to fully cover the costs of building new infrastructure and retrofitting existing infrastructure in neighbourhoods that are intensifying. Often infrastructure crosses municipal boundaries creating complicated and time-consuming “who pays?” questions. Municipal leaders also shared their frustrations with situations where new housing projects are approved and water, sewage and other infrastructure capacity is allocated to the project – only to have the developer land bank the project and put off building. Environmental considerations with new infrastructure add further cost and complexity.

The Task Force recommends:

43. Enable municipalities, subject to adverse external economic events, to withdraw infrastructure allocations from any permitted projects where construction has not been initiated within three years of build permits being issued.

44. Work with municipalities to develop and implement a municipal services corporation utility model for water and wastewater under which the municipal corporation would borrow and amortize costs among customers instead of using development charges.
Create the Labour Force to meet the housing supply need

The labour force is shrinking in many segments of the market

You can’t start to build housing without infrastructure. You can’t build it without people — skilled trades people in every community who can build the homes we need.

The concern that we are already facing a shortage in skilled trades came through loud and clear in our consultations. We heard from many sources that our education system funnels young people to university rather than colleges or apprenticeships and creates the perception that careers in the skilled trades are of less value. Unions and builders are working to fill the pipeline domestically and recruit internationally, but mass retirements are making it challenging to maintain the workforce at its current level, let alone increase it.

Increased economic immigration could ease this bottleneck, but it appears difficult for a skilled labourer with no Canadian work experience to qualify under Ontario’s rules. Moreover, Canada’s immigration policies also favour university education over skills our economy and society desperately need. We ought to be welcoming immigrants with the skills needed to build roads and houses that will accommodate our growing population.

The shortage may be less acute, however, among smaller developers and contractors that could renovate and build new “missing middle” homes arising from the changes in neighbourhood zoning described earlier. These smaller companies tap into a different workforce from the one needed to build high rises and new subdivisions. Nonetheless, 1.5 million more homes will require a major investment in attracting and developing the skilled trades workforce to deliver this critically needed housing supply. We recommend:

45. Improve funding for colleges, trade schools, and apprenticeships; encourage and incentivize municipalities, unions and employers to provide more on-the-job training.

46. Undertake multi-stakeholder education program to promote skilled trades.

47. Recommend that the federal and provincial government prioritize skilled trades and adjust the immigration points system to strongly favour needed trades and expedite immigration status for these workers, and encourage the federal government to increase from 9,000 to 20,000 the number of immigrants admitted through Ontario’s program.

Create a large Ontario Housing Delivery Fund to align efforts and incent new housing supply

Build alignment between governments to enable builders to deliver more homes than ever before

All levels of government play a role in housing.

The federal government sets immigration policy, which has a major impact on population growth and many tax policies. The province sets the framework for planning, approvals, and growth that municipalities rely upon, and is responsible for many other areas that touch on housing supply, like investing in highways and transit, training workers, the building code and protecting the environment. Municipalities are on the front lines, expected to translate the impacts of federal immigration policy, provincial guidance and other factors, some very localized, into official plans and the overall process through which homes are approved to be built.

The efficiency with which home builders can build, whether for-profit or non-profit, is influenced by policies and decisions at every level of government. In turn, how many home developers can deliver, and at what cost, translates directly into the availability of homes that Ontarians can afford.
Collectively, governments have not been sufficiently aligned in their efforts to provide the frameworks and incentives that meet the broad spectrum of housing needs in Ontario. Much action, though, has been taken in recent years.

- The Ontario government has taken several steps to make it easier to build additional suites in your own home: reduced disincentives to building rental housing, improved the appeal process, focused on density around transit stations, made upfront development charges more predictable, and provided options for municipalities to create community benefits through development.

- The federal government has launched the National Housing Strategy and committed over $70 billion in funding. Most recently, it has announced a $4 billion Housing Accelerator Fund aimed at helping municipalities remove barriers to building housing more quickly.

- Municipalities have been looking at ways to change outdated processes, rules, and ways of thinking that create delays and increases costs of delivering homes. Several municipalities have taken initial steps towards eliminating exclusionary zoning and addressing other barriers described in this report.

All governments agree that we are facing a housing crisis. Now we must turn the sense of urgency into action and alignment across governments.

**Mirror policy changes with financial incentives aligned across governments**

The policy recommendations in this report will go a long way to align efforts and position builders to deliver more homes.

Having the capacity in our communities to build these homes will take more than policy. It will take money. Rewarding municipalities that meet housing growth and approval timelines will help them to invest in system upgrades, hire additional staff, and invest in their communities. Similarly, municipalities that resist new housing, succumb to NIMBY pressure, and close off their neighbourhoods should see funding reductions. Fixing the housing crisis is a societal responsibility, and our limited tax dollars should be directed to those municipalities making the difficult but necessary choices to grow housing supply.

In late January 2022, the provincial government announced $45 million for a new Streamline Development Approval Fund to “unlock housing supply by cutting red tape and improving processes for residential and industrial developments.” This is encouraging. More is needed.

Ontario should also receive its fair share of federal funding but today faces a shortfall of almost $500 million despite two thirds of the Canadian housing shortage being in Ontario. We call on the federal government to address this funding gap.

**48. The Ontario government should establish a large “Ontario Housing Delivery Fund” and encourage the federal government to match funding. This fund should reward:**

a) Annual housing growth that meets or exceeds provincial targets

b) Reductions in total approval times for new housing

c) The speedy removal of exclusionary zoning practices

**49. Reductions in funding to municipalities that fail to meet provincial housing growth and approval timeline targets.**

We believe that the province should consider partial grants to subsidize municipalities that waive development charges for affordable housing and for purpose-built rental.

**Sustain focus, measure, monitor, improve**

**Digitize and modernize the approvals and planning process**

Some large municipalities have moved to electronic tracking of development applications and/or electronic building permits (“e-permits”) and report promising results, but there is no consistency and many smaller places don’t have the capacity to make the change.

Municipalities, the provincial government and agencies use different systems to collect data and information relevant to housing approvals, which slows down processes and leaves much of the “big picture” blank. This could be addressed by ensuring uniform data architecture standards.

**Improve the quality of our housing data to inform decision making**

Having accurate data is key to understanding any challenge and making the best decisions in response. The Task Force heard from multiple housing experts that we are not always using the best data, and we do not always have the data we need.
Having good population forecasts is essential in each municipality as they develop plans to meet future land and housing needs. Yet, we heard many concerns about inconsistent approaches to population forecasts. In the Greater Golden Horseshoe, the forecast provided to municipalities by the province is updated only when the Growth Plan is updated, generally every seven years; but federal immigration policy, which is a key driver of growth, changes much more frequently. The provincial Ministry of Finance produces a population forecast on a more regular basis than the Growth Plan, but these are not used consistently across municipalities or even by other provincial ministries.

Population forecasts get translated into housing need in different ways across the province, and there is a lack of data about how (or whether) the need will be met. Others pointed to the inconsistent availability of land inventories. Another challenge is the lack of information on how much land is permitted and how much housing is actually getting built once permitted, and how fast. The Task Force also heard that, although the Provincial Policy Statement requires municipalities to maintain a three-year supply of short-term (build-ready) land and report it each year to the province, many municipalities are not meeting that requirement.

At a provincial and municipal level, we need better data on the housing we have today, housing needed to close the gap, consistent projections of what we need in the future, and data on how we are doing at keeping up. Improved data will help anticipate local and provincial supply bottlenecks and constraints, making it easier to determine the appropriate level and degree of response.

It will also be important to have better data to assess how much new housing stock is becoming available to groups that have been disproportionately excluded from home ownership and rental housing.

**Put eyes on the crisis and change the conversation around housing**

Ours is not the first attempt to “fix the housing system”. There have been efforts for years to tackle increasing housing prices and find solutions so everyone in Ontario can find and afford the housing they need. This time must be different.

The recommendations in this report must receive sustained attention, results must be monitored, significant financial investment by all levels of government must be made. And, the people of Ontario must embrace a housing landscape in which the housing needs of tomorrow’s citizens and those who have been left behind are given equal weight to the housing advantages of those who are already well established in homes that they own.

---

**50. Fund the adoption of consistent municipal e-permitting systems and encourage the federal government to match funding.** Fund the development of common data architecture standards across municipalities and provincial agencies and require municipalities to provide their zoning bylaws with open data standards. Set an implementation goal of 2025 and make funding conditional on established targets.

**51. Require municipalities and the provincial government to use the Ministry of Finance population projections as the basis for housing need analysis and related land use requirements.**

**52. Resume reporting on housing data and require consistent municipal reporting, enforcing compliance as a requirement for accessing programs under the Ontario Housing Delivery Fund.**

**53. Report each year at the municipal and provincial level on any gap between demand and supply by housing type and location, and make underlying data freely available to the public.**

**54. Empower the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to lead an all-of-government committee, including key provincial ministries and agencies, that meets weekly to ensure our remaining recommendations and any other productive ideas are implemented.**

**55. Commit to evaluate these recommendations for the next three years with public reporting on progress.**
Conclusion

We have set a bold goal for Ontario: building 1.5 million homes in the next 10 years.

We believe this can be done. What struck us was that everyone we talked to – builders, housing advocates, elected officials, planners – understands the need to act now. As one long-time industry participant said, “for the first time in memory, everyone is aligned, and we need to take advantage of that.”

Such unity of purpose is rare, but powerful.

To leverage that power, we offer solutions that are bold but workable, backed by evidence, and that position Ontario for the future.

Our recommendations focus on ramping up the supply of housing. Measures are already in place to try to cool demand, but they will not fill Ontario’s housing need. More supply is key. Building more homes will reduce the competition for our scarce supply of homes and will give Ontarians more housing choices. It will improve housing affordability across the board.

Everyone wants more Ontarians to have housing. So let’s get to work to build more housing in Ontario.
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APPENDIX B: Affordable Housing

Ontario’s affordable housing shortfall was raised in almost every conversation. With rapidly rising prices, more lower-priced market rental units are being converted into housing far out of reach of lower-income households. In parallel, higher costs to deliver housing and limited government funding have resulted in a net decrease in the number of affordable housing units run by non-profits. The result is untenable: more people need affordable housing after being displaced from the market at the very time that affordable supply is shrinking.

Throughout our consultations, we were reminded of the housing inequities experienced by Black, Indigenous and marginalized people. We also received submissions describing the unique challenges faced by off-reserve Indigenous Peoples both in the province’s urban centres and in the north.

While many of the changes that will help deliver market housing will also help make it easier to deliver affordable housing, affordable housing is a societal responsibility. We cannot rely exclusively on for-profit developers nor on increases in the supply of market housing to fully solve the problem.

The non-profit housing sector faces all the same barriers, fees, risks and complexities outlined in this report as for-profit builders. Several participants from the non-profit sector referred to current or future partnerships with for-profit developers that tap into the development and construction expertise and efficiencies of the private sector. Successful examples of leveraging such partnerships were cited with Indigenous housing, supportive housing, and affordable homeownership.

We were also reminded by program participants that, while partnerships with for-profit developers can be very impactful, non-profit providers have unique competencies in the actual delivery of affordable housing. This includes confirming eligibility of affordable housing applicants, supporting independence of occupants of affordable housing, and ensuring affordable housing units remain affordable from one occupant to the next.

One avenue for delivering more affordable housing that has received much recent attention is inclusionary zoning. In simple terms, inclusionary zoning (IZ) requires developers to deliver a share of affordable units in new housing developments in prescribed areas. The previous Ontario government passed legislation in April 2018 providing a framework within which municipalities could enact Inclusionary Zoning bylaws.

Ontario’s first inclusionary zoning policy was introduced in fall 2021 by the City of Toronto and applies to major transit station areas. Internationally, inclusionary zoning has been used successfully to incentivize developers to create new affordable housing by providing density bonuses (more units than they would normally be allowed, if some are affordable) or reductions in government fees. Unfortunately, the City’s approach did not include any incentives or bonuses. Instead, Toronto requires market-rate fees and charges for below-market affordable units. This absence of incentives together with lack of clarity on the overall density that will be approved for projects has led developers and some housing advocates to claim that these projects may be uneconomic and thus will not get financed or built. Municipalities shared with us their concerns regarding the restriction in the provincial IZ legislation that prohibits “cash in lieu” payments. Municipalities advised that having the option of accepting the equivalent value of IZ units in cash from the developer would enable even greater impact in some circumstances (for example, a luxury building in an expensive neighbourhood, where the cost of living is too high for a low-income resident).

Funding for affordable housing is the responsibility of all levels of government. The federal government has committed to large funding transfers to the provinces to support affordable housing. The Task Force heard, however, that Ontario’s share of this funding does not reflect our proportionate affordable housing needs. This, in turn, creates further financial pressure on both the province and municipalities, which further exacerbates the affordable housing shortages in Ontario’s communities.
Finally, many participants in Task Force consultations pointed to surplus government lands as an avenue for building more affordable housing and this is discussed in Appendix C.

We have made recommendations throughout the report intended to have a positive impact on new affordable housing supply. We offer these additional recommendations specific to affordable housing:

- Call upon the federal government to provide equitable affordable housing funding to Ontario.
- Develop and legislate a clear, province-wide definition of “affordable housing” to create certainty and predictability.
- Create an Affordable Housing Trust from a portion of Land Transfer Tax Revenue (i.e., the windfall resulting from property price appreciation) to be used in partnership with developers, non-profits, and municipalities in the creation of more affordable housing units. This Trust should create incentives for projects serving and brought forward by Black- and Indigenous-led developers and marginalized groups.

- Amend legislation to:
  - Allow cash-in-lieu payments for Inclusive Zoning units at the discretion of the municipality.
  - Require that municipalities utilize density bonusing or other incentives in all Inclusionary Zoning and Affordable Housing policies that apply to market housing.
  - Permit municipalities that have not passed Inclusionary Zoning policies to offer incentives and bonuses for affordable housing units.

- Encourage government to closely monitor the effectiveness of Inclusionary Zoning policy in creating new affordable housing and to explore alternative funding methods that are predictable, consistent and transparent as a more viable alternative option to Inclusionary Zoning policies in the provision of affordable housing.

- Rebate MPAC market rate property tax assessment on below-market affordable homes.
APPENDIX C:  
Government Surplus Land

Surplus government lands fell outside the mandate of the Task Force. However, this question came up repeatedly as a solution to housing supply. While we take no view on the disposition of specific parcels of land, several stakeholders raised issues that we believe merit consideration:

- Review surplus lands and accelerate the sale and development through RFP of surplus government land and surrounding land by provincially pre-zoning for density, affordable housing, and mixed or residential use.

- All future government land sales, whether commercial or residential, should have an affordable housing component of at least 20%.

- Purposefully upzone underdeveloped or underutilized Crown property (e.g., LCBO).

- Sell Crown land and reoccupy as a tenant in a higher density building or relocate services outside of major population centres where land is considerably less expensive.

- The policy priority of adding to the housing supply, including affordable units, should be reflected in the way surplus land is offered for sale, allowing bidders to structure their proposals accordingly.
APPENDIX D:
Surety Bonds

Moving to surety bonds would free up billions of dollars for building

When a development proposal goes ahead, the developer typically needs to make site improvements, such as installing common services. The development agreement details how the developer must perform to the municipality’s satisfaction.

Up until the 1980s, it was common practice for Ontario municipalities to accept bonds as financial security for subdivision agreements and site plans. Today, however, they almost exclusively require letters of credit from a chartered bank. The problem with letters of credit is that developers are often required to collateralize the letter of credit dollar-for-dollar against the value of the municipal works they are performing.

Often this means developers can only afford to finance one or two housing projects at a time, constraining housing supply. The Ontario Home Builders’ Association estimates that across Ontario, billions of dollars are tied up in collateral or borrowing capacity that could be used to advance more projects.

Modern “pay on demand surety bonds” are proven to provide the same benefits and security as a letter of credit, while not tying up private capital the way letters of credit do. Moving to this option would give municipalities across Ontario access to all the features of a letter of credit with the added benefit of professional underwriting, carried out by licensed bonding companies, ensuring that the developer is qualified to fulfill its obligations under the municipal agreement.

Most important from a municipal perspective, the financial obligation is secured. If a problem arises, the secure bond is fully payable by the bond company on demand. Surety companies, similar to banks, are regulated by Ontario’s Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions to ensure they have sufficient funds in place to pay out bond claims.

More widespread use of this instrument could unlock billions of dollars of private sector financial liquidity that could be used to build new infrastructure and housing projects, provide for more units in each development and accelerate the delivery of housing of all types.
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## Appendix 2
Provincial Housing Affordability Task Force Recommendations and STC Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Staff Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | Set a goal of building 1.5 million new homes in ten years.                     | Neutral  | This goal would have to be set by the Province through population and employment targets through the Places to Grow, Growth Plan and then implemented through Regional and Municipal Official Plans through the Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) process.  

The City of St. Catharines just completed a comprehensive compliance exercise to bring the Garden City Official Plan into conformity with 2051 Growth Plan targets. New targets, and the required compliance exercises and anticipate Ontario Land Tribunal hearings, would negate that work and contribute to further delays.  

If the Province wishes to increase intensification targets again for the 2051-time horizon, it also needs to provide municipalities with infrastructure funding to match population growth.  |
| 2. | Amend the Planning Act, Provincial Policy Statement, and Growth Plans to set “growth in the full spectrum of housing supply” and “intensification within existing built-up areas” of municipalities as the most important residential housing priorities in the mandate and purpose. | Support  | Municipal Official Plans implement Provincial Growth Plan targets and are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement. It is an important city building initiative to focus growth and intensification within existing built-up areas of municipalities. The City’s Garden City Official Plan contains policies directing growth to built up areas, particularly the downtown and GO Major Transit Station Area (MTSA) and supports a variety of housing configurations. |
|   | Limit exclusionary zoning in municipalities through binding provincial action: | Neutral | The City of St. Catharines’s Zoning By-law permits accessory dwelling units, single detached, semi detached, quadplex, and townhouses as-of-right in its lowest density zone. The maximum height permission for this zone is 10m (approximately 33 feet). Staff are supportive of up to four units on a single residential lot provided that performance standards can be achieved. However, a mandatory minimum four storey height limit does not consider neighbourhood context and should have accompanying zoning standards to evaluate the proposed development.

While the Task Force assumes that generation of additional supply will lead to downward pressure on pricing, an as-of-right permission for 4 units per residential lot could actually have the reverse effect of increasing already high property values. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Allow “as of right” residential housing up to four units and up to four storeys on a single residential lot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b.</td>
<td>b. Modernize the Building Code and other policies to remove any barriers to affordable construction and to ensure meaningful implementation (e.g., allow single-staircase construction for up to four storeys, allow single egress, etc.).</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Permit “as of right” conversion of underutilized or redundant commercial properties to residential or mixed-residential and commercial use.</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
underutilized to obtain a “free” rezoning and increase the value of the property. Many municipalities have recently undergone extensive and comprehensive land needs assessments to conform to Provincial Growth and Employment Targets. Permitting as-of-right conversion to residential uses would result in an imbalance of employment and commercial opportunities in municipalities and an imbalance in property taxation. Furthermore, in a downtown context, this recommended permission could result in a plethora of residential units at grade which reduces street activity, animation. This could result in a proliferation of bedroom communities and loss of walkable opportunities for everyday needs.

5. Permit “as of right” secondary suites, garden suites, and laneway houses province-wide. Support The City’s Zoning By-law already permits accessory dwelling units as of right. The City will be examining garden suites and laneway housing as part of the Housekeeping Zoning By-law Review project, tentatively scheduled for the 2023 workplan.

6. Permit “as of right” multi-tenant housing (renting rooms within a dwelling) province-wide. Support Staff support home share and other methods of renting out rooms within a dwelling as an affordable housing option. Licensing should be explored to ensure life safety of occupants.

7. Encourage and incentivize municipalities to increase density in areas with excess school capacity to benefit families with children. Neutral The City of St. Catharines is not aware of any school catchment areas that have excess capacity. As the Province is responsible for administering the Boards of Education, efforts should be made at investing in urban school models in downtown, midtown, uptown, and MTSA contexts (Vancouver has embraced this model with success). Increasing density in established neighbourhoods via medium and high density built form may not generate school age children. Must consider neighbourhood context. Servicing infrastructure may require substantial upgrades to implement this.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Allow “as of right” zoning up to unlimited height and unlimited density in the immediate proximity of individual major transit stations within two years if municipal zoning remains insufficient to meet provincial density targets.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>The City’s zoning currently permits, as of right, unlimited height and density in the downtown, and has since 2013. To date, this has not resulted in a significant amount of affordable or market residential development. This recommendation assumes that servicing infrastructure is adequate to accommodate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Allow “as of right” zoning of six to 11 storeys with no minimum parking requirements on any streets utilized by public transit (including streets on bus and streetcar routes).</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>The City’s policies already encourage intensification along arterial roads, to support public transportation investment. However, bus routes are dynamic and can frequently change, depending on community needs. Transit can also go down local roads. It does not make sense to radically change neighbourhoods based on flexible bus routes. Furthermore, as of right permissions could be detrimental to heritage assets and substantially increase opposition to public transit in an effort to keep density out of established neighbourhoods. This recommendation should be further explored for fixed transit infrastructure, such as BRT, LRT, and rail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Designate or rezone as mixed commercial and residential use all land along transit corridors and redesignate all Residential Apartment to mixed commercial and residential zoning in Toronto.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>This appears to be a Toronto-centric issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Support responsible housing growth on undeveloped land, including outside existing</td>
<td>OPPOSE</td>
<td>Staff strongly oppose expanding the existing urban boundary. Urban boundary delineations are integral to protecting tender fruit lands, specialty crop areas, and Greenbelt lands. Expanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
municipal boundaries, by building necessary infrastructure to support higher density housing and complete communities and applying the recommendations of this report to all undeveloped land.

urban boundaries contributes to suburban sprawl, greater infrastructure burden, and increase in property taxes to support. Furthermore, expanding urban boundaries is contrary to climate change objectives. There is no definition provided for “responsible” housing growth and furthermore, this does not provide for other supporting uses such as institutional and daily commercial needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12a Create a more permissive land use, planning, and approvals system: Repeal or override municipal policies, zoning, or plans that prioritize the preservation of physical character of neighbourhood.</td>
<td>It is unclear if “physical character of neighbourhood” includes heritage conservation districts. The City of St. Catharines has four heritage conservation districts, each of which have their own distinct character. This recommendation dismisses the value of heritage conservation and ignores residential context and removes compatibility from planning analysis. Additional density can still be supported in built forms that compliment character and heritage conservation areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b Exempt from site plan approval and public consultation all projects of 10 units or less that conform to the Official Plan and require only minor variances.</td>
<td>The City’s site plan control by-law currently applies to developments with 4 or more residential dwelling units. Site plan control permits evaluation of a development for compatibility with adjoining lands. This recommendation, if implemented, would eliminate landscaping, drainage, parking review and would remove the ability to assess the development for its compliance with the City’s objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12c Establish province-wide zoning standards, or prohibitions, for minimum lot sizes, maximum building setbacks, minimum heights, angular planes, shadow rules, front doors,</td>
<td>Province wide zoning standards are not context sensitive (i.e. an urban downtown has a very different context from a northern municipality). Applying the same zoning standards to 444 municipalities would significantly add to the number of minor variance applications, hence adding additional delay and process which is counter to the Task Force’s desired outcome. Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building depth, landscaping, floor space index, and heritage view cones, and planes; restore pre-2006 site plan exclusions (colour, texture, and type of materials, window details, etc.) to the Planning Act and reduce or eliminate minimum parking requirements; and view cones are based on site merits, heritage impact assessments, and other contextual values. Standardized minimum height regulations are not context supportive and do not consider shadow impacts, growing zones, native species, etc. Removing colour, texture, and materiality is problematic as it will result in bland, cheap cladding that becomes the occupant’s burden to maintain, prematurely looks dated/dirty, and does not contribute to the streetscape (i.e. excessive stucco). Staff may be supportive of Provincial standards for undertaking a shadow study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12d</td>
<td>Remove any floorplate restrictions to allow larger, more efficient high-density towers.</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Limit municipalities from requesting or hosting additional public meetings beyond those that are required under the Planning Act.</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Require that public consultations provide digital participation options.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Require mandatory delegation of site plan approvals and minor variances to staff or pre-approved qualified third-party technical consultants through a simplified review and approval process, without the ability to withdraw Council’s delegation.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Prevent abuse of the heritage preservation and designation process by: a) Prohibiting the use of bulk listing on municipal heritage registers</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>b) Prohibiting reactive heritage designations after a Planning Act development application has been filed</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What constitutes a development application? Do pre-submission consultations count? What does this mean for the 60 day moratorium on demolitions? What purpose does a HIA have then? Will have a counter effective of ensuring more properties are designated. This recommendation assumes that heritage and new construction/adaptive reuse are mutually exclusive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Requiring municipalities to compensate property owners for loss of property value as a result of heritage designations, based on the principle of best economic use of land.</td>
<td><strong>OPPOSE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is unclear when or how this recommendation would be triggered. Staff would need to understand if this is retroactive to properties on the heritage registry. Development speculation has always had risks; however, it is the responsibility of the buyer to be aware of the responsibilities of their purchase. If there is a potential for a heritage designation, that should be factored into the proposal – it should not be factored in to how much the taxpayers should “compensate” a developer for their purchase. This recommendation, if implemented, would result in inappropriate incentivization and the destruction of cultural heritage assets and landscapes. In MTSAs, the cost of land increases with the proximity of amenities. It would be cost prohibitive to compensate developers for purchasing land in these areas and furthermore, detrimental to cultural heritage assets that exist in these areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This recommendation assumes that there is no value of cultural heritage landscapes, where the opposite is true. Heritage conservation contributes to a sense of community and identity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This recommendation has not been considered with respect to indigenous sites of interest and how “loss of property value” would be calculated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The City of St. Catharines, through its CIP, incentivizes heritage conservation and preservation efforts. In the USA, there are tax credits for heritage preservation. Development applications will always result in a change in property value – to place that burden on the taxpayer is irresponsible. Municipalities and their taxpayers should not compensate developers for a perceived loss of profit. In theory, this could require a payment for “loss of property value” for every heritage designated property. There are significant financial impacts that could materially impact the City’s property tax levy moving forward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Restore the right of developers to appeal Official Plans and Municipal Comprehensive Reviews.</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Legislate timelines at each stage of the provincial and municipal review process, including site plan, minor variance, and provincial reviews, and deem an application approved if the</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | legislated response time is exceeded. | of approval will take the same amount of time for the applicant to clear as they do now. | Bill 108 significantly reduced Planning Act timeframes for the review of development applications. To date, there has been no indication that this has resulted in an improvement in affordability.  
Automatic approvals would result in substandard, lower quality developments.  
Staff would support the Province undertaking a review of application processing timeframes for Provincial ministries and Conservation Authorities and providing the appropriate resources to expedite approvals in their own control. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 20 | Fund the creation of “approvals facilitators” with the authority to quickly resolve conflicts among municipal and/or provincial authorities and ensure timelines are met. | Support | Staff support Provincial Facilitators to facilitate a “one window” approach with Provincial approval agencies. Staff are interested in understanding how the Province will define a hierarchy of priority to apply Provincial Facilitators.  
The City of St. Catharines currently has a vacant Project Expeditor position. Recruitment efforts have not been successful. |
| 21 | Require a pre-consultation with all relevant parties at which the municipality sets out a binding list that defines what constitutes a complete application; confirms the number of consultations established in the previous | Oppose | The Planning Act is silent on pre-submission consultations. The City of St. Catharines already employs a pre-submission consultation process, setting out a list of requirements to form a complete submission. However, staff are unclear on the implementation aspects of this recommendation. Does this limit the municipality’s ability to undertake a peer review? Does this mean the municipality has not ability to deny a stamped document? It is unclear if that means a CAHP stamped heritage |
recommendations; and clarifies that if a member of a regulated profession such as a professional engineer has stamped an application, the municipality has no liability and no additional stamp is needed.

| 22 | Simplify planning legislation and policy documents. | Support | Staff support a full Planning Act reform to improve clarity and consistency. Greater correlation between Provincial Plans should be explored, including prioritizing matters of Provincial interest in instances of land use overlap (i.e. prime agricultural and aggregate).

Staff recommend the Province form an advisory group consisting of municipal planners and lawyers to review and recommend changes. |

<p>| 23 | Create a common, province-wide definition of plan of subdivision and standard set of conditions which clarify which may be included; require the | Oppose | The City of St. Catharines uses standard plan of subdivision conditions and then includes context sensitive site-specific conditions, directly related to the site conditions. A common set of subdivision conditions for 444 municipalities is unrealistic. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>use of standard province-wide legal agreements and, where feasible, plans of subdivision.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Allow wood construction of up to 12 storeys.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Require municipalities to provide the option of pay on demand surety bonds and letters of credit.</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Require appellants to promptly seek permission (“leave to appeal”) of the Tribunal and demonstrate that an appeal has merit, relying on evidence and expert reports, before it is accepted.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 27a | Prevent abuse of process:  
Remove right of appeal for projects with at least 30% affordable housing in which units are guaranteed affordable for at least 40 years. | Neutral | More information is needed to fully understand how this would be administered. Typically, the development application must be completed prior to housing providers committing to service agreements. It is not clear how an applicant can guarantee affordable housing without the development application having certainty. Staff are concerned that this recommendation would encourage lower standards of development. Furthermore, the Province needs to define “affordable housing” for this context. |
<p>| 27b | Require a $10,000 filing fee for third-party appeals. | Oppose | A $10,000 appeal fee for the general public is undemocratic, punitive, and designed to prevent access to the appeal process. Furthermore, persons who could be legitimately impacted by a development deserve an opportunity to appeal to a Provincial body, regardless of financial ability. A $10,000 appeal fee would only be accessible to wealthy resident groups. The application of a $10,000 appeal fee would be the addition of a systemic barrier to a democratic process. |
| 27c | Provide discretion to adjudicators to award full costs to the successful party in any appeal brought by a third party or by a municipality where its council has overridden a recommended staff approval. | Neutral | Staff can appreciate the use of costs to be awarded for blatant abuse of process; however, it is unclear if this is the most appropriate method. |
| 28 | Encourage greater use of oral decisions issued the day of the hearing, with written reasons to follow, and allow those decisions to become binding the day that they are issued. | Support | Staff are supportive of oral decisions being issued the day of the hearing, particularly for matters arising from the hearing of Motions. Oral decisions for complex matters including conditions of approval would be difficult to implement without the written decision and order. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Where it is found that a municipality has refused an application simply to avoid a deemed approval for lack of decision, allow the Tribunal to award punitive damages.</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Provide funding to increase staffing (adjudicators and case managers), provide market-competitive salaries, outsource more matters to mediators, and set shorter time targets.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>In clearing the existing backlog, encourage the Tribunal to prioritize projects close to the finish line that will support housing growth and intensification, as well as regional water or utility infrastructure decisions that will unlock significant housing capacity.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Waive development charges and parkland cash-in-lieu and charge only modest connection fees for all infill residential project up to 10 units or for any development where no new material infrastructure will be required.</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
this recommendation will have significant impacts on municipal financial abilities to support infrastructure projects

Waiving cash-in-lieu of parkland fees would impact the City’s ability to deliver parkland and recreational facilities in proximity to the development, as well as city wide. Making development cheaper for developers does not automatically increase supply of affordable housing. This recommendation, if implemented, will result in a proliferation of 10-unit developments, which may be ultimately underdevelopment for a site just to avoid DC and parkland costs at the expense of the community’s livability.

The implementation of this recommendation will severely impact a municipality’s ability to invest, maintain, and construction in servicing infrastructure and quality recreation spaces for the residents who will be calling these developments home.

| 33 | Waive development charges on all forms of affordable housing guaranteed to be affordable for 40 years. | Neutral | The City of St. Catharines’ DC By-law accommodates DC rebates for true affordable housing. The current Development Charges Act sets an affordability limit of 20 years. The Province would need to amend its Act to implement this recommendation. In doing so, the Province should clearly define “affordable housing” for this purpose. As waiving DCs would impact the City’s capital works program, the Province should adequately fund municipalities with reimbursements for lost DCs for affordable housing. |
| 34 | Prohibit interest rates on development charges higher than a municipality’s borrowing rate. | Oppose | The City of St. Catharines currently does not have an interest policy for development charges; however, one is being considered by Council in Q2 2022. Most of the City’s growth-related infrastructure will not be built until a certain level of development has occurred. Current interest rates paid by the |
municipality on long term debt are far lower than the Non-Residential Construction Cost Index which more accurately reflects the changes in the cost of infrastructure over time. In an indirect manner, the recommendation if implemented would ultimately lead to an increase in DC rates over time. Additionally, those interest rates change over time, and fluctuating interest rates do not provide cost certainty in the same manner that a fixed interest rate could.

|   | Regarding cash in lieu of parkland, s.37, Community Benefit Charges, and development charges:  
Provincial review of reserve levels, collections and drawdowns annually to ensure funds are being used in a timely fashion and for the intended purpose, and, where review points to a significant concern, do not allow further collection until the situation has been corrected.  
Except where allocated towards municipality-wide infrastructure projects, require municipalities to spend funds in the neighbourhoods where they were collected. However, where there’s a significant community need in a priority area of the City, allow for | Oppose | Legislation for Community Benefit Charges and Development Charges already have regulations for reporting, including collections that are allocated to projects. For development charges, large projects often require funds to be collected over a period of time before a project can move forward, and that project may take years to construct. Council ultimately make decisions on capital budgets and forecasts and at times will need to adjust timing to meet other strategic and emergent goals. Annual reviews of cash in lieu reserve funds will not assist in reaching any of the Task Force’s defined goals. Cash in lieu reserves need to be built up in order to acquire appropriate lands for parkland and/or recreational facilities. Areas of greatest parkland need are typically located in areas with the high land values – area specific collection and spending limits remove municipal autonomy in creating people places.  
This recommendation, if implemented, will create an inefficient use of funds, require varied rates, and add administrative burden and unnecessary complexity. DCs are collected on a city-wide basis to be used on city-wide needs. The City of St. Catharines future development will be 95% intensification and as such, infrastructure requirements do not related to or benefit a single area of the City. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36 Recommend that the federal government and provincial governments update HST rebate to reflect current home prices and begin indexing the thresholds to housing prices, and that the federal government match the provincial 75% rebate and remove any clawback.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>More information is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Align property taxes for purpose-built rental with those of condos and low rise.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>More information is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The intent of tax policy is revenue neutrality, which means that any reduction in the tax ratio of one property tax class is shifted and shared among the other remaining tax classes. The City of St. Catharines’ assessment is largely residential (80%), as such, any reduction in the tax ratio of other property tax classes will result in the residential tax base carrying a larger tax burden. Staff could support changing both the tax rate and property value assessment methodology to align with those of condos and low rise, unless there is a distinction between purpose built rental and condo tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Amend the Planning Act and Perpetuities Act to extend the maximum period for land leases and restrictive</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Extending the maximum period for land leases may assist with some forms of affordable housing, such as community land trusts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Support/Neutral/Absent</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Eliminate or reduce tax disincentives to housing growth.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Staff are unable to assess this recommendation until additional information and clarity is provided as to which tax categories disincentivize housing growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Funding for pilot projects that create innovative pathways to homeownership, for Black, Indigenous, and marginalized people and first-generation homeowners.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>The City of St. Catharines is supportive of Provincial funding and administration of these initiatives and suggest that Federal assistance also be obtained to remove systemic barriers in Canada’s banking system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Provide provincial and federal loan guarantees for purpose-built rental, affordable rental, and affordable ownership projects.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Loan guarantees have been previously identified as a barrier for purpose built rental and non-profit housing developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Enable municipalities, subject to adverse external economic events, to withdraw infrastructure allocations from any permitted projects where construction has not been completed.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>The City of St. Catharines does not have substantial greenfield development opportunities that would necessitate the phasing of infrastructure and servicing capacities. Further information and clarity on the intent of this recommendation and how it would be implemented is necessary to better understand potential implications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>initiated within three years of build permits being issued.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td>Work with municipalities to develop and implement a municipal services corporation utility model for water and wastewater under which the municipal corporation would borrow and amortize costs among customers instead of using development charges.</td>
<td><strong>Oppose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td>Improve funding for colleges, trade schools, and apprenticeships; encourage and incentivize municipalities, unions and employers to provide more on-the-job training.</td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undertake multi-stakeholder education program to promote skilled trades.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Recommend that the federal and provincial government prioritize skilled trades and adjust the immigration points system to strongly favour needed trades and expedite immigration status for these workers, and encourage the federal government to increase from 9,000 to 20,000 the number of immigrants admitted through Ontario’s program.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 48 | The Ontario government should establish a large “Ontario Housing Delivery Fund” and encourage the federal government to match funding. This fund should reward:  
   a) Annual housing growth that meets or exceeds provincial targets  
   b) Reductions in total approval times for new housing | Oppose | The City of St. Catharines is supportive of the Province creating a fund to establish truly affordable housing. However, an “Ontario Housing Delivery Fund” has the following implications:  
   a) Municipalities have no control over the market and are unable to force annual housing growth to exceed provincial targets.  
   b) A fund to reward reduction in approval time incentivizes poor process and rewards substandard developments in exchange for the possibility of obtaining a grant. It would be more advantageous for the Province to review internal |
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **c) The speedy removal of exclusionary zoning practices** | Ministries and agencies for bottlenecks and resource accordingly.  
   c) The City of St. Catharines’ Zoning By-law currently has one of the most permissive low density zoning regulations in the Province. Many exclusionary zoning practices were removed City-wide in 2013. |   |
<p>| 49 | Reductions in funding to municipalities that fail to meet provincial housing growth and approval timeline targets | Oppose | The City of St. Catharines have no control over market demand and should not be penalized for the inability or unwillingness of a developer to start construction. Furthermore, financial penalties would only contribute to further application processing delays as less staff and resources would be available to evaluate applications. |
| 50 | Fund the adoption of consistent municipal e-permitting systems and encourage the federal government to match funding. Fund the development of common data architecture standards across municipalities and provincial agencies and require municipalities to provide their zoning bylaws with open data standards. Set an implementation goal of 2025 and make funding conditional on established targets. | Support | The City of St. Catharines was an early adopter of the AMANDA database system and is currently implementing its e-permitting system BuildSTC. A Provincially funded universal e-permitting system would ensure consistency amongst municipalities for data collection and reporting, and support small, less sophisticated municipalities with an opportunity to modernize processes. |
| 51 | Require municipalities and the provincial government to use the Ministry of Finance population projections as the basis for growth management. | Neutral | The Province’s land use planning framework has been predicated on growth targets and implementing policies in the Growth Plan. It is unclear what implications shifting to Ministry of Finance population projections will have on growth management and long |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Resume reporting on housing data and require consistent municipal reporting, enforcing compliance as a requirement for accessing programs under the Ontario Housing Delivery Fund.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Report each year at the municipal and provincial level on any gap between demand and supply by housing type and location, and make underlying data freely available to the public.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Empower the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to lead an all-of-government committee, including key provincial ministries and agencies, that meets weekly to ensure our remaining recommendations and any other productive ideas are implemented.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Commit to evaluate these recommendations for the next three years with public reporting on progress.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>create a consistent methodology and reporting structure to support municipalities in providing data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 10, 2022

Hon. Steve Clark  
Minister of Municipal Affairs & Housing  
17th Floor – 777 Bay Street  
Toronto, ON  
M7A 2J3

Re: OPPI’s Top 10 Housing Supply & Affordability Recommendations

Dear Minister Clark,

On behalf of the Ontario Professional Planners Institute (OPPI), I am pleased to provide our Top 10 recommended measures to address housing supply and affordability in the Province of Ontario.

This letter builds on the initial three recommendations from our December 20th submission to the Housing Affordability Task Force. We hope you consider these additional recommendations as you receive the Task Force report and develop the government’s action plan to address the housing affordability crisis in Ontario.

Overview of Top 10 Recommendations

1. Create a Chief Planner of Ontario with oversight of municipal implementation of provincial plans.
2. Encourage Community Planning Permit Systems in Strategic Growth Areas.
3. Require RPP sign-off on Planning Justification Reports to ensure completeness of applications.
4. Establish a Planning Modernization Fund to align outdated zoning with Official Plans.
5. Align provincial infrastructure funding with growth planning to address servicing gaps.
6. Lead development of a single data standard for planning and development applications.
7. Enhance delegation framework for technical planning implementation approvals.
8. Drive more affordable units into the mix of new housing supply.
9. Promote innovative approaches and provide rehabilitation funding for social housing.
10. Provide provincial policy stability in land use planning once upcoming changes are in place.

About OPPI

OPPI is the recognized voice of Ontario’s planning profession. With over 4,600 members, it serves as both the Professional Institute and regulator of Registered Professional Planners (RPP) in the province. Our members work across the planning spectrum, for consulting firms, provincial and municipal approval bodies, private developers, community agencies and academic institutions.

RPPs are skilled, professional, and dependable navigators employed to help lead communities towards the Ontario of tomorrow. RPPs are the local experts who bring together differing points of view; they
consult and develop recommendations that provide informed choices for decision-makers and elected officials. RPPs act in the public interest as professionals who work to improve the quality and livability of communities in Ontario today and for their sustainability long-term.

**Introduction**

OPPI has worked with the government to advance measures to streamline the land use planning approvals process in the Province of Ontario. We recently collaborated with stakeholders across the municipal and development sector to seek changes to the *Planning Act* that enhance delegation of minor approvals. We thank Minister Clark for adopting these measures in Schedule 19 of Bill 13, *Supporting People and Businesses Act, 2021*.

Additional delegation will help, but it is not the panacea for the housing affordability crisis in Ontario. There is much more work to be done at all levels of government to create a comprehensive plan that adequately addresses this generational challenge.

Many barriers have been identified and solutions proposed by stakeholders in the past few months which we have read with interest. Some innovative and worthy concepts are emerging. OPPI will focus our recommendations on measures that directly relate to actions the provincial government can take regarding land use planning matters.

**OPPI’s Top 10 Recommendations**

1. **Create an Office of the Chief Planner of Ontario (CPO) as an independent, non-partisan Office of the Legislative Assembly to provide oversight of municipal implementation of provincial land use plans and policies.**

   - A recent report by the Auditor General of Ontario found significant oversight, reporting and guidance challenges relating to municipal implementation of provincial land use plans and policies. Some of the key findings included:
     - Minimal information is available on the outcomes of policies associated with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. The province has only once reported on municipal implementation progress since the Plan’s inception.
     - Many municipalities are falling short of targets in the Plan. Only four of the 25 Urban Growth Centres are on pace to meet their density targets by 2031.\(^1\)
     - Municipalities receive insufficient guidance on how to implement policies in provincial plans. In a survey of municipal planners, 70% of respondents said they lacked sufficient guidance or direction from provincial staff.\(^2\)

---


• The Chief Planner of Ontario (CPO) would serve to address these gaps by operating as an arm’s length oversight and advisory function for municipal implementation of provincial planning policy.

• The CPO would publish an annual report on progress towards implementation of provincial land use plans and policies including growth targets. The report would include a macro assessment of the implementation landscape. It would also include a micro review of major municipalities to identify specific policies and/or targets that are lagging.

• The CPO would provide recommendations to municipalities that are misaligned with provincial plans and policies on a path to conformity.

• The CPO would also assist in resolving differences amongst Provincial Ministries on land use planning policies and plans at the municipal level.

2. **Encourage Community Planning Permit Systems (CPPS) in Strategic Growth Areas by providing implementation funding to municipalities.**

   • A CPPS is an existing *Planning Act* tool that combines Zoning By-Law Amendment, Site Plan and Minor Variance into a single streamlined application and approval process. Once implemented the process can significantly speed up the approval process, but there has been limited uptake in Ontario.

   • **The Province should encourage use of a CPPS** in Strategic Growth Areas as set out in the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (i.e., Urban Growth Centres, Major Transit Station Areas, intensification corridors).

   • As an incentive to drive uptake, the Province should provide full implementation funding to municipalities that choose to implement a CPPS through the proposed Planning Modernization Fund (further details below).

   • Provincial standards should be set for a CPPS that include alignment of height and density with the Official Plan.

3. **Require Registered Professional Planner (RPP) sign-off on Planning Justification Reports to indicate completeness of application prior to submission by a proponent.**

   • Municipalities have consistently raised significant concerns with delays caused by poor quality and incomplete applications submitted by proponents.

   • Currently, proponents are required to prepare a Planning Justification Report for a major application including Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, Draft Plan of Subdivision, and/or Site Plan under the *Planning Act*. This report provides necessary background, overview, and planning rationale for the submission.

   • To improve completeness of applications, the **Province should require Planning Justification Reports be signed off by a Registered Professional Planner (RPP)** prior to
submission. The RPP would use professional judgement to attest to the completeness of the submission.

- An upfront rigorous review by an RPP would serve to reduce unnecessary time going back and forth between the proponent and municipality to address missing aspects of the submission.

4. **Establish a Planning Modernization Fund to align outdated zoning with Official Plans.**

- Municipalities raise resourcing as the primary barrier to updating zoning after new Official Plans are approved. This “out-of-date” zoning necessitates Zoning By-Law Amendments which could add as many as 18 or more months to the approval process in some large municipalities.

- **The Province should create a Planning Modernization Fund** that provides grants to municipal planning departments to obtain sufficient resources to update zoning and/or implement a CPPS to conform with new Official Plans. This can be funded by allocating 1% of Land Transfer Tax revenue to the program on an ongoing basis to support municipal planning capacity.

- Funding for local planning by other orders of government is not a novel concept. Historically, the Government of Ontario has provided various planning grants including the Community Planning Service Grant (CPSG).

- Ontario recently announced a **Streamline Development Approval Fund** to accelerate processes for managing and approving housing applications. This fund could likely be used to update zoning or implement a CPPS. However, competitive demands on this fund would still necessitate a dedicated fund to ensure sufficient resources are allocated for these initiatives.

5. **Align provincial infrastructure funding and financing programs with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe to ensure provincial support is targeted towards essential servicing for new housing developments.**

- Servicing costs continue to be a significant impediment to making greenfield lands available for housing development as well as realizing intensification in areas of antiquated infrastructure. Limitations to municipal debt capacity pose challenges that often impede adequate and timely servicing.

- Without adequate resources for key infrastructure, streamlining zoning and the application process will have little impact on housing supply.

- The Province should review all existing municipal infrastructure funding and financing programs and seek to **prioritize support towards gaps in servicing for new housing developments**. This, in effect, would align existing water, wastewater and other provincial funding for municipal infrastructure with growth planning.
• In addition, the Province should also review Ontario’s Long-Term Infrastructure Plan (LTIP) and align investments in provincially-owned assets such as schools, hospitals, and transit to municipal growth plans.

• Private-public partnership to ensure access to reliable broadband should also be explored to ensure new housing development has appropriate connectivity in the new age of telecommuting.

6. **Lead the development of a single data standard for planning and development applications in collaboration with municipalities and industry.**

   • Some municipalities have moved towards e-permitting; however, platforms are siloed, fragmented, and do not take into consideration the multiple government agencies that may need to be consulted.

   • There are no clear and consistent data standards or guidelines across these various commenting and approval agencies. The outcome is a complex array of multi-layered processes that add time and cost to the approval of housing projects.

   • **The Province should lead a data standardization initiative** in partnership with relevant stakeholders. Approaches could include supporting existing initiatives or conducting a joint procurement with the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO). Key principles should include avoiding vendor lock-in and open standards.

   • This can build on recent successes in the building permit space where AMO collaborated with the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC), a provincial agency, to procure Cloudpermit as an approved e-permitting platform for building permits in Ontario.

7. **Enhance delegation framework for technical planning implementation approvals.**

   • The Province recently expanded the ability of municipal councils to delegate minor planning approvals. However, the Province should go further and provide heads of planning departments with the authority to approve certain minor applications. These delegated approvals could “bump up” to Council at its discretion.

   • This would speed up the approval process by authorizing expert planning staff to review and approve technical implementation aspects of housing projects instead of waiting for Council meetings and agenda time.

   • Delegation by elected Councils is a proven method to reduce approval timelines. A recent survey, conducted by OPPI, found that where delegations were in place, 63% of heads of planning departments reported a reduction in development approval timeline of 2-3 months and 11% reported a reduction of 4-5 months.

   • The initial list of technical approvals that should be at the discretion of heads of planning departments include Draft Plan of Subdivisions, Site Plan, Lifting of Holding Provisions and Part Lot Control, Consents within the Built-Up Area, and Validation Certificates.
8. **Drive more affordable units into the mix of new housing supply.**

- A comprehensive housing strategy should include a suite of policies that **create incentives for affordable housing units** within the mix of new supply. These could include:
  
  - An as-of-right framework developed in partnership with the municipal sector to unlock affordable infill development on existing apartment sites.
  
  - Allowing municipalities to provide density bonusing in exchange for affordability requirements, including as part of inclusionary zoning by-laws.
  
  - Requirement for municipalities to have a separate queue for processing affordable housing applications to expedite approval.
  
  - Financial incentives such as provincial rebates for Development Charges and HST for affordable housing projects.

- The approach should also **drive specific design features within new affordable housing units**, including:
  
  - An appropriate mix of unit sizes that align with the nature of households, and in locations with access to local transit options.
  
  - Net zero heating and cooling, environmentally friendly elements, and higher quality materials.

- Private-public partnerships could be pursued to achieve some of these objectives.

9. **Promote innovative approaches and provide capital funding for rehabilitation of existing social housing stock.**

- Municipalities continue to struggle with maintaining existing social housing stock in a state-of-good repair. There are stories of social housing units being decommissioned due to health and safety concerns at a time when we face significant shortages and long waitlists.

- **The Province should create a Social Housing Centre of Excellence** aimed at developing and sharing innovative solutions to address the deferred maintenance crisis in Ontario’s existing social housing stock.

- The Centre can share best practices and provide templates and training on successful approaches, such as ones used in the Regent Park, Lawrence Heights, or Alexandra Park Revitalization projects.

- **The Province should also provide dedicated and ongoing rehabilitation funding to social housing providers**. One approach could be to dedicate 25% of Land Transfer Tax revenue towards the initiative.
10. Provide provincial policy stability in land use planning once upcoming changes are in place.

- Frequent provincial reviews and changes to plans and policies serve as a barrier to new housing development. Municipal capacity to adapt often lags changes to provincial plans.

- For example, the Province amended the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe in 2017 and provided municipalities five years to come into conformity. However, the Province made further amendments in 2019 and then again in 2020 before municipalities had a chance to conform to the previous changes. This further delayed the process as many municipalities had to redo studies and planning work.

- The Auditor General of Ontario noted in her December 2021 report that, “numerous changes in policies have created instability in the land use planning process”.

- Once the upcoming round of policy changes are in place, the Province should provide a period of policy stability to allow municipalities to adapt to the new regime.

In implementation of upcoming policy changes, the Province should apply an equity lens to ensure actions include solutions that address the inequities in accessing housing that Black, Indigenous, and People of Colour (BIPOC) face.

Conclusion

Many challenges have led to Ontario’s current housing affordability crisis. Some of these go beyond the land use planning policy framework and could be driven by a low interest rate environment, speculative demand, labour shortages and other factors.

Within the land use planning policy regime, there are many potential changes to plans and policies that could help accelerate housing supply, however our submission was intended to focus on our Top 10 recommendations.

As we look ahead to government consideration of recommendations by the Housing Affordability Task Force and other stakeholders, OPPIC would value an opportunity to provide ongoing advice to the Ministry as it seeks to implement changes to address Ontario’s housing affordability crisis. We kindly request a role in any implementation advisory tables setup by the Ministry on housing and other planning issues.

If you and/or Ministry staff have any questions on our proposed measures, please feel free to contact Susan Wiggins at (647) 326-2328 or by email at s.wiggins@ontarioplanners.ca.

Sincerely,

Paul Lowes, M.E.S., MCIP, RPP  
President  
Ontario Professional Planners Institute

Susan Wiggins, CAE, Hon IDC  
Executive Director  
Ontario Professional Planners Institute
CC: Luca Bucci, Chief of Staff – Office of the Minister of Municipal Affairs & Housing
CC: Kristin Jensen, Director of Policy – Office of the Minister of Municipal Affairs & Housing
CC: Alex Earthy, Senior Policy Advisor – Office of the Minister of Municipal Affairs & Housing
CC: Jae Truesdell, Director of Housing Policy – Office of the Premier
CC: Kate Manson-Smith, Deputy Minister – MMAH
CC: Joshua Paul, Assistant Deputy Minister of Housing Division – MMAH
CC: Sean Fraser, Assistant Deputy Minister (Acting) of Planning & Growth Division – MMAH
CC: Ewa Downarowicz, Director of Planning Policy Branch – MMAH
CC: Allyson Switzman, Manager of Legislation & Research Unit – MMAH
AMO’s Response to the Province’s Housing Affordability Task Force Report

A Submission to the Government of Ontario

March 1, 2022
Preamble

AMO appreciates the province’s commitment to addressing the housing affordability and supply crisis in Ontario. The COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated the urgency of this work. In our view, the province needs a made-in-Ontario housing framework.

Meaningful results will only be achieved if the social determinants of health, poverty reduction, and climate change mitigation and adaptation, are also addressed. A new collective mindset and transformative change is required, as tinkering around the edges will not be successful. Now is the time to take bold action to address the systemic issues around housing affordability over the long-term. We need a new provincial framework for housing affordability that we can all sign on to and work together to achieve.

Municipal Housing Advocacy to Date

AMO has been actively involved in housing and homelessness work for years. Municipal governments and District Social Service Administration Boards (DSSABs) in the North, are critical players on the front lines and make a meaningful difference for our communities with support from the provincial and federal governments. We are well-positioned to provide advice going forward on what is necessary to address the housing crisis affecting our communities.

In recent years AMO has created several papers on housing that call for government action: “Fixing the Housing Affordability Crisis: Municipal Recommendations for Housing in Ontario” (August 2019), “Ending Homelessness in Ontario” (December 2021), and, “A Blueprint for Action: An Integrated Approach to Address the Ontario Housing Crisis” (February 2022).

The 2019 paper made recommendations that would have served as a foundation for ongoing conversations with both the provincial and federal governments. It called for the National Housing Strategy framework to serve as a platform for the federal, provincial, and municipal orders of government to come together to talk about how best to improve housing outcomes for the people of Ontario.

The 2021 paper reiterated that the municipal role in housing and homelessness prevention cannot be understated and provided 23 potential actions to pursue an integrated systems approach.

The 2022 AMO Blueprint advocates for bold action and leadership by all three orders of government and private, non-profit, and co-operative housing sectors (collectively referred to as “development sector”) to address the housing crisis in Ontario. It provides nearly 90 recommendations that, if implemented by all parties, would improve affordability, diversify the housing mix, and increase supply.

The Province’s Work on Housing Affordability

As you know, AMO was disappointed that in December 2021, the province created a Housing Affordability Task Force (HATF) that lacked any municipal representation. Despite this, best efforts were made to provide municipal perspectives in that process, in hopes that our members would have enough time to provide reactions to the HATF report before the government proceeded.
AMO recognized the HATF had a narrower scope for consultation, which is why we focused instead on commenting on the province's Housing Affordability Survey (January 13, 2022), and making sure there was AMO participation at the Ontario-Municipal Housing Summit (January 19, 2022), and the Rural Housing Roundtable at the Rural Ontario Municipal Association conference (January 23, 2022).

Each of these milestones provided AMO with an opportunity to illustrate how complex the crisis is and the need for an all-of-government approach to truly fix it. Those meetings made it clear that a refresh to our 2019 housing positions was needed. That is why the AMO Housing Blueprint was developed. The positions were informed by our AMO Affordable Housing and Planning Task Forces and AMO Board of Directors who met in January and February.

Then, the province's Housing Affordability Task Force’s (HATF) report was released on February 8, 2022. AMO’s Planning and Affordable Housing Task Forces and the AMO Executive met separately to discuss the HATF. In the end, significant concerns were raised that many premises and recommendations in the HATF report do not align with AMO’s positions on housing. Therefore, AMO is writing to strongly encourage the Ministry to consider the comments below and recommendations made in our Housing Blueprint as it considers how to move ahead with solving these housing challenges.

**AMO’s Response to the Province’s HATF Report**

Based on conversations to date, AMO will not be providing thoughts on individual recommendations in the HATF report. Members were concerned that doing so would be given that many would require details that we do not have, and that many are based on premises that AMO cannot support.

Rather, AMO respectfully submits high-level comments on the HATF report in hopes that the province will consider them fully as it continues its work.

**Underlying Premises**

First, the HATF’s report fails to recognize the role that all orders of government and the development industry play to meaningfully contribute to addressing the housing crisis in Ontario. The HATF recommendations on their own will not address the housing crisis that Ontario faces. Specifically, the private sector alone will not necessarily increase housing affordability without government interventions through various planning and financial instruments.

Further, it seems to have been guided by the premise that the solutions are primarily at the local level to address barriers caused by municipalities and their councils.

Finally, the scope of the report was too narrow by applying the premise that increasing any sort of supply will address affordability. AMO does not believe this will be the case. More targeted action is required to ensure the right mix of supply will meet the needs of the people of Ontario of all income levels.
Importance of Municipal Decision-Making

The report does not recognize the insight into local issues that municipal elected officials and staff have in relation to their communities, including how best to achieve housing targets and intensification. A strengthened and more centralized role for the province in local planning decisions would limit local autonomy and de-value community input.

The HATF report also focuses too much on municipal planning and development approvals. It leaves gaps in areas that were not considered such as the bottle neck at the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) which has slowed down housing development and contributed to higher housing and municipal costs. More work is needed to determine how the approval timing creates pressures on municipal planning staff who are pulled away from approval work to focus on OLT cases. We continue to also ask that De Novo hearings be removed from the OLT process toolbox.

There is also an assumption that municipal development charges and fees unnecessarily increase housing costs, and do not respect the principle that growth must pay for growth. There is no guarantee and no mechanism identified that developers would pass on the savings to consumers to decrease the price of the home or rental unit.

Another concern is that the broader use of surety bonds has been suggested as long-term solution. The financial risk associated with accepting a different instrument of financial security rests with the municipality and ultimately, the local property taxpayer. The decision to accept the appropriateness of such an instrument should remain a local decision, informed by all available evidence.

In our view, many of the recommendations put forward were done so without sufficient municipal engagement or consideration. If implemented, they could erode local decision making and are often punitive in nature. This is not productive when only working together constructively will result in the outcomes we all seek.

Promising Policy Outcomes

The report has some promising policy outcomes for further investigation, including increasing the supply of rental housing, missing middle housing, increasing second suites and garden suites, and increasing density, particularly in Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs). The province should consider achieving their policy objectives by establishing intensification targets and providing the necessary funding and support for municipalities as they achieve those targets through their official plan policies, based on their understanding of their communities.

It is critical that sufficient attention and action be given to regional differences across the province. In some cases, how policy outcomes can be delivered need more consideration. For example, the high cost of servicing land and staffing capacity challenges in rural and northern Ontario ought to be recognized and addressed. As well, the complexity of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) was mentioned but fell short of highlighting the need to revise the PPS to productively enhance growth and development planning beyond rural Ontario’s settlement areas.

We have long advocated that with the complexity and lack of clarity between the Planning Act, Growth Plans, and the PPS, the province needs to take immediate steps to remove ambiguity in and between these policy instruments to assist those working with them to allow a more streamlined approach. Additionally, the province should implement an integrated One Window approach.
involving all provincial line ministries which should involve reasonable timelines for the line ministries and other agencies under provincial authority.

Overall, a more comprehensive examination of the full spectrum of housing is required, including community and supportive housing. The province must also consider innovative funding options and financial tools, rental housing incentives and policies, investor speculation, and community housing.

Underutilized crown land especially in northern Ontario should also be dedicated to affordable housing options, as well as surplus public lands (such as school sites) throughout the province. We would like to see the recommendations in the HATF appendices B and C on community housing and government surplus land elevated to primary government consideration as part of the solution.

**Conclusion**

AMO encourages the provincial government to find ways to address the housing crisis in Ontario in a way that requires all three orders of government and private, non-profit, and co-operative housing sectors (collectively referred to as “development sector”) to work collectively to improve affordability, diversify the housing mix, and increase supply.

AMO has done considerable work on housing from a broader viewpoint, including our most recent Housing Blueprint. We encourage the Ministry to carefully consider the recommendations put forward in that report as an input akin to the HATF report. Considerable work has gone into this paper and is the combined efforts of our members who are speaking with one voice on this matter.

We can provide valuable, on-the-ground expertise of our members and are available to work with the Ministry to finding areas for collaboration and action. Now is the time for bold, collaborative action on housing.
MFOA Response to the Report of the Ontario Housing Affordability Task Force

Introduction

About MFOA
The Municipal Finance Officers' Association of Ontario (MFOA), established in 1989, is the professional association of municipal finance officers with more than 4500 individual members. We represent individuals who are responsible for handling the financial affairs of municipalities and who are key advisors to councils on matters of finance policy. MFOA promotes the interests of our members in carrying out their statutory and other financial responsibilities through advocacy, information sharing, networking opportunities, and through the promotion of fiscal sustainability. We also provide members with training and education to enable continuous professional development and to support excellence in municipal finance.

Objectives
We understand that Ontario’s Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing established the Task Force with the mandate to focus on how to increase market housing supply and affordability. The Task Force was requested to recommend ways to accelerate the progress in closing the housing supply gap to improve housing affordability. In their report, the Task Force clarified that ‘housing affordability’ referred to homes that can be purchased or rented without government support. Affordable housing (units provided at below-market rates with government support) was not part of the mandate, however some suggestions were provided on this topic as well.

While the report offers many suggestions in the areas of planning and governance, MFOA is limiting its comments to the recommendations that specifically affect municipal finance. Overall, MFOA’s response is based on our extensive advocacy work surrounding development charges and is grounded in three guiding principles:

a) Growth should pay for growth on a place-by-place basis
b) Complete, vibrant communities are good for everyone
c) Provincial legislation related to municipal governance should be enabling and permissive

General Comments
MFOA supports the Province’s commitment to addressing the issue of housing affordability in Ontario. However, the Task Force’s report appears to assume that the challenges around the housing crisis are caused primarily by municipalities and their councils, failing to recognize that
market pressures and regulatory barriers, such as the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), are critical factors as well.

MFOA supports the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) in encouraging the provincial government to find ways to address the housing crisis in Ontario in a way that requires all three orders of government and private, non-profit, and co-operative housing sectors (collectively referred to as the “development community”) to work collectively to improve affordability, diversify the housing mix, and increase supply.

**Recommendations Affecting Development Charges**

MFOA is concerned that many of the recommendations around development charges (DCs) in the Report are verbatim or highly similar to those raised by the development community in past years. This is in spite of the municipal sector’s demonstrations to the Province and development community that some of these recommendations are detrimental to financing growth infrastructure and would saddle ratepayers with growth-related funding shortfalls. Regrettably, the concerns consistently raised by the municipal sector are not addressed in the Report’s recommendations. Indeed, these recommendations raise concerns regarding the fiscal sustainability of municipalities.

Housing affordability is a complex issue driven by a multitude of factors, most of which lie beyond municipalities’ control. While MFOA recognizes the need for greater housing supply in Ontario, it also understands measures that put municipalities into financial difficulty or shift growth-related capital costs onto established ratepayers do nothing to improve, and in fact may even harm, housing affordability. A salient omission in the Task Force’s report is a recognition that property taxes and user fees, and not merely new housing prices, are key drivers of housing affordability. The higher are such taxes and fees, the less disposable income households have left to spend on housing. Curtailment of DCs simply raises property taxes and user fees to excessive levels, reducing housing affordability for all residents collectively. Artificial DC exemptions and reductions serve only to distress municipal finances while doing nothing to address root causes of excessive housing prices. MFOA recommends that the Province instead focus on dismantling provincially-created barriers to housing supply, particularly barriers to greater competition in Ontario’s development industry.

**Recommendation #32. Waive development charges and parkland cash-in-lieu and charge only modest connection fees for all infill residential projects up to 10 units or for any development where no new material infrastructure will be required.**

MFOA supports intensification of infill properties to better meet housing demand within neighbourhoods. Concerns lie with the notion of “no new material infrastructure will be required”. Any particular development, whether infill or not, may not require new infrastructure at time of development since the required infrastructure would have been constructed years or decades earlier to accommodate anticipated development. DCs are self-correcting in the sense that yet unrecovered growth-related capital costs remain in DC rates until such time they are recovered.
once all the development to which the costs are associated occurs. That is, yet unrecovered portions of previously incurred growth-related capital costs are recycled through the DC background study and by-law. Waiving DCs on infill development is simply apt to raise property taxes and user fees. As an unintended consequence, this recommendation may also undermine DC background studies in terms of growth and capital forecasts.

Higher intensity infill projects have a greater likelihood of requiring expanded infrastructure to accommodate increased traffic, and higher water, sewer and storm water demands. Such demands may result in infrastructure reaching its designed capacity limits well ahead of their DC planned expansion time lines. While a single higher intensity infill project may not significantly impact infrastructure requirements, several such projects throughout the whole community could indeed stretch infrastructure capacity to its limits.

Recommendation #33. Waive development charges on all forms of affordable housing guaranteed to be affordable for 40 years.

A number of municipalities already waive or reduce development fees for affordable housing projects. However, requiring municipalities to track whether such housing remains in the “affordable housing” category for a minimum of 40 years places an undue administrative burden on municipalities. Furthermore, there is no indication in the recommendation as to what penalty ought to apply if affordable housing is converted to market-priced housing or even to a non-residential use. MFOA seeks clarification over the meaning of “all forms” of affordable housing. Does this refer primarily rent-gear to income units? Are shelters and transitional housing, which are important and necessary supportive housing units, included in this definition? Clear parameters and guidance are needed to understand the implications of this recommendation.

Recommendation #34. Prohibit interest rates on development charges higher than a municipality’s borrowing rate.

MFOA seeks clarification on whether this applies to the s.26.1 or s.26.2 rates under the Development Charges Act, 1997. Are there other alternatives that could meet the intended goal of the recommendation? Whereas DC payment deferrals are available to developers while infrastructure construction is routinely required prior to development, artificial reductions to interest rates are apt to simply raise DC rates as municipalities strive to ensure growth pays for growth.

Recommendation #35. Regarding cash in lieu of parkland, s.37, Community Benefit Charges, and development charges: a) Provincial review of reserve levels, collections and drawdowns annually to ensure funds are being used in a timely fashion and for the intended purpose, and, where review points to a significant concern, do not allow further collection until the situation has been corrected. b) Except where allocated towards municipality-wide infrastructure projects, require municipalities to spend funds in the neighbourhoods where they were collected.
However, where there’s a significant community need in a priority area of the City, allow for specific ward-to-ward allocation of unspent and unallocated reserves.

(a) Municipalities already perform annual reviews of their reserves and report to their councils accordingly. These reports were formally submitted to the Province, however, with a change in policy, this is no longer required. Such reporting to the Province could be reinstated. MFOA urges the Province to consider the unintended consequences of prohibiting collection of development levies (DCs, parkland dedication and CBCs). This could result in growth-related funding shortfalls, delays in the construction of growth infrastructure until sufficient funding is accumulated, and delays in housing construction until development levies are reinstated. All of these effects impede housing supply and thus housing affordability. Intermittent disallowance of development levy collection will, moreover, create inequities as some developments would have to pay such levies while others would not.

There is need for clarification around what is deemed “timely”. There often exists “tipping points”, such as the timing of development projects, to initiate a project vs public opinion as to when such construction is required. Often, there is the need to save for several years to fund certain projects. Checks and balances are already in place, including annual reports to council, along with regulatory requirements such as the Community Benefits Charge (CBC) where 60% of funds need to be allocated each year.

(b) In most cases, municipalities find area-specific DCs impractical and unwarranted, as evidenced by DC background studies. Forcing municipalities to use area-specific DCs when they are impractical or unwarranted undermines municipal autonomy and efforts to create complete and vibrant communities. Forcing municipalities to track DC collections at the neighbourhood or ward level would create an undue and complicated administrative burden. Such unintended consequences should be avoided. There is also concern about what constitutes a “neighbourhood” and the question of who decides where one neighbourhood ends and another begins. Not only does this recommendation seek to micromanage municipalities, it is apt to create an administrative quagmire while provincially-imposed administrative burdens on municipalities are already far too excessive.

It should also be noted that there is no such thing as unallocated DC or CBC reserves. By law, all DC and CBC funds are dedicated to the growth-related projects noted in the respective background studies.

Recommendation # 44. Work with municipalities to develop and implement a municipal services corporation utility model for water and wastewater under which the municipal corporation would borrow and amortize costs among customers instead of using development charges.

Please refer to the reports and letters submitted to the Province on this very topic just three years ago from MFOA and ORSTT, AMO and Watson & Associates (dated January 2019). A research paper published by the Institute on Municipal Finance and Governance speaks to the
model proposed in the recommendation that clearly demonstrates that eliminating water and wastewater DCs would have a detrimental impact on rates.

**Other Recommendations**

**Recommendation # 17.** Requiring municipalities to compensate property owners for loss of property value as a result of heritage designations, based on the principle of best economic use of land.

Consideration of this recommendation should include the basis of valuation, timing of heritage designation, who determines the best economic use of land, and municipal affordability. This recommendation could give rise to the unintended consequence of municipalities declining to preserve historically significant buildings and sites in order to avoid unaffordable compensation.

**Recommendation # 25.** Require municipalities to provide the option of pay on demand surety bonds and letters of credit.

The option of accepting surety bonds already exists. Demanding that municipalities accept them undermines municipal autonomy by removing municipalities’ authority to act according to their risk profiles and preferences and by permitting developers to dictate financial security terms to municipalities. Instead, the Province should encourage municipalities to educate themselves on financial security alternatives, which may help incline more municipalities to accept surety bonds.

**Recommendation # 37.** Align property taxes for purpose-built rental with those of condos and low-rise homes.

MFOA is assuming this recommendation refers to reducing tax ratios for multi-residential housing down to 1.0. If this is an incorrect assumption, please provide clarification as needed.

A provincial freeze on multi-residential taxes for municipalities with multi-residential tax ratios above 2.0 was instituted several years ago, causing municipalities to move these tax ratios down to 2.0. A similar freeze aimed at a target multi-residential tax ratio of 1.0 would eventually implement this recommendation. However, it should be noted that such significant movement of tax ratios often takes time. Municipalities should retain the decision-making power and autonomy over how and how quickly they move towards target tax ratios.

**Recommendation # 38.** Amend the Planning Act and Perpetuities Act to extend the maximum period for land leases and restrictive covenants on land to 40 or more years.
This would create an undue administrative burden on municipal staff to track land leases and restrictive covenants on land for such an extended period of time.

**Recommendation #39. Eliminate or reduce tax disincentives to housing growth.**

Clarification is required as to whether this refers to land transfer tax or something else.

**Recommendation #48. The Ontario government should establish a large “Ontario Housing Delivery Fund” and encourage the federal government to match funding. This fund should reward: a) Annual housing growth that meets or exceeds provincial targets b) Reductions in total approval times for new housing c) The speedy removal of exclusionary zoning practices.**

There is no indication in the report as to appropriate parameters in the setting of targets and if this intended to be an annual comparison or a rolling average. Concerns have been raised around blanket targets that are province-wide or “zone-wide”. Issues are centred around low or non-growth municipalities, growth patterns that are nonlinear or inconsistent, and unfair comparison or increased competition between municipalities or growth areas within a municipality. Furthermore, the basis of evaluation should be identified for consideration such as permits issued, completed housing, and rural vs. urban development.

**Recommendation #49. Reductions in funding to municipalities that fail to meet provincial housing growth and approval timeline targets.**

Clarification is sought as to what funding may be considered in this recommendation. This recommendation may have undue financial impacts if funding outside the fund under recommendation 48 is considered.

We appreciate the opportunity for MFOA to provide comments on the Report of the Ontario Housing Affordability Task Force. Should you have any questions, please contact MFOA’s Executive Director Donna Herridge (donna@mfoa.on.ca).

Staff members: Suzanna Dieleman, Manager of Policy; Christine Duong, Policy Team Lead
March 15, 2022

The Honourable Steve Clark  
Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing  
17th Floor, 777 Bay Street  
Toronto, Ontario  
M7A 2J3

Subject: Response to the Report of the Ontario Housing Affordability Task Force

Dear Minister Clark,

On February 8, 2022, the Ontario Housing Affordability Task Force ("Task Force") published a total of 55 recommended actions aimed at increasing Ontario’s housing supply by 1.5 million households over the next ten years. The recommendations, which are aimed at all levels of government and their associated agencies, primarily seek to increase “as-of-right” intensification within urban areas, streamline development approvals and related timelines, improve tax and municipal financing, and reform the Ontario Land Tribunal appeals process.

The Niagara Region appreciates the Province’s commitment to improving housing affordability across Ontario. Over 20,000 of Niagara’s households were reported to have been in core housing need as of 2016, primarily driven by a lack of affordable housing options within the community. Given the recent surge in housing prices experienced across the Province, rates of core housing need are have risen. Action must be taken to ensure more housing of all types are provided to meet the needs of our growing population.

The provision of affordable, accessible, and adequate housing is a complex matter that requires coordination between all levels of government. The report focuses on the inefficiencies in the land development process and how it contributes to the crisis, however planning approvals at the municipal level are only one factor in housing affordability. There are other economic factors contributing to the housing supply challenge and affordability including:

- building industry capacity (lack of labour);  
- supply chain and shortages in materials ; and,  
- approved land supply being held back by landowners.
While not addressed specifically in the Task Force’s report, the Province should also consider the specific challenges associated with increasing the supply of community housing (i.e. housing owned and operated by non-profit housing corporations, housing co-operatives and municipal governments) and supportive housing. Although an increase in market supply can address the issue of housing affordability in part, the private sector alone cannot solve the entirety of this problem and it is the community housing need that is the most dire and needs to be addressed. A collective effort from all levels of government, housing service providers, and the development industry is required to provide the necessary tools and interventions to address this problem.

The Province should also consider the unique housing challenges faced by communities of all types and sizes, including small to medium sized cities and rural communities. A city like Toronto versus a city like Thorold will have access to different resources and require vastly different solutions towards the achievement of improved housing affordability. In short, a “one-size-fits-all” approach should be avoided.

Regional and local staff have reviewed all recommendations provided by the Task Force. At this time, the Province has not specified which, if any, policy, regulation, and/or protocol changes the Province may elect to advance. In the absence of more substantive details relating to the recommendations, Regional and local staff have outlined general comments on the primary objectives and themes of the Task Force’s report below, which are shared with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing for their consideration. In addition to this letter, a few of our local municipalities have also indicated that they will be submitting comments on these recommendations.

Increase Density and “As of Right” Permissions

Relevant Task Force Recommendations

3. Limit exclusionary zoning in municipalities through binding provincial action:
   a) Allow “as of right” residential housing up to four units and up to four storeys on a single residential lot.
   b) Modernize the Building Code and other policies to remove any barriers to affordable construction and to ensure meaningful implementation (e.g., allow single-staircase construction for up to four storeys, allow single egress, etc.).
4. Permit “as of right” conversion of underutilized or redundant commercial properties to residential or mixed residential and commercial use.

5. Permit as of right secondary suites, garden suites, and laneway houses province-wide.

6. Permit “as of right” multi-tenant housing (renting rooms within a dwelling) province-wide.

7. Encourage and incentivize municipalities to increase density in areas with excess school capacity to benefit families with children.

8. Allow “as of right” zoning up to unlimited height and unlimited density in the immediate proximity of individual major transit stations within two years if municipal zoning remains insufficient to meet provincial density targets.

9. Allow “as of right” zoning of six to 11 storeys with no minimum parking requirements on any streets utilized by public transit (including streets on bus and streetcar routes).

11. Support responsible housing growth on undeveloped land, including outside existing municipal boundaries, by building necessary infrastructure to support higher density housing and complete communities and applying the recommendations of this report to all undeveloped land.

- Staff is generally supportive of the objective to increase the overall density and diversity of housing in built up areas.

- Over 60% of Niagara’s current housing stock is made up of single-detached dwellings. Although recent construction activity has begun a shift towards more medium density builds there is a range of housing types the Region is seeking to encourage through its new Niagara Official Plan.

- Staff do support flexibility in “as of right” permissions for housing, particularly within planned major transit station areas and strategic growth areas and in a manner that is compatible in scale with stable residential areas; however, staff cannot support intensification that is completely unplanned and unrestricted.

- Intensification must be considered in balance with other key considerations needed for the creation of complete communities, such as infrastructure and servicing.
capacity, parking requirements, impacts to neighbourhood character, access to employment uses, and landscaping and public realm design. In the absence of municipal oversight through zoning, there are limited tools to ensure development and related services are planned for in a strategic manner.

- **Recommendation 4**, Regional staff support the conversion of underutilized commercial lands along major arterial transit routes as priority areas for mixed residential and commercial use, provided that these sites do not serve as land supply for population based employment.

- **Recommendation 11**, clarification is needed to understand what is meant by development “outside municipal boundaries”. If referring to settlement area expansions, existing Provincial policy provides sufficient ability for municipalities to consider adjustments to their urban and rural settlement area boundaries, and while Regional staff support higher densities and the creation of complete communities on potential expansion lands, staff do not support unplanned development within natural areas or agricultural lands. Development should be directed to settlement areas where infrastructure and service levels exists to support development vs. to areas outside of settlement area boundaries. The resultant financial burden on municipalities would be significant if development occurs outside of settlement area boundaries.

**Streamline Development Approvals**

**Relevant Task Force Recommendations**

12. Create a more permissive land use, planning, and approvals system:
   a) Repeal or override municipal policies, zoning, or plans that prioritize the preservation of physical character of neighbourhood.
   b) Exempt from site plan approval and public consultation all projects of 10 units or less that conform to the Official Plan and require only minor variances
   c) Establish province-wide zoning standards, or prohibitions, for minimum lot sizes, maximum building setbacks, minimum heights, angular planes, shadow rules, front doors, building depth, landscaping, floor space index, and heritage view cones, and planes; restore pre-2006 site plan exclusions
(colour, texture, and type of materials, window details, etc.) to the Planning Act and reduce or eliminate minimum parking requirements; and

d) Remove any floorplate restrictions to allow larger, more efficient high-density towers.

13. Limit municipalities from requesting or hosting additional public meetings beyond those that are required under the Planning Act.

14. Require that public consultations provide digital participation options.

15. Require mandatory delegation of site plan approvals and minor variances to staff or pre-approved qualified third-party technical consultants through a simplified review and approval process, without the ability to withdraw Council’s delegation.

16. Prevent abuse of the heritage preservation and designation process by:
   a) Prohibiting the use of bulk listing on municipal heritage registers.
   b) Prohibiting reactive heritage designations after a Planning Act development application has been filed.

19. Legislate timelines at each stage of the provincial and municipal review process, including site plan, minor variance, and provincial reviews, and deem an application approved if the legislated response time is exceeded.

49. Reductions in funding to municipalities that fail to meet provincial housing growth and approval timeline targets.

50. Fund the adoption of consistent municipal e-permitting systems and encourage the federal government to match funding. Fund the development of common data architecture standards across municipalities and provincial agencies and require municipalities to provide their zoning bylaws with open data standards. Set an implementation goal of 2025 and make funding conditional on established targets.

- Regional staff support the objective to streamline the development approvals process, expand the usage of delegated approval for applications that are technical and/or minor in nature, and reduce unnecessary delays in the delivery of needed housing supply. However, several of the recommendations noted above impede the ability for municipalities to consider local characteristics and existing built environments as part of planned development. It must also be acknowledged that development approval processes does not only rest with municipalities; there are
development approval processes that take place at the provincial level and there is the need to have appropriate staff resources available to those ministries and a commitment to streamlining provincial development approval processes as well.

- NIMBY is a significant barrier for the development of affordable housing, community housing, supportive housing, and other facilities needed for homelessness services in particular, and presents a challenge for intensification in particular.

- Addressing NIMBY requires continued dialogue, education, negotiation and relationship building is required to demystify the perceived threats associated with growth and development, which is where the importance of public consultation should also be acknowledged. Public consultation allows opportunities to provide information with local residents, allow for open dialogue, and allow a variety of voices to be heard.

- **Recommendation 12 c)**, although staff support additional guidance for flexible zoning standards, a Regional approach would be more appropriate. The growth forecasts, intensification targets, and existing built form in Niagara are different from those of Toronto and the Greater Toronto Area. A “one size fits all” approach with such technical considerations would contribute to a homogenous urban form that disregards local characteristics.

- **Recommendation 13**, Regional staff are of the opinion that the necessity for additional meetings remain at the discretion of the local municipality and/or approval authorities provided they comply with existing Planning Act timeframes.

- With regards to **Recommendation 16**, Regional staff note that recent changes to the Ontario Heritage Act includes statutory timeline limitations for when municipalities can designate a property following the submission of certain applications under the Planning Act. The conservation of culturally and historically significant resources is a Provincial objective that merit continued priority in site specific cases.

Reform the Ontario Land Tribunal Appeals Process

**Relevant Task Force Recommendations**


20. Fund the creation of “approvals facilitators” with the authority to quickly resolve conflicts among municipal and/or provincial authorities and ensure timelines are met.
21. Require a pre-consultation with all relevant parties at which the municipality sets out a binding list that defines what constitutes a complete application; confirms the number of consultations established in the previous recommendations; and clarifies that if a member of a regulated profession such as a professional engineer has stamped an application, the municipality has no liability and no additional stamp is needed.

26. Require appellants to promptly seek permission (“leave to appeal”) of the Tribunal and demonstrate that an appeal has merit, relying on evidence and expert reports, before it is accepted.

27. Prevent abuse of process:
   a) Remove right of appeal for projects with at least 30% affordable housing in which units are guaranteed affordable for at least 40 years.
   b) Require a $10,000 filing fee for third-party appeals.
   c) Provide discretion to adjudicators to award full costs to the successful party in any appeal brought by a third party or by a municipality where its council has overridden a recommended staff approval.

28. Encourage greater use of oral decisions issued the day of the hearing, with written reasons to follow, and allow those decisions to become binding the day that they are issued.

29. Where it is found that a municipality has refused an application simply to avoid a deemed approval for lack of decision, allow the Tribunal to award punitive damages.

30. Provide funding to increase staffing (adjudicators and case managers), provide market-competitive salaries, outsource more matters to mediators, and set shorter time targets.

31. In clearing the existing backlog, encourage the Tribunal to prioritize projects close to the finish line that will support housing growth and intensification, as well as regional water or utility infrastructure decisions that will unlock significant housing capacity.

Regional staff agree that additional changes can be made to continuously improve the appeals process. For instance, subject to further information regarding the manner in which these objectives are implemented, Regional staff generally support the aims of Recommendations 20, 21, 26, 28 and 30 as a means of reducing baseless appeals and reducing the wait times for decisions to be rendered.
• Regional staff are concerned, however, that measures to increase the filing fee for appeals as outlined in Recommendation 27 b) or to introduce the ability to award punitive costs as outlined in Recommendation 29 would essentially eliminate the ability for residents or small interest groups to participate in the appeals.

• Recommendation 18, allowing developers to appeal MCRs will result in a dramatic slow down of the growth management process, and ultimately, the development approvals process. In addition, there are competing interests within the development community itself that will serve to frustrate and lengthen the appeals process. One of the challenges of the last several years has been the instability in the planning and development sector as a result of the long protracted appeals associated with the original conformity exercises to the Growth Plan followed by several years of changes to Provincial legislation and Plans. Permitting these types of appeals will serve to undermine the Province’s goal of streamlining the approvals process and will prevent municipalities from bringing housing on-line in an expedited fashion.

• Recommendation 31, prioritization should focus on proposals that include an affordable housing component, and should allow for equitable consideration across the Province (i.e. in areas outside of Toronto and the Greater Toronto Area). In clearing the existing backlog of appeals priorities should be given to municipal initiated amendments that are appealed.

Improve Municipal Financing and Taxes

Relevant Task Force Recommendations

25. Require municipalities to provide the option of pay on demand surety bonds and letters of credit.

32. Waive development charges and parkland cash-in-lieu and charge only modest connection fees for all infill residential projects up to 10 units or for any development where no new material infrastructure will be required.

33. Waive development charges on all forms of affordable housing guaranteed to be affordable for 40 years.

34. Prohibit interest rates on development charges higher than a municipality’s borrowing rate.

35. Regarding cash in lieu of parkland, s.37, Community Benefit Charges, and development charges:
a) Provincial review of reserve levels, collections and drawdowns annually to ensure funds are being used in a timely fashion and for the intended purpose, and, where review points to a significant concern, do not allow further collection until the situation has been corrected.

b) Except where allocated towards municipality-wide infrastructure projects, require municipalities to spend funds in the neighbourhoods where they were collected. However, where there’s a significant community need in a priority area of the City, allow for specific ward-to-ward allocation of unspent and unallocated reserves.

36. Recommend that the federal government and provincial governments update HST rebate to reflect current home prices and begin indexing the thresholds to housing prices, and that the federal government match the provincial 75% rebate and remove any claw back.

37. Align property taxes for purpose-built rental with those of condos and low-rise homes.

39. Eliminate or reduce tax disincentives to housing growth.

42. Provide provincial and federal loan guarantees for purpose-built rental, affordable rental and affordable ownership projects.

43. Enable municipalities, subject to adverse external economic events, to withdraw infrastructure allocations from any permitted projects where construction has not been initiated within three years of build permits being issued.

44. Work with municipalities to develop and implement a municipal services corporation utility model for water and wastewater under which the municipal corporation would borrow and amortize costs among customers instead of using development charges.

The recommendations included above require further detail and analysis to provide substantive comments. There are a number of recommendations Regional staff have concerns with, including:

- **Recommendation 25**, The Region does not support the use of surety bonds as they do not offer the same financial security as a Letter of Credit.

- **Recommendation 32**, The Region currently has grant programs for development charges on social housing that meet specific grant program criteria. Infill units still create a demand for regional services. Development Charges (DCs) help pay for the construction of growth related infrastructure, waiving them for infill units will have
impacts on the Region’s finances and will shift growth costs to existing homeowners. Also, it is not clear what is meant by “no new material infrastructure” and this could lead to appeals based of different interpretations.

- **Recommendation 33**, DCs help pay for the construction of growth related infrastructure, waiving them for affordable housing will have significant impacts on the Region’s finances and will shift growth costs to existing taxpayer. Additional information is required on the definition of affordable. The Region currently has grant programs for development charges on social housing that meet specific grant program criteria. However, occupants of this housing type still create demand for services which are paid for by DCs. The cost of growth for these developments are funded from Regional taxes and shift growth costs to existing homeowners which also impacts affordability. The Provincial government should provide funding for such programs.

- **Recommendation 34**, The Region has concerns of the potential funding gap that will occur if interest rates are not included in DCs, this places a greater burden on the existing taxpayer. Municipal borrowing rates fluctuate so flexibility needs to be provided to municipalities.

- **Recommendation 35(b)**, The Region does not support and prefers the current flexibility to adopt area specific or Region wide charges and the flexibility to prioritize use of DCs based on actual growth and need.

- **Recommendation 37**, the Niagara Region has a tax policy already in place that charges new multi-residential at the same tax rate as residential.

- **Recommendation 44**, the Region does not support. Municipal development charge models are effective tools to ensure growth pays for growth.

**Moving Forward**

Further consultation with the municipal sector is recommended before the implementation of any strategy, actions, or regulations in response to the Task Force’s recommendations to ensure that strong and effective solutions for facilitating the development of affordable housing is reflected in all communities across the Province. The Report recommendations does not address the need for additional mechanisms to support affordable housing from Provincial and Federal governments (i.e. tax incentives). Long-term funding from all levels of government must also be available to provide needed support services to create healthy mixed income communities.
Regional and local municipal staff are available to convene and contribute municipal expertise and knowledge in this matter.

Respectfully,

__________________________
Diana Morreale, MCIP, RPP
Acting Director, Community and Long Range Planning
Planning and Development, Niagara Region
Niagara Region
1815 Sir Isaac Brock Way, Thorold, ON, L2V 4T7
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<td>4</td>
<td>Township of Cramahe</td>
<td>More Home for Everyone Act, 2022</td>
<td>15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tay Valley Township</td>
<td>AMO – Firefighter Certification</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Solicitor General</td>
<td>Building a Safe and Well Community for All</td>
<td>18-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Solicitor General</td>
<td>Updated Standards for Provincial Animal Welfare Services Act, 2019</td>
<td>21-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ministry of Transportation</td>
<td>Connected the GGH: A Transportation Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe</td>
<td>29-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry</td>
<td>Decision Notice – Proposed Regulation Changes under the Aggregate Resources Act</td>
<td>31-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry</td>
<td>Letter and Information on the LDD Moth</td>
<td>33-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Township of Armour</td>
<td>Support Cambridge Resolution: Request to Impose a Moratorium on All New Gravel Applications</td>
<td>39-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>County of Lennox and Addington</td>
<td>Support Cambridge Resolution: Request to Impose a Moratorium on All New Gravel Applications</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: 05/02/2022  Internal Memo #: IM22-013(CRE)

To: Council

Circulated to: Corporate Leadership Team, Senior Management Team

Department: Corporate Enterprise

Division: Corporate Strategy

From: Brooke Lambert, Director Corporate Strategy

Subject: Government Relations and Grant Summary

Comments

Government Relations and Consultation Activity (January - April 2022)

The Government Relations Consultation review process was developed in order to provide a centralized way to coordinate and track opportunities for the city to provide input into Federal and Provincial legislative, regulatory and programming considerations. This process is governed by the Government Relations Consultation Tracking Policy (Policy Number A09 ADM 008).

From January 1 to April 30, 2022, a total of nine (9) government relations activities took place (Appendix A).

- Three (3) were consultation responses submitted to the appropriate legislative body
- One (1) was advocacy-related submissions (provincial budget), and
- Five (5) were reviewed with no response provided

It should be noted that this summary does not include advocacy, meetings and other consultations attended by the Mayor and/or Council. Examples of this include consultation with the local Members of Parliament, Members of Provincial Parliament, and the Ontario Big Cities Mayors Caucus. In December 2021 and January 2022 the Province of Ontario held a Housing Summit that was attended by the Mayor. Additional comment was provided to the province on some of the outcomes related to those discussions. Staff will be preparing a more fulsome Housing report for Council on May 31, 2022.

External Grant Application Tracking and Results

From January to April 30, 2022, there have been Seven (7) completed grant applications tracked through the Employee Grant Application Database (Appendix B) of those completed:

- 3 were successful
• 1 was unsuccessful
• 2 are awaiting results, and
• 1 was reviewed and determined to be ineligible.

Attachments

Appendix A – Summary of GR activities
Appendix B – Summary of Grant Applications

Approvals:
☐ Manager/Supervisor       ☒ Deputy City Manager       ☒ City Manager
# Appendix A: Government Consultation Tracking Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Title of Consultation/Proposed Legislative Change</th>
<th>Ministry, Department or Agency</th>
<th>Consultation Deadline (or date of submission) (MM/DD/YYYY)</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>Housing Affordability Consultation</td>
<td>Ministry of Municipal Affairs &amp; Housing</td>
<td>01/13/2022</td>
<td>Consultation Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>Fire Certification Regulation Response</td>
<td>Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services</td>
<td>02/5/2022</td>
<td>Consultation Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>Ontario Budget Consultation</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>02/10/2022</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>More Homes for Everyone Act</td>
<td>Legislative Assembly of Ontario</td>
<td>4/29/2022</td>
<td>Consultation Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>Requirements for Advanced Recycling Facilities</td>
<td>Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks</td>
<td>02/25/2022</td>
<td>Reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>Building Broadband Faster Act</td>
<td>Ministry of Infrastructure</td>
<td>4/7/2022</td>
<td>Reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>Floating Accommodations</td>
<td>Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources &amp; Forestry</td>
<td>4/19/2022</td>
<td>Reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>Green belt Plan</td>
<td>Ministry of Municipal Affairs &amp; Housing</td>
<td>4/23/2022</td>
<td>Reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>Housing Services Act</td>
<td>Ministry of Municipal Affairs &amp; Housing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reviewed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B: Grant Application Tracking Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Grant Program</th>
<th>Purpose of Grant</th>
<th>Amount Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>Community Buildings Retrofit Initiative</td>
<td>To repair, renovate or retrofit existing sport and recreation facilities to help strengthen communities.</td>
<td>$347,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>Small Grant – SCWW Expansion Project</td>
<td>Provides the opportunity for participants to join in on health and wellness seminars, educational lectures, brain-stimulating activities, listen to live musical entertainment, join in on general conversations, and make new and meaningful friendships</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>Zero Emission Vehicle Infrastructure Program (Lead by the Region)</td>
<td>Address the lack of charging stations and refueling stations for electric vehicles in Canada</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>My Main Street 2/2</td>
<td>Placemaking projects in Southern Ontario designed to draw visitors and increase local vibrancy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awaiting Results</td>
<td>Active Transportation Fund</td>
<td>To help build new and expanded networks or pathways, bike lanes, trails and pedestrian bridges.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awaiting Results</td>
<td>Municipal Climate Resiliency Grant Program</td>
<td>For climate adaption projects</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed &amp; Not Eligible</td>
<td>Low Carbon Economy Fund – Champions Stream</td>
<td>Projects that will result in measurable GHG emissions reductions towards Canada’s 2030 emissions reductions target.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


THAT Council support the City of Waterloo’s resolution,

WHEREAS the Province of Ontario adopted greenhouse gas reduction targets of 30% by 2030, and emissions from buildings represented 22% of the province’s 2017 emissions,

WHEREAS the draft National Model Building Code proposes energy performance tiers for new buildings and a pathway to requiring net zero ready construction in new buildings, allowing the building industry, skilled trades, and suppliers to adapt on a predictable and reasonable timeline while encouraging innovation;

WHEREAS the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing is consulting on changes for the next edition of the Ontario Building Code (ERO #: 019-4974) that generally aligns with the draft National Model Building Code except it does not propose adopting energy performance tiers, it does not propose timelines for increasing minimum energy performance standards step-by-step to the highest energy performance tier, and, according to Efficiency Canada and The Atmospheric Fund, it proposes adopting minimum energy performance standards that do not materially improve on the requirements in the current Ontario Building code;

WHEREAS buildings with better energy performance provide owners and occupants with lower energy bills, improved building comfort, and resilience from power disruptions that are expected to be more common in a changing climate, tackling both inequality and energy poverty;

WHEREAS municipalities are already leading the way in adopting or developing energy performance tiers as part of Green Development Standards, including Toronto and Whitby with adopted standards and Ottawa, Pickering, and others with standards in development;

WHEREAS while expensive retrofits of the current building stock to achieve future net zero requirements could be aligned with end-of-life replacement cycles to be more cost-efficient, new buildings that are not constructed to be net zero ready will require substantial retrofits before end-of-life replacement cycles at significantly more cost, making it more cost-efficient to build it right the first time.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council request the Province of Ontario to include energy performance tiers and timelines for increasing minimum energy performance standards step-by-step to the highest energy performance tier in the next edition of the Ontario Building Code, consistent with the intent of the draft National Model Building Code and the necessity of bold and immediate provincial
action on climate change;

**THAT** Council request the Province of Ontario to adopt a more ambitious energy performance tier of the draft National Model Building Code as the minimum requirement for the next edition of the Ontario Building Code than those currently proposed;

**THAT** Council request the Province of Ontario provide authority to municipalities to adopt a specific higher energy performance tier than the Ontario Building Code, which would provide more consistency for developers and homebuilders than the emerging patchwork of municipal Green Development Standards;

**THAT** Council request the Province of Ontario to facilitate capacity, education and training in the implementation of the National Model Building Code for municipal planning and building inspection staff, developers, and homebuilders to help build capacity; and

**THAT** this resolution be provided to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, to area MPPs, and to all Ontario Municipalities.

CARRIED

I, Casey Munro, Deputy Clerk for the Corporation of the Municipality of Mississippi Mills, do hereby certify that the above is a true copy of a resolution enacted by Council.

Casey Munro, Deputy Clerk
March 23, 2022

Hon. Steve Clark
Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
College Park, 17th Floor
777 Bay St.
Toronto, ON M7A 2J3

RE: Resolution from the City of Waterloo passed March 21st, 2022 re: Ontario Must Build it Right the First Time

Dear Minister Clark,

Please be advised that the Council of the Corporation of the City of Waterloo at its Council meeting held on Monday, March 21st, 2022 resolved as follows:

WHEREAS the Province of Ontario adopted greenhouse gas reduction targets of 30% by 2030, and emissions from buildings represented 22% of the province’s 2017 emissions,

WHEREAS all Waterloo Region municipalities, including the City of Waterloo, adopted greenhouse gas reduction targets of 80% below 2012 levels by 2050 and endorsed in principle a 50% reduction by 2030 interim target that requires the support of bold and immediate provincial and federal actions,

WHEREAS greenhouse gas emissions from buildings represent 45% of all emissions in Waterloo Region, and an important strategy in the TransformWR community climate action strategy, adopted by all Councils in Waterloo Region, targets new buildings to be net-zero carbon or able to transition to net-zero carbon using region-wide building standards and building capacity and expertise of building operators, property managers, and in the design and construction sector,

WHEREAS the City of Waterloo recently adopted a net-zero carbon policy for new local government buildings and endorsed a corporate greenhouse gas and energy roadmap to achieve a 50% emissions reduction by 2030 for existing local government buildings and net-zero emissions by 2050 (provided the provincial electricity grid is also net-zero emissions),

WHEREAS the draft National Model Building Code proposes energy performance tiers for new buildings and a pathway to requiring net zero ready construction in new buildings, allowing the building industry, skilled trades, and suppliers to adapt on a predictable and reasonable timeline while encouraging innovation;
WHEREAS the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing is consulting on changes for the next edition of the Ontario Building Code (ERO #: 019-4974) that generally aligns with the draft National Model Building Code except it does not propose adopting energy performance tiers, it does not propose timelines for increasing minimum energy performance standards step-by-step to the highest energy performance tier, and, according to Efficiency Canada and The Atmospheric Fund, it proposes adopting minimum energy performance standards that do not materially improve on the requirements in the current Ontario Building code;

WHEREAS buildings with better energy performance provide owners and occupants with lower energy bills, improved building comfort, and resilience from power disruptions that are expected to be more common in a changing climate, tackling both inequality and energy poverty;

WHEREAS municipalities are already leading the way in adopting or developing energy performance tiers as part of Green Development Standards, including Toronto and Whitby with adopted standards and Ottawa, Pickering, and others with standards in development;

WHEREAS the City of Waterloo is finalizing Green Development Standards for its west side employment lands and actively pursuing Green Development Standards in partnership with the Region of Waterloo, the Cities of Kitchener and Cambridge, and all local electricity and gas utilities through WR Community Energy;

WHEREAS while expensive retrofits of the current building stock to achieve future net zero requirements could be aligned with end-of-life replacement cycles to be more cost-efficient, new buildings that are not constructed to be net zero ready will require substantial retrofits before end-of-life replacement cycles at significantly more cost, making it more cost-efficient to build it right the first time.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council request the Province of Ontario to include energy performance tiers and timelines for increasing minimum energy performance standards step-by-step to the highest energy performance tier in the next edition of the Ontario Building Code, consistent with the intent of the draft National Model Building Code and the necessity of bold and immediate provincial action on climate change;

THAT Council request the Province of Ontario to adopt a more ambitious energy performance tier of the draft National Model Building Code as the minimum requirement for the next edition of the Ontario Building Code than those currently proposed;
THAT Council request the Province of Ontario provide authority to municipalities to adopt a specific higher energy performance tier than the Ontario Building Code, which would provide more consistency for developers and homebuilders than the emerging patchwork of municipal Green Development Standards;

THAT Council request the Province of Ontario to facilitate capacity, education and training in the implementation of the National Model Building Code for municipal planning and building inspection staff, developers, and homebuilders to help build capacity; and

THAT this resolution be provided to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, to area MPPs, and to all Ontario Municipalities.

Please accept this letter for information purposes only.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Julie Scott
City Clerk, City of Waterloo

CC (by email):

Catherine Fife, M.P.P (Waterloo)
Laura Mae Lindo, M.P.P (Kitchener Centre)
Belinda C. Karahalios, M.P.P (Cambridge)
Amy Fee, M.P.P (Kitchener-South Hespeler)
Mike Harris, M.P.P (Kitchener-Conestoga)
April 25, 2022

The Honourable Doug Ford, MPP
Premier of Ontario
Premier’s Office, 1 Queen’s Park
Legislative Building, Room 281
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1
premier@ontario.ca

Dear Premier Ford:

Re: Support of Resolution – Request to the Province of Ontario for a Plan of Action to Address Joint and Several Liability

At the Township of Alnwick/Haldimandr’s Regular Council Meeting held on April 7, 2022, Council received the resolution sent by the City of Barrie on March 17, 2022 regarding a plan of action to address joint and several liability. Council of the Township of Alnwick/Haldimand supported and passed the following resolution:

R-114-2022

Moved by Councillor Greg Booth, seconded by Deputy Mayor Sherry Gibson;

"Be it resolved that the correspondence from the City of Barrie dated March 17, 2022, RE: Request to the Province for a Plan of Action to Address Joint and Several Liability, be received; and

Further that Council supports the resolution from the City of Barrie, RE: Request to the Province for a Plan of Action to Address Joint and Several Liability; and

Further that this motion be provided to all Ontario municipalities.

CARRIED

A copy of the above noted resolution from the City of Barrie is attached for your reference.

Sincerely yours,

Yolanda Melburn, Deputy Clerk
Township of Alnwick/Haldimand
905-349-2822 ext. 32
ymelburn@ahlwp.ca

cc: All Ontario Municipalities; and The Honourable David Piccini, MPP
March 17, 2022

The Honourable Doug Ford, MPP
Premier of Ontario
Premier’s Office, 1 Queen’s Park
Legislative Building, Room 281
Toronto ON M7A 1A1
premier@ontario.ca

Dear Premier Ford:

Re: REQUEST TO THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO FOR A PLAN OF ACTION TO ADDRESS JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY

On behalf of the Council of The Corporation of the City of Barrie, I wish to advise that on March 7, 2022, City Council adopted the following resolution regarding a Plan of Action to Address Joint and Several Liability:

22-G-064 REQUEST TO THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO FOR A PLAN OF ACTION TO ADDRESS JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY

WHEREAS the cost of municipal insurance in the Province of Ontario has continued to increase with especially large increases going into 2022; and

WHEREAS Joint and Several Liability continues to ask property taxpayers to carry the lion’s share of a damage award when a municipality is found at minimum fault; and

WHEREAS these increases are unsustainable and unfair and eat at critical municipal services; and

WHEREAS the Association of Municipalities of Ontario outlined seven recommendations to address insurance issues including:

1. That the Provincial Government adopt a model of full proportionate liability to replace joint and several liability.

2. Implement enhancements to the existing limitations period including the continued applicability of the existing 10-day rule on slip and fall cases given recent judicial interpretations and whether a 1-year limitation period may be beneficial.

3. Implement a cap for economic loss awards.

4. Increase the catastrophic impairment default benefit limit to $2 million and increase the third-party liability coverage to $2 million in government regulated automobile insurance plans.
5. Assess and implement additional measures which would support lower premiums or alternatives to the provision of insurance services by other entities such as non-profit insurance reciprocals.

6. Compel the insurance industry to supply all necessary financial evidence including premiums, claims and deductible limit changes which support its own and municipal arguments as to the fiscal impact of joint and several liability.

7. Establish a provincial and municipal working group to consider the above and put forward recommendations to the Attorney General.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Council for the Corporation of the City of Barrie call on the Province of Ontario to immediately review these recommendations despite COVID-19 delays, as insurance premiums will soon be out of reach for many communities and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that this motion be provided to the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario, the Honourable Peter Bethlenfalvy, Minister of Finance, the Honourable Doug Downey, Attorney General of Ontario and MPP for Barrie-Springwater, the Honourable Andrea Khanjin, MPP for Barrie-Innisfil, and all Ontario municipalities.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned, wendy.cooke@barrie.ca or (705) 739.4220, Ext. 4560.

Yours truly,

Wendy Cooke
City Clerk/Director of Legislative and Court Services

WC/bt

Cc:
- The Honourable Peter Bethlenfalvy, Minister of Finance
- The Honourable Doug Downey, Attorney General and MPP for Barrie-Springwater
- The Honourable Andrea Khanjin, MPP for Barrie-Innisfil
- All Ontario municipalities
April 27, 2022

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Office of the Minister
777 Bay Street, 17th Floor
Toronto, ON
M7A 2J3

Overview of Bill 109, More Homes for Everyone Act, 2022 – PLAN-23-22
Resolution No.2022-121
Moved by Councillor Clark
Seconded by Councillor Van Egmond

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council receive Report PLAN-2022-23 for information; and

THAT Council direct staff to prepare a resolution letter to be endorsed by Council, signed by the mayor, and sent to David Piccini, MPP and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing prior to April 29, 2022.

CARRIED.

Re: Bill 109: More Homes for Everyone Act

Dear Minister Clark,

This letter is in response to the request for feedback concerning Bill 109 in addition to the April 20, 2022 Information Session and Technical Overview for Bill 109 presented by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

It is acknowledged that housing affordability and availability is becoming a serious issue in the province of Ontario, however it is the concern of many that the proposed changes will not achieve the goals being set for expediting the housing project process.

Whereas the Township of Cramahe supports housing supply initiatives, especially initiatives that balanced and sustainable growth which is a key objective of its Strategic Plan, the Township of Cramahe and the Northumberland County Official Plans. Although all Municipalities are wanting to expedite housing project processes, it is difficult to see how the proposed changes are executing this goal responsibly.

Whereas municipalities, including the Township of Cramahe, are facing unprecedented development pressures, complex development files, and ongoing resource challenges on the heels of a global pandemic.
Whereas the Province of Ontario through the Homes for Everyone Act, 2022 proposes to:

- enact legislation to refund application fees should certain planning approvals not be issued within prescribed timeframes;
- regulate the supporting materials necessary for a complete site plan application; and,
- to provide limitations on the types of subdivision conditions that can be imposed on development applications.

Now therefore be it resolved that while Council for the Township of Cramahe generally supports many of the revisions to provincial legislation to support increased housing supply, the Township of Cramahe respectfully objects to:

1. Refunding development application fees that would result in lost revenue for staff time spent on files, and which delays may not be attributed to a lack of staff resources on the file, but rather the result of increasingly complex matters that impact timeframes and are largely outside the control of municipal planning departments, including the quality and timeliness of application material by the applicant and/or their consulting team.

2. Prescribing the requirements for a complete site plan application. At the pre-consultation stage together with staff and agencies a detailed list of requirements for the complete site application is provided. Municipal and agency staff together with the applicant work well to scope the types of studies and level of detail through approved Terms of Reference, as required. This practice should be left to Municipalities, with appeal rights provided to the applicant under the Planning Act, should a dispute arise.

3. Limiting the types of conditions of approval for Draft Plans of Subdivision may impact staff and Councils’ ability to appropriately respond to the unique and complex nature of development applications and to best protect the interests of the Municipality. The applicant has the right to appeal under the Planning Act should a dispute arise.

And further that that this resolution be circulated to David Piccini, MPP and through the Provincial commenting window for the More Homes for Everyone Act, 2022.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Mandy Martin
Mayor
Township of Cramahe
(905) 376-7241
mmartin@cramahe.ca

cc. Members of Council
    David Piccini, MPP
    Municipal Clerk
May 3, 2022

Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO)
200 University Ave., Suite 801
Toronto, ON M5H 3C6

Sent via email: resolutions@amo.on.ca

RE: AMO – Firefighter Certification.

RESOLUTION #C-2022-04-23

MOVED BY: Mick Wicklum
SECONDED BY: Fred Dobbie

“That, the Council of Tay Valley Township supports the Association of Municipalities of Ontario’s letter to the Solicitor General of Ontario outlining their concerns with the draft regulations regarding firefighter certification;

AND THAT, this resolution be forwarded to Association of Municipalities of Ontario, the Premier of Ontario, the Solicitor General, the Association of Fire Chiefs and all municipalities in Ontario.”

ADOPTED

If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (613) 267-5353 ext. 130 or clerk@tayvalleytwp.ca.

Sincerely,

Amanda Mabo, Acting CAO/Clerk

cc: Hon. Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario
Hon. Sylvia Jones, Solicitor General
All Municipalities of Ontario
Ontario Association of Fire Chiefs
May 3, 2022

Karen Redman
Regional Chair
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street
Kitchener ON  N2G 4J3
kredman@regionofwaterloo.ca

Dear Regional Chair Redman:

Thank you for completing the community safety and well-being (CSWB) plan for the Region of Waterloo on behalf of Cambridge, Kitchener, North Dumfries, Waterloo, Wellesley, and Wilmot and Woolwich.

The *Building a safe and well community for all: A journey towards transformational change* demonstrates leadership and commitment to proactively addressing crime and complex social issues facing your community. To this end, I would like to commend the joint efforts of all municipalities in the county, including Cambridge, Kitchener, North Dumfries, Waterloo, Wellesley, Wilmot and Woolwich, and your multi-sectoral partners for your collaborative efforts on the development of a comprehensive plan that will target local priority risks such as mental health supports, climate change, and housing through the implementation of your identified programs and strategies. As you know, it is by working together that we can truly make our communities safer and healthier.

The positive impacts of CSWB planning are clear. Through this collaborative planning process, communities can ensure better coordination between police services and community partners. Your CSWB plan will allow for appropriate crisis response and proactive programs that address local risks and improve the social determinants of health such as education, housing, and mental services. This type of planning can also lead to improvements in service delivery across multiple sectors, benefitting everyone in the community.

Further, by engaging in this holistic approach to CSWB planning, communities can ensure that those in need receive the correct response by the appropriate service provider in a timely manner. In so doing, this will alleviate the long-term reliance on the criminal justice system, emergency services, the financial burden of crime on society and will support long-term community safety and well-being.

…/2
Throughout the implementation of your CSWB plan, it will be essential to measure outcomes on an ongoing basis in order to determine progress on addressing local priority risks. Over time, priorities may change as improvements are made to reduce identified risks in the community. Therefore, it will be important to regularly monitor and update your CSWB plan to ensure that the plan continues to be reflective of the needs of the community.

As we move forward with CSWB planning in Ontario, I want to thank you for your continued support and ongoing efforts in helping to build safer, stronger communities in Ontario.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Jones
Solicitor General

c:  Her Worship Kathryn McGarry
    Mayor
    City of Cambridge

    His Worship Berry Vrbanovic
    Mayor
    City of Kitchener

    Her Worship Susan Foxton
    Mayor
    Township of North Dumfries

    His Worship Dave Jaworsky
    Mayor
    City of Waterloo

    His Worship Joe Nowak
    Mayor
    Township of Wellesley

    His Worship Leslie Armstrong
    Mayor
    Township of Wilmot

.../3
Her Worship Sandy Shantz
Mayor
Township of Woolwich
April 22, 2022

Dear Heads of Council:

As part of the province’s commitment to review and update regulations under the Provincial Animal Welfare Services Act, 2019 (PAWS Act) to keep animals safe, Ontario has been reviewing the existing standards of care for dogs that live outdoors under the PAWS Act.

On January 21, 2022, the Ministry of the Solicitor General posted a consultation summary of the proposed updated standards on the Ontario Regulatory Registry. The posting was open for public comment until March 7, 2022.

I am happy to notify you that the updated standards of care for outdoor dogs were filed as an amendment to Ontario Regulation 444/19 (Standards of Care and Administrative Requirements) on April 19, 2022. The amending regulation can be read by visiting Ontario e-Laws. The updates will also appear on the Ontario e-Laws page for Ontario Regulation 444/19 shortly.

The updated standards will come into force on July 1, 2022.

The updated standards are based on stakeholder and public feedback, jurisdicational reviews, academic literature and other published information as well as expert technical advice from veterinarian care, animal sheltering, industry, animal advocacy, enforcement and subject matter experts.

The updated standards replace the previous standards of care for dogs that live outdoors under the PAWS Act and create more comprehensive requirements related to:

- **General care** – including access to shade, food and water, grooming and nail care, and health and welfare maintenance.
- **Outdoor dog shelter** – including when an outdoor dog shelter is required (with exceptions for livestock guardian dogs and dogs that have access to a structure housing livestock), as well as design features and size-related specifications for an outdoor dog shelter.
- **Use of tethering** – including when dogs cannot be tethered, the safe usage of tethers, minimum space requirements when a dog is tethered, and maximum time a dog can spend on a tether (with limited exceptions).
- **Use of housing pens** – including the use of housing pens, minimum housing pen size and restrictions on outdoor dogs that can be penned together (with limited exceptions).

…/2
• **Tethering and housing pen containment area** – including adequate cleaning and sanitation, as well as features to support the physical comfort and welfare of a dog while they are contained outdoors.

Please refer to the attached fact sheet as well as the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) for more information. We welcome you to share the link to the regulation, fact sheet and FAQs with others who may be interested in learning more about the updates.

Please note, the updated standards will not impose any new requirements on municipal by-law enforcement departments. Animal Welfare Services, a branch within the ministry, is the primary body responsible for the enforcement of the PAWS Act and its regulations.

In the event of a conflict between a municipal by-law and the updated standards, section 67 of the PAWS Act continues to apply. Section 67 of the PAWS Act specifies that if there is a conflict between a provision of the PAWS Act or its regulations and a municipal by-law related to the welfare of animals or the prevention of cruelty to animals, the provision that provides the greater protection to animals prevails.

As a next step, the ministry will develop a guidance document that will help impacted owners and custodians understand the updated standards of care and set out additional recommended best practices to assist in meeting the new requirements.

We remain committed to ensuring that appropriate and effective measures are in place to provide animals with the protections they deserve. These updated standards of care will help ensure the welfare, health and safety of outdoor dogs in Ontario.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Jones
Solicitor General

Enclosures
1. What do these updates mean for owners and custodians that have their dogs outdoors? What requirements do I need to meet?

Currently, Ontario Regulation 444/19, the Standards of Care and Administrative Requirements regulation under the Provincial Animal Welfare Services Act (PAWS Act), includes standards of care for dogs that “live primarily outdoors”.

With this amendment, the existing standards of care for dogs that “live primarily outdoors” will be replaced with a new set of standards. The updated standards establish a definition of a dog “kept outdoors” – a dog that is outdoors continuously for 60 or more minutes without being in the physical presence of its owner or custodian – and create associated care requirements. The updated standards will also set out a maximum amount of time that a dog may be tethered outdoors in a 24-hour period before it must receive off-tether time for exercise and enrichment.

The updated requirements create more comprehensive requirements related to:

- **General care** – including access to shade, food and water, grooming and nail care, and health and welfare maintenance.
- **Outdoor dog shelter** – including when an outdoor dog shelter is required (with exceptions for livestock guardian dogs and dogs that have access to a structure housing livestock), as well as design features and size-related specifications for an outdoor dog shelter.
- **Use of tethering** – including when dogs cannot be tethered, the safe usage of tethers, minimum space requirements when a dog is tethered, and maximum time a dog can spend on a tether (with limited exceptions).
- **Use of housing pens** – including the use of housing pens, minimum housing pen size and restrictions on outdoor dogs that can be penned together (with limited exceptions).
- **Tethering and housing pen containment area** – including adequate cleaning and sanitation, as well as features to support the physical comfort and welfare of a dog while they are contained outdoors.

Please review the attached fact sheet or review the amending regulation by visiting Ontario e-Laws.

To assist the public, the Ministry of the Solicitor General (ministry) will develop a guidance document that provides examples of different ways that owners and custodians of outdoor dogs can meet the updated requirements.
2. **Is there a deadline for when the public and businesses will need to meet these new requirements?**

The updated standards will apply across Ontario as of July 1, 2022. This provides time for the public and businesses that choose to keep and tether their dogs outdoors to meet these updated requirements to help ensure the welfare, health and safety of outdoor dogs in Ontario.

3. **Who will be responsible for enforcing these new requirements once they are in effect on July 1, 2022?**

The updated standards will be enforced by the province’s animal welfare enforcement body, Animal Welfare Services (AWS). AWS is responsible for the enforcement of the PAWS Act and its regulations. Provincial inspectors carry out inspections and investigations and respond to concerns of distress. They also conduct outreach and education on animal care best practices.

4. **What are the penalties for someone who breaches these updated standards when they come into effect on July 1, 2022 (for example, fines or jail time)?**

The penalties for contravening the standards of care and administrative requirements for animals under the PAWS Act are:

- In the case of individuals, a fine of up to $75,000 and/or up to six months imprisonment for a first offence and a fine of up to $100,000 and/or up to one year imprisonment for a subsequent offence.
- In the case of corporations, a fine of up to $100,000 for a first offence and a fine of up to $250,000 for a subsequent offence.

Animal welfare inspectors may apply their discretion to enforce based on the circumstances. Inspectors also engage in providing education and use compliance-related tools to encourage adherence to the PAWS Act (for example, warnings and orders).

5. **Where can I report breaches of the new standards, once they are in effect on July 1, 2022?**

If you believe the new standards are not being met after they have come into effect on July 1, 2022, or that an animal is in distress, you can call the Ontario Animal Protection Call Centre (OAPCC) at 1-833-9ANIMAL (1-833-926-4625) to report your animal welfare concerns. This call centre is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Reporting to the OAPCC ensures prompt and appropriate triaging. Kindly note, the call centre cannot provide information about what calls have been received or the status of ongoing investigations.
6. Who was consulted to help develop these updated standards?

To help inform the development of updated and new regulations under the PAWS Act, in November 2020, the ministry established a multi-disciplinary PAWS Advisory Table made up of a group of experts including veterinarians and animal advocates.

Additionally, in March 2021, the ministry formed an Outdoor Dogs Technical Table (Technical Table) to seek further technical expertise. The Technical Table included representation from various dog-related industries (sled and sporting dogs, livestock guardian dogs, kennels and breeders), veterinarians, enforcement entities and other subject matter experts.

Feedback from the PAWS Advisory Table and Technical Table, public and stakeholder submissions received through Ontario’s Regulatory Registry and a review of laws and policies in other Canadian and international jurisdictions, academic literature and other reports helped to inform these updated standards.

7. Why not apply the updated standards to all dogs? What protections exist for other dogs?

The PAWS Act and its regulations ensure that all animals covered under the Act are protected and treated in a humane manner.

Ontario Regulation 444/19 (Standards of Care and Administrative Requirements) contains basic standards that apply to all animals covered under the Act. These standards have general requirements to provide adequate and appropriate food, water, medical attention and care, sanitary conditions, and space to enable natural movement and exercise and more. More details on the basic standards of care can be found at: https://www.ontario.ca/page/animal-welfare.

Due to the risks faced by outdoor dogs, the ministry has determined that additional specific standards are required for the health and safety of outdoor dogs.

8. Why do the updated standards have an exemption from the requirement for a dog shelter for livestock guardian dogs and dogs that have access to a building that houses livestock?

Livestock guardian dogs that are of a typical breed used for protecting livestock from predation and living with the flock or herd they are protecting do not require a dog shelter as they are likely to receive protection from the elements and shelter from living alongside the livestock (for example, livestock guardian dogs will burrow into the centre of the flock to block out wind). Dogs that have access to a building that is housing livestock, such as a barn, are likely to receive warmth and protection through their access to a barn which is warmed by livestock and do not require a dog shelter.
9. **Will the updated standards impact First Nation communities?**

Animal Welfare Services endeavours to engage with First Nation leadership as a matter of practice prior to enforcing the PAWS Act in First Nation communities. The ministry also respects that First Nations have the authority to make their own by-laws related to animals.

10. **Will the updated standards impact municipalities? How will these updated standards work with municipal by-laws that govern the care of outdoor dogs?**

The updated standards will not impose any new requirements on municipal by-law enforcement departments. In the event of a conflict between a municipal by-law and the updated standards, **Section 67 of the PAWS Act** continues to apply. Section 67 of the PAWS Act specifies that if there is a conflict between a provision of the PAWS Act or its regulations and a municipal by-law related to the welfare of animals or the prevention of cruelty to animals, the provision that provides the greater protection to animals prevails.
Shade, Shelter and Protection from the Elements:

**Sufficient protection from the elements** to prevent heat or cold-related distress, and **shade** as required by the weather, including to protect from direct sunlight.

A **dog shelter**, available at all times, that:

- Is waterproof and provides protection from the elements
- Is structurally sound and does not cause injury
- Has an insulated roof, a level, elevated and dry floor, and is ventilated
- Has a doorway free from obstructions
- Has bedding at least 3 inches thick, changed as needed to stay clean, dry, comfortable and unsoiled

**Size of the shelter** must allow all dogs using it to turn around, lie down with their legs extended and stand with their heads held at normal height.

**Livestock guardian dogs** and dogs with access to a structurally sound building used to house livestock do not require a dog shelter.

Food and Water:

**Food** that meets daily caloric requirements, is fit for consumption, not spoiled and does not contain dirt, feces, urine or toxic substances.

**Water** at all times that is not frozen, does not contain dirt, feces, urine or toxic substances, and is replaced at least once every 24 hours.

**Food and water containers** must be constructed to avoid injury and difficulty accessing food and water.

Health and Grooming:

**Daily health and welfare checks**

**Isolation** from other healthy dogs if the dog is at high risk of or suffering from a contagious disease (with exceptions).

**Dogs must not be kept outdoors** if they have an injury or illness that affects their ability to regulate temperature or restricts mobility (with exceptions).

**Grooming**, as needed, of nails and to avoid matting of the dog’s coat or accumulation of ice or mud on its coat or under its paws.

---

A dog “kept outdoors” is a dog that is outdoors for more than 60 minutes without its owner or custodian present.

The full text of the regulation is available at the Ontario e-Laws website. This document is intended to provide a summary only and is not legal advice. If there is any conflict between this document and the regulation, the regulation is the final authority. Produced April 2022.
**Tethers:**

Tethers must:

- Permit 3 metres of horizontal movement
- Allow the dog to move about safely
- Be a size, type and weight that won’t cause discomfort or injury
- Have a swivel at both ends
- Be in good condition and well-attached to prevent escape

**Collars and harnesses** used with a tether must be of a size, type, design and fit that won’t cause discomfort or injury

**When tethering a dog kept outdoors,** an owner/custodian must not:

- Use a **choke, pinch, prong, slip, head halter or martingale collar**
- Tether **dogs under 6 months or that are in heat, whelping or nursing**
- **Cause undue distress,** including because of the age, health or reproductive status of the dog or objects or hazards they can reach

**Housing Pens:**

Use of housing pens must not **cause undue distress** and housing pens must be constructed to prevent escape and provide protection from predators.

**Housing pen minimum size** must be scaled to the height of the dog (measured at shoulder):

- \[1.5 \text{m}^2\] for each additional dog housed in the same pen (with exceptions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height (cm)</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70 or greater</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;= 40 and &lt; 70</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;= 20 and &lt; 40</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aggressive dogs** must not be housed together, and **dogs in heat or coming into heat** must not be housed with male dogs (with exceptions)

**Housing Pen and Tether Area:**

Must provide enough space for **natural behaviours** and **distinct areas** for feeding and drinking and defecating and urinating

Dog must not be forced to stand, sit or lie in feces, urine, mud or water; area must be cleaned as needed to prevent the accumulation of waste; keep sanitary and minimize parasites

**Additional Standards for Dogs Tethered Outdoors:**

Dogs tethered outdoors for 23 hours in a 24-hour period, whether the 23 hours are consecutive or not, must be taken off the tether for at least 60 continuous minutes to allow for exercise and enrichment (with exceptions)

Note: the definition of “kept outdoors” does not apply to this requirement
March 10, 2022

Her Worship Kathryn McGarry
Mayor
City of Cambridge
mayor@cambridge.ca

Dear Mayor McGarry:

I am pleased to announce that the province has released its plan to build a better transportation system in the Greater Golden Horseshoe to meet forecasted population growth and future needs of the region. Connecting the GGH: A Transportation Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe is a 30-year plan that will support population and employment growth, reduce gridlock, connect communities and improve people’s access to jobs, housing, health care and education.

The Greater Golden Horseshoe is a dynamic, integrated economic region with diverse communities requiring different transportation needs. Ontario’s plan considers many new challenges to prepare for the future including impacts of climate change, new technologies such as automated and connected vehicles, and shifting demographics that will change the way people travel.

The 2051 vision includes proposed infrastructure improvements, service improvements and policies organized under four inter-related themes:

- Fighting gridlock and improving road performance;
- Getting people moving on a connected transit system;
- Supporting a more sustainable and resilient region;
- Efficiently moving goods.

Progress is already being made towards this vision, with many actions underway. The plan also sets out more than 100 immediate and near-term actions that the province and its partners are taking, and will take, to make substantial progress towards our 2051 vision for mobility.

.../2
Municipalities have been important partners at every stage of the planning process, and will be essential to support implementation of our plan. We are committed to working closely with municipalities, the public, transportation agencies, Indigenous communities and organizations, industry, and businesses as we consider implementation of the individual elements of the vision.

If you have any questions or comments, or require additional information, please do not hesitate to email GGHTransportationPlan@ontario.ca.

Sincerely,

Caroline Mulroney
Minister of Transportation
Subject: Decision Notice - Proposed Regulation Changes under the Aggregate Resources Act

Greetings,

Further to my letter dated January 11th, I am writing to inform you that a decision notice has been posted regarding the Proposed regulatory changes for the beneficial reuse of excess soil at pits and quarries in Ontario (ERO #019-4801). The Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry made changes so that requirements in Ontario Regulation 244/97 under the Aggregate Resources Act are consistent with provincial requirements that exist under the Environmental Protection Act for excess soil. The proposal was posted for 45 days and during that time we received over 390 comments from key stakeholders including industry, municipalities, Indigenous communities, community groups and individuals. Most comments received were supportive of consistency with the Rules for Soil Management and Excess Soil Quality Standards referenced in the On-site and Excess Soil Management Regulation under the Environmental Protection Act.

The amendments to Ontario Regulation 244/97, which take effect July 1, 2022, include:

- Alignment with the Soil Rules and Excess Soil Standards referenced in Ontario Regulation 406/19 On-site and Excess Soil Management
- Requirements for importation, storage, and placement of excess soil
- Specific quality standards for excess soil placed below the water table, or on Crown land
- Record-keeping requirements to document soil quality, quantity, source site(s), and final placement
- Requirements for licensees and permittees to retain a Qualified Person (i.e., professional engineer or geoscientist) for large sites that import more than 10,000 m³ of excess soil, or sites where excess soil will be placed below the water table
- Self-filing – for licences/permits approved before July 1, 2022, rules have been added that, when followed, enable some conditions to be removed from a site plan when filed with the ministry; and
- Other policy changes to support the beneficial reuse of excess soil at pits and quarries in Ontario
For complete details of these changes please refer to the decision notice posted on the Environmental Registry at the following address: www.ero.ontario.ca; then search for notice: 019-4801.

If you have any questions about the new requirements, or should you require a French version of this letter, please contact us by email at aggregates@ontario.ca.

Sincerely

Jennifer Keyes,
Director, Resources Planning and Development Policy Branch
February 18, 2022

Dear Colleague:

Ontario is currently experiencing an outbreak of LDD moth (previously referred to as gypsy moth), particularly in southern Ontario and some areas of the northeast region of the province. Severe LDD moth infestations are cyclical, occurring every seven to 10 years, and usually last three to five years.

In the spring and early summer, LDD moth larvae consume leaves, defoliating trees and leaving them looking nearly dead. LDD prefers oak trees, but during severe outbreaks other hardwoods and, in some cases, conifer will be defoliated. Hardwood trees can produce a second crop of leaves during the growing season allowing them to continue growing and storing nutrients into the fall and winter months. Since conifers can’t produce a second crop of foliage, they may be impacted by severe defoliation. Healthy growing trees can withstand a few seasons of severe defoliation before branch and twig dieback start to occur.

In 2021, the Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry (NDMNRF) conducted aerial and ground surveys to map damaged areas and forecast defoliation for 2022. The results suggest 2022 will be another year with high populations of LDD moth causing moderate to severe defoliation in some areas. Lighter defoliation is forecasted in some areas that have been impacted in previous years. NDMNRF will continue to monitor LDD moth throughout the current outbreak cycle.

Although the ministry conducts pest management programs on Crown land to protect foliage of high-value stands (e.g., jack pine and spruce budworm programs), management of LDD moth on private land is the responsibility of the landowner or municipality. The ministry supports these efforts by providing information on forest pests and options for reducing defoliation by LDD moth. Ontario’s Invasive Species Centre also offers resources and information to help people prevent LDD moth from damaging their trees.

In the spring, landowners can put bands of burlap around their trees. This gives the larvae a place to congregate during warm days and they can be physically removed and killed. In the fall, landowners can remove and destroy egg masses.
Landowners wishing to reduce impacts on their property can also have trees sprayed with Btk (*Bacillus thuringiensis kurstaki*) in the spring by a licensed insecticide application company. This is best carried out by coordinating efforts with other local landowners. Landowners can check their local listings for a reputable insect control provider in their area.

In the past, demand for aerial spraying of LDD has exceeded industry capacity. If landowners are considering having their property sprayed, it is best to engage a licensed insecticide application company as early as possible.

There are also natural controls on LDD moth populations in Ontario:
- Cool, wet conditions provide an ideal environment for a natural fungus (*Entomophaga maimaiga*) known to contribute to LDD moth population collapse.
- A viral infection (nuclear polyhedrosis virus or NPV) also kills LDD larvae.
- There are other natural enemies of LDD moth as well, including parasitic insects and predators such as birds and mammals.

I have attached a fact sheet and a roles and responsibilities document to help your office assist your constituents who may have questions about managing LDD moths during the outbreak period.

Sincerely,

The Honourable Greg Rickford
Minister of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry

Attachments
**Provincial forest health monitoring**

Forest health is monitored every year by the Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry (NDMNR). The ministry conducts ground and aerial surveys to map major forest health disturbances on the landscape. When pest populations reach outbreak levels, NDMNR may complete pest specific forecast surveys to help predict defoliation for future years.

The forest health monitoring program provides scientific advice and supports training and interpretation of forest health disturbances.

**LDD moth information**

NDMNR provides information on LDD moth (previously referred to as gypsy moth), defoliation maps and forecasts, and control options at [www.ontario.ca/page/lymantria-dispar-dispar-ldd-moth](http://www.ontario.ca/page/lymantria-dispar-dispar-ldd-moth).

**LDD moth monitoring**

NDMNR’s aerial forest health surveys include determining the severity and extent of the LDD moth defoliation. The ministry also conducts egg mass surveys to collect forecast data to guide activities, including monitoring of virus and fungus impacts on the population.

In 2022, NDMNR expects a continued outbreak with substantial levels of defoliation in the same areas that experienced it last year – most of southern and parts of northeastern Ontario.

As part of the annual monitoring program, the ministry also works with the Canadian Food Inspection Agency to deploy pheromone traps outside the area where LDD moth infestations are known to occur. These traps are used as an early detection tool and to support federal quarantine legislation.

The forest health program will continue to conduct surveys to monitor this pest throughout the duration of its outbreak cycle.

NDMNR works with Canadian Forest Service (CFS, Natural Resources Canada) to support the development of science and evaluate sampling methodologies.

**Federal regulation and enforcement**

LDD moth is a regulated pest by the [Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA)](http://www.inspection.gc.ca). The CFIA is responsible for establishing and maintaining standards to prevent the introduction and spread of plant pests in Canada.
Pesticide regulation

The Health Canada Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA) is responsible for pesticide regulation in Canada. Pesticides are stringently regulated in Canada to ensure they pose minimal risk to human health and the environment. Under authority of the Pest Control Products Act, Health Canada requires thorough scientific evaluation to determine that pesticides are acceptable for a specific use and that registered pesticides remain acceptable for use once on the market.

Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) regulates the sale, storage, use, transportation and disposal of pesticides in Ontario. Ontario regulates pesticides by placing appropriate education, licensing and/or permit requirements on their use under the Pesticides Act and Ontario Regulation 63/09 (O. Reg. 63/09).

Insect management on Crown land

In Ontario, to achieve sustainable forest management on Crown land, there is a forest management planning system under the Crown Forest Sustainability Act (CFSA).

For more information about this process visit Sustainable forest management.

The CFSA and the Forest Management Planning Manual dictate acceptable forest management activities on Crown land in Ontario. Decisions to conduct an insect control program on Crown land are science-based and involve NDMNRF staff and local forest managers.

Some insect outbreaks can cause extensive tree mortality on high-value stands that may lead to significant economic and cultural impacts and increase the risk of fire to northern communities. During these outbreaks, usually in Northern Ontario, an insect pest management program is developed as required in the Forest Management Planning Manual to evaluate all options. If the pest management program involves aerial application of insecticides, the Forest Management Planning Manual outlines a specific process which includes creating project proposals, First Nation and Métis community involvement, and public consultation.

Currently, there is no alternative process for private landowners to request permission to spray on Crown land.

Insect management on private land

NDMNRF does not manage LDD moth on private land; insect management on private land is the responsibility of property owner. The ministry does provide information on forest pests that includes suggestions for landowners on how to control localized populations. The ministry also leverages partners such as Ontario’s Invasive Species Centre, and the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters’ Invading Species Awareness Program to provide information to landowners, and to assist with tracking citizen reports of LDD moth.

Municipalities and conservation authorities may choose to develop integrated pest management plans to manage trees, parks and other green spaces within their jurisdiction.
LDD moth (*Lymantria dispar dispar*) in Ontario

LDD (*Lymantria dispar dispar*) is an invasive species that is native to Europe. It was first detected in Ontario in 1969. This defoliator feeds on a variety of hardwood species, preferring oak, birch, and aspen. During severe outbreaks, softwoods such as eastern white pine, balsam fir, and Colorado blue spruce may be affected. LDD moth outbreaks have become cyclical, typically occurring every seven to 10 years, with outbreaks lasting three to five years.

What does LDD moth do to forests?

- Larvae (caterpillars) feed on new foliage.
- After defoliation, hardwood trees can produce a second crop of leaves during the growing season enabling them to continue to grow.
- Conifers can’t produce a second crop of foliage but healthy trees can withstand repeated years of defoliation before branch and twig dieback start to occur.
- Defoliation stresses trees making them more susceptible to damage from secondary pests, drought, and poor growing conditions.

LDD moth life cycle

1. Overwinters in the egg stage — tan-coloured masses — often on the bark of trees.
2. In spring, eggs hatch and larvae ascend the trees to feed on the new foliage. Initially, larvae feed during the day but as they mature feeding occurs mainly at night.
3. Mature larvae, seen in early summer, are about 50 mm long, dark-coloured, hairy, with a double row of five pairs of blue spots down their backs followed by a double row of six pairs of red spots.
4. By July, the larvae are done feeding, pupate for 1 to 2 weeks, then hatch into moths.
5. Male moths are light brown and slender-bodied, while females are white, wingless, and heavy-bodied. They live only long enough to mate and lay eggs.
Control methods

The ministry does not manage LDD moth on private land. Landowners can find licensed insect control service providers with experience in controlling LDD moth populations by checking their local listings.

In spring, placing burlap bands around the tree stem gives the travelling larvae a place to congregate during warm days. The larvae can then be removed and killed.

After larvae have emerged, registered insecticides can also be applied to help protect trees from defoliation. Landowners considering spraying their property should engage a licensed insecticide application business as early as possible, as commercial capacity may be limited.

In fall and winter, removal of egg masses is also effective.

Tip: During a drought year, help your trees by watering them into the fall where appropriate to do so (ornamental or open grown trees). In a woodlot setting, manage trees to allow proper spacing and light to promote a healthy forest. Plant a diversity of species for a forest that is more resilient to insect and disease disturbances!

Ontario's forest health monitoring

The ministry monitors forest health across the province every year. Previous years’ LDD moth defoliation information is included in our annual Forest Health Conditions in Ontario reports, available at ontario.ca/page/foresthealth-conditions.

Related information

ontario.ca/page/lymantria-dispar-dispar-ldd-moth

Invasive Species Centre
invasivespeciescentre.ca/invasive-species/meet-the-species/invasive-insects/gypsy-moth/

Invading Species Awareness Program
invadingspecies.com/invaders/forest/ldd-moth/
April 19, 2022

City of Cambridge
50 Dickson Street
Cambridge, ON
N1R 5W8

Re: Support Resolution

At its meeting held on April 19, 2022, the Township of Armour passed Resolution #14. A copy of Council's Resolution dated is attached for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Danika McCann
Administrative Assistant
(Enclosed)
CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ARMOUR

RESOLUTION

Date: April 12, 2022

That the Council of the Township of Armour supports the City of Cambridge in requesting that the Province impose an immediate temporary moratorium on all new gravel applications, including expansions to existing licensed sites, pending a broad consultation process that would include First Nations, affected communities, independent experts and scientists, etc. to chart a new path forward for the extraction and processing of aggregates in Southern Ontario.

Moved by: Blakelock, Rod
Brandt, Jerry
MacPhail, Bob
Ward, Rod
Whitwell, Wendy

Seconded by: Blakelock, Rod
Brandt, Jerry
MacPhail, Bob
Ward, Rod
Whitwell, Wendy

Carried / Defeated

Declaration of Pecuniary Interest by:

Recorded vote requested by:

Recorded Vote:
Blakelock, Rod
Brandt, Jerry
MacPhail, Bob
Ward, Rod
Whitwell, Wendy

For

Opposed
April 28, 2022

Danielle Manton
City Clerk
City of Cambridge
50 Dickson Street, P.O. Box 669
Cambridge ON N1R 5W8

Dear Ms. Manton,

Please be advised that the Council of the County of Lennox and Addington endorsed the following resolution at its Regular Meeting held April 27, 2022:

*That the March 31, 2022 - resolution re: **Request to Impose a Moratorium on All New Gravel Applications** (City of Cambridge) be endorsed.*

*CARRIED*

*(signed) Warden Ric Bresee*

I trust that County Council’s support may be beneficial in your pursuit of this matter.

Sincerely,

Tracey McKenzie
Clerk
To: SPECIAL COUNCIL
Meeting Date: 5/17/2022
Subject: Inflationary Impact Strategy
Submitted By: Sheryl Ayres, Chief Financial Officer
Prepared By: Katie Fischer, Deputy Treasurer
Report No.: 22-032-CRS
File No.: C1101
Wards Affected: All Wards

RECOMMENDATION(S):

- THAT Report 22-032-CRS Inflationary Impact Strategy be received for information.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

This report identifies how the City plans to address inflationary impacts and supply chain issues that are being realized as a result of the ongoing pandemic, and the impact these issues are having on both the City’s capital and operating budgets.

Key Findings

Inflation, and in particular construction inflation as calculated using the construction price index, has been exceptionally high at 15.3% on year-over-year basis as at December 31, 2021. It is anticipated that as inflation takes hold there may be increased number of projects that come in over budget. Additionally, forecasting has become more challenging due to the significant volatility seen in the markets, leading to uncertainty in which procurements will result in budget shortfalls.

In the event of budget shortfalls, staff may identify lower priority projects within their divisional portfolio to defer, thus freeing up funding for the highest priority projects.

In the event procurements do require additional funding and therefore require Council approval, staff will work to prioritize these procurement award reports to Council
ensuring that prices obtained through the procurement process are honoured and the work proceeds in a timely manner.

It should be noted that deferring projects only pushes the funding challenges further into the future, namely the 2023 Capital Budget. The City’s prioritization model will continue to be used as part of the 2023 Capital Budget process to ensure priority work proceeds within constrained funding limits.

Financial Implications

This report is for information purposes and has no impact on the approved 2022 budget.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action; or
☒ Core Service

Objective(s): Not Applicable

Strategic Action: Not Applicable

Program: Finance

Core Service: Financial Planning

Providing information and strategy surrounding how the City will adapt and respond to the impacts of high inflation and ongoing supply chain issues on capital projects supports the transparency and sustainability of the City’s finances.

BACKGROUND:

The Government of Canada and Bank of Canada have a joint inflation target of 2%, as a mid-point of a 1%-3% control range. Inflation in this sense is based on the 12-month rate of change in the Consumer Price Index (CPI). As a result of various factors including robust consumer spending, supply constraints, and the war in Ukraine, inflation in most economies including Canada remains high. CPI in Canada averaged 3.4% in 2021, and based on the Bank of Canada’s April 2022 Monetary Policy Report it is forecasted to average just below 6% for the first half of 2022 and remain well above the control range through the rest of the year⁴.

CPI measures inflation based on a basket of goods and services of a typical household. While CPI inflation remains high, the City’s capital portfolio more closely follows the

Non-Residential Building Construction Price Index, which is a measure of inflation on the “basket of goods and services” that go into non-residential construction. This construction price index had increased by 15.3% over the previous year as of December 31, 2021, for the Toronto census metropolitan area\(^2\). (First quarter data of 2022 was not yet released at time of writing this report).

The construction price index incorporates more commodity goods such as lumber and copper which leads to a wider range of variation than seen on the CPI inflation measure. Even still, the recent increase of 15.3% remains unprecedented in the past 20 years as demonstrated on the following chart.

As part of its monetary policy process, the Bank of Canada has begun raising interest rates, due to the strengthening economic performance as the impacts of COVID-19 subside and to address continued pervasive inflation. The Bank of Canada increased its policy interest rate by 0.25% on March 2, 2022 and by another 0.50% on April 13, 2022. Further increases are expected in 2022. These rate increases are anticipated to moderate spending and gradually reduce excess demand in the Canadian economy, helping to lower inflation.

\(^2\) https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=1810013502&pickMembers%5B0%5D=2.8&cubeTimeFrame.startMonth=10&cubeTimeFrame.startYear=2021&referencePeriods=20211001%2C20220101
In the meantime, the City’s capital portfolio will see rising costs due to this high construction price index. Even as inflation cools, it is not predicted to go negative (termed “deflation”), such that costs have increased to a new level and are expected to stay at that level or continue to increase. This report identifies how the City plans to address these rising costs on its capital portfolio.

**ANALYSIS:**

To date in 2022, the following seven procurement awards have required Council approval of additional funding in order to proceed:

- 22-007-CRS First Avenue and Grand Avenue Reconstruction (2.6% under budget*)
- 22-011-CRS Henderson, Bella St & Kribs St Reconstruction (0.5% under budget*)
- 22-025-CRS South Street Reconstruction (12.0% over budget)
- 22-018-CRS Old Mill Rd. Culvert Reconstruction (18% over budget)
- 22-021-CRS Gail Street, Northview Heights, Lincoln Park Playground Replacements (10.6% over budget)
- 22-016-CRS Westminster Drive North and Westminster Drive South Reconstruction (15.8% over budget)
- 22-017-CRS Parklawn Chapel Renovation (1.9% over budget)

This compares to two reports requiring Council approval during the same time period in 2021. It should be noted that two of these awards above (those marked with an asterisk) are overall within budget, but certain funding sources are over-budget requiring Council approval for those draws. This increased number of procurement awards coming in over budget is representative of the rising costs seen in the construction marketplace.

Similarly, staff are finding a reduction in the number of suppliers/contractors/consultants with sufficient available capacity to bid on work. This is mainly the result of high economic activity resulting in excess demand for goods and services in the marketplace.

For projects that have been approved but not yet gone through procurement, it is anticipated that as inflation takes hold there may be increased number of projects that come in over budget. Additionally, forecasting has become more challenging due to the significant volatility seen in the markets, leading to uncertainty in which tenders will result in budget shortfalls.

In the event procurements do require additional funding and therefore require Council approval, staff will work to prioritize these procurement award reports to Council. This
ensures that prices obtained through the procurement process are honoured and the work proceeds in a timely manner.

In the event of budget shortfalls, divisions who manage a larger number of projects on a regular basis (i.e. Engineering, Facilities, Technology Services) will work within their respective portfolios to ensure the highest priority projects are procured first and in as timely of manner as possible. Should funding be required beyond what is available through any other capital portfolio savings and/or capital reserve funds, staff may identify those lower priority projects within the portfolio to defer, thus freeing up funding immediately for the highest priority projects.

It is important to note that deferring projects only pushes the funding challenges further into the future, namely the 2023 Capital Budget. The 10-year capital plan as part of the 2022 Budget and Business Plan included $575 million in funded capital projects. However, it also included 36 unfunded projects totalling $38 million of funding needs. Further, these cost estimates for the projects were based on typical construction inflation assumptions of 2%-3%; as staff roll forward these forecasted projects and prepare the 2023 Draft Budget, the projects’ estimated costs will need to be inflated based on the construction price index at the time of preparing the draft budget. This will drastically drive cost increases in the capital budget. Meanwhile, the revenues or funding side of creating a “balanced budget” will be constrained based on available tax or user rate revenues. This may result in an increase to the number of unfunded projects over the ten years.

Through the capital budget process, the City uses a prioritization model to aid in balancing the capital projects within available funding constraints. This model focuses on ensuring the City’s existing assets are maintained, while also providing for strategic initiatives and projects that will realize a return on investment. It uses nine factors in determining the priority score of a project:

1. Project Category (i.e. mandatory, efficiency, strategic etc.)
2. Alignment with Corporate Strategic Direction
3. Operating Budget Impact
4. Risk Assessment
5. Public Value
6. Service Levels
7. Infrastructure Impact
8. Community Impact
9. Economic Impact

As a result of the prioritization model, projects are presented in the Capital Budget in priority sequence within each service area. This prioritization model will continue to be
used as part of the 2023 Capital Budget process to ensure priority work proceeds within constrained funding limits.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):
The Budget Control By-Law 152-14 identifies roles, responsibilities and spending authorities for accountability around the City’s financial management. It also identifies reporting requirements to ensure both accountability and transparency around the City’s finances.

The Procurement By-law 19-187 establishes policies for the procurement of goods and services in a fair, open, transparent and non-discriminatory manner, reflecting best value for the City and protecting the City’s financial interests.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
This report is for information purposes and has no impact on the approved 2022 budget.

PUBLIC VALUE:
Providing information and strategy surrounding how the City will adapt and respond to high inflation on capital projects supports the transparency and sustainability of the City’s finances.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:
Not applicable.

PUBLIC INPUT:
Posted publicly as part of the report process.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:
Staff from the Project Management Office and Procurement were consulted in the writing of this report.

CONCLUSION:
Construction inflation as calculated using the construction price index has been exceptionally high at 15.3% on year-over-year basis as at December 31, 2021. This will lead to pressures on the City’s current capital portfolio. With the anticipation of increased number of projects coming in over budget in the coming months, the measures proposed in this report will improve efficiency in 2022 and allow timely awards on priority projects to secure contracts and pricing. It is important to note that deferring projects only pushes the funding challenges further into the future, namely the 2023 Capital Budget.
REPORT IMPACTS:
Agreement: No
By-law: No
Budget Amendment: No
Policy: No

APPROVALS:
This report has gone through the appropriate workflow and has been reviewed and or approved by the following as required:
Director
Deputy City Manager
Chief Financial Officer
City Solicitor
City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:
Not applicable.
To: SPECIAL COUNCIL
Meeting Date: 5/17/2022
Subject: T22-37 – Black Bridge Emergency Repair
Submitted By: Sheryl Ayres, Chief Financial Officer
Prepared By: Dave Mawdsley, Manager of Procurement
Report No.: 22-033-CRS
File No.: T22-37
Wards Affected: Ward 1

RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 22-033-CRS T22-37 – Black Bridge Emergency Repair be received;

AND THAT T22-37 be awarded to Marbridge Construction Ltd., 2233 Argentia Rd, Suite 300, Mississauga, Ontario, L5N 2X7 in the amount of $178,540, inclusive of HST;

AND FURTHER THAT Council approve the transfer from reserve funds as outlined in the Financial Impact section of this report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The bridge located on Black Bridge Road between Guelph Avenue and Townline Road (Black Bridge) sustained collision damage by a semi-tractor trailer vehicle in November 2021.

The scope of work of this tender involves repairs to the Blackbridge Road steel truss bridge over the Speed River, following the collision and damage sustained to the bridge. The repairs include removal and replacement of damaged members of the transverse truss at the west portal frame, heat straightening of the south diagonal truss member of the west portal frame, and installation of a temporary bracing system in order to carry out the work.

It is recommended that T22-37 be awarded to Marbridge Construction Ltd., 2233 Argentia Rd, Suite 300, Mississauga, Ontario, L5N 2X7 in the amount of $178,540, inclusive of HST.

Council report 22-021-CD previously approved a budget in the amount of $130,000 for the repair of Black Bridge. It is recommended to further increase this budget by $55,781.
to complete the required work. The City’s Risk and Compliance Staff have initiated the
process to recover all eligible costs form the party responsible for the collision. All non-
eligible costs will require funding from the Rate Stabilization Reserve.

STRA
CERTIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action; or
☒ Core Service

Objective(s): Not Applicable

Strategic Action: Not Applicable

Program: Road Management

Core Service: Road Maintenance

The public bidding process ensures the City maintains an open and transparent public
process that provides accountability on the utilization of financial resources.

BACKGROUND:

On November 4th, 2021 at approximately 8:20 p.m. the bridge located on Black Bridge
Road between Guelph Avenue and Townline Road (Black Bridge) sustained collision
damage by a semi-tractor trailer vehicle. The vehicle exceeded the load and height
restrictions of the bridge. The vehicle was travelling east bound and became stuck on
the west side of the bridge. Council report 22-021-CD, approved by Council on March
1, 2022, provided further details of the events and the structural damage sustained to
the bridge.

The scope of work of this tender involves repairs to the Blackbridge Road steel truss
bridge over the Speed River, following collision damaged sustained to the bridge. The
repairs include removal and replacement of damaged members of the transverse truss
at the west portal frame, heat straightening of the south diagonal truss member of the
west portal frame, and installation of a temporary bracing system in order to carry out
the work.

ANALYSIS:

Only one (1) bid was received in response to the City’s Request for Tender.

The timeline for tender was extended to three weeks to try to improve interest amongst
bidders. Preliminary feedback from potential bidders is that other work ongoing and
available by other owners did not permit them to bid on the project. The bridge repairs are required to maintain public safety and prevent the need for future bridge closures.

**EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):**

Under Procurement By-law 19-187, the Manager of Procurement or their designate, who is under the general direction of the Chief Financial Officer, is delegated the authority to approve the award of Tenders and Proposals when all of the following conditions have been satisfied:

a) when there is sufficient funding, as approved by Council through the budget process and verified by the Finance Division by the Departmental Recommendation to Award Report.

b) when all procedures in accordance with this By-law, have been followed; and

c) when the lowest compliant Tender bid or highest scored Proposal is accepted and recommended.

This tender award requires approval from Council as additional funding is required from some of the funding sources.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

Overall the tender came in over budget by 42% resulting in the need for an additional budget request in 2022. The timeline for tendering had been extended to three weeks to try to improve interest among bidders. However, potential bidders indicated that other ongoing work and availability did not permit them to bid. There was one (1) bid received through a competitive tender process. The increased costs are attributed to substantial inflationary increases seen in material prices. This is creating challenges for cost estimation based on past project experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item of Expense</th>
<th>Reserve Fund</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Tender T22-37*</th>
<th>Other Commitments</th>
<th>Savings/(Deficit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Bridge Emergency Repair Rate Stabilization</td>
<td>Rate Stabilization</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$160,781</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$(55,781)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Savings/(Deficit)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$160,781</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$(55,781)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tender amounts are net of applicable HST rebate

Council report 22-021-CD previously approved a budget in the amount of $130,000 for the repair of Black Bridge. It is recommended to further increase this budget by
$55,781. The City’s Risk and Compliance Staff have initiated the process to recover all eligible costs from the party responsible for the collision. All non-eligible costs will require funding from the Rate Stabilization Reserve.

PUBLIC VALUE:

The public bidding process ensures the City maintains an open and transparent public process that provides accountability on the utilization of financial resources.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:

Not Applicable

PUBLIC INPUT:

The advertising for this tender was as follows:

a) Advertised on the City’s Bids and Tenders website: March 7, 2022
b) Tender Closing Date: March 29, 2022

Final Date for Acceptance of Tender: June 27, 2023

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:

Request for Tender documents were compiled by Procurement, however the detailed specifications contained within the tender documents were prepared and submitted to Procurement by Engineering and Transportation Services.

CONCLUSION:

It is recommended that T22-37 be awarded to Marbridge Construction Ltd., 2233 Argentia Rd, Suite 300, Mississauga, Ontario, L5N 2X7 in the amount of $178,540, inclusive of HST.

REPORT IMPACTS:

Agreement: No
By-law: No
Budget Amendment: Yes
Policy: No

APPROVALS:
This report has gone through the appropriate workflow and has been reviewed and or approved by the following as required:

Director
Deputy City Manager
Chief Financial Officer
City Solicitor
City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

N/A
RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 22-020-OCM Cambridge Sports Park – Designation of Municipal Capital Facility be received;

AND THAT the addition to the Cambridge Sports Park to be built by Buckingham Sports Properties Company be designated as a municipal capital facility for the purpose of being used for recreational purposes for the City of Cambridge and for public use;

AND THAT by-law 22-XXX attached as Appendix “A” which authorizes the City to enter into a municipal capital facility agreement with Buckingham Sports Properties Company and to exempt the proposed addition to the existing facility from taxation for municipal and school purposes pursuant to section 110(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001, be passed;

AND FURTHER THAT Council authorize the Mayor and Clerk to execute the municipal capital facility agreement between the City of Cambridge and Buckingham Sports Properties Company;

AND FURTHER THAT Council direct the Clerk to give written notice of the by-law to the Minister of Finance, the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation, the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and the secretary of the affected school boards.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

- The purpose of this report is to seek Council’s approval of the by-law attached as Appendix “A” to this report which seeks to designate the proposed addition to the
existing Cambridge Sports Park facility located at 1001 Franklin Boulevard as a municipal capital facility and to exempt the proposed addition pursuant to section 110(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001, from taxation for municipal and school board purposes. In addition to authorize the Mayor and Clerk to sign the Municipal Capital Facility Agreement between the City and Buckingham Sports Properties Company (“Buckingham”).

Key Findings

- Council at its meeting on January 6, 2022 approved the recommendations in report 22-002(IFS) whereby the City entered into a lease amending agreement with Buckingham which will allow for the expansion of the Cambridge Sports Park to build two new ice pads and the purchase of prime, non-prime and summer ice time at the expanded facility.

- This agreement was executed by the parties on January 10, 2022 and is now in effect. Among other terms, it allows for the designation of the addition to the existing facility as a municipal capital facility pursuant to section 110(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001 and section 6 of Ontario Regulation 603/06.

- The municipal capital facility designation will be for a period of 20 years in the first instance commencing on September 1, 2023.

- Under this designation, the building addition will be exempted from property taxes for municipal and school board purposes.

- The City is required to pass a bylaw as well as enter into a municipal capital facility agreement with Buckingham in order to designate the addition to the Cambridge Sports Park as a municipal capital facility.

Financial Implications

- Capital costs and operating budget impacts to build and operate a City owned twin pad arena was presented to Council on June 4, 2019 and is available as appendix- D of council report 19-178(CRE). As of June 2019, the cost to build a City owned twin pad arena was $26,000,000 to be debt financed with operating budget impacts of 1.8-2.5%.

- As the addition to the Cambridge Sports Park will be funded entirely by Buckingham, the City will not incur the capital and operating costs associated with building and operating the facility.
• Until the addition to the facility is built and assessed by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC), the municipal and school board taxes that will not be collected cannot be determined.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action; or
☒ Core Service

Objective(s): INCLUSION - Deliver accessible, diverse and inclusive services, programs and infrastructure for all ages and abilities

Strategic Action: Create and activate spaces that offer things for people to do

Program: Recreation Programming

Core Service: Recreation, Fitness & Leisure

BACKGROUND:

At its meeting on January 6, 2022, Council approved City entering into an amended lease agreement with Buckingham for 25 years to allow for the construction of a twin-pad ice hockey arena, additional seating and change rooms serving the existing ice pads, additional areas, renovation and development of the site.

In addition, there will be changes to ice times and rates, payment of property taxes and fees and other terms and conditions. The parties signed the agreement on January 10, 2022.

One requirement of the agreement is for the City to designate the addition to the existing Cambridge Sports Park as a municipal capital facility in accordance with the requirements of section 110(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001 and section 6 of Ontario Regulation 603/06. This designation would be effective September 1, 2023 and would be for 20 years in the first instance. Upon the expiry of the twenty-year period, the City would enter into a new municipal capital facility agreement with Buckingham for additional 5 years as long as the property is being used for recreational purposes as outlined in the lease amending agreement.

ANALYSIS:

Designation as a Municipal Capital Facility
Section 110(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001 allows the City to enter into agreements with any person for the provision of municipal capital facilities and for Council to exempt from taxation for municipal and school board purposes, land or a portion of land, on which municipal facilities are or will be located.

Section 6 of Ontario Regulation 603/06 allows the designation as a municipal capital facility of property used for recreational purposes and where the municipality owns the property. The City is the owner of the Cambridge Sports Park property and it has been leased to Buckingham under this new arrangement.

The Municipal Act requires that a by-law permitting a municipality to enter into a municipal capital facility agreement must be passed and upon the passing of the by-law the Clerk must give written notice of the by-law to:

- the Minister of Finance;
- the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation;
- the Clerk of the Region of Waterloo; and
- the secretary of the affected local school boards.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

There is no existing policy/by-law. However, section 110 of the Municipal Act, 2001 and section 6 of Ontario Regulation 603/06 are applicable.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Buckingham will pay all capital costs to improve and expand the existing facility to a four-pad facility. The City will not be responsible to contribute any cost towards the upgrade and expansion of the facility.

Buckingham will also be fully responsible for all operating costs of the facility including maintenance of ice surfaces, change rooms and other facility components and providing ice facilities to the City’s recreation services.

The exemption of the expansion from taxation for municipal property taxes will mean that the City will not receive revenue from taxes. The amount of lost revenues from property taxes can only be determined once the property is built and assessed by MPAC.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:
PUBLIC INPUT:
Posted publicly as part of the report process.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:
There was no internal/external consultation undertaken.

CONCLUSION:
In order to give effect to Council’s approval of the lease amending agreement with Buckingham, the City is required to designate the addition to the Cambridge Sports Center as a municipal capital facility pursuant to section 110 of the Municipal Act, 2001. This designation will allow the addition to be exempt from municipal and school board taxes for a period of 20 years in the first instance. Council is required to pass a by-law to give effect to this exemption. The tax exemption is effective from September 1, 2023 which is the commencement date of the amended lease agreement with Buckingham.

REPORT IMPACTS:
Agreement: Yes
By-law: Yes
Budget Amendment: No
Policy: No

APPROVALS:
This report has gone through the appropriate workflow and has been reviewed and or approved by the following as required:

Director
Deputy City Manager
Chief Financial Officer
City Solicitor
City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Report 22-020-OCM Appendix A – By-law XX-XX

BY-LAW NO.

OF THE

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Being a by-law of The Corporation of the City of Cambridge to designate the MCF Building at 1001 Franklin Boulevard as a municipal capital facility.

WHEREAS Subsection 110(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25, as amended (the “Municipal Act, 2001”) permits a municipality to enter into agreements for the provision of municipal capital facilities;

AND WHEREAS Subsection 110(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001 permits a Council of a municipality to designate lands within the classes of lands described in section 6 of Ontario Regulation 603/06, as amended, as a municipal capital facility and to exempt that facility from taxation for municipal and school purposes;

AND WHEREAS the proposed addition to the existing facility on the lands located at 1001 Franklin Boulevard, Cambridge, Ontario, N1R 8B5, described in Schedule “A” to this by-law (the “Lands”), being the plan of the proposed addition in Schedule “B” to this by-law (the “MCF Building”) shall be used for the provision of municipal community centre services, for the purposes of the municipality and for public use, being a permitted class under section 6 of Ontario Regulation 603/06 as amended;

AND WHEREAS in accordance with the authorization of the Council on January 6, 2022, the City of Cambridge and Buckingham Sports Properties Company will enter into an agreement, conditional on the passage of this by-law, in the form attached as Schedule “C” that provides for the use the MCF Building as a municipal capital facility for a term of twenty years commencing on September 1, 2023 (the “Municipal Capital Facility Agreement”);

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

1. The Council hereby designates the MCF Building as a municipal capital facility used for and all present and future improvements thereto as a municipal capital facility for the provision of municipal community centre services, for the purposes of the municipality and for public use, and the implementation of such designation by way of a Municipal Capital Facility Agreement in the form attached hereto as Schedule “C”.
2. The MCF Building and all present and future related improvements thereto are hereby exempt from the payment of taxation for municipal and school purposes and shall be so exempt until the earliest of:

   a. the termination date of the Municipal Capital Facilities Agreement between the City of Cambridge and Buckingham Sports Properties Company;

   b. the day that the Municipal Act, 2001 or such other applicable or successor legislation is repealed or amended such that the designation of the MCF Building as a municipal capital facility is no longer available to be made or applicable; and,

   c. the day the MCF Building cease to be used as a municipal capital facility as that term is defined in Ontario Regulation 603/06, as amended, from time to time.

3. The City shall cause its Clerk to give written notice of the by-law permitting the City to enter into this agreement to the Minister of Education as provided for in subsection 110(5) of the Municipal Act, 2001.

4. The City shall cause its Clerk to give written notice of the contents of this by-law to the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation, the Clerk of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and the secretary of any school board if the area of jurisdiction of any such board included the land that is exempted by this by-law, as required under section 110(8) of the Municipal Act, 2001.

5. This by-law shall be effective as of the date of passing.

   Read a First, Second and Third time this 17th day of May, 2022.

   Enacted and passed, this 17th day of May, 2022.

   ________________________________
   Kathryn McGarry
   Mayor

   ________________________________
   Danielle Manton
   City Clerk
SCHEDULE “A”

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF THE LANDS

ALL AND SINGULAR that certain parcel or tract of land and premises situated, lying and being in the City of Cambridge, in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, being compromised of:

PT LT 1 RCP 1380 CAMBRIDGE PT 17-21, 27 & 28 67R2899, PT 2, 67R1684 EXCEPT PT 1, 58R8109 & PT 1, 58R10305; CAMBRIDGE

PIN: 03796-0121 (LT)

LRO: #58
SCHEDULE “B”

PLAN OF THE MCF BUILDING

the complete by-law is included on pages 481-489 of the agenda
SCHEDULE “C”

FORM OF AGREEMENT FOR
MUNICIPAL CAPITAL FACILITY

See next pages attached.
APPENDIX “B”

MUNICIPAL CAPITAL FACILITY AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT dated the 18th day of May, 2022.

BETWEEN:

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

(the “City”)

AND:

BUCKINGHAM SPORTS PROPERTIES COMPANY

(“Buckingham Sports”)

WHEREAS:

A. The City owns the lands known municipally as 1001 Franklin Boulevard, Cambridge, Ontario, N1R 8B5, described in Schedule “A” to this agreement (the “Lands”);

B. Buckingham Sports leases, operates and pays property taxes on an existing facility on the Lands;

C. Buckingham Sports wishes, pursuant to Section 110(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001 to enter into an agreement with the City for the use of a proposed addition to the existing facility on the Lands, being the plan of the proposed addition in Schedule “B” to this agreement (the “MCF Building”) as a municipal capital facility;

D. The City wishes, pursuant to Section 110(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001, to exempt the MCF Building from taxation for municipal and school purposes;

E. The MCF Building shall be a municipal community centre to serve the community of the City of Cambridge being qualified as a class of municipal capital facility described in subsections 2(1)(14) of Ontario Regulation 603/06;

THEREFORE, in consideration of the making of this Agreement and the mutual covenants contained herein, the parties undertake, covenant and agree as follows:

DESIGNATION

1. The City will by by-law, designate the MCF Building as a municipal capital facility and exempt the MCF Building from taxation for municipal and school purposes.

TERM
2. The term of this Agreement and the designation of the MCF Building as a municipal capital facility shall be from September 1, 2023 to the earliest of:

   a. August 31, 2043;

   b. the day that the Municipal Act, 2001 or such other applicable or successor legislation is repealed or amended such that the designation of the MCF Building as a municipal capital facility is no longer available to be made or applicable; and,

   c. the day the MCF Building ceases to be used as a municipal capital facility as that term is defined in Ontario Regulation 603/06, as amended, from time to time.

TAX EXEMPTION

3. The City shall, pursuant to subsection 110(6) of the Municipal Act, 2001, exempt the MCF Building from property taxation for municipal and school purposes.

ZONING

4. For the purposes of clarity, the City acknowledges and agrees that neither this Agreement nor the by-law shall in any way affect the zoning of the MCF Building or the permitted uses of the MCF Building under applicable laws.

REGISTRATION

5. The by-law referred to in section 1 of this Agreement may be registered by the City on title to the Lands.

OBLIGATIONS AS COVENANTS

6. Each obligation expressed in this Agreement, even though not expressed as a covenant, is considered to be a covenant for all purposes.

ENTIRE AGREEMENT

7. This Agreement contains all the covenants, agreements and understandings between the parties concerning its subject matter.

ENUREMENT

8. This Agreement shall enure to the benefit of and be binding upon the parties hereto and their respective successors and assigns.
9. If any provision of this Agreement or the application of it to any person or circumstances is held to any extent invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this Agreement or the application of the provisions to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid or unenforceable is not affected.

FURTHER ASSURANCES

10. The parties shall do and execute all such further acts, deeds, instruments or things as may be necessary or desirable for the purpose of carrying out the intent of this Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties hereto have duly executed this Agreement.

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Per: ____________________________________________
Kathryn McGarry
Mayor

Per: ____________________________________________
Danielle Manton
City Clerk
We have the authority to bind the corporation.

BUCKINGHAM SPORTS PROPERTIES COMPANY

Per: ____________________________________________
John Cook
Vice President

Per: ____________________________________________
Paul Campoli
Chief Financial Officer
We have the authority to bind the corporation
SCHEDULE “A”

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF THE LANDS

ALL AND SINGULAR that certain parcel or tract of land and premises situated, lying and being in the City of Cambridge, in the Region of Waterloo, being compromised of:

PT LT 1 RCP 1380 CAMBRIDGE PT 17-21, 27 & 28 67R2899, PT 2, 67R1684 EXCEPT PT 1, 58R8109 & PT 1, 58R10305; CAMBRIDGE

PIN: 03796-0121 (LT)

LRO: #58
SCHEDULE “B”

PLAN OF THE MCF BUILDING

The complete by-law is included on pages 481-489 of the agenda.
To: SPECIAL COUNCIL
Meeting Date: 5/17/2022
Subject: 2022-2026 Joint Compliance Audit Committee
Submitted By: Danielle Manton, City Clerk
Prepared By: Jennifer Shaw, Manager of Council & Committee Services / Deputy City Clerk
Report No.: 22-028-CRS
File No.: C1101
Wards Affected: All Wards

RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 22-028-CRS 2022-2016 Joint Compliance Audit Committee be received;
AND THAT a Joint Municipal Election Compliance Audit Committee be established for the 2022-2026 term of Council in accordance with the draft Terms of Reference attached as Appendix A to Report 22-028-CRS.
AND THAT the City Clerk be delegated authority to select and appoint Committee Members with Council to be advised of the appointments by way of an Information Report once members have been selected.
AND FURTHER THAT the City Clerk be delegated authority to review and revise the Terms of Reference throughout the term of the Committee in consultation with other participating municipalities.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

To provide Council with information regarding the creation of a Joint Municipal Election Compliance Audit Committee and draft Terms of Reference.

Key Findings

- A qualified elector who believes on reasonable grounds that a registered third party or candidate has contravened a provision of the MEA relating to election campaign finances, may apply for a compliance audit.
- The Clerk is required to prepare a report and forward to the Compliance Audit Committee identifying each contributor to a candidate for office on a council who appears to have contravened any of the contribution limits of the MEA.
- The Region of Waterloo municipalities have been establishing Joint Municipal Compliance Audit Committees since the 2010 Municipal Election with the City of Guelph added as a participating municipality during the 2018 Municipal Election.
- Any costs associated with the Joint Compliance Audit Committee, or an auditor, shall be the responsibility of the municipality requiring the services.
- The Clerk received no compliance audit applications for the 2018-2022 term.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications at this time; however, costs will be incurred if a request for a compliance audit is received.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action; or
☒ Core Service

Objective(s): WELLBEING - Connect people to services that support individual and community wellbeing

Strategic Action: Not Applicable

Program: Council Support

Core Service: Municipal Election Management

The establishment of a Municipal Election Compliance Audit Committee and its Terms of Reference is an essential component in preparing for the upcoming Municipal Election and fulfills one of the Clerk’s responsibilities under the MEA. It aligns with the City’s Strategic Plan in fulfillment of the Objective of wellbeing by enabling citizens of Cambridge to become engaged in local government processes designed to ensure accountability and transparency.

BACKGROUND:
Section 88.37 of the Municipal Elections Act, 1996, S.O. 1996, c. 32, as amended, requires that a Council or local board shall establish a Municipal Election Compliance Audit Committee (MECAC) before October 1 of an election year.

There are no restrictions in the MEA precluding municipalities from sharing a Municipal Election Compliance Audit Committee.

The Committee has the full authority provided by sections 88.33 to 88.37 of the MEA to address applications requesting an audit of a candidate’s or third-party advertiser’s election campaign finances and to consider reports from the City Clerk citing apparent instances of over-contributions to a municipal campaign.

The MEA provides that an elector who is entitled to vote in an election and believes on reasonable grounds that a candidate or registered third party has contravened a provision of the MEA relating to election campaign finances, may apply for a compliance audit of the registered third party or candidate’s election campaign finances. Applications for a compliance audit can be submitted by eligible electors to the Clerk, who will in turn forward the application to the Compliance Audit Committee.

In accordance with the MEA, the Compliance Audit Committee shall review each application to determine whether or not there are reasonable grounds to request an audit. If the request is granted, the committee then appoints an auditor to audit the registered third party or candidate’s finances.

Upon completion of an audit, the Compliance Audit Committee reviews the auditor’s report to determine whether any contraventions to the MEA occurred and whether legal proceedings against the registered third-party or candidate should take place.

Since the 2014-2018 term, the City of Cambridge has partnered with the Region of Waterloo, Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo and Townships of North Dumfries, Wellesley, Wilmot and Woolwich (participating municipalities) to establish a Joint Municipal Election Compliance Audit Committee. In 2018 the City of Guelph joined in this partnership.

The total number of compliance audit applications received from the Region of Waterloo participating municipalities, including Guelph, in the 2018 municipal election was one (1). This compliance audit was associated with the City of Guelph. No requests for compliance audits were received by any of the other participating municipalities.

In accordance with the Terms of Reference, the mandate of the Compliance Audit Committee is considered to be complete at the end of each four-year term of Council at which time a successor committee must be appointed.
ANALYSIS:

Clerk’s Office staff have met with the Area Clerks within the Region of Waterloo and the City of Guelph and it was agreed that a Joint Municipal Election Compliance Audit Committee should again be formed for the 2022-2026 term with all to participate in the recruitment and appointment of members.

Taking into consideration the competition for qualified applicants, as well as the potential for conflicts for those applicants with accounting/auditing backgrounds, a Joint Municipal Election Compliance Audit Committee offers the greatest potential to reach the broadest spectrum of interested applicants across the participating municipalities, in a cost-effective manner while also offering a high degree of operational flexibility.

Current Committee

The Act requires that a Municipal Election Compliance Audit Committee must have between three (3) and seven (7) members, the 2018-2022 Joint Municipal Compliance Audit Committee consisted of a pool of 10 members. Committee members shall not be employees, officers, members of Council, or applicable local board members or candidates.

In May 2019, the City of Guelph received one application for a compliance audit. Upon receipt of the application, the City Clerk assembled a committee from the 2018-2022 Joint Municipal Election Compliance Audit Committee pool, to conduct a compliance audit hearing and provide a decision on the application.

Terms of Reference

On June 12, 2018 Council approved the 2018-2022 Terms of Reference for the creation of a Joint Municipal Compliance Audit Committee.

In a meeting with Area Clerks, the 2018-2022 Terms of Reference were reviewed, and staff are recommending modifications as a result of legislative changes including:

- Section 3 – Council’s term of office commences on November 15
- Section 4 – Municipalities are no longer permitted to recover costs of auditor reports

Staff are also recommending the following administrative changes:

- Section 8 – Permitting meetings in person or electronically
- Section 8.3 – Requiring agenda to be posted a minimum of two (2) business days prior to the date of the meeting
- Section 8.5 – Increasing the remuneration rate from $175 to $200
• Section 10 – Revising the list of applicable legislation and adding further provisions for removal of members if unable to attend three (3) meetings in a row or unable to fulfill duties of the Municipal Election Compliance Audit Committee pool
• Section 12 – Permitting the Clerk to develop additional administrative practices and procedures at any time
• Conflicts of Interest Policy – Adding definitions distinguishing between personal and pecuniary conflicts of interest and clarifying when conflicts are to be disclosed.

Next Steps

Upon approval to proceed with the establishment of a Joint Municipal Compliance Audit Committee, staff will work with the Area Clerks of the participating municipalities to begin the recruitment process for members. Those selected will receive proper orientation and training so they are prepared in the event that an audit request is received. Information reports will be forwarded to Council once the members of the committee have been determined.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

The requirement for the establishment of a Municipal Compliance Audit Committee is set out in Section 88.37 of the Municipal Elections Act, 1996, S.O. 1996, c.32, as amended.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Administrative costs for such items as printing, mail and mileage will be funded from the Election Reserve Budget. Advertising costs will be incurred to solicit applications for appointment to the Joint Municipal Compliance Audit Committee and funded from the same reserve.

PUBLIC VALUE:

Sustainability:

The establishment of a Joint Municipal Compliance Audit Committee supports sustainability by offering a high degree of operational flexibility and the pooling of resources in a cost-effective manner.

Collaboration:
Collaboration will involve working in partnership with participating municipalities in the Joint Municipal Compliance Audit Committee.

**Transparency:**

To ensure transparency, the recruitment process for members of the Joint Municipal Election Compliance Audit Committee will be advertised widely throughout the Region and within the City of Guelph to reach as many interested and qualified candidates as possible. The approved Terms of Reference along with administrative practices and procedures will be posted publicly on the City’s website.

**Engagement:**

As part of the recruitment process for the Compliance Audit Committee, interested and qualified members of the public will be invited to submit applications for appointment to the Committee.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:**

Not Applicable.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

**INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:**

Consultations and coordination with participating Area Clerks has taken place. The City’s Legal and Finance Divisions will be consulted and involved as necessary.

**CONCLUSION:**

Based on consultations with Area Clerks of participating municipalities and in consideration of the benefits of sharing membership, staff are recommending the establishment of a Joint Municipal Compliance Audit Committee for the November 2022-November 2026 term of council.

**REPORT IMPACTS:**

Agreement: **No**

By-law: **No**

Budget Amendment: **No**
Policy: No

APPROVALS:
This report has gone through the appropriate workflow and has been reviewed and or approved by the following as required:
Director
Deputy City Manager
Chief Financial Officer
City Solicitor
City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:
When naming attachments please use the following format:
1. 22-028-CRS Appendix A – Draft Municipal Compliance Audit Committee Terms of Reference
Municipal Election Compliance Audit Committee (MECAC)

Terms of Reference

Refer to Section 88.37 of the Municipal Elections Act, 1996

1. **Name of Committee**

The Participating Municipalities have agreed to create a joint Municipal Election Compliance Audit Committee which is named:

the “Municipal Election Compliance Audit Committee” ("MECAC")

2. **Definitions**


“Clerk” means the Clerk of the municipality or designate.

“Conflict of Interest” means a situation in which a member is in a position to derive personal benefit from actions or decisions made in their official capacity on the Committee.

“Conflict of Pecuniary Interest” means the potential, perceived or actual financial gain or loss a Member may experience, directly or indirectly, from their membership on the Committee.

“Host Municipality” means the municipality where the application for a compliance audit is received. A Host Municipality can only receive applications for candidates or third parties registered in its municipality.

“Participating Municipalities” means the municipalities who have agreed to participate in a joint MECAC and includes:

- The City of Cambridge
- The City of Guelph
- The City of Kitchener
- The City of Waterloo
- The Township of North Dumfries
- The Township of Wellesley
- The Township of Wilmot
- The Township of Woolwich
- The Region of Waterloo
3. **Duration**

The term of office for the committee shall be from November 15, 2022 to November 14, 2026 to deal with applications from the 2022 election and any by-elections during Council’s term.

The establishment of this Committee and its terms of reference will be reviewed prior to the start of the next term of Council.

4. **Mandate**

The MECAC will operate within the provisions of the Act.

The MECAC will consider an application for a compliance audit of a candidate’s or registered third party’s election campaign finances received under Sections 88.33 or 88.35 of the Act from an elector to determine if the application should be granted or rejected. If granted, the MECAC will appoint an auditor, receive and consider the auditor’s report, and decide whether legal proceedings should commence or if there were reasonable grounds for the application.

MECAC will also receive the Clerk’s report identifying apparent contribution contraventions, prepared under Section 88.34 of the Act. Within 30 days after receiving a Clerk’s report, the MECAC shall consider it and decide whether to commence a legal proceeding against a contributor for an apparent contravention.

5. **Advertising, Applications and MECAC Pool Selection**

The terms of reference and application form will be posted, as a minimum, on the municipal websites of the member municipalities to solicit membership for the MECAC pool. Staff will also contact and solicit those individuals with the qualifications listed in Section 6 of these Terms of Reference. In addition, previous MECAC members may be contacted, along with direct contacts by municipal staff.

All applicants will be required to complete an application form outlining their qualifications and experience. The Clerks of the Participating Municipalities will meet to review the applications. A pool of up to ten (10) members for MECAC will be developed and approved by the Clerks of the Participating Municipalities. Appointments to the MECAC pool will be approved by a majority vote of the Clerks.

6. **MECAC Pool Eligibility**
Members of the MECAC pool will be selected on the basis of the following:

- demonstrated knowledge and understanding of municipal election financing rules;
- proven analytical and decision-making skills;
- experience working on a committee, task force or similar setting;
- availability and willingness to attend meetings during the day or evening;
- excellent oral and written communication skills
- expertise in:
  - accounting and audit;
  - academic with expertise in political science or local government;
  - legal;
  - knowledge of the campaign finance rules contained in the Act.

Members of the MECAC pool shall not include:

- members of any municipal Council represented;
- employees or officers of the municipalities represented;
- any persons who are candidates in the election for which the committee is established; or
- any persons who are registered third parties in the municipality in the election for which the committee is established.

7. **Committee Selection**

When an application is made to MECAC, the Clerk of the Host Municipality shall determine the composition and membership of the Committee. The Committee shall be composed of not fewer than three (3) and not more than seven (7) members from the MECAC pool.

To determine membership, the Clerk of the Host Municipality shall contact members of the pool to form the membership of the Committee to hear the application. It is at the full discretion of the Clerk of the Host Municipality to determine the order that members from the MECAC pool will be contacted.

The Chair of the MECAC will be selected by resolution at the start of the first meeting of each MECAC application by the members present.

8. **Committee Meetings**

Meetings of the Committee shall be open to the public. The meetings may be held either in person or electronically at the host municipal clerk’s discretion.
8.1 **Closed Meetings of Committees**

MECAC may deliberate in closed session as needed and will follow the procedures of the Host Municipality.

8.2 **Timing of Meetings**

Meetings shall be called by the Clerk of the Host Municipality as required under the provisions of the *Municipal Elections Act*. The periods for receiving applications and holding meetings shall be as established by the *Municipal Elections Act*.

The Clerk of the Host Municipality will be responsible for determining the location of the meeting, scheduling the meeting and communicating the meeting details directly to the Committee members. Subsequent meetings will be held at the call of the Chair in consultation with the Clerk of the Host Municipality.

8.3 **Meeting Notices, Agenda and Minutes**

The agenda shall constitute notice. A minimum of two (2) business days prior to the date of each meeting, not including weekends or holidays, the agendas and minutes of the meetings shall be posted on the member municipality’s website. Minutes of each meeting shall outline the general deliberations and specific actions and recommendations that result.

The Clerk of the Host Municipality is responsible for the administrative duties associated with MECAC, but may contact the Clerk of any of the participating municipalities for assistance with minutes or any other matters if required.

8.4 **Meeting Procedures**

Quorum will be a majority of the members of the MECAC.

Voting by consensus will be used for decisions of the Committee or a majority vote by members, usually performed by the show of hands. The Chair is also entitled to a vote on MECAC.

Meetings will be governed by the Procedural By-law of the Host Municipality and Roberts Rules of Order as required.

8.5 **Meeting Remuneration and Expenses**

Members of the MECAC shall be paid a rate of $200 per meeting plus the applicable mileage rate from the Host Municipality. Expenses will be paid by the Host Municipality.
9. **Conflict of Interest Policy**

Members of the MECAC will conform to the Conflict of Interest Policy, attached as Schedule "A" to these Terms of Reference.

10. **Removal of Members**

The current MECAC may recommend to the Clerk of the Host Municipality for the removal of a member for reasons as listed, but not limited to:

- the member being in contravention of the *Municipal Act, 2001*, the *Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, the *Provincial Offences Act*, the *Municipal Elections Act, 2001* or the *Municipal Elections Compliance Audit Committee Conflict of Interest Policy*;
- the member being in contravention of the Code of Conduct and/or Procedural By-law of the Host Municipality; or
- other legal issues
- If a member is unable to attend three meetings in a row
- The member becomes unable to fulfill the duties of the MECAC Pool

The Clerk of the Host Municipality may select another person from the MECAC Pool if necessary.

11. **Errors/Omissions**

The accidental omission to give notice of any meeting of the MECAC to its members, or the non-receipt of any notice by any of the members, or any error in any notice that does not affect its substance, does not invalidate any resolution passed or any proceedings taken at the meeting. Any members of the MECAC may at any time waive notice of the meeting.

12. **Administrative Practices and Procedures**

The Terms of Reference constitute the Administrative Practices and Procedures of the Committee. Any responsibilities not clearly identified within these Terms of Reference shall be in accordance with Section 88.33 to 88.37 of the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996*.

The Clerk of the Host Municipality, has the right to develop additional administrative practices and procedures at any time.
Municipal Elections Compliance Audit Committee (MECAC)

Conflict of Interest Policy

Policy Application

This policy applies to the Municipal Elections Compliance Audit Committee (MECAC) for the municipalities of the Region of Waterloo, Cities of Cambridge, Guelph, Kitchener, Waterloo, Townships of North Dumfries, Wellesley, Wilmot and Woolwich.

Operating Principles:

Members of the MECAC have a duty to conduct themselves in an impartial and objective manner. It is recognized that appointees have a broad range of interests and, from time to time, actual or perceived conflicts of interest or conflicts of pecuniary interest (or the appearance of such conflicts) may arise. The purpose of this policy is to enable the MECAC to deal with such conflicts in as open and appropriate a way as possible.

It is understood that members of MECAC will perform their duties in such a way as to promote public confidence and trust in the integrity, objectivity and impartiality of the Committee. No member shall directly or indirectly receive any profit from his/her position, provided that an honorarium, as established in the Terms of Reference and reasonable expenses may be paid in the performance of their duties.

Definitions

“Affected Party” means any individual, partnership, corporation, organization or other legal entity which has an interest in property, objects or other assets which are the subject matter of consideration by the Committee;

“Business associate” means an individual in a formal partnership or in a shared ownership of a company or enterprise with a Member;

“Committee” is the Municipal Elections Act Compliance Audit Committee (MECAC);

“Immediate family” means a parent, child, spouse or common-law spouse of a Member;

“Member” is an individual formally appointed to the MECAC in accordance with the Terms of Reference.

Conflicts

Conflicts of pecuniary interest arise when Members may financially benefit, directly or indirectly, from their membership on a Committee. Such involvements include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Members being the Affected Party or employed by or doing business with the Affected Party
- Members’ immediate family being the Affected Party or employed by or doing business with the Affected Party
- Members’ business associates being the Affected Party or employed by or doing business with the Affected Party

A conflict of interest may be an actual or perceived conflict of pecuniary interest. The same duty to disclose applies to each. The pecuniary interests of a Member’s immediate family or business associate are considered to also be the pecuniary interests of the Member. Full disclosure in itself does not remove a conflict of interest.

**Principles and procedures**

It is important that Members be sensitive to appearance and perception and err on the side of transparency. In case of conflicts, whether personal or pecuniary, actual, potential or apparent, Members are expected to fully disclose the potential conflict. Members shall disclose any potential conflicts to the Clerk of the Host Municipality prior to being appointed to the Committee. If a potential conflict arises while sitting on the Committee, the Member shall disclose it as soon as it arises and before the Committee makes any decisions in the matter where the conflict exists.

Once such a disclosure has been made, the Member involved shall abstain from voting and shall not participate in the discussion of the matter which gave rise to the conflict. The affected Member must not in any way, whether before during or after the meeting, attempt to influence the outcome of any discussion or voting on the matter. If the meeting at which the matter is discussed is not open to the public, in addition to the above, the Member must leave the meeting room for the duration of any discussion and voting on the matter.

In cases where one or more of the Committee’s Members has abstained from voting as a result of conflict, such Members shall be identified in the minutes of the meeting.

Individual Members are encouraged to seek independent advice on conflicts or potential conflicts.

**Quorum**

Where the number of Members who, by reason of conflict, are unable to participate in a meeting such that the remaining Members no longer constitute a quorum as set out in the Committee’s Terms of Reference, then remaining Members shall be deemed to constitute a quorum provided there are not less than two Members present.

**Solicitation**

No Member may in any way, either overtly or otherwise, use the fact of their membership on the Committee to solicit business for their own benefit or the benefit of their immediate family or business associates.
To: SPECIAL COUNCIL  
Meeting Date: 5/17/2021  
Submitted By: Kevin De Leebeeck, Director of Engineering  
Prepared By: Shannon Noonan, Manager of Transportation  
Report No.: 22-034-CD  
File No.: N/A  
Wards Affected: Ward 8

RECOMMENDATION(S):  
THAT Report 22-034-CD, Upper Country Club Subdivision – Neighbourhood Traffic Safety Petition be received as information;

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:  
Purpose  
• This report summarizes the actions taken to address a petition submitted by area residents in the Upper Country Club Subdivision (UCC).

Key Findings  
• In June 2021, a petition related to traffic safety in the Upper Country Club Subdivision was submitted to City Staff.

• Meetings were held with City Staff, the Ward Councillor and area residents to discuss the petition requests in more detail and results of subsequent completed traffic studies.

• Based on the completed traffic studies, it was determined that vehicle speeds and traffic volumes in the UCC area are typical, except for one location on Arthur Fach Drive.

• All UCC locations were included as part of the City wide 2022 Speed Management Program Action Plan recently approved by Council.
• All-way Stop control is not warranted at the intersection of Baintree Way at Coulthard Boulevard.

• Enforcement of parking regulations, such as parking time limits, will begin to resume as Provincial orders related to the pandemic are lifted. In addition, a complete review of on-street parking regulations is scheduled to be undertaken later this summer.

• The City is bound by Provincial Bill 108 to amend Zoning By-law policies that encourage, rather than prevent, intensification and growth, including the Upper County Club area.

• All pavement markings including centerline and bike lanes were refreshed within the UCC neighbourhood in 2021.

• A staff report summarizing the results of the Neighbourhood 40km/h Speed Limit Pilot is to be provided for Council consideration in the Fall of 2022. Should neighbourhood speed limits be expanded or adopted City wide in residential areas, the UCC Neighbourhood could be a candidate location.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications associated with this report.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action; or  ☑ Core Service

Objective(s): Not Applicable

Strategic Action: Not Applicable

Program: Transportation Management

Core Service: Traffic Operations

Completing traffic safety assessments where specific neighbourhood traffic concerns have been raised ensures the most appropriate tools are being used and that resources are being allocated efficiently.
BACKGROUND:
In June 2021, a petition regarding traffic safety concerns in the Upper Country Club Subdivision (UCC) was submitted by area residents. The petition was generated online and can be found in Appendix A.

The petition specifically requests the following:

1. Implement traffic calming measures (speed bumps, stop signs).
2. Update and/or enforce parking by-laws governing on-street parking to restrict current residents from using on-street parking as an extension of their own personal driveway.
3. Enforce existing zoning bylaws to prevent further intensification and growth within the neighborhood that will result in increased traffic volumes and increased on-street parking.
4. Extend bike lanes to enhance safety for residents.

ANALYSIS:
City staff meet with area residents and the Ward Councillor on June 23, 2021 to discuss and gain a better understanding of the petition requests. Specific concerns expressed related to speeding, traffic control, the delineation of the bike lanes, parking within bike lanes, parking enforcement and Zoning By-law policies as they relate to growth and intensification.

A primary action item identified at this meeting, was the need to collect current traffic speed and volume data in order to conduct a comprehensive review of the area.

Traffic Calming
Data collection was undertaken at nine (9) study locations within the Upper Country Club Subdivision (UCC). Automated Traffic Recorder (ATR) studies were completed for a 7-day period for all locations with the exception of one location on Garth Massey and one location on Dellgrove Circle which were completed for 1-day each. Below is an overview of the data collection results:

- The lowest Average Annual Daily Traffic volume recorded was 67 vehicles/day on a local road
- The highest recorded volume was 1914 vehicles/day on a collector road that serves as one of the primary entry/exit points to the subdivision.
- The 85th percentile speed (the speed at which 85% of drivers are travelling at or below) ranged between 34 km/h and 52 km/h.
A map summarizing the data collection locations and findings is provided in Appendix B.

All roads within the UCC Subdivision have a 50km/h speed limit, except Arthur Fach Drive between Garth Massey Drive and Coulthard Boulevard, which has a 40 km/h Playground Zone associated with Witmer Park. To determine the extent of speeding the City follows industry best practice and compares the speed limit to the 85th percentile speed obtained from the ATR study. Vehicle speeds are considered to be atypical when the 85th percentile speed exceeds 10 km/h over the speed limit.

Study results were shared at a subsequent meeting with City staff, the Ward Councillor and area residents on August 9, 2021. Based on the completed traffic studies, the recorded traffic volumes and vehicle speeds are considered typical for these types of roadways. The only location where vehicle speeds were found to be greater than expected was Arthur Fach Drive between Garth Massey Drive and Coulthard Boulevard in the 40 km/h Playground Zone. This location is scheduled to receive seasonal traffic calming as part of the 2022 Speed Management Program Action Plan, recently approved by Council.

In an effort to help bring speed awareness to the UCC neighbourhood the Radar Message Board and Tommy & Friends programs were implemented at various locations and times through late August and September 2021. These programs are also scheduled to resume in the UCC neighbourhood for 2022.

While the Upper Country Club neighbourhood traffic review was initiated as a result of submitted petition, the assessment approach and associated remedial measures are consistent with the City’s Speed Management Program.

**All- Way Stop Control**

As per the petition and meeting discussions, an all-way stop was also considered for the intersection of Baintree Way at Coulthard Boulevard. This intersection currently has stop control for Coulthard Boulevard approaching traffic. It was determined that none of the warrants were satisfied to convert this intersection location to an all-way stop. The purpose of an all-way stop is to assign right-of-way at an intersection and is not intended to be used as a speed control device (Ontario Traffic Manual, Book 5). Unwarranted all-way stops are not recommended as they lead to poor motorist compliance and contribute to increased vehicle emissions and noise pollution.

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

In 2021 a pilot project was initiated to evaluate the effectiveness of neighbourhood wide 40km/h speed limits in four Cambridge neighbourhoods across the City, described as: Central Cambridge, Lower Preston, North Hespeler and Southwest Galt. All streets within the pilot areas have a speed limit of 40km/h marked with 40km/h Area signs at each boundary entry point.
Reduced speed limit neighbourhoods are intended to set an expectation for more conscious driving and to change driver behaviour while travelling in residential neighbourhoods. If the pilot project is successful, reduced speed limits could be adopted in a variety of manners, such as expanding to other individual neighbourhood areas, on a roadway classification basis, or applied City wide to all residential areas.

A staff report summarizing the results of the Neighbourhood 40km/h Speed Limit Pilot is anticipated for Council consideration in the Fall of 2022. Should reduced speed limits be expanded to other neighbourhood areas, the UCC could be a candidate neighbourhood.

**On-Street Parking**

Through discussion a number of questions were raised about on-street parking, parking programs and enforcement in the area. Due to the pandemic, enforcement resources were focused on Provincial orders with many parking by-laws temporarily relaxed, however posted parking restrictions, such as No Parking and No Stopping zones continued to be enforced. Enforcement of parking regulations, such as parking time limits, will begin to resume as Provincial orders are lifted and the impacts of the pandemic subside.

The Lower Driveway Residential Parking Program (LDPP) is currently in place on Baintree Way, Coulthard Boulevard and Arthur Fach Drive. Implementation of the LDPP was based on submitted formal majority of resident support. In order to remove the program, it was explained that a formal request in the form of a petition signifying resident support of removal would be required.

With Provincial orders being lifted and pandemic response seemingly coming to an end, a complete on-street parking regulation review is scheduled to be undertaken later this summer. New on-street parking regulations could be implemented as a result of this review.

**Zoning By-law – Growth and Intensification**

With regard to Zoning By-law policies and preventing further intensification and growth in the Upper Country Club neighbourhood, the City is bound by Provincial mandates.

The introduction of Provincial Bill 108: More Homes, More Choice Act, 2019, was put in place to expand the options municipalities have for providing a wide range of affordable housing in their communities and increase housing stock to address Ontario’s housing crisis. To comply with Bill 108, municipalities are required to amend their policies to permit additional residential units (ARUs) on lots with detached, semi-detached, or townhouse dwellings. ARUs allow for gentle intensification in neighbourhoods, where municipal services already exist, putting less strain on the environment. Although ARUs are permitted across the City, it is important to note that to add an ARU, homes must still adhere to all the criteria within the Zoning By-law (i.e. parking, setbacks, access
etc.). While the recent policy changes can permit up to two ARUs on a property, the Upper Country Club neighbourhood, in particular, is restricted to only one ARU on a property due to the zoning of the neighbourhood.

**Bike Lanes**

All pavement markings including centerline and bike lanes were refreshed on Baintree Way, Coulthard Boulevard and Arthur Fach Drive in 2021. New Bike symbols were also painted on Baintree Way and Coulthard Boulevard.

**EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):**

The Council approved Speed Management Program was used in the review of the petition request related to traffic calming measures.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

There is no financial impact associated with this report.

**PUBLIC VALUE:**

Engagement:

Engagement with the community members who initiated the petition provided an opportunity to review, discuss and better understand the issues of concern for the Upper Country Club community in an inclusive and constructive manner.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:**

Advisory Committees Consulted: N/A

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

Posted publicly as part of the report process. In addition, the community members who initiated the petition were notified of this meeting via emailed letter.

**INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:**

A meeting was held on June 23, 2021 with City Staff, the Ward Councillor, and area residents to discuss and gain a better understanding of the petition requests. City staff included Transportation, Planning and Bylaw Compliance staff. A primary action item identified from this meeting was the need to collect current speed and volume data. On August 9, 2021, a follow up meeting was held with the same meeting attendees to review results of the data collection.
CONCLUSION:

As part of its role and mandate to ensure that residents and visitors can enjoy livable, sustainable, and accessible neighbourhoods, the City of Cambridge operates and supports a number of initiatives to promote road safety. This report summarizes the actions undertaken to address issues raised by the UCC neighbourhood in response to road safety concerns.

REPORT IMPACTS:

Agreement: No
By-law: No
Budget Amendment: No
Policy: No

APPROVALS:

This report has been reviewed by the Chief Financial Officer and City Solicitor. It has been reviewed and approved by the Director, Deputy City Manager and City Manager.

ATTACHMENTS:

When naming attachments please use the following format:

1. 22-034-CD Appendix A – Upper Country Club Petition
2. 22-034-CD Appendix B – Upper Country Club Neighbourhood Data Collection Summary
Keep our neighborhood safe in the Upper Country Club neighborhood in Cambridge Ont.

This petition has been prepared for the Upper Canada Country Club neighborhood in Cambridge, Ontario. While this petition is being originally posted in the group’s Facebook page for easy access and in keeping with COVID protocols of social distancing, at this time, we encourage distribution of the link to change.org to neighbors who may not be on Facebook.

Petition:

We need to address traffic safety concerns in our neighborhood. On June 3, 2021, a young child was struck at the corner of Baintree and Coulthard and taken to hospital. This is not the first accident that has taken place in our neighborhood.

We request city council implement the following measures to mitigate known risks and prevent further incidents:
1. Implement traffic calming measures (speed bumps, stop signs).

2. Update and/or enforce parking by-laws governing on-street parking to restrict current residents from using on-street parking as an extension of their own personal driveway.

3. Enforce existing zoning bylaws to prevent further intensification and growth within the neighborhood that will result in increased traffic volumes and increased on-street parking.

4. Extend bike lanes to enhance safety for residents.

In 2005 the City of Cambridge approved the Mattamy development known as the Upper Canada Country Club, creating a special zoning amendment for Mattamy Homes to build more homes on smaller lots and narrower streets in a smaller space than normally allowed (there are approximately 887 dwellings in our neighbourhood). This has resulted in compromised lines of sight for both drivers and pedestrians, unsafe on-street parking and an unsafe areas for children to play. The safety concern is increased by drivers observed speeding and driving through stop signs on a daily basis.

We are deeply saddened by what took place on June 3rd and seek Council’s urgent response to this matter.

Members of our group will share details of this electronically signed petition with the mayor and council and seek a vote on these matters in an open forum for full transparency to the community.

Sincerely,

The Residents of Upper Canada Country Club neighborhood
To: SPECIAL COUNCIL
Meeting Date: 5/17/2022
Subject: Tiny Homes – City Staff’s Review of Growing Demand for Additional Secondary Dwelling Units
Submitted By: Lisa Prime, Chief Planner
Prepared By: Michael Campos, Intermediate Planner
Report No.: 22-026-CD
File No.: N/A
Wards Affected: Not Applicable

RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT report 22-026(CD) be received for information relating to Tiny Homes in the City of Cambridge.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Purpose
This Report is being presented to Council in response to a motion set forth in April 2021 that directed staff to evaluate options for encouraging development of small and tiny dwellings, including best practices, acceptable sizing, requirements, land use, and any other necessary requirements to allow for and to encourage the development of tiny homes. This Report will provide insight on the following:

- Provincial direction to encourage and promote the development of tiny homes to support growing populations in built-up areas;
- Current local planning policy and zoning land use permissions relating to the development of tiny homes;
- Overview of current work being completed by Planning Staff on permissions for Additional Residential Units (ARUs), which is a form of tiny homes;
- A review of current Building Code permissions with respect to smaller dwellings; and,
- A review of best practices and examples from local municipalities.
Key Findings

- The development of tiny homes is a rapidly growing movement that reflects both the demand for affordable housing in a real estate market that continues to climb, as well as downsizing one’s lifestyle.

- Tiny homes and ARUs assist in achieving provincial, regional and local planning objectives that encourage the provision of a range and mix of housing types and tenures.

- Although ARUs have grown in popularity with existing property owners, development applications proposing a stand-alone tiny home as a principal dwelling has not seen the same demand.

- Options for encouraging the use of stand-alone tiny homes could include financial incentives such as reduced building permit fees; relaxing some zoning requirements; and showcasing existing tiny homes for individuals to view and examine.

Financial Implications

- This report has been prepared for information purposes. As a result, there are no financial implications as a result of this report.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☒ Strategic Action; or
☐ Core Service

Objective(s): PLANNING FOR GROWTH - Provide for a mix of development, useses and amenities in order to meet the needs of a changing and diverse population

Strategic Action: Increase housing options

Program: Not Applicable

Core Service: Not Applicable

It is important to provide a range of development options within the City that can support the needs of a changing and diverse population. The need to support the growth of tiny homes and ARUs in our community enables people who reside or plan to reside in Cambridge access to attainable and affordable housing that contributes to our City’s ability to become a complete community. Tiny homes are an important aspect of intensification that can support a range of incomes and assist those most impacted by a growing housing crisis and increased land values.
BACKGROUND:
A “tiny home” is defined as a small, private and self-contained dwelling unit that provides living and dining areas, kitchen and bathroom facilities, and a sleeping area. It is intended that a tiny home be used as a primary dwelling on a lot or as an accessory dwelling on a property that already has an existing house. Within the City of Cambridge, the primary form of tiny dwellings are as ARUs.

The provision of ARUs is one measure to increase affordable rental housing stock within the City. This type of housing is recognized in Provincial policy, as well as in the Regional and City Official Plans.

In 2018, City Council passed By-law No. 108-18 to allow for a secondary dwelling unit (this is the same as an accessory residential unit) in any residential zone in the City, so long as it was located on a property containing single-detached, semi-detached or linear row house dwellings (townhouses) with specific requirements relating to lot area, frontage, parking and gross floor area, amongst others. Since 2018, the City has issued over 194 building permits for secondary dwelling units (the greater part of these building permits proposed secondary units within a principal dwelling instead of as a separate detached structure on the property). Approximately 66 of those building permit applications required minor variances to support the proposed ARU.

ANALYSIS:
On March 22nd, 2022, City of Cambridge Council chose to approve an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment that addressed changes to the City’s 2018 Secondary Dwelling Unit By-law No. 108-18, which reflected provincial policies established through the 2019 More Homes, More Choices Act (Bill 108). Specifically, these changes were required to permit Additional Residential Units in detached, semi-detached and row house or townhouse dwellings in an accessory building or structure, totalling up to a maximum of three dwelling units on a single residential lot.

The changes implemented by the passing of By-law No. 22-017 in March 2022 by Cambridge Council removed some of the more restrictive development specifications that made it difficult for many land owners to achieve a secondary dwelling unit on their property. Some of these changes included removing the minimum lot area and frontage requirements; reducing the minimum number of required parking spaces; and, permitting basement units within a principal dwelling to be used in its entirety for a dwelling unit.

The By-law does not, however, permit tiny homes on wheels. ARUs are intended to be permanent structures on the property that are connected to municipal servicing.
infrastructure. Any dwelling that is designed to be mobile is considered a mobile home by the City’s Zoning By-law, and is not permitted within residential zones.

The opportunities for ARU and tiny homes respond to the 2019 More Homes, More Choices Bill, however, these changes also reflect the number of minor variance applications received as a result of residential properties not being able to meet the previous minimum requirements to permit a Secondary Dwelling Unit. Amending the restrictive permissions that have been the cause for the increased number of minor variances would support our Strategic Plan of encouraging a mix of housing and creating vibrant, affordable and welcoming neighbourhoods.

**Building Code**

Presently, the City of Cambridge permits secondary dwelling units to be constructed at a minimum size of 17.5 square metres (188 square feet), if for a one-bedroom dwelling (Bachelor unit). If considering a two-bedroom dwelling, the minimum size of the dwelling is required to be 39.11 square metres (421 square feet).

The Building Code requires all buildings to be inspected during construction. In the case of factory-built buildings, quality control inspections and monitoring occur during the assembly of buildings and building components. A tiny home built off-site or on-site without a Canadian Standards Association (CSA) certification will likely not have had the appropriate inspections. This may become an issue when applying for a building permit to locate a tiny home on a property.

**Best Practices**

To support understanding other ways tiny homes may be used, staff reviewed best practice examples. There has been progress on tiny homes within the City and in other municipalities. These examples set some strong direction for how tiny homes can continue to contribute to housing solutions in the City.

*University of Waterloo - School of Architecture Research Partnership*

The University of Waterloo’s School of Architecture approached the City with an opportunity to partner on a second phase of research related to the use of tiny homes as part of an affordable housing solution.

The City’s partnership with this project considers using Tiny Homes as a way to fill an affordable housing gap through innovative strategies that will help support long-term growth goals. The School is building prototypes, and through the sharing of these prototypes the hope is that it will showcase how best to build a tiny home. The idea is that these prototypes, combined with the City’s revised zoning by-law amendments to
permit 3rd units in a backyard, will encourage early adoption of this type of housing stock.

**City of Kitchener**

In April 2021, the City of Kitchener Council approved their Additional Dwelling Unit provisions that facilitated the creation of additional dwelling units that can both be attached (i.e. duplex, semi-detached duplex, accessory basement apartment) or detached (i.e. backyard home, coach house, laneway suite, tiny house etc.). The City of Kitchener has implemented these permissions on most properties zoned R-1 through to R-7.

Similar to the recently approved City of Cambridge Additional Residential Unit By-law No. 22-017, the City of Kitchener introduced minimum zoning provisions that are required to be met and complied with for additional dwellings. The minimum zoning provisions do vary in some aspects from the City of Cambridge’s minimum requirements. Notably, the following differences are found between the neighbouring municipalities:

- The City of Kitchener permits a minimum lot area of 395 square metres, whereas the City of Cambridge does not have a minimum lot area to be complied with;

- The City of Kitchener permits ARUs to have a maximum floor area which equates to 50 percent of the main house or 80 square metres (excluding the basement), whereas the City of Cambridge permits a maximum floor area of 40 percent of the principal dwelling. If an ARU is located within the basement of a principal building, it may occupy the entire basement area;

- For a detached ARU, the maximum footprint of the structure must not exceed 15 percent of the total lot area in the City of Kitchener, whereas the City of Cambridge permits a maximum footprint area of 10 percent of the area of a lot; and,

- With respect to parking, the City of Kitchener requires that a minimum rate of one space per unit be provided. If located within 800 metres of an ION Station, no additional parking spaces are required for additional units. In the City of Cambridge, one parking space is required per ARU (maximum of two bedrooms are permitted).

The City of Kitchener requires that a resident pursuing an additional dwelling unit on their property be required to obtain a scoped site plan approval, whereas in Cambridge, no site plan application is currently required.
Bluegrass Meadows Micro Village, Regional District of Kitimat-Stikine, British Columbia

The Bluegrass Meadows Micro Village is recognized as Canada’s first “legal” tiny house village. This community was privately financed and developed by the owner of a tiny house build and design company. The property consists of site-owned dwellings (cabins and tiny homes) available for long-term rental. Homeowners are also permitted to bring their own tiny homes on wheels to the site but they must be CSA certified.

Units on this property were sized between 100 square feet (9.2 square metres) and 500 square feet (46.45 square metres) and included bathroom/kitchen facilities on a parcel of land approximately 2500 to 4000 square feet in size (232.26 square metres to 371.61 square metres, respectively). The tiny homes were both on permanent foundations, temporary foundations (on high-gravel pads/piers), and on permeable pads (anchored and skirted).

This is a unique proposal that could provide an opportunity for a tiny home community within a municipality. However, it does come with several challenges, with the most significant being the current land prices within the City. In order to proceed with a proposal such as the Micro Village in British Columbia, a large parcel of land within the urban boundary would be required to accommodate several tiny homes. An option such as this one in the City of Cambridge would likely rely on either the donation of land to permit this type of development or a privately financed project that is open to supporting an affordable housing community.

If a Micro-Village proposing tiny homes was being considered on a property outside of the urban boundary, on a farm for example, an Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment would need to be submitted and approved. The policies found in the Regional Official Plan and the City of Cambridge Official Plan are more restrictive towards residential development within Prime Agricultural Areas or Rural Areas, however, there may be opportunities within Rural Areas for residential infill, subject to being in compliance with certain circumstances outlined in the existing policies.

City of Grand Forks, British Columbia

In 2016, the City of Grand Forks undertook a review of its Official Community Plan (similar to our Official Plan) and requested public and stakeholder feedback on permitting innovative housing types, including small, cluster and eco-homes. In 2018, the City amended their Official Plan and Zoning By-law to permit tiny homes on wheels (including tiny homes on foundations), and garden suites in all residentially zoned properties, as well as in all industrial zones.
Council for the City of Grand Forks waived the application fees associated with the development of these tiny homes. The minimum requirements required to be complied with for the development of the tiny homes included the following:

- The tiny home can either be a second smaller home on a lot, or in some cases, the only home on site;
- The design and form of the tiny house must maintain the character of the neighbourhood and be built in a sustainable manner;
- The home must be serviced using temporary RV connections, unless it is functioning as a principal dwelling on the lot in which case it must be connected to municipal services;
- To place a tiny home on wheels on a lot, applicants were required to apply for a combined Development and Temporary Use Permit;
- The tiny house owner is eligible for two, three-year extensions for a maximum period of six years, after which the owner needs to put the tiny house unit on a permanent foundation or reapply and pay the appropriate fees.

Differentiating the acceptance of tiny homes on wheels from trailers would be a challenge, unless the City were to permit trailers occupied year-round within our urban setting.

**St Thomas Affordable Housing Tiny Home Project (Tiny Hope)**

YWCA St. Thomas-Elgin, Sanctuary Homes and Doug Tarry Limited (DTL) have come together as local St. Thomas-Elgin organizations to work collaboratively with shared interests related to affordable housing in St. Thomas. Project Tiny Hope’s vision is that all members of the community have access to safe, affordable, clean, and sustainable housing. Tiny Hope seeks to develop this housing through a combination of building tiny homes and low-rise apartment units while creating a community and providing amenities to support those in this development.

This is a different solution to providing tiny homes, whereas instead of adopting permissions for zoning across the town, this future project will focus on creating a community of tiny homes and multi-unit residential apartments on a piece of land that has already been secured through a large donation. The multi-unit apartment building will provide approximately 20 units comprised of 1- and 2-bedroom units, where a portion of the units will be offered at deeply affordable rental rates. The main floor of the apartment building will include a large community space for residents, and additional meeting rooms will be made available for case management and support services to be
located. This initiative provides an opportunity to support lower income individuals and families through a community project.

The idea of providing subsidized housing or reduced rent is not new and has been completed in the past through the Region and by private organizations. However, the concept of creating a tiny dwelling community is one that could be transitioned across many municipalities. Lands that are currently vacant or are underutilized within the City could be considered for such use as tiny house communities. In situations such as this, site specific zoning amendments could be established to better plan the development of tiny dwellings and to ensure appropriate and proportionate development is considered for these types of development opportunities.

**Homes for Heroes Foundation – Canada**

The Homes for Heroes Foundation is working to build villages across Canada with the goal to end homelessness among veteran populations. The foundation works with municipal, provincial and federal stakeholders to secure sites for each village and seeks financial assistance from Canadians in order to construct villages across the Country. To date, the foundation has successfully completed villages in Calgary and Edmonton and are in the process of completing a village in Kingston, Ontario that would support the development of tiny homes. As an example, the Kingston village is shown on the image below:
The project is envisioned to be a place of community that would be comprised of separated blocks of tiny homes, along with amenity spaces/buildings.

In Edmonton, the completed project provides for similar tiny homes with amenity spaces that are available to residents. An image of the Edmonton community is shown below:
A scenario such as the villages shown above would require the availability of land to be secured. Zoning provisions could be amended to support blocks of tiny homes on a site by site basis. Zoning requests to reduce minimum lot areas, amenity areas and parking are some examples of site-specific provisions that could be requested to accommodate a tiny home village on properties throughout the City’s urban area.

The size of the land made available for these types of developments, as well as site planning regulations help determine the number of tiny homes that are constructed in these villages, however, the foundation usually targets to achieve approximately 15-25 homes per site.

This is a viable option within the City of Cambridge if lands are able to be successfully acquired for the development. An Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment would likely be necessary to accommodate this type of development.

**Evaluation of Options to Promote Tiny Home Development**

The City of Cambridge is moving in the right direction with respect to promoting and encouraging tiny home development through the recently Council approved ARU By-law (No. 22-017) that permits the construction of two additional units on existing residential properties. In a City where land prices are high, providing relaxed permissions to create smaller affordable units will encourage further development of these units.
Another option that can be considered to help encourage the development of tiny homes in the City of Cambridge is to reduce associated planning and building fees relating to tiny homes. Fee reductions or the elimination of fees would assist in promoting this type of development. Alternatively, financial grants could also be created to assist the achievement of these developments.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

Planning Legislation

*Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)*

The PPS provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development and promotes healthy, liveable and safe communities through accommodation of a mix of residential building types, including additional dwelling units. The PPS requires that municipalities provide for an appropriate range and mix of housing options, encourage the efficient use of land and resources, and promote opportunities to accommodate a significant supply of housing. The use of tiny homes or accessory residential units is an efficient form of meeting these provincial objectives. Intensifying the built-up area by permitting smaller dwellings creates the supply of housing units while providing for a more affordable housing option.

*A Place to Grow – Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan)*

The Growth Plan is the Province’s plan for growth and development and it aims to support economic prosperity, protect the environment, and help communities achieve a high quality of life. The plan supports the achievement of complete communities that are designed to meet people's daily needs. The plan strongly encourages and promotes intensification to meet the objective of providing for a range and mix of housing options, which includes tiny homes and ARUs. The ability to provide a mix of housing options helps to serve a range of residents of different ages, incomes and to serve all sizes of families. The Growth Plan supports tiny homes/ARUs and encourages the creation of these smaller units in existing residential neighbourhoods.

*Regional Official Plan (ROP)*

The ROP is the Region’s guiding document for directing growth and change. The Plan outlines key objectives relating to growth, one being that municipalities plan for an appropriate range and mix of housing choices for all income groups. The provision of a full and diverse range and mix of permanent housing is a key theme in the ROP, and the plan encourages the local municipalities to permit individual lot intensification such as secondary apartments and garden suites in residential neighbourhoods.
City of Cambridge Official Plan

The Cambridge Official Plan is the City’s guiding document on growth and development. Through this plan, key goals, objectives and policies manage and direct land use change in the City of Cambridge. Similarly, to the policies found in the Provincial Policy documents and Regional Official Plan, the City’s Official Plan promotes a wide range of housing and building types within new and existing neighbourhoods. The Official Plan indicates that the City will permit the establishment of an accessory 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. ARUs would be subject to certain criteria including parking; no separate road access; is subordinate to the main dwelling unit; adequate servicing; neighbourhood compatibility; and compliance with minimum standards of maintenance and occupancy.

Tiny homes, which can be developed as the principal dwelling on a residential property would be permitted on lands designated for low/medium density residential by the Official Plan. The minimum size of a tiny dwelling cannot be smaller than the minimum required size set out in Ontario’s Building Code, which is 188 square feet (17.5 square metres). As a principal dwelling on a lot, a tiny home would not be subject to a maximum size requirement. The only requirement that must be complied with is the maximum lot coverage provision of 40 percent, which is a common standard found in all residential zones.

Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended

The City of Cambridge Zoning By-law came into effect on October 27, 1986. ARUs were not permitted in the original by-law. In 2018 Council passed by-law 108-18 to allow second residential units within single detached, semi-detached and street fronting townhouses subject to specific regulations being complied with for lot area, frontage and parking, amongst other requirements. Since the passing of this by-law new requirements are necessary due to the Provincial direction to allow for an additional third unit on a residential property. In addition, a review of the 2018 regulations is necessary at this time to assess their impact, effectiveness and appropriateness in comparison with other municipalities.

On March 22nd, 2022, an amending By-law was approved by Council which introduced site development standards that permit a maximum of three total dwelling units on a single residential lot. This change would permit a primary dwelling unit to be accompanied by two ARUs on a lot, either within the same principal building or in a detached structure, subject to complying with the minimum requirements of the By-law.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
This report has been prepared for information purposes. As a result, there are no financial implications as a result of this report.

PUBLIC VALUE:

Leadership:

This report is an important step in moving the City of Cambridge forward with respect to achieving a community that is intended for all. Understanding and recognizing that affordable housing is becoming less attainable in the City of Cambridge requires innovation to find solutions for those who are most impacted. This report represents the City's leadership in finding solutions to attain affordable housing for those in the City of Cambridge.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:

Not Applicable

PUBLIC INPUT:

- This report has been prepared for Council for information purposes. There has been no public input/consultation involved with the creation of this report.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:

- There was no internal/external consultation undertaken as part of the development of this report.

CONCLUSION:

City of Cambridge Council passed a By-law in 2018 to allow one accessory residential unit on single-detached, semi-detached and street townhouse residential properties subject to meeting specific zoning criteria. As a result, over 194 residential ARU permit applications have been received and processed. These provisions allow for what is considered a tiny dwelling accessory to a principal dwelling. Through the recent approval of the ARU By-law No. 22-017, the City of Cambridge has now moved to allowing up to two ARUs on a single residential lot, further promoting and encouraging tiny home style living.

The City of Cambridge has made successful policy changes to permit smaller dwellings that support the overall provincial and regional policies to provide for a range and mix of housing types and affordable housing options through ARUs. With the recent relaxation of some requirements to help better streamline this process, we expect that the City of Cambridge will be a leader in permitting ARUs all across the City.

REPORT IMPACTS:
Agreement: No
By-law: No
Budget Amendment: No
Policy: No
APPROVALS:

This report has been reviewed by the Chief Financial Officer and City Solicitor. It has been reviewed and approved by the Director, Deputy City Manager and City Manager.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Not Applicable
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To: SPECIAL COUNCIL
Meeting Date: 5/17/2021
Subject: Recreation Complex & Idea Exchange – Conceptual Design and Updates
Submitted By: Lesley Head, Director of Recreation & Culture
Prepared By: Shane Taylor, Project Lead – Recreation Services
Report No.: 22-046-CD
File No.: A/00463-30; A/00463-40
Wards Affected: Ward 7

RECOMMENDATION(S):
THAT Report 22-046-CD, Recreation Complex & Idea Exchange – Conceptual Design and Updates be received;
AND THAT Council direct staff to procure design architects to complete three concept designs of graduated value and obtain Order of Magnitude cost estimates for each;
AND FURTHER THAT Council direct staff, following the completion of the three concepts, to seek direction at a future Council meeting on which concept and budget to proceed into detailed design.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose
In light of recent price instability in the construction industry, and following several recent tenders closing significantly over budget on other similar projects in Ontario municipalities, the Project Team is recommending a staged and flexible approach to advance the Recreation Complex & Idea Exchange to the design development stage.

Key Findings
- Construction market volatility is expected to persist for the immediate future, it is unclear how or if the current situation will improve longer-term.
- Tenders recently run in the Municipalities of Guelph and Vaughan closed up to 60% over-budget.
- Staff recently retained the services of CS&P Architects and Turner & Townsend Quantity Surveyors to update the cost estimates from the Council-approved program in February 2021 and worked with staff to come up with high-level options for reduced programs within the building in an effort to control costs in a volatile construction market.
- Staff are recommending completing three separate concept designs which provide options for both scaled budgets and programs to provide Council with flexibility and comfort to proceed with obtaining design architect services in order to commence the detailed design phase.
- In July 2021 the City applied to the Green and Inclusive Community Buildings Grant.

Financial Implications

- Staff, and Colliers Project Leaders acting as the Council approved Project Management Firm for the project, are recommending a flexible approach to the initial design stage.
- The construction budget for A/00463-40 is recommended to come forward in the 2024 Capital Budget; construction cost indexing will be applied in the 2023 budget forecast.
- Additional funding and grant opportunities will be explored prior to approval of the 2024 Capital Budget.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☑ Strategic Action; or
☐ Core Service

Objective(s): WELLBEING - Connect people to services that support individual and community wellbeing

Strategic Action: Provide age-friendly services that are accessible to all

Program: Design & Approvals

Core Service: Design

Approaching the design development stage in a flexible and controlled manner will ensure the new recreation complex & library are well planned and budgeted, ensuring a facility that can be funded and constructed.

BACKGROUND:
Council Direction February 18, 2021

On February 18, 2021, City staff brought forward report 21-038(CD) Recreation Complex – Joint Use Campus Opportunities. CS&P Architects gave a presentation walking through the Joint Use Campus Feasibility Study, identifying Concept 4 (119,442 sq. ft.) as the preferred design for the Recreation Complex and Library, at a budget of $66,123,000 including design and construction. Council approved the concept along with two Council requested revisions – 1) to change the pool from 8 lanes to 10 lanes, and 2) to change the proposed walking track to a running track. Cost implications for the Council-directed program changes were not included in the original cost estimate.

Joint-Use Campus Progress

The Waterloo Region District School Board (WRDSB) and Waterloo Catholic District School Board (WCDSB) have been quickly advancing the joint-school site design. City staff continue to work with the project management consultant, Colliers Project Leaders, in the development of terms of reference for joint-use agreements between the project partners. The Joint-Use Campus Coordination Committee (composed of City, Idea Exchange, WRDSB and WCDSB staff) continues to meet at regular intervals to discuss joint project-related matters. Staff will provide an update to the May 31, 2022 Council meeting outlining current progress on the Joint-Use Campus design, highlighting recent discussions between the project partners and next steps.

Green and Inclusive Community Buildings Program

On June 29, 2021 staff brought forward report 21-179(CD) for Council endorsement to move forward with applying to the Net-Zero Carbon grant from Green and Inclusive Community Buildings (GICB), valued up to $25M. Council directed staff to only proceed with Net Zero Carbon design if the GICB grant were successful. On April 19, 2022 Infrastructure Canada contacted City staff for more information on the City’s submission. No decision has been communicated at this time.

Construction Market Price Volatility, Covid-19 Pandemic, and Global Events

Since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, the construction industry has experienced rapidly accelerating cost escalations at unprecedented rates. There are many factors for the cost increase including market instability, labour shortages, resourcing issues, supply chain issues, and historically high inflation rates. The outfall of this instability has resulted in construction projects, particularly high-dollar construction projects, being grossly underfunded. Project staff have been monitoring similar scoped projects in the Southwestern Ontario construction market to understand the impacts of the recent rapid price increase. For Council’s reference the following municipalities recently closed tenders on similar scoped projects:
- On January 31, 2022 the Carrville Community Centre in Vaughan tender closed with three bids received. This facility is planned at 95,826 sq. ft. The middle bid was $86.9M ($906/ft²).
- On March 9, 2022 the Guelph South End Community Centre tender closed with three bids received. This facility is planned at 165,000 sq. ft. The middle bid was $126.3M ($765/ft²).

Both of the community centres closed far in excess of the budget amounts for each project, in one case the tender closed more than 60% over budget. Recognizing that a substantial funding discrepancy has the potential to be project-altering, it is important to understand the financial impacts on Cambridge’s Recreation Complex project in the current market.

Global conditions have further affected construction prices which has had an impact on the availability of construction products. Within the Province we are already experiencing price increases for structural steel specifically related to the supply of pig iron steel. Traditionally, recreation buildings are built with steel frame structures to facilitate long spans and open spaces for programming activities.

**Procurement of Project Architects**

Starting early in 2022 the Project Team has been developing draft terms and conditions for a Request for Quotation (RFQ) from architecture firms to undertake the design of the Recreation Complex and Idea Exchange. In order to release the RFQ for bids, expectations for budget and scope of work must be well defined and must be considered achievable; based on the recent trends of over-budget tender closings on similar facilities, it is not possible to release budget and program numbers with any level of certainty for consultants to bid on.

**ANALYSIS:**

**Advantages to Moving Forward with Design at this Time**

- Project costs, although currently high, are not likely to see any significant decrease moving forward. This is not only the case for construction costs but also design costs, which are typically based on a percentage of the overall project cost. Pausing any forward momentum on the design at this stage will not help the City save any money.
- The Public and Catholic school boards are advancing their site design quickly and will be in a position to break ground on their new school and grounds in the near future. Design decisions that impact both sites are being made presently and to ensure the City’s interests are both met and maintained it is in the best interest of the City to retain a design architect at this time to ensure details are properly coordinated with project partners at this current stage of design. This will ensure that City’s needs are best represented within the shared components of the Joint-Use Campus site.

- The Project Team is aware of a number of other similar scope municipal projects coming online over the next number of months and years within our neighbouring municipalities. It would be advantageous to hire the architecture firm before those projects come online, to ensure high quality firms have capacity and interest in bidding on this project, and which would also encourage more competitive professional fees.

**Updates to Cost Estimate and Alternate Scenarios**

In order to firm up the draft terms and conditions in the RFQ for architecture services, the Project Team re-engaged CS&P Architects and Turner Townsend Quantity Surveyors to update its February 2021 cost estimate, to incorporate latest industry pricing rates and including the additional program revisions Council requested at its meeting of February 18, 2021. Additionally, CS&P Architects were tasked with looking into ways of modifying the approved scope of work to come up with an option that could be constructed within the Council approved budget of $66,123,000 on February 18, 2021, and another option exceeding the approved budget but is more closely aligned to the desired program and more affordable.

CS&P Architects delivered three different scenarios, outlined below:

**Scenario 1: Full Build – 125,781 sq. ft.**

Consists of the Council-approved program per February 18, 2021 meeting, and including the following additions:

- Add Net-Zero Carbon design;
- 10-lane pool, revised from proposed 8-lane pool;
- Running track, revised from proposed walking track;
- Idea Exchange increased by 1,000 sq. ft. (required to accommodate extra footprint from running track).

| Estimated Project Price per sq. ft: | $805 |
| Estimated Construction Price per sq. ft: | $608 |
| Estimated Total Project Price: | $101,236,000 |
Scenario 2: Modified Build – 105,442 sq. ft.

Consists of the following changes from Scenario 1: Full Build

- Delete Net-Zero Carbon;
- 8-lane pool, in lieu of a 10-lane pool;
- Walking track, in lieu of a running track;
- 2 gymnasiums, in lieu of 3 gymnasiums;
- Delete bleacher seating in gym;
- Delete 1 family change room;
- Reduce the Idea Exchange footprint by 1,000 sq. ft. (due to removal of running track).

Estimated Project Price per sq. ft.: $793
Estimated Construction Price per sq. ft.: $599
Estimated Total Project Price: $83,590,000

Scenario 3: Reduced Build – 86,290 sq. ft.

Consists of the following changes from Scenario 1: Full Build

- Reduce the size of the Recreation and Community Spaces;
- Reduce the size of the Idea Exchange;
- Delete Net-Zero Carbon;
- 6-lane pool, in lieu of a 10-lane pool;
- Reduced-size walking track, in lieu of a running track;
- 1.5 gymnasiums, in lieu of 3 gymnasiums;
- Delete 2 fitness change rooms.

Estimated Project Price per sq. ft.: $828
Estimated Construction Price per sq. ft.: $626
Estimated Total Project Price: $71,429,000

Note that in the above scenarios, Net-Zero Carbon has been removed from the programs of both Scenarios 2 and 3. This was done in order to produce more affordable scenarios for consideration, and to assess potential project impacts should the City not be successful in its application for the GICB grant. Should the City be awarded the GICB grant, the project would proceed with the Net-Zero Carbon scope added back into Scenarios 2 and 3 at an estimated cost of $7,408,700 per scenario, and will be refined through design and cost estimating.

Note that the approved construction budget of $66,123,000 does not factor in indexing for the year 2022. The Statistics Canada Construction Cost Index indicates a 15.3%
increase from Q4 2020 to Q4 2021, and if applied to the approved and forecasted budget, would result in an increased project budget of $76,239,819.

The key outcome of this exercise is to construct a framework that architects can accurately bid on, that does not limit the City’s ability to move forward responsibly and confidently toward meeting Council’s expectations, and that balances program, budget and delivery date.

**Design Flexibility and Staged Approval Built into Procurement of Architects**

With the updated analysis from CS&P, the Project Team has been assembling an RFQ structure that promotes flexibility and structured cost checks, while also building in Council check-in points to ensure the project stays on track. The Project Team proposes to deliver three different scenarios of programs with corresponding costs; the process of approving the design would be staged in 2 steps, plus a third step being construction administration – as outlined in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract #</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Council Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract #1 – Concept Design</td>
<td>3 design concepts</td>
<td>Council decision on which concept &amp; budget to move forward to detailed design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Order of Magnitude cost estimates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report to Council in Q1 2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract #2 – Detailed Design</td>
<td>Detailed design of Council-directed option</td>
<td>Approval of Detailed Design &amp; Final budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class C, B &amp; A cost estimates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular updates to Council on progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Tender Package</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract #3 - Construction</td>
<td>Administer the construction contract</td>
<td>Decisions will be brought forward to Council at an as-needed basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Regular updates to Council on progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contract #1 will require the architects to provide 3 concept designs and associated Order of Magnitude cost estimates, and will be loosely based on the three scenarios (Full Build, Modified Build or Reduced Build) assembled by CS&P Architects. Extensive consultation will form an integral part of this phase of work. The Project Team expects this phase to take approximately 6 months to complete and would conclude with a staff report to Council outlining the merits and faults of each scenario, resulting in a decision from Council on which concept to move into detailed design. Following Council decision, the City will immediately enter into Contract #2 with the design architects.
Contract #2 will be set up as a standard stipulated sum contract that outlines detailed design through to tender. Regular check-in points with Council will be identified and decision will be required to finalize the detailed design and final construction budget. Following the successful administration of Tender the City will immediately enter into Contract #3 for Construction Administration services.

Likewise, with Contract #2, Contract #3 will be set up as a standard stipulated sum contract to cover administration of the construction works.

Next Steps

Following Council direction on the subject matter of this report, the Project Team is ready to release the RFQ immediately through the City's Procurement Division. Assuming the Procurement by-law is fully adhered to, the City will award Contract #1 immediately following the contract procurement process.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

There is no existing policy/by-law.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

- Project A/00463-30 Recreation Complex Design, $5,585,000 was approved in the 2021 Capital budget year.

- Project A/00463-40 Recreation Complex Construction, $60,538,000 is currently forecasted for budget approval in the 2023 Capital budget year.

- The Project Team is recommending a forecast adjustment of A/00463-40 Recreation Complex Construction shifting from 2023 to 2024 budget year, to align with the anticipated project schedule.

- Statistics Canada Construction Price Index identifies a 15.3% increase in indexing from Q4 2020 to Q4 2021. Indexing values, obtained from Statistics Canada, will be applied to the project budget on a year-by-year basis until budget approval is obtained when applied to the current approved and forecasted budget, the Construction Price Index would result in an increased project budget of $76,239,819.

- Development Charges Study – update to be taking place spring 2023 following Regional projected growth numbers being published fall 2022.

- Taking a broader and more flexible approach at this stage will enable project staff
and Council to maintain greater control over final expenditures. More checks and balances can be performed, more certainty can be obtained on detailed cost estimates and there is a possibility that the construction market may experience some stabilization before final budget approval is required. Staff are of the opinion that a flexible approach to the initial design stage and detailed cost estimating will result in a project budget that is controlled in a volatile construction market.

PUBLIC VALUE:

Sustainability:

This project will support sustainability by taking a controlled approach over expending public resources at a time when construction market volatility could otherwise control outcomes. By adding the additional measures of checks and balances, staff and Council will provide the best opportunity for delivering successful project outcomes, and will ensure responsible management of financial resources, ensuring transparency and accountability.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:

Not Applicable

PUBLIC INPUT:

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:

Consultation took place with the Recreation Complex Project Management Team (that includes Idea Exchange staff) and Project Steering Committee.

CONCLUSION:

The City of Cambridge is balancing programmatic needs with affordability for the Recreation Complex and Idea Exchange facility. The construction market from the time of Council approval in February 2021 to now continues to experience turbulence. There have been unprecedented issues triggered by the COVID-19 pandemic which include the availability of materials and labour, significant price inflation and new health and safety protocols. We anticipate the market for design services for this type of facility may also have supply issues as a number of community and recreation projects come
on line within the Province in the next few years. The Project Team recommends mitigating the construction market issues and design services issues by moving forward proactively to procure the services of the design architect. The Project Team is recommending issuing the RFQ for architecture services as soon as possible to facilitate the design development and provide information to support a decision of Council in 2023 of the preferred scenario moving forward.

REPORT IMPACTS:
Agreement: No
By-law: No
Budget Amendment: No
Policy: No

APPROVALS:
This report has gone through the appropriate workflow and has been reviewed and or approved by the following as required:
Director
Deputy City Manager
Chief Financial Officer
City Solicitor
City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:
2. A/00463-30 Appendix B – Joint Use Campus Feasibility Study
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© Turner & Townsend. This document is expressly provided to and solely for the use of C S & P Architects in Feb 2022 and takes into account their particular instructions and requirements. It must not be made available or copied or otherwise quoted or referred to in whole or in part in any way, including orally, to any other party without our express written permission and we accept no liability of whatsoever nature for any use by any other party.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Introduction

Turner & Townsend is retained to provide Cost Planning & Design Cost Control services, including preparation of this Concept Design Feasibility Study Construction Cost Analysis, based on the information listed in Appendix A. Our estimate is an Opinion of Probable Cost only and reflects current local market rates based on normal competitive conditions. Our estimate is intended to be comparable to a range of bids received from a number of competitive general contractors and sub-trades.

Turner & Townsend does not guarantee that tenders or actual construction costs will not vary from this estimate. Adverse market conditions, proprietary and/or sole source specifications, single sourcing of materials and equipment or reduced competition among contractors may cause bids to vary from reasonable estimates based on normal competitive conditions.

The purpose of this Cost Plan is to provide C S & P Architects with a budget framework within which the project can be developed and cost managed, from Feasibility to Tender award stage.

The Cost Plan has been prepared solely in accordance with the documentation outlined within this document.

This Cost Plan is subject to review, confirmation and/or amendments following revisions to the information stated and discussion(s) with the Client and Design Consultants at which time this report will be reviewed and may be re-issued if required.

1.2 Procurement and Schedule

The Construction Cost Estimate includes all direct construction costs and contractor’s overhead and profit. It assumes that the project will be procured on a Stipulated Lump sum basis, and that bids will be received from a minimum of three to five pre-qualified general contractors. We also assume that the project will be completed in a reasonable time frame and have not included any premiums related to "fast-tracking" the project, if required. The unit rates in our estimate are based on construction activities occurring during normal working hours and proceeding within a non-accelerated schedule.

1.3 Risk Assessment

Pricing reflects 1Q 2022 rates and present market/local conditions. Escalation allowance to the mid-point of construction schedule has been included from our cost analysis. We understand the project will commence in September 2023 and will be substantially completed in July 2025.

The estimate includes an Estimating/Design Contingency Allowance to account for increases in cost as a result of design development through to 100% complete tender documentation.

Post-Contract Contingency (i.e. for Change Directives/Change Orders that may arise during construction) has been Excluded from our Construction Estimate. However a 3% to 5% allowance is deemed included in Project Soft Costs budget.

We have not accounted for a construction market allowance within the report, however based upon our past and ongoing construction cost project experience in Cambridge, ON, we do not foresee any risk of receiving non-competitive bids from major sub – trades.
1.4 Level of Documentation and Assumptions

The estimate is based on the conceptual / preliminary drawings as well as functional program provided. It is supplemented by correspondence and discussions with the Design Consultants.

We outline some of the major assumptions we have made with respect to this cost analysis:

- Estimating Contingency is 10%
- General Requirements is 9% & Fee is 3%
- Project to be procured via Stipulated Lump Sum contract
- Our estimate excludes premiums included by either the General Contractor or sub trades due to any prohibitive contractual clauses such as Liquidated Damages or penalties for non completion of the work
- No major site grading allowed; relatively flat site is assumed
- No major phasing requirements
- No ‘Accelerated’ schedule premiums allowed
- Open cut excavation, no shoring allowed

1.5 Measurement and Pricing

The estimate has been developed using generally accepted principles on method of measurement as per the Canadian Institute of Quantity Surveyors Elemental Cost Analysis (CIQS).

The rates used for this estimate include labour and material, equipment, and subcontractor’s overheads and profit. Pricing developed for this project is based upon our company’s experience with similar projects, and/or quotes provided by subcontractors and suppliers as noted within the estimate. It does not take into account extraordinary market conditions, where bidders may be limited and may include in their tenders disproportionate contingencies and profit margins.

1.6 General Conditions and Fee

The fee included within the estimate for the General Contractor is included as a percentage of the hard construction cost. The general requirements are based on our assumptions of the anticipated construction approach and construction schedule for the project (see section 1.2). The general requirements percentage includes the cost associated with bonding and insurance, however excludes development and/or building permit costs.

1.7 Taxes

Our cost estimate excludes HST.

1.8 General Statement of Liability

This report is not intended for general circulation, publication or reproduction for any other person or purpose without prior express written permission to each specific instance. Furthermore, this report was written for the exclusive use of CS&P and is not to be relied upon by any other party. Turner Townsend does not hold any reporting responsibility to any other party.

Turner & Townsend strongly recommends the owner and/or design team review the cost estimate report including line item descriptions, unit prices, allowances, assumptions, exclusions, and contingencies to ensure the appropriate design intent has been accurately captured within the report.
## COST SUMMARY

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY - FULL BUILD (GFA 125,781 sf)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT 4 CITY PROJECTS</th>
<th>RECREATION CENTRE</th>
<th>IDEA EXCHANGE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFA (sf)</td>
<td>$/sf</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Building Construction Cost</td>
<td>111,181</td>
<td>$472</td>
<td>$52,490,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Site Cost Component</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,218,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total - Construction Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$55,708,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINGENCIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Design Allowance @ 10% Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Escalation Allowance - Construction Start Sept 2023 (allow 8% p.a. for 2022 and 5% p.a beyond 2022) 15%</td>
<td>$8,124,000</td>
<td>$890,000</td>
<td>$9,014,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Construction Contingency Allowance - Post Contract Included in #6 Included in #6 Included in #6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total - Contingencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,124,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total Estimated Concept 4 Construction Cost</td>
<td>111,181</td>
<td>$574</td>
<td>$63,832,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER COSTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Net Zero Premium Costs - See Table Below for Inclusions</td>
<td>$4,948,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$751,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total Estimated Concept 4 Construction Cost</td>
<td>111,181</td>
<td>$574</td>
<td>$68,780,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER COSTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Project Soft Costs - allowance based on 30% of Construction Cost 30%</td>
<td>$20,634,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,324,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total Estimated Concept 4 Project Cost, excl HST</td>
<td>111,181</td>
<td>$584</td>
<td>$89,414,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 HST 1.76%</td>
<td>$1,579,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$177,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Concept 4 Project Cost</td>
<td>111,181</td>
<td>$584</td>
<td>$90,990,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### List of Net Zero Premium Costs Excluding Soft Cost Premiums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Premiums</th>
<th>GFA (sf)</th>
<th>$/sf</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slab on grade - R15 for 1.2 m at perimeter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement walls - R15 insulation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Opaque Walls - R25 insulation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$184,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing - 400 mm insulation for R36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple Glazed Low E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$648,000</td>
<td>$207,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC - Natatorium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC - Other Air</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$546,000</td>
<td>$71,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC Plant + Hot and Chilled Water</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,266,000</td>
<td>$167,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC Plant - Geo-thermal Field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,528,000</td>
<td>$201,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Zero Premiums</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,948,000</td>
<td>$751,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

1. The above is an opinion of Probable Cost Only
2. The above amount assumes that the project is to be procured via Stipulated Lump Sum contract
3. Therefore have not included for any additional costs or schedule delays. However, we will continually monitor the situation and once we become aware of any supply issues that may affect the project, we will inform you.

The following have been specifically excluded:

1. Construction Price Escalation Beyond 2Q 2024
2. Removal of Contaminated Material, if any
3. Premiums for Single Sourced Materials
4. Schedule Acceleration Premium
5. LEED Initiatives Beyond LEED Gold
6. AESS Grade Steel
## COST SUMMARY

**Project No. can21291**  
**Rev. 4**  
**March 3, 2022**

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY - MODIFIED BUILD (GFA 105,442 sf)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT 4 CITY PROJECTS</th>
<th>RECREATION CENTRE</th>
<th>IDEA EXCHANGE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPA (sf)</td>
<td>$/sf</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction Cost</td>
<td>111,181</td>
<td>$472</td>
<td>$52,490,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Cost Component</td>
<td>$1,218,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total - Construction Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$53,708,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINGENCIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Allowance @ 10%</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation Allowance - Construction Start Sept 2023 (allow 8% p.a. for 2022 and 5% p.a. beyond 2022)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency Allowance - Post Contract</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total - Contingencies</td>
<td>$8,124,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$890,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub - Total Estimated Concept 4 Construction Cost</td>
<td>111,181</td>
<td>$574</td>
<td>$63,832,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COST REDUCTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclude Net Zero Premium Costs</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete entire running track and floor area increases</td>
<td>5,339</td>
<td>$ (2,087,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete one gymnasium and associated storage</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>($3,101,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete bleachers in gym and reduce floor area</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>($483,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete Family Changeroom</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>($405,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce pool to 8 lane pool</td>
<td>(1,000,000)</td>
<td>($100,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete some spectator seating to the pool</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>($310,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete 1,000 square feet from the library</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Concept 4 Construction Cost</td>
<td>91,842</td>
<td>$615</td>
<td>$66,446,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Soft Costs - allowance based on 30% of Construction Cost</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$16,934,000</td>
<td>$2,099,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Concept 4 Project Cost, excl HST</td>
<td>91,842</td>
<td>$799</td>
<td>$73,380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Concept 4 Project Cost</td>
<td>$93,590,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
1. The above is an opinion of Probable Cost Only.
2. The above amount assumes that the project is to be procured via Stipulated Lump Sum contract.
3. The following have been specifically excluded:
   1. Construction Price Escalation Beyond 2Q 2024
   2. Removal of Contaminated Material, if any
   3. Premiums for Single Sourced Materials
   4. Schedule Acceleration Premium
   5. LEED Initiatives Beyond LEED Gold
   6. AESS Grade Steel
4. We would note the current situation with COVID-19 may affect the supply of labour and material on this project. We are unable to provide an opinion of the likely impact at this time, however, we will continually monitor the situation and once we become aware of any supply issues that may affect the project, we will inform you.
COST SUMMARY

Project No. can21291
Rev. 4
March 21, 2022

CAMBRIDGE JUC CITY PROJECTS FEASIBILITY STUDY - OPTION 4
CONCEPT COST ANALYSIS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY - REDUCED BUILD (GFA 89,400 sf)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT 4 CITY PROJECTS</th>
<th>RECREATION CENTRE</th>
<th>IDEA EXCHANGE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFA (sf)</td>
<td>$/sf</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Building Construction Cost</td>
<td>77,265</td>
<td>$499</td>
<td>$38,578,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Site Cost Component</td>
<td>$3,053,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total - Construction Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$41,631,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINGENCIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Design Allowance @ 10%</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td></td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Escalation Allowance - Construction Start Sept 2023</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,071,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Construction Contingency Allowance - Post Contract</td>
<td>Incl in #6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incl in #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total - Contingencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,071,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Concept 4 Construction Cost</strong></td>
<td>77,265</td>
<td>$617</td>
<td>$47,702,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Project Soft Costs - allowance based on 30% of Construction Cost</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,311,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Concept 4 Project Cost, excl HST</strong></td>
<td>77,265</td>
<td>$803</td>
<td>$62,013,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 HST</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,091,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Concept 4 Project Cost</strong></td>
<td>77,285</td>
<td>$817</td>
<td>$63,104,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The above is an opinion of Probable Cost Only.
2. The above amount assumes that the project is to be procured via Stipulated Lump Sum contract.
3. We would note the current situation with COVID-19 may affect the supply of labour and material on this project. We are unable to provide an opinion of the likely impact at this time, therefore have not included for any additional costs or schedule delays. However, we will continually monitor the situation and once we become aware of any supply issues that may affect the project, we will inform you.

The following have been specifically excluded:
1. Construction Price Escalation Beyond 2Q 2024
2. Removal of Contaminated Material, if any
3. Premiums for Single Sourced Materials
4. Schedule Acceleration Premium
5. LEED Initiatives Beyond LEED Gold
6. AESS Grade Steel
**CONCEPT COST ANALYSIS**

**Cambridge JUC City Projects Feasibility Study - OPTION 4**

**ELEMENTAL COST SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Ratio to GFA</th>
<th>Elemental Quantity</th>
<th>Elemental Unit Rate</th>
<th>Elemental Amount</th>
<th>Cost/m2</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Cost/m2</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A SHELL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 SUBSTRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11 Foundation</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>8,082 m²</td>
<td>$180.28</td>
<td>$1,457,000</td>
<td>$124.69</td>
<td>$1,569,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12 Basement Excavation</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>2,171 m³</td>
<td>$51.58</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>$9.58</td>
<td>$124.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 STRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21 Lowest Floor Construction</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>8,082 m²</td>
<td>$79.93</td>
<td>$646,000</td>
<td>$55.28</td>
<td>$1,569,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22 Upper Floor Construction</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>3,603 m²</td>
<td>$249.38</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
<td>$231.07</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23 Roof Construction</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>8,384 m²</td>
<td>$531.25</td>
<td>$4,454,000</td>
<td>$381.17</td>
<td>$4,454,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 EXTERIOR ENCLOSURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A31 Walls Below Grade</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>400 m²</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$25.67</td>
<td>$726,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A32 Walls Above Grade</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>3,366 m²</td>
<td>$756.39</td>
<td>$2,546,000</td>
<td>$217.89</td>
<td>$2,546,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A33 Windows &amp; Entrances</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>693 m²</td>
<td>$1,614.72</td>
<td>$1,119,000</td>
<td>$95.76</td>
<td>$1,119,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A34 Roof Covering</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>8,384 m²</td>
<td>$349.95</td>
<td>$2,934,000</td>
<td>$251.09</td>
<td>$2,934,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A35 Projections</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11,685 m²</td>
<td>$70.69</td>
<td>$826,000</td>
<td>$70.69</td>
<td>$826,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B INTERIORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 PARTITIONS &amp; DOORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11 Partitions</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11,633 m²</td>
<td>$293.64</td>
<td>$3,416,000</td>
<td>$292.34</td>
<td>$3,416,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12 Doors</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>154 No</td>
<td>$3,759.74</td>
<td>$579,000</td>
<td>$49.55</td>
<td>$579,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 FINISHES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21 Floor Finishes</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>10,741 m²</td>
<td>$149.61</td>
<td>$1,573,000</td>
<td>$137.53</td>
<td>$1,573,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22 Ceiling Finishes</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>10,741 m²</td>
<td>$111.72</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$102.70</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23 Wall Finishes</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>19,513 m²</td>
<td>$32.70</td>
<td>$638,000</td>
<td>$54.60</td>
<td>$638,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 FITTINGS &amp; EQUIPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B31 Fittings &amp; Fixtures</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11,685 m²</td>
<td>$135.99</td>
<td>$1,589,000</td>
<td>$135.99</td>
<td>$1,589,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B32 Equipment</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11,685 m²</td>
<td>$370.30</td>
<td>$4,327,000</td>
<td>$370.30</td>
<td>$4,327,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B33 Conveying Systems</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3 Stp</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$50.67</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 MECHANICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11 Plumbing &amp; Drainage</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11,685 m²</td>
<td>$170.90</td>
<td>$1,997,000</td>
<td>$170.90</td>
<td>$1,997,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12 Fire Protection</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11,685 m²</td>
<td>$469.89</td>
<td>$546,000</td>
<td>$45.98</td>
<td>$546,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13 H.V.A.C.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11,685 m²</td>
<td>$782.63</td>
<td>$9,145,000</td>
<td>$782.63</td>
<td>$9,145,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14 Controls</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11,685 m²</td>
<td>$44.42</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>$44.42</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 ELECTRICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21 Service &amp; Distribution</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11,685 m²</td>
<td>$135.39</td>
<td>$1,582,000</td>
<td>$135.39</td>
<td>$1,582,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22 Lighting, Devices &amp; Heating</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11,685 m²</td>
<td>$128.80</td>
<td>$1,505,000</td>
<td>$128.80</td>
<td>$1,505,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23 Systems &amp; Ancillaries</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11,685 m²</td>
<td>$104.41</td>
<td>$1,220,000</td>
<td>$104.41</td>
<td>$1,220,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NET BUILDING COST (Excluding Site)**

|        | $4,030.98 | $47,102,000 | 76% |

**D SITE & ANCILLARY WORK**

|        | $252.55 |

**E GENERAL REQUIREMENTS & ALLOWANCES**

|        | $525.63 |

**Z TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE (Excluding Allowances)**

|        | $56,195,000 | 91% |

**Z TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE (Including Allowances)**

|        | $61,815,000 | 100% |

|        | $0.00 |

|        | $0.00 |

|        | $0.00 |

**HST**

|        | EXCLUDED |

|        | $0.00 |

**TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE (Including Allowances)**

|        | $61,815,000 | 100% |

|        | $0.00 |

**Cost/unit**

|        | GFA 11,685 m² | $5,290 m² |

|        | GFA 125,777 sf | $491 sf |
## ELEMENTAL COST SUMMARY
### CONCEPT COST ANALYSIS

**Project:** Concept 4 Scenario 3  
**Location:** Cambridge, ON  
**Date:** March 21, 2022  
**Owner/Client:** Cambridge JUC  
**Architect:** C S & P Architects Inc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Ratio to GFA</th>
<th>Elemental Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Rate</th>
<th>Elemental Amount</th>
<th>Cost/m²</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A SHELL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 Substructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11 Foundation</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>6,613 m²</td>
<td>$188.72</td>
<td>$1,248,000</td>
<td>$150.25</td>
<td>$1,360,000 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12 Excavation Exclusion</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>2,173 m³</td>
<td>$51.58</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>$43.11</td>
<td>$468,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2 STRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21 Lowest Floor Construction</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>6,613 m²</td>
<td>$82.72</td>
<td>$547,000</td>
<td>$65.86</td>
<td>$5,453,000 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22 Upper Floor Construction</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1,694 m²</td>
<td>$782.17</td>
<td>$1,325,000</td>
<td>$159.52</td>
<td>$2,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23 Roof Covering</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>6,789 m²</td>
<td>$527.47</td>
<td>$3,581,000</td>
<td>$431.13</td>
<td>$4,370,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Roof Projections</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8,306 m²</td>
<td>$76.21</td>
<td>$633,000</td>
<td>$76.21</td>
<td>$6,520,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A3 EXTERIOR ENCLOSURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A31 Walls Below Grade</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>400 m²</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$36.12</td>
<td>$361,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A32 Walls Above Grade</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>2,942 m²</td>
<td>$756.97</td>
<td>$2,227,000</td>
<td>$268.12</td>
<td>$2,620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A33 Windows &amp; Entrances</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>603 m²</td>
<td>$1,631.84</td>
<td>$984,000</td>
<td>$118.47</td>
<td>$1,184,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A34 Roof Covering</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>6,789 m²</td>
<td>$349.98</td>
<td>$2,376,000</td>
<td>$286.06</td>
<td>$2,860,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A35 Projections</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8,306 m²</td>
<td>$76.21</td>
<td>$633,000</td>
<td>$76.21</td>
<td>$6,520,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B INTERIORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Partitions &amp; Doors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11 Partitions</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8,299 m²</td>
<td>$298.35</td>
<td>$2,476,000</td>
<td>$298.10</td>
<td>$2,968,000 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12 Doors</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>119 m²</td>
<td>$143.45</td>
<td>$162,139</td>
<td>$143.45</td>
<td>$162,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B2 FINISHES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21 Floor Finishes</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>7,642 m²</td>
<td>$170.36</td>
<td>$1,302,000</td>
<td>$156.75</td>
<td>$1,430,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22 Ceiling Finishes</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>7,643 m²</td>
<td>$140.78</td>
<td>$1,076,000</td>
<td>$129.54</td>
<td>$1,235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23 Wall Finishes</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13,968 m²</td>
<td>$32.36</td>
<td>$452,000</td>
<td>$54.42</td>
<td>$544,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B3 FITTINGS &amp; EQUIPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B31 Fittings &amp; Fixtures</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8,306 m²</td>
<td>$150.61</td>
<td>$1,251,000</td>
<td>$150.61</td>
<td>$1,251,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B32 Equipment</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8,306 m²</td>
<td>$307.46</td>
<td>$2,677,000</td>
<td>$307.46</td>
<td>$3,054,000 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B33 Conveying Systems</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,806 m²</td>
<td>$49,000.00</td>
<td>$150.25</td>
<td>$150.25</td>
<td>$4,682,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Mechanical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11 Plumbing &amp; Drainage</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8,306 m²</td>
<td>$170.24</td>
<td>$1,414,000</td>
<td>$170.24</td>
<td>$1,414,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12 Fire Protection</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8,306 m²</td>
<td>$469.50</td>
<td>$399,000</td>
<td>$469.50</td>
<td>$399,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13 H.V.A.C.</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8,306 m²</td>
<td>$779.68</td>
<td>$6,476,000</td>
<td>$779.68</td>
<td>$6,476,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14 Controls</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8,306 m²</td>
<td>$44.31</td>
<td>$368,000</td>
<td>$44.31</td>
<td>$368,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2 ELECTRICAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21 Service &amp; Distribution</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8,306 m²</td>
<td>$134.60</td>
<td>$1,118,000</td>
<td>$134.60</td>
<td>$1,118,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22 Lighting, Devices &amp; Heating</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8,306 m²</td>
<td>$128.70</td>
<td>$1,069,000</td>
<td>$128.70</td>
<td>$1,069,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23 Systems &amp; Ancillaries</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8,306 m²</td>
<td>$104.38</td>
<td>$867,000</td>
<td>$104.38</td>
<td>$867,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET BUILDING COST (Excluding Site)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,283,900 91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D SITE &amp; ANCILLARY WORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,283,900 91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Site Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11 Site Development</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>51,738 m²</td>
<td>$44.67</td>
<td>$2,311,000</td>
<td>$278.23</td>
<td>$2,782,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12 Mechanical Site Services</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>51,738 m²</td>
<td>$6.76</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$42.14</td>
<td>$421,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13 Electrical Site Services</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>51,738 m³</td>
<td>$3.87</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$24.08</td>
<td>$240,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2 ANCILLARY WORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D21 Demolition</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0 m²</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D22 Alterations</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0 m²</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET BUILDING COST (Including Site)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$38,157,000 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z GENERAL REQUIREMENTS &amp; ALLOWANCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$47,123,000 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1 General Requirements</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>$3,434,000</td>
<td>$413.44</td>
<td>$4,682,000</td>
<td>$4,682,000 10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z2 Estimating Allowance</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>$4,284,000</td>
<td>$515.77</td>
<td>$4,284,000</td>
<td>$4,284,000 9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE (Including Allowances)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$47,123,000 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cost/unit**

- **GFA** 8,306 m²: $5,673 m²
- **GFA** 89,406 sf: $527 sf
## AREA SUMMARY

### Concept 4 Scenario 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GRND</th>
<th>BSMNT</th>
<th>SECOND</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>Total SM</th>
<th>Total SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rec Centre</td>
<td>5485</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,179</td>
<td>77,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID EX</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>12,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6613</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,307</td>
<td>89,416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this feasibility study is to examine and evaluate the opportunities for a joint-use campus shared by the City of Cambridge, Idea Exchange (Cambridge Public Library), Waterloo Region District School Board (the WRDSB), and Waterloo Catholic District School Board (the WCDSB). The study explores conceptual design approaches to the facilities and site, integrating the facilities to maximize community benefits. Results and recommendations from this study will assist City Council, and the Library Board and School Boards in decision making regarding this proposed community hub.

The potential for a joint-use community hub was envisioned by the partners in the late-1990s. The 1997 Southeast Galt Community Plan noted a general location for a joint campus, including two schools, a child care facility, public library, and community recreation facilities on a shared site. For this purpose, in 2007, the City acquired a 32.5-acre parcel in the southeast of the City of Cambridge and the programming for the joint campus was expanded to include the community park for this neighbourhood.

PARTNERS AND PROGRAM COMPONENTS

City of Cambridge Recreation Complex
- Gross floor area: 104,020 square feet
- Aquatics
- Gymnasiums, multi-purpose rooms
- Walking track
- Storage, office and administrative space

Idea Exchange (City of Cambridge Public Library)
- Gross floor area: 13,600 square feet
- Spaces to provide access to library materials and services and to a variety of programs and events
- Reading, lounge, making and study spaces
- Internet and computer access

WRDSB Elementary School
- Gross floor area: School – 53,240 square feet, Child Care – 8,500 square feet
- 519 students in Junior Kindergarten to Grade 8
- 5 room Child Care

WCDSB Elementary School
- Gross floor area: 42,645 square feet
- 354 students in Junior Kindergarten to Grade 8
Executive Summary
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Feasibility Study was conducted through a collaborative and interactive process, engaging the partners’ Steering Committee in a variety of interactive explorations to co-imagine a joint-use campus that not only meets the current and future needs of this Cambridge community, but most importantly creates a vibrant, inviting and multi-generational community hub. These preliminary visioning sessions and meetings became the foundation for the agreed vision and guiding principles, which informed all decisions going forward. The development of a decision matrix for assessment of the site concepts referred back to this agreed unified vision.

Separate visioning and programming meetings were held with each of the four key partner/stakeholder groups. Each partner contributed their own vision and priorities which included specific program requirements, budgetary constraints, past experience with similar projects, and their excitement and possibly their trepidation going into a collaborative and negotiated joint project.

A detailed site analysis was undertaken to explore existing site conditions, zoning requirements, Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) wetland impacts, transportation issues, local development plans, and community connections.

The preliminary draft space needs assessment was explored and developed in detail to find synergies and joint-use opportunities between all users’ space programs.

The conceptual site options were built on the learnings and feedback from the research and analysis phase, including an examination of the opportunities and constraints of the site and program, and the benefits and challenges of a joint building or separate building approach to the campus. Five concepts were explored – three approaches to a single consolidated shared building: One Campus, One Facility, and two approaches to separate buildings sharing the site: One Campus, Separate Facilities. Functional and operational impacts were fully considered. An order of magnitude cost estimate was completed for each concept.

The pros/cons/opportunities/challenges of each concept were assessed using defined criteria and with reference to the vision and principles established by the Steering Committee.

The findings of this study conclude that the site is appropriate in size, location and characteristics to accommodate the proposed joint-use campus. Many joint-use sharing opportunities are available, e.g., parking and service areas; outdoor amenity and play areas; gymnasiums; multi-purpose rooms; specialty classrooms; and reading, lounge and study spaces. More than one approach to the campus can be successfully developed.
The consulting team guided the committee through an iterative process where two preferred concepts were selected – one for a consolidated building and site; and one for two separate buildings sharing a campus.

A detailed analysis was completed for the two preferred approaches, these are referred to in the report as – Consolidated Building Concept 2: One Campus, One Facility, L-shaped Plan and Separate Buildings Concept 4: One Campus, Two Separate Facilities.

The recommended approach for a successful joint-use campus is to locate two separate building on the joint site: Concept 4: One Campus, Two Separate Facilities. The two schools share one facility. The Recreation Complex and Idea Exchange share the second facility. The two facilities frame a generous and welcoming community park facing Wesley Boulevard. The facilities can operate independently, but are designed and programmed to promote shared use of selected spaces both indoors and outdoors. When located in a separate building, on a more clearly defined site, the safety and security of the elementary school students, within the larger context of the campus, is better achieved. Separating the schools from the Recreation Complex and the Idea Exchange allows the partners to proceed with the design and construction at their own pace. The timeline for the design and construction of the Recreation Complex will be longer than for the schools. This is an important consideration for the schools as the Ministry benchmark for capital costs for the schools’ construction does not allow for construction cost escalation. The longer the project is deferred the more difficult it will be to build the schools on budget.

The order of magnitude estimate, detailed for all concepts, is based on the initial functional program and preliminary conceptual plans. The level of certainty, or potential cost variation, of this level of estimate is generally +/-15% to 20%. The estimated total project costs for Concept 4 are as follows:

- WRDSB Elementary School: $13,892,000
- Child Care: $2,651,000
- WCDSB Elementary School: $11,857,000
- Recreation Complex: $58,490,000
- Idea Exchange: $6,245,000
- Total Joint-use Complex: $93,135,000
A framework for the development of shared-use and operational models (refer to Section 8) was developed in tandem with the concept designs. This is a creative exercise working with the specific design concepts looking for efficiencies and opportunities that allow for a variety of multiple use strategies - independent use and control by each partner; structured or scheduled use by various groups, or common use at all times.

This proposed joint-use campus will create a community hub offering educational, recreational and cultural activities for all ages in this rapidly developing Cambridge community. A shared approach provides better value for money for the community, and best utilization of all program spaces.

The conclusion of this Feasibility Study is that the proposed joint-use campus is achievable and provides tremendous benefits to each partner and to the community.
Vision & Guiding Principles
VISION & GUIDING PRINCIPLES

VISION

The vision for this partnership is to provide a multi-generational community hub for the residents of Cambridge, with one-stop access to education, recreation and cultural amenities. This project is a unique opportunity for all partners to enjoy more amenities and uses over what each partner would have if it was a stand-alone facility.

This commitment to shared use maximizes the benefits to the community and provides better value for each partner’s investment.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Create a vibrant, inviting and multi-generational community hub

Leverage sharing opportunities to maximize program synergies, to encourage the best utilization of space, and to reduce capital and operating costs for all parties

Showcase the main building activities, animating the streetscape and creating a distinct identity for each partner

Provide a safe and secure design, both indoors and out, that allows for both separation and sharing

Allow for flexibility of use and potential to grow and change over time

Maximize the use and amenity of open and green space on the site

Encourage active transportation by creating safe and inviting green connections to the neighbourhood

Incorporate sustainable initiatives that foster environmental responsibility; improve building performance and energy efficiency; and contribute to the health and well-being of the users
SITE EVALUATION

SITE EVALUATION SUMMARY

The 32.5 acre site of the future joint-use complex is located in the south-east end of Cambridge in the area known as Littles Corners, north of the intersection of Dundas Street South and Branchton Road.

The site is bordered by Moffat Creek and a vegetated wetland buffer along its north-western edge. At the east boundary of the site, there are plans for a future Regional Road (East Boundary Road). The primary access to the site is from the extension of Wesley Boulevard. Consisting of former hilly, agricultural lands, the site slopes north-west towards Moffat Creek, with a difference in height of 14m from east to west. The developable site area is reduced by the wetland to the west and the road allowance to the east. The remaining site area available for development is approximately 26.3 acres.

Significant growth is anticipated for the region – with future residential low to mid-rise subdivisions planned throughout the vicinity – the most notable of which are the South Point lands. It is estimated that once the area is fully developed, over 26,500 residents will be within a 15-minute walking distance from the proposed campus.

New Multi-Use Trails and Bike Paths are planned to promote active transportation to, from and through the site, and an extension to the current nearby bus route is planned, running along Wesley Boulevard, with a new bus stop to serve the complex directly.

Refer to Appendix A1 for a detailed Site Evaluation.
Program & Needs Analysis
PROGRAM & NEEDS ANALYSIS
PROGRAM COMPONENTS
CITY OF CAMBRIDGE RECREATION COMPLEX

The original Recreation Complex space program was developed in 2015 - prior to the decision to locate the facility at the joint-use campus.

The Net Functional Area of the Recreation Complex program totals 90,450 square feet. Net Functional Area describes the room-specific space program and refers to the usable or assignable square footage within a room or area (inside wall-to-wall dimensions).

Gross Floor Area (GFA) represents the overall footprint of a floor or building, respectively, and includes support spaces, washrooms, circulation, elevators, stairs, the space occupied by the building’s exterior walls, and major mechanical spaces.

The Recreation Complex program allocates a 15% gross up bringing the prescribed GFA to 104,020 square feet.

The major components of the program include:
- **Aquatics**
  - 25-metre pool
  - Leisure/learning/therapy pool
  - Pool change room facilities
  - Pool office, storage and administrative space
  - Spectator viewing
- **Dry Land**
  - 3 FIBA (Fédération Internationale de Basketball) size gymnasia
  - Indoor walking/running track
  - Multi-use program rooms/meeting space
  - Fitness studio
  - Gymnasium/fitness Change rooms
- **Storage, office and administrative space**

IDEA EXCHANGE (CITY OF CAMBRIDGE PUBLIC LIBRARY)

The Idea Exchange Net Functional Area totals 11,370 square feet. The program allocates a 16% gross up bringing the prescribed GFA to 13,600 square feet.

The major components of the program include:
- Spaces to provide access to library materials and services and to a variety of programs and events
- Reading, lounge, making and study spaces
- Internet and computer access
WRDSB AND WCDSB ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SPACE PROGRAMS

The Ontario Ministry of Education determines the space program and benchmark capital funding for new and replacement schools. The Ministry Space Template is used to determine the number and type of instructional areas and the required operational and circulation areas to be included in each school based on the expected student enrollment. The Space Template also allocates space for Community Use Rooms such as Child Care facilities.

WRDSB Elementary School

The WRDSB Elementary School Net Instructional and Operational Areas total 38,920 square feet. The space program allocates a 37% gross up bringing the prescribed GFA to 53,240 square feet. An additional GFA of 8,500 square feet is allocated for the Child Care Facility.

The major components of the program include:
- 519 students in Junior Kindergarten to Grade 8
- 5 Kindergartens, 14 Classrooms, Art, Science, Special Education
- Gymnasium, Library/Learning Commons
- General Office, Staff, Custodial and support spaces
- 5 room Child Care centre
- Outdoor amenities, such as asphalt play area, soccer field, multi-use playing field, creative play structure, outdoor classroom
- Space for up to 12 portables

WCDSB Elementary School

The WCDSB Elementary School Net Instructional and Operational Areas total 30,905 square feet. The space program allocates a 38% gross up bringing the prescribed GFA to 42,645 square feet.

The major components of the program include:
- 354 students in Junior Kindergarten to Grade 8
- 3 Kindergartens, 11 Classrooms, Art, Science, Special Education
- Gymnasium, Library/Learning Commons
- General Office, Staff, Custodial and support spaces
- Outdoor amenities, such as asphalt play area
- Space for up to 6 portables
SITE PROGRAM COMPONENTS

PARKING AND DROP-OFF

The preliminary space program, developed by the City and joint-use partners, noted a requirement for 552 parking spaces (80 WRDSB and Child Care, 75 WCDSB, 375 Rec Centre, 22 Idea Exchange). The peak parking demand is projected to be between 8:00 to 9:00 am on weekdays.

The City of Cambridge encourages active transportation and has provided for bike lanes and a safe off-street multi-use trail servicing this site. Grand River Transit plans to extend its local bus route to this site. The Wesley Boulevard road profile includes parking on the north side of the road - estimated at about 40 spaces (this number will be reduced slightly by the proposed bus stop). These initiatives will reduce the overall parking demand on the site. Based on the above, 500 parking spaces are included in the site fit assessment and conceptual plans. In the separated buildings concepts the full number of school related spaces are located adjacent to the schools. The parking spot savings are realized in the parking lot adjacent to the Recreation Complex and Idea Exchange building.

Parking requirements should be confirmed with a parking demand study as the project moves into detailed design.

Limited parent drop-off for the schools will be provided on site. Kindergarten, child care and barrier-free drop-off require park and drop provisions close to the facility entrances. All other parent drop-off will be accommodated on Wesley Boulevard, with safe access provided to the school play yard. Convenient drop-off and additional barrier-free parking spaces will be provided for the Recreation Complex and Idea Exchange users, requiring enhanced accessibility.

BUS DROP-OFF

Based on enrollment projections and potential catchment areas for the schools, both School Boards anticipate the requirement for four full size school buses each. Bell times for the schools may be staggered to reduce the need to provide a bus drop-off zone with a capacity for all eight buses. In addition, WCDSB and WRDSB may explore shared busing. This practice already occurs in other jurisdictions, and could be done here. However, to future-proof the school site and allow flexibility for scheduling, a bus drop-off for eight buses, shared by the two schools, is shown on the concept plans.

Special education vehicles will have a different loading and unloading location, close to the school entrance, for safety and accessibility.
OUTDOOR PLAY AND LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

The schools each require both hard surface and soft (sodded) play areas. Hard surface play and play fields are exclusive and shared use for the schools only during the school day. School playgrounds are generally fenced for security and the safety of the students. Outdoor classroom spaces and provision of space for play structures are required by both Boards. The wetland area, running along Moffatt Creek, on the west side of the site, provide an opportunity for exploration and naturalized play. Care is needed to avoid supervision issues related to multiple school populations in the playground.

Each school will have its own Kindergarten play area, which will be fenced and connected directly to the Kindergarten classrooms. The Child Care outdoor play is fenced and connected directly to the Child Care playrooms. The required area of outdoor play for the Child Care is regulated by the Child Care and Early Years Act.

Outdoor amenities for the Recreation Complex and Idea Exchange include shared outdoor basketball nets, small games areas, play structures, passive outdoor play, outdoor classrooms/reading gardens, interactive public art, and provisions for future tennis courts where possible. These City outdoor amenities will be funded through a separate City project.

Additional program elements to create a welcoming community hub include a community park located on Wesley Boulevard, and a multi-use trail, connected to the City bike path and trail system and circumnavigating the site.

PORTABLES AND FUTURE ADDITIONS

Both School Boards require provisions for future portables (WRDSB - 12 portables, WCDSB - 6 portables) and space for future permanent additions to each school. Portables will be located on the hard surface play area in proximity to school exit doors.

GARBAGE AND RECEIVING

Garbage, service and receiving areas are required for all users. Day-to-day deliveries to the site will not require a loading dock accommodating full size transport trucks. Daily book delivery and pick-up must be accommodated for the Idea Exchange. Garbage and recycling will be picked-up on a regular schedule. Garbage storage rooms can be minimized if inground/underground garbage storage containers are used. The swimming pool requires conveniently located and regular service deliveries for pool chemicals.

The site and building components are illustrated in the following diagrams.
The overall planning and programming for this joint-use campus must have inherent adaptability so that the buildings and site will be able to make adjustments to changing program needs over time. The concept designs include creating environments that can grow into more fluid sharing as the partners learn to use their new facilities and become more comfortable with the possibilities. The designs look for efficiencies and strategies that allow for multiple use opportunities - independent use and control by each partner; structured or scheduled use by various groups; or common use at all times. If sharing opportunities create learning opportunities and add value there is a strong rationale for proceeding with a joint-use campus.

The concept designs should reflect safety/security and identity needs of each partner, while allowing flexibility to ‘grow into’ or expand sharing opportunities over time.

Programming and sharing decisions will lead to the development of Joint-use and Operational Agreements. This is both a legal and a creative exercise - developed in tandem with the facility design.
Spaces to support before and after school programming should be carefully considered as all partners offer school-age programs. In addition, there is a potential challenge regarding duplication of services offered by Recreation and Culture through the Recreation Complex and the Idea Exchange. Program spaces should have inherent flexibility to support both arts/cultural and recreational programming. This will provide the opportunity for the partners to differentiate their offerings to the community. The Joint-use Agreement should address these issues.

The development of a consolidated space program finds opportunities for maximizing utilization of space, finding synergies between program components, and reducing overall floor areas (and therefore cost) through sharing and placement strategies. The following spaces were considered for potential joint-use by the partners:

**GYMNASIUM/FITNESS**
- Two Recreation Complex gyms are fully utilized all day
- School gyms are exclusive use during school hours
- School gyms are available to Recreation Complex community for gym and fitness programming after hours

Proposed Program Changes:
- Reduce number of full-size gyms programmed for the combined joint-use campus (3 City, 1 WRDSB, 1 WCDSB) from five to four
- Recreation Complex contributes floor area to increase WRDSB gym to larger sized FIBA size gym
- Provide one shared stage between the two school gyms using portion of WRDSB gym area and portion of WCDSB flex area

**LIBRARY LEARNING SPACES**
- Idea Exchange program includes a 1,800 square feet Lounge Seating and Learning Commons area which is accessible to students during the school day

Proposed program changes:
- Reduce both schools’ Library floor area designated to general study

**ART/SCIENCE/MAKER/TECH**
- Idea Exchange has designated two spaces for exclusive use by the schools during school hours – a large Multi-purpose room at 750 square feet and a Makerspace at 580 square feet
- Both school programs include an art room and a science room
- Four art and science rooms are required for the joint-use campus to meet the pupil loading/capacity requirement of each school
Proposed program changes:

- Increase the floor area of the Idea Exchange Maker space and Multi-purpose room to meet the area requirements for art and science rooms (with floor area contributions from both Boards)
- WRDSB to build one science room (including tech space), which will be shared with WCDSB, and delete one art room from its program
- WCDSB to contribute one art room, which will be shared with WRDSB, and delete one science room from its program
- Both Boards will have access to the Idea Exchange rooms for art and science programming to replace the two deleted rooms

MEETING ROOMS

- Combining and co-locating meeting rooms will result in synergies and potential floor area reductions

MECHANICAL

- A typical indoor central mechanical plant for a building of this scale is approximately 4% of the GFA (not including pool mechanical)
- Sharing of central plant requires the School Boards’ agreement on operational issues
- Assuming a shared central mechanical plant, the total area required floor area for mechanical space is 10,235 square feet

PARKING/DROP-OFF/SERVICE AREAS

- Number of parking spaces to be right-sized for time-of-day use
- Sharing of main school bus drop area was considered, relies on staggered bell-times
- Active transportation is encouraged by all users
- On site drop-off required for:
  - Accessibility requirements
  - Park and drop for child care and kindergartens
  - Limited convenience drop-off for other users
- Sharing of garbage, loading and receiving will be determined by site plan configuration, as well as ease of access for users.
- If shared, location of garbage needs to be in a central and convenient location for all users

OUTDOOR PLAY

- Kindergarten and Child Care play areas are exclusive use
- All other outdoor play areas are available for community use after-hours and should be located for passive surveillance
- School sharing of hard surface play and play fields relies on scheduling of bell-times and nutrition/recess/lunch breaks
KEY RELATIONSHIPS

Key relationships required to accommodate the agreed joint-use opportunities create the framework for the development of the concept plans. The following diagrams illustrate desired adjacencies and synergies that will promote sharing.
SPACE PROGRAM FOR CONSOLIDATED AND SEPARATE BUILDINGS

Three Space Programs were developed using the City’s original Recreation Complex and Idea Exchange programs, and Ministry of Education’s Space Template for the schools as a framework. Each program shows the original program and area allocations, the proposed program, and resulting changes to each partner’s floor area. Sharing of outdoor amenity spaces remains achievable in all approaches to the building space program.

The Consolidated Building Space Template: One Campus, One Facility incorporated all of the potential opportunities for joint-use and sharing. This space program results in the most significant potential floor area reductions for all users. The target area reductions, for the total joint-use campus, are approximately 7,300 square feet over the original space program. The development of site concepts based on the proposed program modifications will confirm whether these area reductions are actually achievable.

The Separate Buildings Space Template: One Campus, Two Separate Facilities outlines a space program for a campus plan for two separate buildings on the site. The City components (Recreation Complex and Idea Exchange) share one building. The two schools share the second building. The floor area reductions resulting from joint-use and sharing of program spaces are more limited. The third gym is required to be built in the Recreation Complex, as access to the school gym presents security and convenience challenges. Additional science and art rooms are required in the schools, as the Idea Exchange multi-purpose room and makerspace are similarly challenging for regular school day use. Sharing of services spaces and a central mechanical plant are also unachievable. This program results in modest floor area reductions for the shared schools. The target area reductions, for the combined schools, is approximately 1,000 square feet over the original space program.

The second Separate Buildings Space Template: One Campus, Three Separate Facilities, outlines a space program for a campus plan for three separate buildings on the site. The City components share one building. The two schools each occupy their own building. There are no floor area reductions resulting from joint-use and sharing of program spaces. In addition to the program changes noted above, the schools also lose the opportunities for day-to-day sharing of spaces. The shared stage between the gyms is no longer available; and each school must build its own general office, library, science and art rooms, and mechanical and service spaces.

Refer to the Appendix A3 for detailed Space Programs for Consolidated and Separate Buildings.
SUSTAINABILITY

SUSTAINABLE APPROACH SUMMARY

The sustainability response should be evaluated against the balancing of complex parameters including environmental responsibility, energy efficiency, and creating a healthy environment that contributes to user well-being. Evaluating associated construction cost premiums, as well as the ability to optimize cost of ownership over the life cycle, will be a fundamental metric. As energy use has the greatest impact on operating costs, the assistance of rating system criteria that can help reduce energy use and associated greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions may be prioritized.

To support the creation of a healthy and sustainable communities, the City of Cambridge has mandated all new municipal buildings meet LEED Gold Standards. This is achievable in the Separated Building Concepts. In the Consolidated Building Concepts achieving LEED would be more complex for the City components of the facility. Although Ministry funding benchmarks limit pursuing LEED certification for the schools, new schools are designed and built to a high level of sustainability. The Ontario Building Code requirements result in building envelope (cladding) design and mechanical systems that are highly energy efficient; and Site Plan Approval requirements include many storm water management and other site provisions that align with many of the LEED requirements that the City components will be pursuing.

A practical approach which prioritizes Passive House high performance envelope principles and air quality, together with targeted renewables such as geothermal and photovoltaic (solar panels), may have the greatest impact in both reducing energy, significantly lowering GHG emissions, and promoting a healthy and energy efficient facility. This approach would be suitable for both consolidated and separated design options.

In the next stage of detailed design, it is recommended that energy modeling and an associated financial analysis that can demonstrate a reasonable business case can be prepared. This business case can include premium capital costs associated with the energy saving measures, as well as payback and savings over time. A detailed geothermal feasibility study, together with site testing, should be included in this scope. This work should optimally be done as a formalized Sustainability Study in the Schematic Design period of the next phase of design.

Refer to Appendix A2 for detailed commentary on sustainability strategies.
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Conceptual Plans
CONCEPTUAL PLANS

The development of all conceptual plans for the two approaches to the joint-use campus, consolidated and separate, were based on the Guiding Principles, the agreed key relationships, and the following building and site design criteria:

- A Ground Floor location is preferred for the following program components:
  - School - general office, kindergartens, special education classrooms, gymnasiums
  - Child Care – all program areas
  - Recreation Complex - lobby/reception, swimming pool and associated change rooms, gymnasiums and associated change rooms
  - Idea Exchange – all program areas
  - Garbage and receiving for all parties

- A generous welcoming entrance and a central internal circulation system, that acts as a “main street”, highlights the major building components, creating excitement and synergies between uses

- The swimming pool and Idea Exchange are the key identifiers of the City facility, with a prominent face to the community, visible from Wesley Boulevard

- The schools have distinct identity and entrances to the exterior that provide safe and secure access for walkers, cyclists and people arriving by car, school bus or transit

- Schools are located adjacent to the wetland area, the more naturalized and quiet part of the site

- Recreation Complex and its larger parking component are located on the east side of the site, with the bulk of the parking adjacent to the busier future East Boundary Road and associated roundabout.
CONSOLIDATED BUILDING CONCEPT PLANS: ONE CAMPUS, ONE FACILITY

The consolidated conceptual designs result in a compact footprint for the building, maximizing the open and greenspace accessible to the surrounding community. In each of the three consolidated concepts, there is a main building entrance that provides access to all facilities. In addition, the schools have a main entrance or “front door” to the street. In all consolidated concepts the school internal circulation is designed to operate independently of the Recreation Complex/Idea Exchange to ensure the safety and security of the school population. Physical and visual connections are provided between all uses to allow sharing when and where desired. Where possible each school’s circulation is separated from the other.

The consolidated concepts maximize the opportunity for planned and serendipitous sharing of facilities. Building operations and maintenance are more efficient than stand-alone buildings. Although potential area reductions were targeted in the space program, these were not achievable due to additional required circulation, low gross-up and plan configurations required to bring daylight into the facility.

Construction phasing opportunities to accelerate the occupancy of any of the partners’ facilities are limited.
CONCEPT 1

- L-shaped plan with all main entrances for all partners addressing Wesley Boulevard
- Lowest overall GFA of all concepts
- Outdoor play and amenity areas shared between all users on an agreed schedule
- Clearly separated parking and drop-off for School Board and City components, which may be shared as per agreement
- Limited visibility and access to playground and outdoor open space from the street
- Entrance to City facilities creates a “main street” highlighting key activities
- Clear separation between City and School Board components
- Limited visibility and access to schools from “main street”
- School circulation is clearly separated for each Board
- School wraps around a courtyard ensuring daylight in all teaching spaces
- Total Joint-use Complex:
  - GFA: 217,880 square feet
  - Estimated Total Project Cost: $ 92,393,000
CONSOLIDATED BUILDING CONCEPT PLANS
CONCEPT 1: One Campus, One Facility, L-shaped Plan
Second Floor Plan
CONCEPT 2

- Block shaped plan with main entrance for City components addressing Wesley Boulevard and main shared School Board entry facing west to the school playground
- Most compact ground-floor footprint of all concepts
- Outdoor play and amenity areas shared between all users on an agreed schedule
- Clearly separated parking and drop-off for School Board and City components, which may be shared as per agreement
- Maximizes visibility and access to playground and outdoor open space from the street
- Entrance to City facilities creates a “main street” highlighting all partners’ key activities
- Central courtyard brings daylight into the centre of a dense plan
- Clear separation between City and School Board components
- School circulation is clearly separated for each Board
- C-shaped school wings frame kindergarten play areas and ensure daylight in all teaching spaces
- Total Joint-use Complex:
  - GFA: 229,144 square feet
  - Estimated Total Project Cost: $96,076,000
CONCEPT 3

- Linear plan located on east portion of the site running parallel to the future East Boundary Road with all main entrances addressing East Boundary Road
- Outdoor play and amenity areas shared between all users on an agreed schedule
- Combined parking and drop-off for School Board and City components
- Separate bus loop for schools
- Conceptualized as a building pavilion in a park, maximizing visibility and access to playground and outdoor open space from the street
- A linear “main street” highlights all partners’ key activities
- Clear separation between City and School Board components, except school gymnasiums are located within the City section of the facility
- School circulation is clearly separated for each Board
- C-shaped school wings ensure daylight in all teaching spaces
- Recreation Complex gymnasiums are located on the second floor, over the Idea Exchange
- Total Joint-use Complex:
  - GFA: 224,213 square feet
  - Estimated Total Project Cost: $94,077,000
CONCEPTUAL PLANS

CONCEPT 3: One Campus, One Facility, Linear Plan
Second Floor Plan
SEPARATE BUILDINGS CONCEPT PLANS: ONE CAMPUS, SEPARATE FACILITIES

The separate buildings conceptual designs allow for the two or three separate facilities to share the campus.

The facilities can operate independently, but are still designed and programmed to promote shared use of selected spaces both indoors and outdoors. The gross floor area reductions achieved in the consolidated building concepts cannot be achieved. The Recreation Complex will require its own third gymnasium in lieu of convenient time-of-day access to the WRDSB gymnasium. The schools will be required to build additional art and science classrooms in lieu if the dedicated classroom and maker space shared with the Idea Exchange in the consolidated concepts. Opportunities for joint-use and sharing with the Recreation Complex and Idea Exchange are maximized with the multi-purpose room and the makerspace. Sharing of building services and support spaces, and the associated savings in operations and maintenance costs, are also reduced.

Urban design benefits of separated buildings include distinct identity and addresses for each partner, and smaller building volumes more in keeping with the scale of the surrounding neighbourhood. When located in a separate building, on a more clearly defined site, the safety and security of the elementary school students, within the larger context of the campus, is better achieved. Separating the schools from the Recreation Complex and the Idea Exchange allows the partners to proceed with the design and construction at their own pace.

If the lands are severed between the City Components and the School Boards, each site would be required to meet zoning and municipal approvals requirements independently. If the campus remains as one property, then these approvals will be required for the entire site as a whole. However, the school design and construction could be fast-tracked for earlier occupancy.
CONCEPT 4

*Preferred Concept*

- Two separate buildings: City (Recreation Complex and Idea Exchange) and School Boards (both schools and child care)
- Developable site can be severed according to the ownership ratios determined between the City and School Boards
- Outdoor play and amenity areas continue to be shared between all users on an agreed schedule
- Fully separated parking and drop-off for School Board and City components, which may be shared as per agreement
- Community park located between the two buildings maximizes visibility and access to playground and outdoor open space from the street
- Entrance to City facilities creates a “main street” highlighting all key city activities
- Compact and efficient plan reduces the combined schools’ gross floor area
- School circulation is clearly separated for each Board
- Total Joint-use Complex:
  - GFA: 222,053 square feet
  - Estimated Total Project Cost: $93,135,000
CONCEPT 5

- Three separate buildings: City (Recreation Complex and Idea Exchange), WRSDB Elementary School and Child Care, and WCDSB Elementary School
- Developable site can be severed according to the ownership ratios determined between the City and School Boards
- Outdoor play and amenity areas continue to be shared between all users on an agreed schedule
- Fully separated parking and drop-off for School Board and City components, which may be shared as per agreement
- Limited visibility and access to playground and outdoor open space from the street
- Entrance to City facilities creates a "main-street" highlighting all key City activities
- Total Joint-use Complex:
  - GFA: 225,003 square feet
  - Estimated Total Project Cost: $94,339,000
SEPARATE BUILDINGS CONCEPT PLANS
CONCEPT 5: One Campus, Three Separate Facilities
Second Floor Plan
ENGINEERING DESIGN BRIEFS

Civil, structural, mechanical and electrical design briefs were prepared to describe the site and building engineering design requirements for the concepts. Refer to Appendix A4 for Civil, Structural, Mechanical and Electrical Design Briefs

ANALYSIS

PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT MATRIX

A detailed matrix was used to assess each concept during the preliminary concept development phase of this feasibility study. All partners participated in assessing the concepts. The advantages/disadvantages, risks and opportunities for each concept were assessed, evaluating the following:

- Site
- Building Program
- Building Operations
- Sustainability
- Capital and Operating Costs
- Construction Implications

Concept designs were finalized and a detailed analysis and ranking was completed for each, the results of which are presented below.

*All partners agreed on the overall ranking of the five preliminary concept plans. Concepts 2 and 4 emerged as the preferred approaches to the joint-use campus.*
CONCEPT 1: One Campus, One Facility, L-shaped Plan

Site
- Opportunities for sharing outdoor play and amenity spaces are maximized
- Separated and convenient parking and drop-off for each user
- Conflict between school buses and access to school parking lot
- Conflict between main building service area and City parking lot access (this will be mitigated by future access from East Boundary Road)
- Limited open space and play areas available to community during the school day
- Wesley Boulevard frontage dominated by building and asphalt; does not present a “park face” to the community
- Very good identity for each user, with addresses on Wesley Boulevard

Building Program
- Opportunities for joint-use and sharing are maximized
- Each component’s footprint is clearly delineated
- No potential for future additions to the schools

Building Operations
- Each component can be independently secured
- Very good access for sharing between the schools and the Idea Exchange
- Access to the WRDSB’s shared gymnasium requires Recreation Complex users to use school corridors
- Distance to a single shared service and garbage is challenging for the schools
- Very efficient centrally located shared mechanical plant
- Shared central plant will require the School Boards to follow the City’s operational timelines

Sustainability
- Achieving LEED Gold for the City facilities is challenging due to the complexities of separating the building systems
- Building envelope (cladding ratio of exterior wall to gross floor area) is high for the school reducing efficiency

Capital and Operating Costs
- All building components have achieved gross floor area reductions over the original benchmarks space program
- Area reductions have not been achieved over the reductions targeted through sharing program spaces due to additional circulation/connections to Recreation Complex
- Exterior cladding ratios for the schools are higher than benchmark due to courtyards designed to bring daylight into a dense building form
- The estimated total Construction Cost for Concept 1 is a blended $340 per square foot for all components totaling $74,122,000
- The total construction cost is lowest for this concept because it has the lowest gross floor area of all concepts
- The estimated Total Project Cost (including soft costs) is $92,393,000
- The shared centralized heating, cooling, and air distribution systems can provide significant operational cost savings
- Energy savings can be realized by more efficient equipment, energy recovery, and control strategies
- Maintenance costs can be reduced by using fewer pieces of equipment in fewer locations

Construction Implications
- Limited opportunities to phase the construction as the building systems are interconnected
- Potential to open the schools prior the completion of the Recreation Complex with careful planning and scheduling of construction activities
- Safety is a major concern when partially occupying a school site while under construction
- Construction timelines for the schools are longer than a stand-alone facility affecting occupancy date and construction costs
CONCEPT 2: One Campus, One Facility, Block Plan

Site
- Opportunities for sharing outdoor play and amenity spaces maximized
- Separated and convenient parking and drop-off for each user
- School bus drop-off and access to school parking lot are completely separated
- Conflict between main building service area and City parking lot access (this could be mitigated by future access from East Boundary Road)
- Most open site area available for school playgrounds of all concepts
- More open space and play areas are available to community, during the school day
- Location of building and parking along Wesley Boulevard frontage opens up views and access providing a better “park face” to the community
- Good identity for each user, with main complex addresses on Wesley Boulevard, and school entrances, visible from street, located off the playground

Building Program
- Opportunities for joint-use and sharing are maximized
- Each component’s footprint is clearly delineated
- Good potential for future additions to the schools by expanding the classroom wings to the west

Building Operations
- Each component can be independently secured
- Very good access for sharing between the schools and the Idea Exchange
- Recreation Complex users can access WRDSB’s shared gymnasium without entering school corridors
- Access to the single shared service and garbage is good for all users
- Very efficient centrally located shared mechanical plant
- Shared central plant will require the School Boards to follow the City’s operational timelines

Sustainability
- Achieving LEED Gold for the City facilities is challenging due to the complexities of separating the building systems
- Building envelope (cladding ratio of exterior wall to gross floor area) is fair for the schools and good for the City components

Capital and Operating Costs
- All building components have achieved gross floor area reductions over the original benchmarks space program
- Area reductions have not been achieved over the reductions targeted through sharing program spaces due to additional circulation/connections to Recreation Complex
- Exterior cladding ratios are higher than benchmark funding for the schools due to plan configuration to bring daylight into a dense building form
- The estimated total Construction Cost for Concept 2 is a blended $335 per square foot for all components totaling $76,843,000
- The construction cost is higher than Concept 1 due to the larger GFA of the Recreation Complex. The overall cost per square foot is lower. The GFA can be reduced during the design development phase to reduce construction costs
- The estimated Total Project Cost (including soft costs) is $96,076,000
- The shared centralized heating, cooling, and air distribution systems can provide significant operational cost savings
- Energy savings can be realized by more efficient equipment, energy recovery, and control strategies
- Maintenance costs can be reduced by using fewer pieces of equipment in fewer locations

Construction Implications
- Limited opportunities to phase the construction as the building systems are interconnected
- Potential to open the schools prior to the completion of the Recreation Complex with careful planning and scheduling of construction activities
- Safety is a major concern when partially occupying a school site while under construction. Construction timelines for the schools are longer than a stand-alone facility affecting occupancy date and construction costs
CONCEPT 3: One Campus, One Facility, Linear Plan

Site

- Opportunities for sharing outdoor play and amenity spaces maximized
- Single driveway access creates major conflict and congestion issues
- No clear separation of parking for each user group
- Linear parking layout creates safety issues
- Drop-off for schools and child care are not conveniently located
- Conflict between school buses and access to main parking lot
- Conflict between main building service area and City parking lot access (this could be mitigated by future access from East Boundary Road)
- Maximizes open site area available for school playgrounds of all concepts
- Some open space and play areas are available to community, during the school day
- Location of building and parking along the future East Boundary Road frontage opens up views and access creating a “building in a park”
- Poor identity for each user from Wesley Boulevard; each user has an identity and access off the parking and greenspace along East Boundary Road

Building Program

- Opportunities for joint-use and sharing are maximized
- The schools’ footprint is not clearly delineated; school gymnasiums are accessed from the Recreation Complex circulation
- Recreation Complex gymnasiums are located above the Idea Exchange resulting in access and supervision issues, and complex construction to mitigate sound and vibration issues
- Good potential for future additions to the schools by expanding the classroom wings to the south west

Building Operations

- More challenging to independently secure each component
- Distance to the Idea Exchange makes access for sharing with the schools challenging
- Conflict between for Recreation Complex users and the schools in accessing school gymnasiums
- Distance to a single shared service and garbage is challenging for the City
- Components, requiring access through the schools
- Linear plan reduces efficiency of shared mechanical plant
- Shared central plant will require the School Boards to follow the City’s operational timelines

Sustainability

- Achieving LEED Gold for the City facilities is challenging due to the complexities of separating the building systems
- Building envelope (cladding ratio of exterior wall to gross floor area) is high for all components (except the Idea Exchange) reducing efficiency

Capital and Operating Costs

- Gross floor area reductions over the original benchmarks space program have not been achieved by all building components
- Area reductions have not been achieved over the reductions targeted through sharing program spaces due to inefficient building plan and additional circulation/connections to Recreation Complex
- Exterior cladding ratios are highest of all concepts due to linear building configuration
- The estimated total Construction Cost for Concept 3 is a blended $337 per square foot for all components totaling $75,537,000
- The estimated Total Project Cost (including soft costs) is $94,077,000
- The shared centralized heating, cooling, and air distribution systems can provide operational cost savings
- Energy savings can be realized by more efficient equipment, energy recovery, and control strategies
- Maintenance costs can be reduced by using fewer pieces of equipment in fewer locations

Construction Implications

- Limited opportunities to phase the construction as the building systems are interconnected and building program elements not clearly separated
- No potential to open the schools prior the completion of the Recreation Complex
- Construction timelines for the schools are longer than a stand-alone facility affecting occupancy date and construction costs
CONCEPT 4: One Campus, Two Separate Facilities

*Preferred Concept*

Site
- Opportunities for sharing outdoor play and amenity spaces maximized
- Community Park is highly visible and inviting to the neighbourhood
- Separated and convenient parking and drop-off for each user, can be shared as needed
- School bus drop-off and access to school parking lot are completely separated
- Conflict between City building service area and City parking lot access (this could be mitigated by future access from East Boundary Road)
- Generous open site area available for school playgrounds
- Very good identity for each user, with addresses on Wesley Boulevard

Building Program
- Opportunities for joint-use and sharing are maximized in the schools
- Opportunities for joint-use and sharing between the schools and City components are available, but not readily accessible
- Opportunities for sharing between the Recreation Complex and Idea Exchange are maximized with the multi-purpose rooms and makerspace
- Recreation Complex requires a third gym as sharing with the schools is not convenient
- Schools require additional science and art classrooms as the classroom and maker space located in the Idea Exchange are not convenient
- Each component’s footprint is clearly delineated
- Some potential for future additions to the schools by expanding to the north

Building Operations
- Each component can be independently secured
- Two building can operate completely independently
- Balances opportunities for sharing with need for identity, security & funding limitations
- Separate garbage and service areas are required for each building
- Separate mechanical plants are required for each building

Sustainability
- LEED Gold for the City facilities is achievable
- Building envelope (cladding ratio of exterior wall to gross floor area) meets acceptable standards for all components

Capital and Operating Costs
- The schools have achieved gross floor area reductions over the original benchmarks space program
- The Recreation Complex has achieved the targeted gross floor area
- Exterior cladding ratios are efficient for each of the buildings
- The estimated total Construction Cost for Concept 4 is a blended $335 per square foot for all components totaling $74,491,000
- The construction cost per square foot is the lower for this concept based on simple efficient building forms
- The estimated Total Project Cost (including soft costs) is $93,135,000
- The decentralized approach can lead to higher operational costs due to less efficient equipment, more equipment to be maintained, and lower load diversity
- The capital cost of the decentralized equipment can be considerably lower

Construction Implications
- The site can be severed and the schools can be built on their own schedule, in advance of the City portion of the site if desired
CONCEPT 5: One Campus, Three Separate Facilities

Site
- Opportunities for sharing outdoor play and amenity spaces maximized
- Separated and convenient parking and drop-off for each user
- Conflict between school buses and access to school parking lot and Recreation Complex drop-off
- Conflict between City building service area and City parking lot access (this could be mitigated by future access from East Boundary Road)
- Generous open site area available for school playgrounds
- Limited open space and play areas are available to community during the school day
- Wesley Boulevard frontage dominated by building and asphalt; does not present a “park face” to the community
- Very good identity for each user, with addresses on Wesley Boulevard

Building Program
- Opportunities for joint-use and sharing between all partners are available, but not readily accessible
- Recreation Complex requires a third gym as sharing with the schools is not convenient
- Each school requires its own science and art classrooms as they cannot easily share with each other and the classroom and maker space located in the Idea Exchange are not convenient
- Each school requires its own provisions for a stage as they cannot share as in the other concepts
- Each component’s footprint is clearly delineated
- Some potential for future additions to the schools by expanding to the north

Sustainability
- LEED Gold for the City facilities is achievable
- Building envelope (cladding ratio of exterior wall to gross floor area) is higher for the schools, because they are separate buildings, reducing efficiency

Capital and Operating Costs
- The schools meet the gross floor area of the original benchmarks space program
- The Recreation Complex has not achieved gross floor area reductions due to the low gross-up percentage allocated on the space program and the inherent inefficiencies locating the majority of the program elements on the ground floor resulting in a small second floor plate
- Cladding ratios are efficient for each of the buildings
- The estimated total Construction Cost for Concept 5 is a blended $336 per square foot for all components totaling $75,571,000
- The estimated Total Project Cost (including soft costs) is $94,339,000
- In Concept 5, the HVAC systems are further decentralized resulting in the highest operational costs of all concepts due to the amount of equipment provided and the lowest load diversity
- The capital cost is unlikely to be less than that of Concept 4 because a larger number of smaller pieces of equipment are required

Construction Implications
- The site can be severed and the schools can be built on their own schedule, in advance of the City portion of the site if desired
ORDER OF MAGNITUDE COST ESTIMATE METHODOLOGY

An Order of Magnitude Cost Estimate is an estimate based on an initial functional program and preliminary conceptual plans. It is comprised of an elemental summary, and based on a rough cost per square foot for each element. The level of certainty, or potential cost variation, of this estimate is generally +/-15% to 20% depending on the complexity of the project. The costing includes a design and pricing allowances of 10% for items not yet known at this early stage of design. Allowances for construction price escalation and potential impact of Covid-19 on construction costs are not included in this estimate and should be evaluated as the project proceeds.

Order of Magnitude Construction Cost Estimates were completed for all concepts. Building and site costs were allocated to each component.

Total Project Budget

Total Project Budget is defined as all costs to complete a building project, excluding land acquisition, and in the case of this site, site servicing and rough grading being completed by the subdivision developer. The total project budget is comprised of Hard Costs (construction costs for the site and building) and Soft Costs (other non-construction related costs).

Hard Costs would typically include:
- All labour and material costs directly related to the physical construction of the building, fixed equipment and site
  - Site development, on-site servicing, paving and landscaping
  - Structure
  - Exterior enclosures (cladding and roofing)
  - Interiors (partitions and doors, finishes, fixed fittings and equipment)
  - Services (mechanical, electrical, IT, security, etc.)
  - General Contractors overhead costs and profit

Soft Costs would typically include:
- Furniture and loose equipment
- Consulting fees
- Permit and municipal approvals fees
- Studies such as geotechnical investigations, surveys
- Legal fees
- Internal administration costs
- Owner’s construction contingency
- HST
Development charges are not included in soft costs, and should be treated as a specific exclusion as these can be waived for certain owners. Development charges are not paid by City or School Boards when developing lands for their own purposes.

For school construction soft costs are calculated at 15% of the construction budget. This ratio is stipulated in the Ministry benchmarks for construction. Soft costs for the Recreation Complex and Idea Exchange would be in the range of 25% to 30% of construction budget. School Board soft costs are generally lower than those for public recreational facilities. The largest difference is in FFE (furniture, fittings and equipment). The outfitting of a Recreation Complex and Library is more extensive and expensive. Design and consulting fees are lower for a school project. Project management costs are generally higher for municipal clients.

Construction Cost Methodology for Consolidated Building Concepts (Concepts 1, 2 and 3)

Building Development Costs
- Building costs were allocated to each partner based on their measured GFA, exterior wall area, roofing area, etc. Where spaces are shared, for instance some circulation or mechanical spaces, the costs were allocated pro-rata to each partner.
- School estimated costs are based on standard specifications for a stand-alone school built to Ministry of Education benchmarks, e.g., quality of cladding, roofing, finishes, etc.
- City facility costs are based on specifications for a high-performance building designed to LEED Gold standards.
- Operating costs for the school portion may be higher as the building envelope does not meet the high-performance standards required for the City portions to achieve the desired LEED rating.
- Building envelope (cladding) ratios are higher in the consolidated concepts where courtyards are used to bring daylight into internal spaces of a dense compact plan.
- It is anticipated that a higher tier general contractor would construct the larger, more complex consolidated concepts, because of the Recreation Complex aquatics component, therefore the General Conditions and Fees would be at a higher rate than a stand-alone school or joint schools.
- Shared components, where not specifically designated to one partner’s space program, are allocated to each partner using their respective gross floor area ratio.

Site Development Costs
- Site areas designated for school play were allocated to each Board using the ownership ratios agreed to in the Memorandum of Understanding between all parties (55.2% WRDSB, 44.8% WCDSB)
- Site areas designated for City play, e.g., community park, outdoor courts, future tennis, were allocated to the Recreation Complex
- Parking and paved areas were allocated to each partner using a ratio of the number of parking spaces designated for each
- The remainder of the site development area was allocated to each partner using their agreed ownership ratios (55.4% City, 24.6% WRDSB, 20% WCDSB)

Construction Cost Methodology for Separate Buildings Concepts (Concepts 4 and 5)

Building Development Costs
- Costs were calculated assuming the site is severed using the agreed ownership ratios (55.4% City, 44.6% schools), and facilities are built by two separate contractors
- School estimated costs are based on standard specifications for a stand-alone school built to Ministry of Education benchmarks, e.g., quality of cladding, roofing, finishes, etc.
- City facility costs are based on specifications for a high-performance building designed to LEED Gold standards
- It is anticipated that a higher tier general contractor would construct the larger, more complex City facility therefore the General Conditions and Fees would be at a higher rate than for the stand-alone schools

Site Development Costs
- Site costs were allocated as per the agreed ownership ratios (55.4% City, 44.6% schools)
- Site areas designated for school play were allocated to each Board using their agreed ownership ratios (55.2% WRDSB, 44.8% WCDSB)
- Site areas designated for City play, e.g., community park, outdoor courts, future tennis, were allocated to the Recreation Complex
- Parking and paved areas were allocated to each School Board and between the Recreation Complex and the Idea Exchange, using a ratio of the number of parking spaces designated for each
- Parking and paved areas were allocated to the Recreation Complex and the Idea Exchange using a ratio of the number of parking spaces designated for each

The agreed ownership ratios may be revisited based on detailed design and anticipated needs for building footprint and outdoor amenities, such as play areas, future portable space, drop off areas, etc.
School Costing Notes

The order of magnitude cost estimates for both schools in all concepts exceed the Ministry benchmarks for funding. The WRDSB funding was approved by the Ministry in 2016. The total benchmark project funding for this school is $10,932,002. The WCDSB funding was approved in 2020, at a higher per square foot cost, with total project benchmark funding for this school at $8,652,378. Total project costs includes both hard costs and soft costs. The portion of this funding allocated to construction costs is 85%. School Boards receive funding in addition to the benchmarks noted above, through Education Development Charges (EDC). This funding is available for site preparation costs and extraordinary site costs, e.g., poor soils conditions, engineered fill, storm water management and site services, retaining walls, structural premiums due to site conditions, etc. EDC costs for the schools may be in the order of up to $1,000,000 for each school.

It is typical at the concept design phase for estimated construction costs for school projects to exceed the funding available. Costs are refined through value-engineering as the design progresses.

Value Engineering

Value engineering is a creative and systematic effort, which analyzes the requirements of a project for the purpose of achieving the essential functions at the lowest total costs (capital, staffing, energy, maintenance) over the life of the project. Through a collaborative effort, by all team members, value and economy are improved through the study of alternate design concepts, materials, and methods without compromising the agreed functional and value objectives. Value engineering can be applied at any point in a project, even in construction. However, typically the earlier it is applied the higher the return on the time and effort invested.

The next step in establishing project budgets, as the partners move into the design development phases of the project, would include a value engineering exercise. Value engineering workshops can be where the design team and building stakeholders first create an extensive list of opportunities for savings. In the workshop, “pros and cons” would be established for each item and a corresponding capital value established for each. At the end of the workshop the client group would be asked to agree which items would be accepted to achieve the required cost savings.
General Costing Notes

Achieving the gross floor area targeted reductions for the Recreation Complex is a challenge due to the low gross-up allocated on the space program, and the requirement for generous circulation spaces to operate the facility. Further development of the space program and design, as the project moves forward, will result in efficiencies that will mitigate this issue. This process is typical and is similar to the value engineering process.

There may be opportunities to fund specific items e.g., school playground equipment, outdoor classrooms, Recreation Complex equipment, etc., through community fundraising or corporate sponsorships.

As the difference in total construction costs for the various concepts is not substantial, a 5% variance between the lowest and highest, capital cost should not be used as the key factor in selecting the preferred concept. Over a 40-year building lifespan design and construction costs are approximately 15% to 20% of the total building cost, capital asset management is 10% to 20%, and operations and maintenance are by far the biggest cost of ownership at 60% to 80%.

The following chart summarizes the estimate total project cost for each partner in relation to their benchmark areas, targeted area reductions for joint-use of space in the consolidated concepts, and benchmark funding for the schools.

Refer to the Appendix A5 for the Elemental Cost Summary for each Concept.
## CAMBRIDGE JOINT-USE CAMPUS - TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CONCEPT 1</th>
<th>CONCEPT 2</th>
<th>CONCEPT 3</th>
<th>CONCEPT 4</th>
<th>CONCEPT 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GFA</strong></td>
<td><strong>$/sf</strong></td>
<td><strong>Amount</strong></td>
<td><strong>GFA</strong></td>
<td><strong>$/sf</strong></td>
<td><strong>Amount</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WRDSB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>56,741 $295</td>
<td>$14,959,000 51,990 $279</td>
<td>$14,483,000 53,206 $291</td>
<td>$15,503,000 52,773 $263</td>
<td>$13,892,000 54,896 $271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target GFA for construction (including larger gym in Consolidated)</td>
<td>53,745</td>
<td>53,745</td>
<td>53,745</td>
<td>53,705</td>
<td>53,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target GFA (to be funded by WRDSB, only applies to Consolidated)</td>
<td>52,535</td>
<td>52,535</td>
<td>52,535</td>
<td>52,535</td>
<td>52,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WRDSB Child Care</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>8,934 $317</td>
<td>$2,836,000 8,611 $317</td>
<td>$2,729,000 8,503 $318</td>
<td>$2,704,000 8,503 $312</td>
<td>$2,651,000 8,665 $318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark (based on 2016 Ministry Funding)</td>
<td>8,500 $303</td>
<td>$2,571,267 8,500 $303</td>
<td>$2,571,267 8,500 $303</td>
<td>$2,571,267 8,500 $303</td>
<td>$2,571,267 8,500 $303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WCDSB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>40,935 $308</td>
<td>$12,607,000 39,267 $307</td>
<td>$12,064,000 42,528 $315</td>
<td>$13,395,000 41,335 $287</td>
<td>$11,857,000 42,001 $293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark (based on 2020 Ministry Funding)</td>
<td>42,645 $203</td>
<td>$8,652,378 42,645 $203</td>
<td>$8,652,378 42,645 $203</td>
<td>$8,652,378 42,645 $203</td>
<td>$8,652,738 42,645 $203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target GFA for construction (including shared stage in Consolidated)</td>
<td>39,655</td>
<td>39,655</td>
<td>39,655</td>
<td>41,215</td>
<td>42,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target GFA (to be funded by WCDSB, only applies to Consolidated)</td>
<td>39,065</td>
<td>39,065</td>
<td>39,065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation Complex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>103,670 $541</td>
<td>$56,115,000 115,676 $527</td>
<td>$60,936,000 106,375 $534</td>
<td>$56,843,000 105,842 $553</td>
<td>$58,490,000 105,842 $550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target GFA (to be funded by City, only applies to Consolidated)</td>
<td>100,960</td>
<td>100,960</td>
<td>106,160</td>
<td>106,160</td>
<td>106,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idea Exchange</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>13,600 $432</td>
<td>$5,876,000 13,600 $430</td>
<td>$5,854,000 13,600 $414</td>
<td>$5,632,000 13,600 $459</td>
<td>$6,245,000 13,600 $458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Approved GFA</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>13,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target GFA for construction (Consolidated Concepts only)</td>
<td>13,790</td>
<td>13,790</td>
<td>13,790</td>
<td>13,790</td>
<td>13,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target GFA (to be funded by Idea Exchange)</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>13,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint-use Complex Total Estimated Project Cost</strong></td>
<td>217,880 $424</td>
<td>$92,393,000 229,144 $419</td>
<td>$96,076,000 224,213 $420</td>
<td>$94,077,000 222,053 $419</td>
<td>$93,135,000 225,003 $419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSTRUCTION TIMELINES

Typical Project Schedule

Consolidated Concepts

After completion of the Feasibility Study, and agreement by all parties to proceed, the design and construction phase of the project will begin. Design and approvals for a project of this scope and complexity will take 18 to 24 months. The bidding and procurement (tender) phase would take 2 to 3 months, and construction would span a minimum 2 years. A typical project schedule, for a project of this scope and complexity, from the beginning of the design and construction phase to occupancy is 4 to 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Name</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUC Draft Project Schedule</td>
<td>198 wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP for Consulting Services</td>
<td>12 wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Approvals</td>
<td>74 wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schematic Design</td>
<td>10 wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development</td>
<td>12 wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Documents</td>
<td>28 wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approvals</td>
<td>36 wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Plan Approval</td>
<td>36 wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit</td>
<td>8 wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry Approval to Proceed</td>
<td>16 wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender</td>
<td>8 wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Administration</td>
<td>112 wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>104 wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial Performance</td>
<td>0 wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Fit-up</td>
<td>8 wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>0 wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Separated Buildings Concepts

For the recommended approach, Concept 4, if the site is severed each partner can proceed at its own pace. The City facility schedule will be the same as the schedule for the Consolidated Concepts. For the combined school facility, the design and approvals phase will take 12 to 18 months. The bidding and procurement (tender) phase would take 2 months, and construction would span a minimum 14 months. A typical project schedule, for the combined schools, from the beginning of the design and construction phase to occupancy is approximately 3 years.
POTENTIAL RISKS

When the project moves forward into the design and construction phase there are risks that should be monitored. These are noted throughout the report and summarized below:

### Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation of Development and Joint-use Agreements</td>
<td>Delay to project start and occupancy for all parties</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding allows work to continue while agreements are resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Select a separate buildings option and sever land to allow owners to proceed at own pace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex approvals process including Rezoning, Site Plan Approval, GRCA</td>
<td>Delay to project start and occupancy for all parties</td>
<td>Allow for lengthy approvals process in project schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further reduction of usable site area due to wetland restrictions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of construction of East Boundary Road</td>
<td>Limits access to site from one street only - Wesley Boulevard</td>
<td>Ensure on-site traffic can operate effectively without the future EBR access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenges in meeting Ministry benchmarks for school construction</td>
<td>Delayed Ministry Approval to Proceed with Construction</td>
<td>Continuous value engineering and assessment of all decisions throughout the design process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation costs due to lengthy project schedule are not funded by Ministry</td>
<td>Extensive cost savings measures required to meet benchmark, affecting project scope or quality</td>
<td>Maximize sharing opportunities and minimize gross-up to reduce GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark square foot costs do not align with current construction market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting the gross floor area cap for the Recreation Complex when the allocated percentage gross-up area is insufficient</td>
<td>Gross floor area exceeds City benchmark, increasing construction cost</td>
<td>Careful review of space program to find efficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuous value engineering and assessment of all decisions throughout the design process to reduce GFA while maintaining required functional program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenge in achieving LEED Gold for City components in consolidated building concepts</td>
<td>City does not meet its sustainability targets, affecting operating costs</td>
<td>Maximize sustainable initiatives within LEED framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

When the project moves forward into the design and construction phase there are a number of items that should be addressed. These are noted throughout the report and summarized below:

Site
- Undertake a topographical survey of the property upon completion of the developer’s grading (currently underway at time of this report) to assess new site conditions and full scope of grading challenges and opportunities
- Update geotechnical investigations to provide general soils information for detailed engineering design, and to assess the feasibility of geothermal, ground source heat pump systems, on site
- Complete a detailed review of Zoning requirements and how they might be different once the property is severed
- Maintain ongoing conversation with the Region to keep updated on the design and construction timing of future East Boundary Road, as well as explore right-in-right-out access from this road onto the site
- Maintain ongoing conversations with the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA): conduct a thorough review of the Environmental Impact Study to confirm detailed bounds of development related to the wetlands, as well as details of required GRCA development permit
- Determine ownership conveyance of the protected wetlands on the north-western site boundary
- Maintain ongoing conversations with Grand River Transit to assess appropriate location of new bus stop on Wesley Boulevard or potentially on the joint-use campus site
- Undertake a transportation impact and parking demand study to confirm parking requirements

Space Program and Project Costs
- Continue detailed development of space program requirements for Recreation Complex including:
  - Consideration of 8-lane pool, which is typical for many other municipalities and will reduce project cost
  - Review of allocation of gross-up area, which at 15% is very low for a facility of this scope and complexity
- Engage in on-going value engineering for all components to align gross floor area and project costs with benchmarks, while achieving the essential functions over the life of the project
- Undertake energy modeling and an associated financial analysis, comparing premium capital costs associated with energy saving measures against payback and savings over time, to determine sustainability targets for the project.
- Allowances for construction price escalation and potential impact of Covid-19 on construction costs are not included in this estimate and should be evaluated as the project proceeds.
- Pursue additional funding for school design and construction of the schools through a detailed analysis of funding available from Education Development Charges, which are available for site preparation costs and extraordinary site costs.
- Consider opportunities to fund specific items through community fundraising or corporate sponsorships.

Partner Agreements
- Engage in continuing collaboration between all partners to establish development, joint-use and operational agreements.
- Revisit ownership ratios based on detailed design and anticipated needs.
Joint Use Agreements
JOINT USE AGREEMENTS

In addition to Development and Capital Cost Sharing Agreements, the partners must work together to establish a Joint-use Agreement for the campus. This is a formal agreement between all parties setting out the terms and conditions for shared use of the site and facilities.

The agreement will reflect the unique requirements of the specific design of the facility, e.g., the agreement for a fully consolidated building will look very different from the agreement for one or two, or three separate buildings sharing a site; and it will be different again if the site is severed.

The negotiation of a joint-use agreement is a lengthy legal process and requires cooperation from all parties. The partnership between the City, Idea Exchange and School Boards has been strengthened by their cooperative effort throughout the feasibility study process. The collaborative development of multiple design concepts has advanced all of the partners’ understanding and appreciation of the benefits and complexities of sharing.

The following topics will form the basis of the Joint-use Agreement:

General Terms of the Agreement
- Establish effective date, number of years, and protocol for renewal

Governance
- Establish a Joint Campus Operations Steering Committee
- Investigate any union/contract issues between parties to the agreement

Communication Protocol
- Identify who will be responsible for communicating with partners about the agreement
- Identify who will be responsible for making decisions regarding the agreement
- Establish a process for resolving disagreements regarding any aspect of the agreement

Priority of Uses/Scheduling
- Rank the priority of use of specific shared facilities between each partner, to allocate facility use accordingly, e.g., use of gymnasiums; meeting rooms; outdoor play areas; before and after school programs and space use; etc.
- Determine which entity will be responsible for scheduling use
- Determine how to accommodate schedule changes
- Establish staggered bell-times for two schools to accommodate drop-off and use of outdoor play areas

Third-Party Use
- Establish the priority of uses for third-party programs
- Agree on the protocol for scheduling
- Coordinate third-party permitting or lease procedures
Access and Security
- Determine security needs
- Identify employees who will need access to each partner’s property or facilities
- Develop security protocol
- Establish one security platform that can be customized for each party, e.g., School Boards’ lock-down and safe welcome requirements
- Consider one full time central contact and security office for all parties

IT and Communications
- Coordinate IT and communications systems for shared networks with individual controls for each user
- Establish IT network security protocols

Custodial Services
- Determine any shared custodial services/equipment needed
- Allocate responsibility for waste management

Operations and Maintenance
- Establish a single Building Operations lead (likely the City) to manage shared facilities and building systems
- Determine which components of costs to measure, the methodology to use to determine costs, and how to allocate costs and fees
- Ensure separate metering of any shared services for each partner
- Allocate responsibility for regular property maintenance
- Determine whether additional maintenance is needed, and which party will provide service

Inspection and Notification of Damage
- Coordinate the manner/frequency of property inspection
- Determine protocol for notifying partners of damage

Restitution and Repair
- Determine the method and responsibility for property repair and replacement
- Determine the methods of calculating and allocating repair costs

Improvements Protocols
- Establish conditions governing how partners will be permitted to make improvements (renovations/additions)

Risk Management and Legal Issues
- Determine the types and amounts of insurance to require, consistent with each partners’ risk management requirements
- Allocate liability risk and determine whether or what type of indemnification is required

Dispute Resolution
- Establish a procedure for resolving disputes
Conclusions
The proposed joint-use campus will create a community hub offering educational, recreational and cultural activities for all ages for this Cambridge community. A shared approach provides better value for money for the community, and best utilization of all program spaces.

A number of approaches (consolidated and separate) have been explored. All conceptual approaches demonstrate that a joint-use campus is achievable and will provide much greater benefits to the community than stand-alone buildings on stand-alone sites.

The site is well located for access by the current and future residents of this developing neighbourhood. Planned active transportation networks and transit infrastructure will provide healthy and sustainable alternatives to vehicular access to the campus. The wetland to the west creates learning opportunities for the students and a naturalized buffer to the site. The site is appropriately sized to accommodate the building program and required parking and drop-off facilities, while providing generous open greenspace for active and passive play.

The proposed partnership between the City, Idea Exchange and two School Boards creates an exemplary community hub providing a seamless integrated day from child care, school day, before and after, and after hours and weekends for all age groups. A detailed analysis of each partner’s program offerings explored sharing opportunities and synergies that benefit all users. Students and users of the joint-use campus benefit from sharing and exposure to new activities at the Recreation Complex and Idea Exchange. Families can participate in multiple different activities on the same site. Multi-generational community connections are enhanced and encouraged.

Many factors were considered when making a final decision on whether to proceed with a fully consolidated building (Concept 2: One Campus, One Facility) or a separated buildings approach (Concept 4: One Campus, Two Separate Facilities).
The **Consolidated Building Concepts**, of which Concept 2: One Campus, One Facility is preferred, exploit the many joint-use and sharing opportunities most effectively through proximity, convenience, and both physical and visual access to these activities which are all available within a single complex. Within a consolidated facility both planned and serendipitous joint-use are possible. Open greenspace and playground areas are maximized. The facility and its central plant can be managed by a single operator (the City), reducing operations and maintenance costs.

The decision to proceed with a **Separated Buildings Concept**, of which **Concept 4: One Campus, Two Separate Facilities** is preferred, is based on three major factors.

The first important factor is capital cost. The separated concepts allow the City and the School Boards to proceed at their own pace. The design and construction of the City facility will take longer than the shared school building. In this concept the school construction can be accelerated. This is important as the funds for school construction are fixed; the Ministry benchmark does not allow for additional funding for construction cost escalation. Meeting the required gross floor areas is also more achievable for all partners in separated buildings. The additional circulation required to maintain safe and secure access to each component while sharing, and the complex plan configurations required to bring daylight into the dense building footprint are eliminated. Reducing gross floor area, while maintaining the required functional program, is an essential consideration in reducing both capital and operating costs.

The second issue is the necessary separation of elementary-aged school children, for safety and security reasons, from the general population using the rest of the facility. Although this challenge is addressed in the concept designs of the consolidated building by ensuring separate and secure entrances and circulation for the schools, all partners agree that the campus will operate most successfully in two separate buildings. Outdoor play space for the schools is also more clearly defined and secured during the school day. The two separate buildings frame a community park, accessible at all times to local residents directly off Wesley Boulevard.

The third factor is the challenge and complexity of the development a Joint-use Agreement, which may take a number of years to complete, and the impact that may have on opening date of these much needed elementary schools. A memorandum of understanding, regarding the joint-use terms and conditions could mitigate this issue. As the schools’ scheduled opening is paramount, Concept 4 allows the site to be severed and the school construction to proceed at an accelerated pace.
Effective deployment of capital investment and operational efficiencies will be realized to varying degrees depending on the approach selected when moving forward with the project. It is important to note that the concept designs are only the beginning of a process. When a decision is made to proceed, the selected space program and design will continue to be developed in detail, meeting each users’ specific program requirements, while finding more synergies, and value-engineering to achieving the essential functions at the lowest total costs over the life of the project.

The purpose this study, and of testing a variety of conceptual designs, is to facilitate a decision on whether the proposed joint-use campus is feasible. Is it a good investment of public funds? Does it enhance each partner’s vision? Does the community benefit? This study concludes that the answer is “yes” to all of those questions.

_The final recommendation is to proceed with Concept 4: One Campus, Two Separate Facilities_
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SITE EVALUATION
SITE LOCATION

The 32.5 acres site of the future joint-use complex is located in the south-east end of Cambridge, north of Dundas Street South and Branchton Road, in a developing residential community. The areas directly to the north of the site include agricultural lands. Further north are the Shades Mill Conservation Lands and Reservoir.

Moffat Creek, and its adjacent wetlands (protected by the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA)), form the western boundary of the site. A significant commercial and retail hub exists further west to serve the community at Dundas Street South and Franklin Boulevard.

The east property line runs adjacent to the future East Boundary Road, while the South Point subdivision (also referred to as the Bosdale Subdivision) is under development to the south of the site.
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS

The site’s nearby lands have been subject to increasing development pressure from the west. The surrounding residential neighbourhoods consist of predominantly low-rise, single-family home subdivisions. Further development of similar and increased density is planned to be developed over the next 5-10 years.

Immediately south of the new joint-use campus site is the South Point subdivision, a mixed density residential subdivision. Future plans will include single family homes, as well as a greater density through the inclusion of townhomes. It is planned for over 300 new residential units.
Lands south-east of the site near Vanier Drive have approved plans for single family units and townhouses (1,065 units). Lands immediately north-east of the site are owned by the developers of the South Point lands. While no plans are known at the time of writing this report, it is reasonable to anticipate further residential subdivisions in this area. Further north of the site, just beyond Hwy 97 (Main Street), the proposed Moffat Creek housing development is planned to include low-rise single-family and townhouse units (approximately 200+ units).

It is estimated that once the area is fully developed, over 26,500 residents will be within a 15-minute walking distance from the proposed complex. (report to City Council: Recreation Complex Opportunities, March 5, 2019,)
ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Soils and Site Grading

The lands north of ‘Littles Corners’ up to Main Street (Hwy 97) and beyond consist of ‘Wentworth till’: fairly stony, sandy silt till with ‘Hummocky’ (hilly) topography. Further details about the present soil conditions can be found in the Geotechnical Investigations prepared by Naylor Engineering Associates (2005). It is recommended these reports be updated by the City prior to construction.


The joint-use campus site – consisting of former agricultural lands – had largely retained those characteristics until recent regrading efforts. The site drains north-west in the direction of Moffat Creek, from 298.5m (AMSL) at the south-east corner to a low point of 284.50m at the site’s western edge – though the planned elevation at the limit of development will be closer to 289.0m according to the site grading plan.

At the time of this report, grading had begun of both the Joint-use site and South Point lands to the south, to conform with requirements for the overall subdivision stormwater management strategy. The ultimate intent is for the hills to be smoothed out, and for the site to retain a more gradual slope north and west towards the creek and wetlands (as well as the Storm Water Management (SWM) basin south of the site), with an area of maximum 3:1 slope to meet current grades along the western edge of the wetland buffer and development boundary.
Stockpiling of surplus topsoil for both the City site and subdivision is anticipated along a substantial portion of the eastern edge of the site. Significant grade differential along this eastern edge will require any development (including paving) to be setback from the eastern property line. It is recommended that surveying of the property be undertaken upon completion of the developer’s grading to assess full scope of grading challenges and requirements.

**ACCESS**

Primary access to all facilities of the site will be from Wesley Boulevard. It is recommended that primary access align, where possible, with new Faith Street to the south and that any secondary eastern access point align with Bastien Street to the east. The current plan of subdivision does not contemplate that the western private road west of Faith Street connect to Wesley Boulevard at this time. This approach to site access appears to be supported by the City.

Connection to Wetland  (source CS&P)

**Connection to wetland**

Usable site area is reduced from 32.5 acres to approximately 26.3 acres by wetland setbacks and alignment of the future East Boundary Road. Further details about wetlands can be found in the GRCA subsection below.
EAST BOUNDARY ROAD

The proposed East Boundary Road is a Regional road, planned as an urban road divided by a raised concrete median. Construction of Phase 1 from Franklin Boulevard to the Wesley Boulevard roundabout is scheduled for 2026/2027. Depending on City progress and coordination of Wesley Boulevard construction, East Boundary Road may be completed for service, or the construction may be limited to pre-grade, construct ditching and outlet. The section running north of Wesley is a future phase and is not currently programmed within the next 10 years for construction. Timing is contingent on Regional Council approvals, and could be subject to change.

To improve access to the proposed joint-use campus and relieve anticipated traffic volume on Wesley Boulevard, it is suggested that Right-In-Right-Out access to the site be further explored with the Region. As the timing for the portion of East Boundary Road bounding the site is uncertain, the concept plans must function without this access. Plans for a potential future driveway will improve site access and internal site circulation. The Region may extend the East Boundary Road to provide access to the joint-use site in Phase 1.

ZONING

Currently, the majority of the site is zoned H(R4) – low density residential. Re-zoning of lands to institutional (N1 for schools, childcare and library) and recreational (OS2 and/or C1) land use may be required to support the development of the facility.

The south-western portion of the site, bounded by Moffat Creek is zoned OS1 – Open Space – which does not support the introduction of buildings or structures with very limited exceptions. See section 3.5.1.1 of the City of Cambridge Zoning By-Law No. 150-85 for further details of exceptions.
GRAND RIVER CONSERVATION AUTHORITY (GRCA)

Moffat Creek, which runs along the western boundary of the site, is located in the Moffat Creek Subwatershed of the larger Grand River Watershed.

Due to its proximity to Moffat Creek, and regardless of distance from regional flood boundaries, development on any part of the site will be subject to full GRCA review as part of the Authority having jurisdiction (AHJ) approvals process - at time of Site Plan Approval (SPA) and Building Permit submissions (and likely during re-zoning). A development permit from GRCA will be required to build on this site.

GRCA confirmed the site has been severed as ‘city lands’ in the plan of subdivision, though as stated above, the zoning appears to remain unchanged from the current low-density residential H(R4) designation at the time of writing this report.

A 30m wide wetland buffer runs through the north-west edge of the site and the Waterloo Regional flood line boundary runs along a similar line nearby. In addition, a 10m vegetation drip line buffer runs nearby, reducing the area available for development from the 32.5-acre site to approximately 26.3 acres.
Any development proposed that infringes GRCA wetland or flood boundaries would be subject to significant additional approvals, environmental studies and development permits. This would result in a longer development schedule for the project. Development of any kind – other than a possible recreational pedestrian trail - is therefore not recommended beyond the wetland buffer limits, the regional flood line or the drip line buffer (to the west and north).

GRCA does not anticipate any other restrictions/setbacks imposed that would further impede onto the site or reduce the build-to line other than noted above and in the diagram below (site area available for development).

**STORMWATER MANAGEMENT**

It is understood that stormwater management (SWM) for the site will be handled as part of the larger South Point subdivision SWM plan. As per site servicing plans the SWM facility is located within South Point subdivision (outside City Lands). Grading for the site to support that plan is underway at time of writing this report. Refer to Appendix A4 for Municipal Site Engineering Review for further known details and recommendations concerning SWM.
ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION - TRAILS AND CONNECTIONS

The City of Cambridge encourages active transportation. The Waterloo Region has a rich network of bike and multi-use trails connecting its various townships. ‘Bike your city: Cambridge Cycling Master Plan’, finalized in March 2020, and endorsed by Council on October 20, 2020, identifies the development of bike lanes on the north and south sides of Wesley Boulevard as a long-term goal. Bike lanes are also planned for future development on either side of East Boundary Road. The joint-use campus will be well supported by this network of bike and multi-use trails.

Existing and Proposed Bikeway Networks in South Cambridge (source: Bike Your City Cycling Master Plan Final Report, March 2020)

Bike and Multi-Use Trails around and through the site – Current and Proposed Trails (source: CS&P, generated from research retrieved from City of Cambridge – Engineering and Transportation Services Community Development)
GRAND RIVER TRANSIT

The current plan under development is for Route 50 to extend across Wesley Boulevard, with on street stops at the joint-use campus, turn south on Faith Street to Dundas and Branchton. This plan is in early stages and requires coordination, consultations and approvals prior to implementation. Planning should include a concrete pad for future bus shelters at stops on the north and south side of Wesley. Consideration may be given for a bus stop on the Joint-use site; however, this is not currently in the transit plan.

Transit (Bus) route map – Current and Future extension of route 50 to serve the site and neighbouring subdivision (source: CS&P, generated from maps and in discussion with Region of Waterloo - Grand River Transit, Transit Development)
SUSTAINABILITY STRATEGIES

REGIONAL DIRECTION

An overarching regional climate mitigation direction and Climate Action Plan for the Waterloo Region has been created, and looks to coordinate the activities of the member communities and monitor their progress on green house gas (GHG) emission targets. The long-term goal is to achieve an 80% greenhouse gas emission reduction below 2010 levels by 2050, using a ladder of goals over time to achieve this target. The 2020 target was a 6% GHG reduction over the base condition at inception. The 10-year target starting in year 2021 has not yet been determined. During the next phase of detailed development, regional targets should be clarified and used as design benchmarks for the project.

GENERAL SUSTAINABLE PRINCIPLES

Building construction and operations can have extensive direct and indirect impacts on the environment, on society, and the economy. Sustainable design principles seek to balance the needs of these areas by using an integrated approach to create design solutions. The main objectives of sustainable design are to reduce, or avoid, depletion of critical resources like energy, water, land, and raw materials; prevent environmental degradation caused by facilities and infrastructure throughout their life cycle. The goal is to create built environments that are accessible, secure, healthy and productive, while minimizing negative impacts upon society, the environment, and the economy.

A number of rating systems and guiding criteria have been developed that can help to guide facility and site design decisions, and optimize a sustainability response. Each rating systems is unique in how they approach and prioritize various sustainability measures. Selected best practice systems and opportunities for the proposed community hub development are outlined below.

LEED

LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) is an internationally recognized green building certification system, providing third-party verification that a facility was designed and built using strategies aimed at improving performance. Metrics include energy savings, water efficiency, CO2 emissions reduction, improved indoor environmental quality, and stewardship of resources and sensitivity to their impacts. LEED provides a point system to score green building design and construction. The system is categorized in five basic areas: Sustainable Sites, Water Efficiency, Energy and Atmosphere, Materials and Resources, and Indoor Environmental Quality. Buildings are awarded points based on the extent various sustainable strategies are achieved. The more points awarded the higher the level of certification achieved from Certified, Silver, Gold, to Platinum.
To support the creation of healthy and sustainable communities, the City of Cambridge has mandated all new municipal buildings be LEED Gold Standards. However, Ministry of Education funding benchmarks would limit pursuing LEED certification for the partner public schools, so they may not be included in the LEED certification. The schools have indicated they would be open to implement any recommended sustainable measure and meet the LEED standard as long as they remain within capital funding parameters.

In order to obtain certification, the Recreation Complex would, as part of the LEED process, require its own independent HVAC system, within a LEED defined envelope. As the schools may not be part of the LEED envelope or boundary, they should be separate from an energy standpoint. This means that operational sharing opportunities for a consolidated facility are therefore constrained, and suggest a more defined and independent footprint for the school and city owners would assist in the LEED effort. The consolidated option where all users are in one building is still possible, although perhaps more complex as a defined boundary needs to be created both within the building and on the site.

PASSIVE HOUSE

Passive House (PH) is a rigorous energy-based standard in the design and construction industry, originally developed in Germany for the residential market. It has since expanded across the world and is being applied in many sectors of the industry. The intent of Passive House is to focus on energy and emissions reduction above all other measures, as being most fundamental to climate change remediation. Five principles are central to PH design and construction: super insulated envelopes, airtight construction, high-performance glazing, thermal bridge free detailing, and heat recovery ventilation. For certification, the international PH standard requires very high levels of energy reduction with defined criteria: space heat demand max. 15 kWh/m²a, pressurization test result at 50 Pa max. 0.6 ACH, and Total Primary Energy Demand max. 120 kWh/m²a.

As Passive House is an envelope-based standard, it would not be feasible to apply in a consolidated footprint with partners who were not also seeking certification, as school Ministry funding benchmarks would preclude pursuing PH certification for each or any of the partner public schools. As the Recreation Complex has an energy intensive swimming pool, it is suggested that full certification is not practically achievable in any event. As the level of PH energy reduction targets are very challenging for institutional owners to achieve, many municipal projects are implementing PH principles of energy efficient construction to inform and improve their design, but are not targeting official certification, which could be a suitable approach for this joint use project.
NET ZERO ENERGY BUILDING

A Net Zero Energy Building (NZEB) is defined as a building that produces as much renewable energy as it consumes on an annual basis, while maintaining an acceptable level of service and functionality. In order to meet this requirement, a high performance envelope is first necessary to minimize energy requirements. Once energy uses are reduced to a minimum, then a renewable energy system can be provided as needed to meet the reduced energy load. On site renewable energy sources may include solar water heating, photovoltaics (PV), ground source geothermal and/or air source heat pumps.

A Net Zero Energy Building is possible to achieve on recreation and school buildings. For example, Net Zero is now a required target on many new City of Toronto municipal buildings. The additional capital cost of a NZEB can include triple glazing, increased insulation, envelope testing, as well as PV and geothermal renewable energy sources. The focus on a high performance envelope and other measures with a high impact benefit may offset initial costs and provide a payback over time. Funding strategies can involve roughing in some components and adding at a later date. For example, the facility could be designed with infrastructure to support a solar ready design, with PV panels provided when and if funding becomes available.

There may be financial incentives to offset the increased cost of achieving a net zero energy building, including the Save on Energy High Performance New Construction Initiative, Federation of Canadian Municipalities Innovation Program, and other programs that may become available.

GEOTHERMAL

For renewable energy systems such as geothermal, it is recommended that an exploratory feasibility study be prepared in the early detailed design phase. A business case can be prepared that demonstrates energy savings and payback over a defined period, and identifies incremental design and installation costs of the geothermal renewable energy system over a conventional system.

Design parameters, Building Automation Systems (BAS) capabilities, proposed Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) systems and bore field location studies can verify that a ground source geothermal heat pump system is appropriate for the site. The consulting team can work with a local driller and review the Ontario Geological Survey data to estimate the ground thermal conductivity. A test borehole is usually not required at the early feasibility stage, however, a thermal conductivity test is mandatory during later detailed design if the decision has been made to move forward with the system. As part of the study, an evaluation of the energy modeling, cost, and GHG savings should be prepared, to compare against a conventional system.
Due to the large size of the Joint Use Campus site, preliminary evaluations are that geothermal can be an efficient and effective renewable energy source, for both a consolidated facility option or a separated facility option.

**CONCLUSION**

The sustainability response will be evaluated against the balancing of complex parameters including environmental responsibility, energy efficiency, and creating a healthy environment that contributes to user well being. Evaluating associated construction cost premiums, as well as the ability to optimize cost of ownership over the life cycle, will be a fundamental metric. As energy use has the greatest impact on operating costs, the assistance of rating system criteria that can help reduce energy use and associated GHG emissions may be prioritized.

A practical approach which prioritizes Passive House high performance envelope principles and air quality, together with targeted renewables such as geothermal and PV, may have the greatest impact in both reducing energy, significantly lowering GHG emissions, and promoting a healthy and energy efficient facility. This approach would be suitable for both consolidated and separated design options.

In the next stage of detailed design, it is recommended that energy modeling and an associated financial analysis that can demonstrate a reasonable business case be prepared. This business case can include premium capital costs associated with the energy saving measures, as well as payback and savings over time. Financial incentive programs can be explored to help offset some of the premium costs. A detailed geothermal feasibility study, together with site testing, should be included in this scope. This work should optimally be done as a formalized Sustainability Study in the Schematic Design period of the next phase of design, and would model a number of design options (say 3) against a base case.
### INSTRUCTIONAL AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Location</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Area - Loaded (400-699 sf)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Area - Unloaded (&lt;400 sf)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium Area and Stage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Rooms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Instructional Area

- **Original Program**: 31,870 sf
- **Proposed Program**: 31,070 sf

### OPERATIONAL AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Location</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Office</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Room and Teacher Work Rooms</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>1,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial Areas</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Storage</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>1,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium Storage</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Storage (in Gymnasium)</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Spaces</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>2,130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Operational Area

- **Original Program**: 7,050 sf
- **Proposed Program**: 8,215 sf

### Changes to Areas funded by WRDSB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Original GFA</th>
<th>Proposed GFA</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium Stage Area</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>-850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add for increase to Makerspace</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Changes to Areas funded by WRDSB

- **Original Program**: 38,920 sf
- **Proposed Program**: 38,405 sf

### Total Child Care (GFA)

- **Original Program**: 8,500 sf
- **Proposed Program**: 8,500 sf
- **No changes to Child Care**
# CONSOLIDATED JOINT BUILDING SPACE PROGRAM

## INSTRUCTIONAL AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Type</th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Room Size SF</td>
<td>Floor Area SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Area - Loaded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Area - Unloaded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium and Stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Rooms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Area Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Instructional Area</strong></td>
<td>23,890</td>
<td>22,260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OPERATIONAL AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Type</th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Office</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Shared General Office with WRDSB, efficiency reduces area by 200 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Room and Teacher Work Rooms</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial Areas</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Room</td>
<td>1 230</td>
<td>1 230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Storage</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium Storage</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Storage (in Gymnasium)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Spaces</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>Shared central plant @ 4% of GFA for each partner, area reduced by 340 sf to right-size mechanical space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operational Area</strong></td>
<td>7,015</td>
<td>6,475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sub-total (Net Area)

| WCDSB | | |
| 30,905 | 28,735 |

### Gross-up (38%)

| WCDSB | | |
| 11,740 | 10,920 |

### Total WCDSB (GFA to be constructed)

| WCDSB | | |
| 42,645 | 39,655 |

### WCDSB Potential Area Change

| WCDSB | | |
| -2,990 | |

### Changes to Areas funded by WCDSB

| WCDSB | | |
| Delete Gymnasium Area | -500 | Funded by Recreation Complex |
| Add for increase to Makerspace | 70 | WRDSB portion of area to increase size of Idea Exchange Makerspace to 750 sf |

### Sub-total (Net Area)

| WCDSB | | |
| 30,905 | 28,305 |

### Gross-up (38%)

| WCDSB | | |
| 11,740 | 10,760 |

### Total GFA to be funded by WCDSB

| WCDSB | | |
| 42,645 | 39,065 |

### WCDSB Area Change for Funding

| WCDSB | | |
| -3,580 | |
## Reconnaissance Complex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Type</th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Ground Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Room Size SF</td>
<td>Floor Area SF</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUATICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natatorium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Rooms</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Viewing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,950</td>
<td>11,950</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pool) Mechanical</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Aquatics Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>47,740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATIONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,665</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/Running Track</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use/Meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use/Meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use/Meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Hall of Fame</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Studio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym Storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Recreational Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>42,710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby/Reception</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Skateboard/Scooter Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servery/Canteen</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste/Recycling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading/Receiving</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Other Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total (Net Area)</td>
<td></td>
<td>90,450</td>
<td></td>
<td>86,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross-up (15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,570</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rec Complex (GFA to be constructed)</td>
<td>104,020</td>
<td>99,260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec Complex Potential Area Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4,760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to Areas funded by Rec Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Gymnasium Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total (Net Area)</td>
<td></td>
<td>90,450</td>
<td></td>
<td>87,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross-up (15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,570</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GFA to be funded by Rec Complex</td>
<td>104,020</td>
<td>100,960</td>
<td>Total GFA not to exceed 104,020 sf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec Complex Area Change for Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3,060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Recreation Complex Original Space Program as approved by Council June 18, 2019)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Size</th>
<th>Floor Area</th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size</th>
<th>Floor Area</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC USE SPACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Area with Laptop Bar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lounge Seating &amp; Learning Commons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>Shared with both Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult &amp; Young Adult Book Stacks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's - Program Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's - Play Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's - Book Stacks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Study/Meeting Rooms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Study/Meeting Rooms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Exclusive use by both Boards during school hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makerspace</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Exclusive use by both Boards during school hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Station Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Desk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Entrance &amp; Security Gates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Universal Washroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET PUBLIC USE AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| OPERATIONAL SPACE | | | | | | | |
| IT Server Room | 100 | 100 | |
| Administrative | 1,000 | 1,000 | |
| Staff/Kitchenette/WR | 100 | 100 | |
| Custodial | 0 | 0 | Included in gross up |
| Storage | 0 | 0 | Included in gross up |
| Mechanical | 560 | 560 | Central shared, metered mechanical preferred |
| Waste/Recycling | 0 | 0 | Included in gross up |
| Loading/Receiving | 0 | 0 | Included in gross up |
| NET OPERATIONAL AREA | | | | | | | 1,760 | 1,760 |

| SUB-TOTAL (Net Area) | | | | | | | 11,730 | 11,900 |
| Gross-up (16%) | 1,870 | 1,890 | |
| TOTAL IDEA EXCHANGE (GFA to be constructed) | | | | | | | 13,600 | 13,790 |
| IDEA EXCHANGE POTENTIAL AREA CHANGE | | | | | | | 190 | |

| CHANGES TO AREAS FUNDED BY IDEA EXCHANGE | | | | | | | |
| Delete area to increase Makerspace | | | | | | | -170 | |
| TOTAL IDEA EXCHANGE | | | | | | | 11,730 | 11,730 |
| Gross-up (16%) | 1,870 | 1,870 | |
| TOTAL GFA TO BE FUNDED BY IDEA EXCHANGE | | | | | | | 13,600 | 13,600 |
| IDEA EXCHANGE AREA CHANGE FOR FUNDING | | | | | | | 0 | |

| TOTAL JUC GFA | | | | | | | 222,005 | 214,860 |
| TOTAL JUC POTENTIAL AREA CHANGE | | | | | | | -7,345 | |
### INSTRUCTIONAL AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Type</th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>5 1,100 5,500 Y</td>
<td>5 1,100 5,500 Y</td>
<td>Between Boards, based on utilization Community use after hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>14 760 10,640</td>
<td>14 760 10,640</td>
<td>Between Boards, based on utilization Community use after hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Room</td>
<td>1 1,030 1,030</td>
<td>1 1,030 1,030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Room</td>
<td>1 1,230 1,230</td>
<td>1 1,230 1,230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Area</td>
<td>1 1,395 1,395 Y</td>
<td>1 1,395 1,395 Y</td>
<td>Exclusive use Ground floor location, near entry and bus drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Area - Loaded</td>
<td>1 615 615</td>
<td>1 615 615</td>
<td>Exclusive use during school day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Area - Unloaded</td>
<td>3 210 630</td>
<td>3 210 630</td>
<td>Potential for sharing between Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium Area and Stage</td>
<td>2 3,060 6,120 Y</td>
<td>2 3,060 6,120 Y</td>
<td>Exclusive use during school day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community use after hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Rooms</td>
<td>2 230 460 Y</td>
<td>2 230 460 Y</td>
<td>Exclusive use during school day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1 2,630 2,630</td>
<td>1 2,000 2,000</td>
<td>Shared library with WCDSB, some exclusive use area Area reduced by 630 sf for efficiency of sharing Community use after hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Purpose</td>
<td>3 540 1,620</td>
<td>2 510 1,020</td>
<td>Area reduced to contribute 600 sf to Stage Community use after hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Instructional Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>WRDSB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31,870</td>
<td>31,240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPERATIONAL AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Type</th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Office</td>
<td>1,375 Y 1,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Safe Welcome” design, shared General Office with WCDSB, efficiency reduces area by 275 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Room and Teacher Work Rooms</td>
<td>1,145 945</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shared with WCDSB, area reduced by 200 sf for efficiency of sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial Areas</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Storage</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium Storage</td>
<td>575 Y 575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Storage (in Gymnasium)</td>
<td>460 Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Spaces</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td>Shared central plant @ 4% of GFA for each partner, area increased by 1,440 sf to right-size mechanical space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Operational Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>WRDSB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,050</td>
<td>8,015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total (Net Area)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>WRDSB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38,920</td>
<td>39,255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gross-up (38.8%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>WRDSB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14,320</td>
<td>14,450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total WRDSB (GFA to be constructed)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>WRDSB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53,240</td>
<td>53,705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WRDSB Potential Area Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>WRDSB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHILD CARE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>WRDSB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Child Care (GFA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>WRDSB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No changes to Child Care**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Size</th>
<th>Floor Area</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Room Size</th>
<th>Floor Area</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>Between Boards, based on utilization Community use after hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>Between Boards, based on utilization Community use after hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Room</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Room</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium Area and Stage</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Exclusive use during school day Community use after hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Stage</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600 sf Instructional Area Flexibility dedicated to a shared 1,200 sf Stage with WRDSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Rooms</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Exclusive use during school day Community use after hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Shared library with WRDSB, some exclusive use area Area reduced by 400 sf for efficiency of sharing Community use after hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Area Flexibility</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td></td>
<td>WCDSB to define uses - which will include chapel and break-out spaces, 600 sf allocated to shared Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Instructional Area</strong></td>
<td>23,890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23,490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATIONAL AREA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Office</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shared General Office with WRDSB, efficiency reduces area by 200 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Room and Teacher Work Rooms</td>
<td>780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>680</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shared with WCDSB, area reduced by 100 sf for efficiency of sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial Areas</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Room</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Storage</td>
<td>355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium Storage</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Storage (in Gymnasium)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Spaces</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shared central plant @ 4% of GFA for each partner, area reduced by 540 sf to right-size mechanical space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operational Area</strong></td>
<td>7,015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Net Area)</strong></td>
<td>30,905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross-up (38%)</td>
<td>11,740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total WCDSB (GFA to be constructed)</strong></td>
<td>42,645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41,215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WCDSB Potential Area Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1,430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RECREATION COMPLEX

**AQUATICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Ground Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Occasional scheduled use by Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td>Wet - family, male, female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,950</td>
<td>11,950</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,950</td>
<td>11,950</td>
<td>Contributes area to &quot;main street&quot; central circulation spine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Administrative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Ground Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>Staff change - M, F, GN (all staff)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pool Office**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Ground Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Ground Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Occasional scheduled use by Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td>Wet - family, male, female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,950</td>
<td>11,950</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,950</td>
<td>11,950</td>
<td>Contributes area to &quot;main street&quot; central circulation spine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Administrative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Ground Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>Staff change - M, F, GN (all staff)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Aquatics Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47,740</td>
<td>43,240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECREATIONAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Ground Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,665</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>FIBA sized gyms with spectator seating @ 7,600 sf each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>Time of day exclusive use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>All parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>All parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>970</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>All parties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change Rooms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Ground Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>lunch room, WR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gymnasium (FIBA size)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Ground Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Part of gross-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gymnasium**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Ground Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Staff change - M, F, GN (all staff)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fitness Studio**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Ground Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Not equipment based, storage required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change Rooms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Ground Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Staff change - M, F, GN (all staff)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gymnasium**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Ground Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Staff change - M, F, GN (all staff)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Lobby/Viewing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Ground Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Part of gross-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lobby/Reception**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Ground Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000 sf minimum, large, welcoming &quot;grand/statement&quot; entrance (includes area from Pool Viewing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bike/Skateboard/Scooter Storage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Ground Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Included in gross-up area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Server/Canteen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Ground Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Included in gross-up area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Waste/Recycling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Ground Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Included in gross-up area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Washrooms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Ground Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Included in gross-up area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mechanical**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Ground Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Room Size SF</th>
<th>Floor Area SF</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>Shared City operated central plant @ 4% of GFA for each partner, area reduced by 340 sf to right-size mechanical space and reallocated out of area originally shown for Pool Mech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Other Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total (Net Area)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90,450</td>
<td>92,310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gross-up (15%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13,570</td>
<td>13,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Rec Complex (GFA to be constructed)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104,020</td>
<td>106,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rec Complex Potential Area Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Recreation Complex Original Space Program as approved by Council June 18, 2019)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC USE SPACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>1 500 500</td>
<td>1 500 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Area with Laptop Bar</td>
<td>1 500 500</td>
<td>1 500 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lounge Seating &amp; Learning Commons</td>
<td>1 1,800 1,800</td>
<td>1 1,800 1,800</td>
<td>Shared with both Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult &amp; Young Adult Book Stacks</td>
<td>1 1,600 1,600</td>
<td>1 1,600 1,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's - Program Room</td>
<td>1 750 750</td>
<td>1 750 750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's - Play Area</td>
<td>1 640 640</td>
<td>1 640 640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's - Book Stacks</td>
<td>1 1,350 1,350</td>
<td>1 1,350 1,350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Study/Meeting Rooms</td>
<td>2 130 260</td>
<td>2 130 260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Study/Meeting Rooms</td>
<td>1 260 260</td>
<td>1 260 260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose Room</td>
<td>1 750 750</td>
<td>1 750 750</td>
<td>All partners, shared with Recreation Complex Available for school visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makerspace</td>
<td>1 580 580</td>
<td>1 580 580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Station Area</td>
<td>1 200 200</td>
<td>1 200 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Desk</td>
<td>1 400 400</td>
<td>1 400 400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Entrance &amp; Security Gates</td>
<td>1 270 270</td>
<td>1 270 270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Universal Washroom</td>
<td>1 110 110</td>
<td>1 110 110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Public Use Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONAL SPACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Server Room</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Kitchenette/WR</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Included in gross up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Included in gross up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>Central shared, metered mechanical preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste/Recycling</td>
<td>0 Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Included in gross up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading/Receiving</td>
<td>0 Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Included in gross up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operational Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total (Net Area)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross-up (16%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Idea Exchange (GFA to be constructed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Public Use Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea Exchange Potential Area Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL JUC GFA</td>
<td>222,005</td>
<td>223,180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total JUC Potential Area Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INSTRUCTIONAL AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Type</th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kindergarten</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Room Size</td>
<td>Floor Area</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Boards, based on utilization</td>
<td>Community use after hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>10,640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Boards, based on utilization</td>
<td>Community use after hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Art Room</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science Room</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Education Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Area - Loaded (400-699 sf)</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Boards, based on utilization</td>
<td>Community use after hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Area - Unloaded (&lt;400 sf)</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for sharing between Boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gymnasium Area and Stage</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>6,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive use during school day</td>
<td>Community use after hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change Rooms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive use during school day</td>
<td>Community use after hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Purpose</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive use during school day</td>
<td>Community use after hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Instructional Area**  
31,870  

### OPERATIONAL AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Type</th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Safe Welcome&quot; design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Room and Teacher Work Rooms</strong></td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kitchen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Custodial Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Storage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>435</td>
<td></td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washrooms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gymnasium Storage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair Storage (in Gymnasium)</strong></td>
<td>460</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanical Spaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>690</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4% of GFA typical, area increased by 1,440 sf to right-size mechanical space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Operational Area**  
7,050  
8,490

**Sub-total (Net Area)**  
38,920  
40,360

**Gross-up (36.8%)**  
14,320  
14,850

**WRDSB Potential Area Change**  
1,970

### CHILD CARE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Type</th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Child Care (GFA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no changes to Child Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INSTRUCTIONAL AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Type</th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between Boards, based on utilization Community use after hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>3 1,200 3,600</td>
<td>3 1,200 3,600</td>
<td>Between Boards, based on utilization Community use after hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Room</td>
<td>1 1,050 1,050</td>
<td>1 1,050 1,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Room</td>
<td>1 1,050 1,050</td>
<td>1 1,050 1,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Area - Loaded (400-699 sf)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Area - Unloaded (&lt;400 sf)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium Area and Stage</td>
<td>1 4,000 4,000</td>
<td>1 4,000 4,000</td>
<td>Exclusive use during school day Community use after hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Rooms</td>
<td>2 400 800</td>
<td>2 400 800</td>
<td>Exclusive use during school day Community use after hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1 2,400 2,400</td>
<td>1 2,400 2,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Area Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WCDSB to define uses - which will include chapel and break-out spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Instructional Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23,890</td>
<td>23,890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPERATIONAL AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Type</th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Office</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Room and Teacher Work Rooms</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial Areas</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Room</td>
<td>230 1 230</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Storage</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>1,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium Storage</td>
<td>330 Y</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Storage (In Gymnasium)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Storage</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td>1,705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Operational Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,015</td>
<td>6,675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GROSS-UP (38%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,905</td>
<td>30,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross-up (38%)</td>
<td>11,740</td>
<td>11,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total WCDSB (GFA to be constructed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42,645</td>
<td>42,175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WCDSB Potential Area Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RECREATION COMPLEX

#### AQUATICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Ground Floor Location</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natatorium</td>
<td>1 20,000 20,000 Y 1 20,000 20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Occasional scheduled use by Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Rooms</td>
<td>3 1,830 5,490 Y 3 1,830 5,490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 tanks - 10 lane 25 m, warm water/therapy, leisure/learning, on deck viewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Viewing</td>
<td>1 11,950 11,950 Y 1 11,950 11,950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet - family, male, female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Office</td>
<td>1 250 250 Y 1 250 250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributes area to &quot;main street&quot; central circulation spine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Storage</td>
<td>1 750 750 Y 1 750 750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>1 1,800 1,800 Y 1 1,800 1,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff change - M, F, GN (all staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pool) Mechanical</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>1 3,000 3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pool mech only (remaining mechanical listed in OTHER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### RECREATIONAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Ground Floor Location</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium (FIBA size)</td>
<td>3 6,665 20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 7,600 15,200</td>
<td>FIBA sized gyms with spectator seating @ 7,600 sf each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>1 6,000 6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/Running Track</td>
<td>1 12,000 12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 12,000 12,000</td>
<td>Time of day exclusive use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use/Meeting</td>
<td>1 2,990 2,990</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2,990 2,990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use/Meeting</td>
<td>1 2,150 2,150</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2,150 2,150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use/Meeting</td>
<td>1 970 970</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 970 970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Hall of Fame</td>
<td>1 0 0 Y 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part of gross-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Studio</td>
<td>1 2,000 2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2,000 2,000</td>
<td>Not equipment based, storage required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Rooms</td>
<td>2 800 1,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 800 1,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym Storage</td>
<td>1 1,000 1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1,000 1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>0 1 1,000 1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lunch room, WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lobby/Viewing</td>
<td>0 Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Recreational Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3,000 sf minimum, large, welcoming "grand/statement" entrance (includes area from Pool Viewing)

#### OTHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lobby/Reception</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Skateboard/Scooter Storage</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servery/Canteen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Included in gross-up area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste/Recycling</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Included in gross-up area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading/Receiving</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Included in gross-up area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Included in gross-up area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shared central plant with Idea Exchange @ 4% of GFA for each partner, area reduced by 340 sf to right-size mechanical space and reallocated out of area originally shown for Pool Mech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Other Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Sub-total (Net Area)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Gross-up (15%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Total Rec Complex (GFA to be constructed)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Rec Complex Potential Area Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Recreation Complex Original Space Program as approved by Council June 18, 2019)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Type</th>
<th>Original Program</th>
<th>Ground</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>Potential Sharing/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Room Size SF</td>
<td>Floor Area SF</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC USE SPACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Area with Laptop Bar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lounge Seating &amp; Learning Commons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult &amp; Young Adult Book Stacks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's - Program Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's - Play Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's - Book Stacks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Study/Meeting Rooms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Study/Meeting Rooms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makerspace</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Station Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Desk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Entrance &amp; Security Gates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Universal Washroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Public Use Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATIONAL SPACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Server Room</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Kitchenette/WR</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste/Recycling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading/Receiving</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operational Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Net Area)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross-up (16%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Idea Exchange (GFA to be constructed)</strong></td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idea Exchange Potential Area Change</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL JUC GFA</strong></td>
<td>222,005</td>
<td>225,645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total JUC Potential Area Change</strong></td>
<td>3,640</td>
<td>3,640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 1, 2021 via email: Maureen@csparch.com

Ms. Maureen O'Shaughnessy
CS&P Architects
2345 Yonge Street, Suite 200
Toronto, ON M4P 2E5

Dear Ms. O'Shaughnessy:

CAMBRIDGE JOINT USE FACILITY, CAMBRIDGE PROPOSED SITE PLAN DEVELOPMENT MUNICIPAL SITE ENGINEERING REVIEW

IBI Group was retained by CS&P Architecture (CSPA) to provide municipal civil engineering services for this project.

The purpose of this letter-report is to provide an overview of the area grading and municipal servicing for the Cambridge Joint Use Community Centre (JUC). Further, the letter-report will also provide a functional review of Five (5) concepts being considered for the facility at time of writing in order to assist the selection decision.

1. **INTRODUCTION:**

   The Cambridge Joint Use Community Centre (JUC) subject site is located within the Bosdale residential subdivision which in turn is located in southeast Cambridge on the north side of Dundas Street at the northerly extension of Branchton Road. A proposed Region of Waterloo arterial road, the East Boundary Road (EBR) is to be constructed on the eastern limits of the JUC Site and the Bosdale subdivision. Refer to Plate 1 for a plan of the Bosdale Subdivision and JUC Site.

   The JUC Site area is approximately 11ha and proposes the development of a Community Centre, swimming pool, Library, and two Schools all sharing the site as a joint-use facility.

   Currently the City of Cambridge (City) is exploring concepts for the site’s development. CS&P Architecture (CSPA) has been retained by the City to assist in this work. IBI Group was retained by CSPA to provide municipal Civil engineering expertise (grading and municipal servicing) for the site review.

   IBI Group is familiar with the subject lands and the environs as we are the Municipal Engineers for the grading, servicing and roads within the Bosdale Subdivision, of which the subject JUC Site are a part.
2. **EXISTING AND PROPOSED CONDITIONS**

It was determined that efficiencies would result from the concurrent development of the JUC Site with the Bosdale residential subdivision of which it is a part. Earth moving operations would benefit from the cut/fill balance generated between the two lands, a joint use and shared municipal SWM facility would reduce the total land area required for SWM facilities as well as allow a wet pond (constructed wetland) to be utilized, and shared municipal servicing and road access could be constructed. Further, developing the two lands concurrently bettered the economies of scale.

The following sections describe the grading and municipal servicing design intent and constraints relating to the JUC Site. Reference is also made to Attachment ‘A’ for the subdivision engineering plans.

### 2.1 Road and Pedestrian Access

Access to the JUC lands will be provided via the construction of municipal roads within the Bosdale Subdivision. The proposed municipal roads are:

- Wesley Boulevard: extended from the existing eastern terminus of Wesley Boulevard through the subdivision to the proposed Regional East Boundary Road;
- Faith Street: extended from Dundas Street northerly to Wesley Boulevard.
Active transportation facilities will be constructed, including:

- Pedestrian sidewalk on all roads;
- Multi-use paths on Wesley Boulevard, Faith Street and through Open Spaces;
- Bike lanes on Wesley Boulevard and Faith Street.

The Region’s East Boundary Road will be constructed along the eastern flankage of the JUC lands. Construction is tentatively scheduled to start in 2026/2027. The Regional road will be limited/controlled access.

2.2 Area Grading

The original topographical conditions of the JUC Site had the site rolling with highs and lows across the site and included areas with no overland drainage outlet. In general the site had an approximately high elevation in the southeastern area of 300.0m and a low elevation of 286.0m in the southwestern area. Refer to Attachment ‘A’ for the area grading plans which include the original topographic contours.

The design intent for the Bosdale Subdivision’s area grading, including the JUC site, was to direct all stormwater drainage to a proposed SWM facility located in the southeastern quadrant of Wesley Boulevard and Moffat Creek (i.e., to the southwest of the JUC Site) – refer to Plate 1.

2.3 Stormwater Management

A Stormwater Management (SWM) pond is proposed to receive, treat and discharge stormwater from the subdivision and JUC Site. The SWM pond will provide quantity control attenuating post-development flows to pre-development flow levels. The pond will also treat stormwater quality through the implementation of a constructed wetland.

The minor (up to the 5 year storm) stormwater flows from the JUC Site will be directed via overland routes to an internal storm sewer system which will outlet to the Wesley Boulevard storm system (refer to next section). Larger storm events (in excess of the minor storm) will be conveyed overland via sheet flow to Wesley Boulevard which in turn will covey flows overland within its right-of-way to the SWM pond.

Given the proposed municipal SWM pond was designed to control stormwater from the JUC Site, there are no requirements for on-site SWM controls for stormwater quantity or quality control. The only requirements for the JUC lands are:

- The maximum impervious cover must be less than 65%. If the site development exceeds 65%, additional on site controls will be needed;
- Water balance must be achieved (e.g., infiltration of stormwater from rooftop and other areas);
- Conveyance of the minor storm (up to the 5-year storm event) via storm sewers to the proposed storm service laterals on Wesley Boulevard (refer to next section); and,
- Conveyance of storms in excess of the minor storm via overland surface routes to the Wesley Boulevard road allowance.

2.4 Municipal Servicing

The development of the subdivision will extend municipal infrastructure required to service the JUC lands. Refer to Attachment ‘A’ for the plan & profile drawings of the adjacent municipal servicing.

The pertinent services for the JUC lands include:

a. Sanitary sewers:
A municipal 375mm diameter sanitary sewer is proposed to be extended along the full length of Wesley Boulevard from the existing eastern terminus of Wesley Boulevard to the East Boundary Road.

Currently, two sanitary laterals are proposed to be extended from Wesley Boulevard: one lateral (300mm diameter) will be located at the intersection of Faith Street and Wesley Boulevard, and the other (200mm diameter) will be located near the eastern limit of the SWM pond. The subdivision’s design flow rate discharging the school site was 6.5 L/s.

Note, the proposed 300mm diameter sanitary lateral was sized to accommodate the full buildout of the proposed JUC Site, including an allowance for “emergency” draining of the proposed swimming pool at a rate of 66 L/s.

b. Storm sewers:
Storm sewers (various sizes) will be extended along Wesley Boulevard from the proposed SWM Pond to approximately 200m east of Faith Street. The storm sewers have been sized for the 5 year storm for the contributing catchment areas, which includes the JUC Site. Storms greater than the 5 year storm will be directed overland via the road allowance to the SWM pond.

Currently two storm sewer laterals, each sized at 750mm diameter, are proposed to be extended from Wesley Boulevard: one lateral will be located at the intersection of Faith Street and Wesley Boulevard, and the other located near the eastern limit of the SWM pond. Each sewer was sized via the rational method to convey the 5 year storm from approximate 50% of the JUC Site area utilizing a 0.70 runoff coefficient.

c. Watermain:
Watermain (300mm diameter) will be extended along the full length of Wesley Boulevard from the existing eastern terminus of Wesley Boulevard to the East Boundary Road. The watermain will also be
“looped” via a 300mm diameter watermain to the existing watermain on Dundas Street.

Currently one 300mm diameter water service lateral is proposed at the Wesley Boulevard/Faith Street intersection. It is noted that per City of Cambridge policy only one service per property is permitted.

2.5 Subdivision Construction Timing (anticipated)

At the time of writing, the following is the status of construction:

a. Area Grading:
   At the time of writing, the subdivision, including the JUC Site, have been rough graded. Work completed on the developing area of the Bosdale Subdivision and JUC Site includes:
   - All vegetation removed;
   - All windrowed rocks from the former farming operations removed and disposed;
   - All topsoil stripped and either stockpiled or used as fill in perimeter slopes; and,
   - Rough grading has been completed, and earth has been cut and filled to bring the subdivision and JUC Site to pre-grade elevations. The pre-grade elevation of the JUC Site was approximately 0.3m below proposed finished grade.

b. Municipal Servicing and Road Construction:
   Further, at the time of writing, a servicing and road construction contract had been awarded by the Subdivision developer, with cost sharing with the City of Cambridge. Construction commenced in December 2020 and is scheduled to be completed in summer 2021. This contract will install municipal servicing (sewers and watermain) and construct the municipal roads within the first phase of the Bosdale subdivision. Phase 1 includes the following main facilities:
   - The subdivision’s stormwater management (SWM) pond: located in the southeastern quadrant of Wesley Boulevard and Moffat Creek;
   - Wesley Boulevard: from its existing western terminus on the west side of Moffat Creek to Faith Street;
   - Faith Street: from Wesley Boulevard to Dundas Street; and,
   - Bastian Street: from Faith Street eastward approximately 120m.

c. Utility Servicing:
   Concurrent with the road construction, electrical and telecommunication services will also be installed within the municipal road right-of-ways. A meeting with Energy+ on December 17, 2020 notified Energy+ of the JUC development intentions so that the primary electrical supply within the Bosdale subdivision will accommodate the JUC Site.
With the completion of the above described work (anticipated by summer 2021), the JUC Site will be left rough graded, and municipal, electrical and telecommunication services will be installed and stubbed at the JUC Site property line. In addition, Wesley Boulevard and Faith Street will be constructed and will provide vehicular and pedestrian access to the JUC Site.

3. **JUC SITE DEVELOPMENT CONCEPTS**

At the time of writing five development concepts had been developed for the JUC Site. A review of the five concepts was completed from a grading, drainage, municipal servicing and access perspective. All five Concepts appear feasible; however, the Concepts differ in the ease and cost with which they can be implemented from a grading and servicing perspective. Table 1, attached, summarizes our review and findings.

The site development should follow the local municipal, regional and provincial planning and design criteria, including but not limited to:

- City of Cambridge Site Plan Review - Reference Guide;
- City of Cambridge Engineering Standards and Development Manual;
- Region of Waterloo and Area Municipalities Design Guidelines and Supplemental Specifications for Municipal Services (DGSSMS); and,
- Ontario Building Code.

Note, the most current versions of the above guidelines should be used.

4. **CLOSURE**

We trust the information provided in this letter-report assists in the review and planning of the development of the JUC Site.

Should you have any questions, or require further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

IBI GROUP

John Perks, MBA, P.Eng.
Associate Director

JRP/ms

February 1, 2021
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEW PARAMETER</th>
<th>CONCEPT 1</th>
<th>CONCEPT 2</th>
<th>CONCEPT 3</th>
<th>CONCEPT 4</th>
<th>CONCEPT 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Access</td>
<td>The location of the driveway accesses appears favourable to the proposed subdivision intersections: the central and eastern driveways appear to be opposite Wesley Boulevard's intersections with Faith Street and Bastien Street.</td>
<td>Similar to Concept 1.</td>
<td>The location of the driveway accesses appears favourable to the proposed subdivision intersections: the central and eastern driveways appear to be opposite Wesley Boulevard's intersections with Faith Street and Bastien Street. The internal driveway is significantly longer than other concepts.</td>
<td>Similar to Concept 1.</td>
<td>Similar to Concept 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Access</td>
<td>It appears the main building access locations front Wesley Boulevard. Wesley Boulevard has a multi-use path on its northern side which will readily facilitate pedestrian and cyclist access to the site.</td>
<td>Similar to Concept 1.</td>
<td>While access to the Wesley Boulevard active transportation facilities is achieved, the distance for pedestrians and cyclists is increased versus the other concepts.</td>
<td>Similar to Concept 1.</td>
<td>Similar to Concept 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading and Drainage</td>
<td>The positioning of the building will readily facilitate drainage in a westerly and southerly direction as required by the subdivision development. No concerns.</td>
<td>Similar to Concept 1.</td>
<td>It appears the parking along the EBR is located close to the property limit. The current grading of the site has a ~4m high 3:1:1 slope (~12m wide) falling from the site to the property line with the EBR. The parking lot will need to be setback to respect this slope. Given the positioning of the proposed building, the eastern parking lot will need to be made to drain in a north to south direction to get around the proposed building – this is opposite to the direction slope of the EBR. While this grading is “awkward”, it is achievable. Note, given the long length of the building it likely could not have a constant finished floor elevation and it would need to be stepped.</td>
<td>Similar to Concept 1.</td>
<td>Similar to Concept 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Servicing</td>
<td>The positioning of the proposed western and central driveway is favourable to storm servicing.</td>
<td>Similar to Concept 1.</td>
<td>While feasible to do, given the location of the building, the storm sewer will need to be extended for a significantly longer distance versus other Concepts. As the site is more spread-out, the storm system would likely be more expansive versus Concepts 1 and 2.</td>
<td>As the site is more spread-out, the storm system would likely be more expansive versus Concepts 1 and 2.</td>
<td>Similar to Concept 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Servicing</td>
<td>The positioning of the proposed western and central driveway is favourable to sanitary servicing. The location of the proposed building is favourable to discharge to the proposed sanitary servicing on Wesley Boulevard.</td>
<td>Similar to Concept 1.</td>
<td>While feasible to do, given the location of the building, the sanitary sewer will need to be extended for a significantly longer distance versus Concept 1 and 2, and possibly 4 and 5. Given two separate buildings, the on site sanitary system would be increased over Concepts 1 and 2.</td>
<td>Given two separate buildings, the on site sanitary system would be increased over Concepts 1 and 2.</td>
<td>Similar to Concept 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Servicing</td>
<td>The positioning of the proposed central driveway is favourable to water servicing. The location of the proposed building is favourable to the location of the water service.</td>
<td>Similar to Concept 1.</td>
<td>While feasible to do, given the location of the building, the water service will need to be extended for a significantly longer distance versus the other Concepts. Given two separate buildings, on site watermain length would be increased over Concepts 1 and 2, and additional hydrants would likely be needed. Note, if the two buildings will occupy the same property, the City policy of one service per property would need to be explored if indeed it was desired to service the buildings independently.</td>
<td>Given three separate buildings, on site watermain length would be increased over Concepts 1 and 2, and additional hydrants would likely be needed. Note, if the three buildings will occupy the same property, the City policy of one service per property would need to be explored if indeed it was desired to service the buildings independently.</td>
<td>Similar to Concept 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT ‘A’

Bosdale Subdivision Engineering Plans
1 GENERAL

The purpose of this study is to outline the structural requirements and implications of constructing a multi-purpose facility that houses a school, a community and recreation complex and a library into one building. There are five different concepts being looked at and this brief will comment on the structural implications.

The new building will be constructed on an open field and we understand that there were no buildings constructed on this site in the past. Based on grading drawings prepared by IBI in 2019, the site slopes by about 3 to 4 meters from end to end. The elevation towards the south end of the site is about 297 m. The elevation at the NE corner is about 294 m and slopes down westward to about 291 m. We also understand that grading of the site is underway.

This brief will discuss the structural materiality that is common for all concepts and will address specific requirements related to stacking of different programs and location on the site.

1.1 APPLICABLE CODES AND STANDARDS

The building occupancy for purposes of the structural design will be treated as a school and a community centre, resulting in an importance category of “High” as specified under the 2012 Ontario Building Code.
(OBC) Amendment 8. High importance classification is common to all uses of the proposed facility. Design environmental loading data for Cambridge will be as per Supplementary Standard SB-1. Additional requirements included in the User's Guide – NBC 2015 Structural Commentaries (Part 4 of Division B) will be considered.

2 STRUCTURAL SYSTEMS

2.1 ROOF

The roof structure will consist of structural steel beams, open web steel joists and steel deck. Over the gymnasium, the deck will be a painted acoustic deck. The structural members and deck within the pool area will be galvanized or epoxy painted deck and steel members.

We expect that some mechanical units will be located on the roof with a screen for acoustic and aesthetics purposes. In these areas, the roof structure will have a concrete topping for the extent of the mechanical area. The roof screen will cantilever from the main roof structure. The main mechanical room will most likely be located on the second-floor level similar to a plant room in schools.

Concepts 4 and 5 show two separated buildings. The systems will be similar to the combined blocking schemes. Since the importance factor for the school and community are the same, combining or separating the two building blocks does not impact the structural costs other than any reduction of perimeter foundations. However, roofs with many different elevations cause snow piling and will add premium to the steel structure since the roof will have to support higher loads.

2.2 SECOND FLOOR

The structural materials could vary for the different schemes. However, based on the size of the project and local practices, it is our opinion that a structural steel solution maybe the most economical. Steel framing tends to be faster and less dependant on weather conditions. This also considers the fact that the roof will be steel due the large span requirements in many areas. In addition, steel tends to provide more flexibility such as achieving longer spans and to transfer columns between floors if required to accommodate the floor layouts.

The structural steel system will consist of 127 mm reinforced concrete topping on steel deck supported by composite steel beams (with shear studs) and steel deck. The columns will also be steel wide flange sections. The steel members would require fire proofing, but the topping on the deck can be designed to meet the fire separation requirements by increasing the topping thickness and avoiding spraying the underside of the deck.

In areas where mechanical room, gymnasium or exercise spaces are located over acoustically sensitive spaces such as the Idea Exchange, mitigation measures will be implemented. These measures include thicker concrete topping with stiffer beams as well as possibly a floating slab on acoustic isolators. In addition, measures can be taken to secure finishes in a manner to avoid transmission of noise and vibration between spaces and floors.
Concepts 1 and 3 have the Ideas Exchange under mechanical room or a gymnasium respectively and will require some isolation.

### 2.3 FOUNDATIONS

A geotechnical investigation report was prepared by Naylor Engineering Associates dated May 2015. The investigation was primarily done using shallow test pits. The investigation was for a new subdivision with lightweight housing units. Therefore, the report did not provide any information regarding foundation design bearing capacity, site classification or ground water conditions. However, the recommendation in the report is to remove all organic and fill materials before backfilling the site and to backfill in lifts of 300 mm using imported or excavated materials. Unfortunately, this does not provide adequate information to predict the foundation requirements for this type of recreation/school facility but is a good indication that the material under the slab on grade will be suitable. We recommend that certification of the backfill process be transferred to the design team once available. The report does mention wet soil conditions in some of the test pits; therefore, some allowance should be provided to deal with water during excavation. A geotechnical investigation with deep boreholes will be needed once the footprint of the building is set.

Concept 3 shows a linear building footprint along East Boundary Road and stretches from the south end to the north end of the site. We understand that grading can be changed to suit the future design elevation and connection to the roads. For now, we will assume that there will be a change in floor level which will require short retaining walls and stepping of footings along the length of the building.

We do not anticipate any need for shoring of excavation in any of the concepts due to vast free space around the footprint of the buildings.

### SLAB-ON-GRADE

**Interior Spaces**

We anticipate that the slab-on-grade in interior spaces will be 125mm thick concrete slab reinforced with mesh reinforcement. The slab on grade will bear on well compacted granular subgrade. There will be depressions in areas where specialized flooring is required (such as spring flooring in gymasia). In the gymnasium, special depressed flooring with moisture barrier will be placed for spring flooring. Localized slab thickening will be required under masonry partitions.

### 2.4 LATERAL LOAD RESISTING ELEMENTS

Lateral wind and earthquake loads will be resisted by steel cross bracing located in each direction that are hidden in exterior and interior walls. Elevator and stair well shaft walls will also be used as part of the lateral system. The lateral system will not be much difference between a single block or separate blocks since the roof levels are at different elevations and the diaphragm is not continuous. We anticipate each section will require its own lateral system. There will be several expansion joints, mainly between single storey portions such as the gymnasium, and the two storey portions.

### 2.5 POOL TANK

We expect the pool tank will be cast in place concrete. This can be done with either formed walls or use of shotcrete system. However prefabricated metal and lined systems may also be feasible.
3 BUILDING CODE REQUIREMENTS

3.1 GRAVITY LOADS
All structural elements will be designed to resist the loads meeting the requirements and allowances specified in the 2012 Ontario Building Code Amendment 8.

3.2 WIND LOADS
The design wind loads will be based on pressures and parameters recommended in the Ontario Building Code. Hourly wind pressures of 0.36 kPa will be used in the design of structural members for strength and deflections. This pressure represents reference velocity pressures on probabilities of being exceeded 1 in 50 years for strength and for serviceability. High Importance factor (Iw) for wind of 1.15, will be used for both the recreation centre as well as the school.

3.3 SEISMIC LOADS
The structure will be designed to withstand the seismic forces assigned to a high importance building category with an importance factor (Ie) of 1.3. The site classification needs to be determined by a geotechnical investigation. However, Cambridge is a lower seismic zone and therefore we do not expect that non-structural elements will need to be restrained. As mentioned earlier, High Occupancy classification is suitable for school and community centre.

3.4 STRUCTURAL DESIGN
Structural design will be undertaken using the Limit States approach in accordance with the Ontario Building Code and applicable referenced standards. ULS will be used for strength design; SLS will be used for serviceability checks.

4 STRUCTURAL MATERIALS AND STRENGTHS
The following represents the typical materials and strengths that will be used. Specific areas may be revised to meet the design criteria that could not be determined at this stage.

4.1 CONCRETE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slab-on-Grade</td>
<td>25 MPa</td>
<td>Class C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Slabs</td>
<td>35 MPa</td>
<td>Class C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Slabs (above grade)</td>
<td>35 MPa</td>
<td>Class N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Walls, Grade Beams, Footings</td>
<td>35/40 MPa</td>
<td>Class F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skim Coats</td>
<td>10 MPa</td>
<td>Class N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Un-reinforced Concrete (Sidewalks, Curbs, etc.)</td>
<td>30 MPa</td>
<td>Class C2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 REINFORCING STEEL

Grade: 400 MPa
Sizes: 10M to 30M

4.3 STRUCTURAL STEEL:

New carbon steel conforming to G40 Series Structural Quality Steel

- Rolled Shapes: 350 MPa
- Hollow Structural Sections: 350 MPa
- Angles and Plates: 300 MPa
- 38mm & 76mm Metal Decking: 230 MPa

All exterior exposed steel and pool structure shall be Hot-Dip Galvanized Steel.

5 SERVICEABILITY REQUIREMENTS

Serviceability requirements will be checked against the requirements specified in the Ontario Building Code and all other applicable reference standards including CSA Standards A23.3 Design of Concrete Structures and S16.1-01 Limit States Design of Steel Structures.

The structural systems will be designed to meet the following criteria:

- Live Load Deflection: Span/360
- Wind Storey Drift: Height/500
- Seismic Storey Drift: Height/100

6 LEED STRATEGIES

Strategies related to LEED for building structures centre around maximizing recycled content, minimizing construction waste and total elimination and/or significant reduction in the use of materials containing VOC’s, and designed to accommodate future flexibility in design.
Ms. Maureen O’Shaughnessy
CS&P Architects
2345 Yonge St., Suite 200
Toronto, Ontario M4P 2E5
Maureen@csparch.com

RE: Proposed Mechanical Systems Revision 1
Cambridge JUC

Ms. O’Shaughnesssey,

The following is a brief summary of the mechanical systems that are proposed for this project. We recommend that this proposal be reviewed by your organization and the Cost Consultants to determine if the systems meet all requirements, preferences, and budget constraints.

The Joint Use Complex in Design Concepts 1, 2, and 3 shall be designed to achieve LEED Gold. For Concepts 4 and 5, only the Recreational Centre building will be designed to achieve LEED Gold, the combined school facility in Concept 4 or the separate school buildings in Concept 5 shall be designed as per OBC energy requirements. The systems described in this brief may be modified or changed throughout the design phase as required to meet LEED Gold requirements.

1. Plumbing

   a. Piping Systems (applicable to all Design Concepts):

      i. The sanitary and the storm piping systems running within the building will be connected to new site service piping. All site service piping will connect to the municipal services.

      ii. The storm water system will be designed according to the allowable flow rate. Roof drain quantity, locations, and drain down time shall comply with Code requirements. Scupper drains shall be provided by others, as required to comply with Code requirements.

      iii. The incoming water service will serve all domestic water systems and an automatic wet sprinkler system.

      iv. Consideration shall be given to providing a Sullage system to supply Water Closets.

      v. A new gas service will be provided. All gas piping will be located on the exterior of the building except for the piping serving the new domestic water heaters, boilers, and the Science Classrooms (the amount of piping within the building will be kept to an absolute minimum).

      vi. Sanitary and storm piping systems will be plastic, copper, or cast iron according to OBC requirements.

      vii. Domestic water piping will be type ‘L’ copper. Plastic piping will not be permitted.

      viii. Isolation valves will be provided in the Corridor to isolate all fixture groups. Isolation
valves will not be provided for branches serving a single fixture except that where the fixture isolation valves are not easily accessible at the fixture, isolation valves in the branch piping will be provided in the Corridor.

ix. Hydronic heating and chilled water piping shall be schedule 40 steel complete with malleable iron screwed fittings, steel welded fittings, or grooved fittings.

b. Metering:

i. Metering for Concepts 1, 2, and 3 shall be provided as follows:
   I A new utility-supplied water meter will be installed to service the entire complex.
   II A new gas meter assembly will be supplied and installed by the local utility to service the entire complex.
   III Private sub-metering of services to the Public School, Catholic School, and Childcare area will be included.

ii. Metering for Concept 4 shall be provided as follows:
   I A new utility-supplied water meter will be installed for the Recreational Complex and for the combined school facility.
   II A new gas meter assembly will be supplied and installed by the local utility at the Recreational Complex and at the combined school facility.
   III Private sub-metering of the Public School or Catholic School (depending on ownership) and the Childcare will be included in the combined school facility.

iii. Metering for Concept 5 shall be provided as follows:
   I A new utility-supplied water meter will be installed for each building.
   II A new gas meter assembly will be supplied and installed by the local utility at each building.
   III Private sub-metering of services to the Childcare area will be included within the Public School building.

c. Domestic Hot Water:

i. Domestic hot water (applicable to all Design Concepts):
   I The Recreational Centre area shall have domestic hot water provided by a gasketed plate type, double walled heat exchanger (Taco PF series or equal), utilizing heating water as the heat source. The domestic hot water produced shall be stored in four 757 L (200 USG) vertical storage tanks (A.O. Smith TJV series or equal) at 57°C (135°F) for safety purposes.
      1) Note that if ground source heat pumps are utilized as the building heating source (see Heating System section below), the Recreational Centre domestic hot water shall be provided by two gas fired, condensing water heaters (A.O. Smith BTH series or equal) complete with two 757 L (200 USG) vertical storage tanks (A.O. Smith TJV series or equal).
   II The Public School, Catholic School, and Childcare areas will each be served by a dedicated tank-type, gas fired condensing water heater (A.O. Smith BTH series or equal) to allow for sub-metering (where required in Concepts 1, 2, 3, and 4). The water heaters will be set to store water at 57°C (135°F) for safety purposes.
III  A central mixing valve will be provided at the storage tanks and each water heater to reduce the water temperature to 49°C (120°F) prior to delivery to the fixtures. The water temperature shall be further reduced as required by limit stops in the single handle faucets and by fixture mounted mixing valves (as applicable).

IV  A hot water recirculating system will be provided for each water heater.

d.  Water Softening (applicable to all Design Concepts):

    i.  The Recreational Centre area, Public School area, Catholic School area, and Childcare shall each have dedicated water softening systems.

    ii.  For Concepts 1, 2, and 3, the common heating water system shall be served by the Recreational area water softener.

e.  Plumbing Fixtures (applicable to all Design Concepts):

    i.  Plumbing fixtures will be provided where indicated on the Architectural drawings.

    ii.  All water closets shall have a water consumption of 6.0L per flush.

        I  Where required by the user group, water closets shall be revised to meet the High Efficiency Toilet (HET) definition with a water consumption of 4.8L per flush.

    iii. All water closets in the Recreation Centre area and Student Washrooms (excluding the Kindergarten areas) in the Public and Catholic School areas will be barrier-free height, elongated rim type, floor-mounted complete with flush valves.

    iv. All water closets in the Staff Washrooms in the Public and Catholic School areas will be elongated rim, floor-mounted tank type.

    v.  All water closets in the Kindergarten Washrooms in the Public and Catholic School areas will be residential style round front, floor-mounted tank type to emulate home use.

    vi.  Wall-mounted lavatories shall be provided in Kindergarten washrooms in the Public and Catholic School areas mounted at 24” (610mm) above finished floor.

    vii. Kindergarten classrooms in the Public and Catholic School areas shall include a high-level drop-in stainless steel sink with a single lever handle faucet for teacher use.

    viii. Kindergarten classrooms in the Public and Catholic School areas shall also include a low-level stainless steel washfountain complete with two spray heads for student use.

    ix.  Wall-mounted drinking fountains shall be provided in Kindergarten classrooms in the Public and Catholic School areas mounted at 24” (610mm) above finished floor.

    x.  All lavatory faucets shall be sensor activated type and shall be complete with 0.5 GPM (1.9 LPM) outlets to reduce water consumption. All sink faucets shall be complete with 1.5 GPM (5.7 LPM) outlets.

    xi. Elkay (or approved equal) non-refrigerated and non-filtered bottle fillers shall be provided throughout the corridors of the entire complex or throughout each building (as applicable).

    xii. An eye wash station will be installed in all Custodial rooms.

    xiii. Hose bibbs will be located so that the complete perimeter of the complex or individual buildings (as applicable) can be reached using a 30m (98ft) long hose.

    xiv. Interior hose bibbs shall be provided at mop sinks.

    xv. Floor drains shall be located in all washrooms, change rooms, custodial rooms, mechanical rooms, electrical rooms, and service rooms.

    xvi. All trim for plumbing fixtures shall be Delta or approved equal.

    xvii. Traps and trap seal primers shall be provided for all floor drains and standing wastes
2. Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

a. Heating Systems:

   i. The heating system for Concepts 1, 2, and 3 shall be provided as follows:

      I Four high efficiency, modulating gas fired condensing boilers (Cleaver-Brooks CFC-E 4000 or equal) shall be provided as the primary heating source within the facility. Additionally, the following equipment shall be provided for the heating plant:

         1) System pumps complete with variable frequency drives.
         2) Boiler pumps.
         3) Chemical treatment system.
         4) Category IV gas venting system.
         5) Air separator.
         6) DDC controls.
         7) Expansion tank.

      II Heating plant piping shall utilize a primary-secondary arrangement whereby the boiler piping shall make up the primary piping loop and the system piping serving terminal heating equipment shall make up the secondary loop.

      III Consideration shall be given to providing ground source heat pumps (AERMEC or equal) as the primary heating source for all occupiable spaces within the facility based on the suitability of the site. The heat pumps shall be capable of recovering heat when simultaneous heating and cooling is required. The domestic hot water and pool heating systems shall be modified if ground source heat pumps are used. See applicable sections.

      IV Perimeter heating shall be provided by a combination finned tube radiation and fan-powered terminal units for all spaces with exterior exposure depending on space requirements.

      V Radiant in-floor heating shall be considered in certain spaces as an alternative to finned tube radiation or fan-powered terminal units based on user requirements (e.g. Kindergarten classrooms, Childcare toddler rooms, etc.). Radiant in-floor heating can provide higher operational efficiencies due to the low heating water temperatures utilized.

   ii. The heating systems for Concept 4 shall be provided as follows:

      I The Recreational Complex shall be served by three high efficiency, modulating gas fired condensing boilers (Cleaver-Brooks CFC-E 2000 or equal) as the primary heating source. The remainder of the heating system shall be as described above for Concepts 1, 2, and 3.

      II The combined school facility shall be heated by a combination of gas fired rooftop units (refer to Air Distribution Systems section for details on rooftop units) for the conditioned spaces (e.g. classrooms, offices, library, etc.) and a single high efficiency, modulating gas fired condensing boiler (Laars NTH 500 or equal) for areas not served by the rooftop units (e.g. washrooms, vestibules, stairs, utility rooms, etc.). The boiler system shall be complete with the following equipment:
1) Boiler pump.
2) System pump.
3) Chemical treatment system.
4) Category IV gas venting system.
5) Air separator.
6) DDC controls.
7) Expansion tank.

III In-floor heating shall not be provided.

iii. The heating systems for Concept 5 shall be provided as follows:

I The Recreational Complex shall be served by three high efficiency, modulating gas fired condensing boilers (Cleaver-Brooks CFC-E 2000 or equal) as the primary heating source. The remainder of the heating system shall be as described above for Concepts 1, 2, and 3.

II Both the Public School building and Catholic School building shall be heated as described above for the combined school facility in Concept 4 and each building shall have a single high efficiency, modulating gas fired condensing boiler (Laars NTH 399 or equal).

1) A second boiler shall be included where required by the user groups for redundancy.

iv. For all Design Concepts, wall mounted forced flow heaters shall provide heat for all entrance vestibules and exit stairwells. Ceiling suspended horizontal unit heaters shall provide heat for all un-conditioned storage and service spaces with exterior exposure. The forced flow and horizontal unit heaters shall utilize hot water as the heat source.

b. Cooling Systems:

i. The cooling system for Concepts 1, 2, and 3 shall be provided as follows:

I Two water-cooled magnetic bearing centrifugal chillers (Daikin WMC series or equal) shall provide chilled water as the primary cooling source for all conditioned spaces within the facility having an approximate load of 485 refrigeration tons (1,705 kW). The chillers condenser water loop shall be served by a two-cell cooling tower (Evapco UT series or equal), which shall be mounted on the roof. The following equipment shall be provided for the chilled water plant:

1) Chiller primary pumps.
2) Chilled water system pumps complete with variable frequency drives.
3) Condenser water pumps.
4) Chemical treatment systems.
5) Air separator.
6) DDC Controls.
7) Expansion tanks.

II The chilled water plant shall utilize a primary-secondary arrangement whereby the chiller piping connections shall make up the primary piping loop and the system piping serving air handling units shall make up the secondary piping loop.

III Consideration shall be given to providing ground source heat pumps (as described in the Heating System section above) as the primary cooling source for
all occupiable spaces within the facility based on the suitability of the site. The heat pumps shall be capable of recovering heat when simultaneous heating and cooling is required.

ii. The cooling systems for Concept 4 shall be provided as follows:
   I The cooling system serving the Recreational Centre area shall be as described above for Concepts 1, 2, and 3, and shall meet a load of approximately 235 refrigeration tons (825 kW).
   II The combined school facility shall be cooled by rooftop units (refer to Air Distribution Systems section for details on rooftop units) complete with direct expansion cooling coils.

iii. The cooling systems for Concept 5 shall be provided as follows:
   I The cooling system serving the Recreational Centre area shall be as described above for Concepts 1, 2, and 3, and shall meet a load of approximately 235 refrigeration tons (825 kW).
   II Both the Public School building and Catholic School building shall be cooled as described above for the combined school facility in Concept 4.

iv. For all Design Concepts, ductless split air conditioning units shall be provided for cooling I.T. rooms. For smaller I.T. rooms and electrical rooms with transformers, exhaust fans complete with reverse acting thermostats shall be provided to control temperature.

c. Air Distribution Systems:

i. Air distribution systems for Concepts 1, 2, and 3 shall be provided as follows:
   I Indoor air handling units (Daikin CAH series or equal) shall distribute air throughout the facility and shall be complete with the following:
     1) Hot water heating coil and chilled water cooling coil.
     2) Low-leakage dampers.
     3) Variable frequency drives for fan motors to allow variable air volume (VAV) control.
     4) Low voltage terminal strip to permit use of third-party controls.
     5) Economizer dampers.
   II VAV boxes complete with heating coils to temper the supply air will be provided at each zone for individual temperature control.
   III Dedicated air handling units will be provided for each gymnasium. Gymnasium units shall be complete with demand controlled ventilation to reset the outdoor air damper position when high levels of carbon dioxide are measured in the space. The units serving the Public School and Catholic School gymnasiums shall be without mechanical cooling. Free cooling shall be provided using the economizers.
   IV Large, centralized indoor energy recovery ventilators (Daikin CAH series or equal) shall be provided to recovery energy from building exhaust (washrooms, changerooms, etc.) and to distribute ventilation air to each of the air handling units. The energy recovery ventilators shall be complete the following:
     1) Hot water heating coil and chilled water cooling coil.
     2) Low-leakage dampers.
3) Energy recovery enthalpy core.
4) Variable frequency drives for fan motors to allow VAV control.
5) Low voltage terminal strip to permit use of third party controls.

ii. Air distribution systems for Concept 4 shall be provided as follows:

I Air distribution for the Recreational Centre shall be as described above for Concepts 1, 2, and 3.

II Air distribution, including ventilation air, for the combined school facility shall be provided by packaged gas fired / direct expansion rooftop units (Carrier 48HC series or equal) complete with the following:
   1) Economizer.
   2) Stainless steel heat exchanger.
   3) Two-stage gas heat control.
   4) Two-stage cooling control.
   5) 610mm (24") high roof curb.
   6) Variable volume-temperature (VVT) zone dampers and bypass damper to allow room by room temperature control.
   7) Demand controlled ventilation.

III Rooftop energy recovery ventilators (Aldes PE series or equal) shall be provided for the combined school facility to recovery energy from building exhaust and to distribute ventilation air to each of the rooftop unit return ducts. Rooftop energy recovery ventilators shall be without heating and cooling.

IV The gymnasiums in the combined school facility shall each be served by a gas fired rooftop heating and ventilating unit (Daikin DAH series or equal) complete with following:
   1) Economizer.
   2) Modulating gas burner.
   3) Exhaust fan.
   4) 610mm (24") high roof curb.
   5) Demand controlled ventilation.

V Where required by the user groups occupying the combined school facility, cooling shall be added to one or both gymnasiums. Where cooling is added, the rooftop unit shall be revised to Daikin DPS series or equal complete with direct expansion cooling coil and modulating cooling control.

iii. Air distribution systems for Concept 5 shall be provided as follows:

I Air distribution for the Recreational Centre shall be as described above for Concepts 1, 2, and 3.

II Air distribution for both the Public School building and Catholic School building shall be as described above for the combined school facility in Concept 4.

d. Exhaust Systems:

i. Commercial kitchen exhaust system compliant with NFPA 96 shall be provided where required.

ii. Washrooms, changerooms, custodial rooms, etc. shall be served by the energy recovery ventilators as previously described above. The ventilators shall operate during all occupied hours.
iii. All exhaust systems controlled by the BAS will be controlled to remain operational on a fire alarm condition.

e. Indoor Pool Water Heating and Dehumidification System:

i. Dehumidification system (applicable for all Design Concepts):
   - The indoor pool shall be served by a standalone indoor dehumidifier (Dectron LD series or equal) complete with following:
     1) Direct expansion evaporator coil.
     2) Hot gas reheat coil.
     3) Internal water-cooled condenser.
     4) Remote mounted dry cooler (to be located on the roof).
     5) Exhaust fan.
     6) Internal pool water heater (utilizes condenser heat).

ii. Pool water heating system (applicable for all design concepts):
   - Pool water heating shall be provided by a gasketed plate type heat exchanger (Taco PF series or equal) utilizing heating water as the heat source.
     1) Note that if ground source heat pumps are utilized as the building heating source (see Heating System section above), a high efficiency, modulating gas fired condensing boiler (Cleaver-Brooks CFC-E 1500) shall be provided in the pool equipment room to provide heating water to the gasketed plate type heat exchanger.

f. De-stratification Systems:

i. To control de-stratification in the Gymnasiums, high volume low speed (HVLS) fans and low-level return air grilles will be provided.

g. Building Automation System:

i. A building automation system (BAS) will be used to monitor and control the HVAC, plumbing and electrical systems.

ii. System operation data will be available for retrieval and logging through the internet by a web-based interface.

iii. Unless otherwise noted, thermostats with slide bar adjustment and an over-ride push-button will be used throughout the building. Plate type sensors having no adjustment capability or night setback over-ride capability will be used in the Corridors.

iv. BACnet protocol shall be utilized.

v. The above features shall be modified or additional features shall be added as directed by the user groups.

h. Cost Implications of HVAC System Selection:

i. The centralized heating, cooling, and air distribution systems proposed for Design Concepts 1, 2, and 3 can provide significant operational cost savings over the systems proposed for Design Concepts 4 and 5. Energy savings can be realized by more efficient equipment, energy recovery, and control strategies to increase part load efficiencies, and
maintenance costs can be reduced by using fewer pieces of equipment in fewer locations. Additionally, the high diversity of heating and cooling loads increases equipment efficiencies and reduces capital costs of central plant equipment.

ii. A decentralized approach to HVAC systems was proposed for Concept 4 due to the separation of the combined school facility and the Recreational Centre. The decentralized approach can lead to higher operational costs due to less efficient equipment, more equipment to be maintained, and lower load diversity. However, the capital cost of the decentralized equipment can be considerably lower.

iii. In Concept 5, the HVAC systems are further decentralized. This will likely lead to the highest operational costs of all Design Concepts due to the amount of equipment provided and the lowest load diversity. Furthermore, the capital cost is unlikely to be less than that of Concept 4 because a larger number of smaller pieces equipment are required.

3. Sprinkler System:

   a. Sprinkler system zone devices and alarm valves will be located in the water service entrance room.
   b. The piping system will be zoned according to the area limitations of NFPA 13.
   c. The fire department connection will be located adjacent to the fire route.
   d. Sprinklers will be as follows:

      i. Concealed sprinklers in all Washrooms and Corridors.
      ii. Recessed pendant sprinklers in the Classrooms, Staff Areas and Childcare areas.
      iii. Upright and sidewall sprinklers in utility, storage, mechanical and electrical rooms and in areas with no suspended ceiling as required for proper coverage.

If you have questions or require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Regards,

Andrew Berg, P. Eng.
Mechanical Engineer
Ms. Maureen O’Shaughnessy
CS&P Architects
2345 Yonge St., Suite 200
Toronto, Ontario M4P 2E5
Maureen@csparch.com

RE: Proposed Electrical Systems
Cambridge JUC

Ms. O'Shaughnessy,

The following is a brief summary of the electrical systems that are proposed for this project. We recommend that this proposal be reviewed by your organization and the Cost Consultants to determine if the systems meet all requirements, preferences and budget constraints.

1. Site Servicing

   a. The proposed site is currently unserviced. The local electrical utility (Energy +) anticipates that a three-phase high voltage service will be extended to the property as part of the subdivision servicing.

   b. Energy + will provide utility owned transformation to up to 3000 kVA to each property. This will be more than sufficient for any of the five concepts. Note that it is assumed that lots will be legally severed for Concepts 4 and 5 where there are two and three buildings respectively.

   c. For Concepts 1, 2 & 3, one building is proposed. A 2000 kVA utility owned transformer is recommended for each.

   d. For Concept 4, two buildings are proposed. A 1000 kVA utility owned transformer is recommended for each.

   e. For Concept 5, three buildings are proposed. A 500 kVA utility owned transformer is recommended for each of the school buildings and a 1000 kVA transformer is recommended for the Fitness and Library building.

   f. The costs associated with Energy + work can be estimated at $60,000 per transformer.

   g. Aluminum secondary conductors are proposed for secondary feeders. To mitigate costs, the length of the secondary feeders should be minimized.

   h. The service will be 600/347V, three phase, four wire.

   i. The service entrance board, utility metering and distribution shall be located within the main electrical room located centrally, near an outside wall on either the main floor or the basement. Direct exterior access is not anticipated.

   j. A temporary service will be required to aide with construction.

   k. Underground conduits shall be provided for three-six pack portable classrooms.

   l. Electric Vehicle (EV) charging stations shall be roughed in. A total of fifteen rough-ins are suggested for the site. If LEED Gold is desired for the Fitness Centre/Library building, four EV chargers should be provided on the rough-ins.

   m. Communication duct banks (3-100mm) will be provided from the street to the main
communications room of each building. The main communications room should be located near the main electrical room as described above.

n. Communications services from the respective sources to the demarcation point in the communications room shall be the responsibility of the respective utilities (Rogers, Bell, etc.).
o. The costs associated with the communications providers work is unknown.

2. Site Lighting

a. Exterior lighting will be accomplished with LED heads mounted on poles, or on the building.
b. Illumination levels and uniformity will comply with the local municipal standards. An average of 20lx and average to minimum ratio of 4:1 will be provided.
c. Exterior lighting shall be controlled by an astronomic time signal from the Building Automation System (BAS).
d. Provision (rough-ins) shall be provided for future illumination of the sports field.
e. Provisions (rough-ins) shall be provided for illuminated road signs. One sign is anticipated for each driveway entrance.
f. Accent lighting may be provided for any unique site features.

3. Service Entrance

a. The main service entrance switchboard will be 600V, three phase, four wire and sized as follows:
   i. Concept 1: 2000A
   ii. Concept 2: 2000A
   iii. Concept 3: 2000A
   iv. Concept 4:
      1. 1200A for school building.
      2. 1200A for Fitness and Library
   v. Concept 5:
      1. 600A for WRDSB school building.
      2. 600A for WCDSB school building.
      3. 1200A for Fitness and Library
b. Each switchboard shall incorporate the following:
   i. Wire way to permit cable entry & bus termination.
   ii. A LSIG main breaker ampacity as indicated above. The interrupting rating shall be sized to suit the available fault current.
   iii. A metering compartment suitable to house Energy + equipment. The compartment shall be linked to a remote metering cabinet. A single utility meter shall be provided by Energy +.
   iv. Customer digital meter connected to BAS for customer monitoring.
   v. Grounding conductors to the electrical service ground.
   vi. Bonding conductors to the metallic water piping, natural gas service, IT hubs, elevators, structural steel.
   vii. Provision for power failure relays, tied to the intrusion alarm system for offsite notification of a utility power failure or phase loss condition.
   viii. Distribution section containing over current protection devices (breakers) for the proposed 600V loads.
c. All building feeders greater than and equal to 100A shall be aluminum alloy. All smaller feeders and branch circuit conductors shall be copper.
d. Provisions shall be made for future rooftop photovoltaic generation and associated net metering for each building.

4. Emergency Power Supply - Generator
a. A natural gas emergency generator shall be exterior pad mounted in a weatherproof, sound-attenuated enclosure. Preliminary standby size is as follows:
   i. Concepts 1,2&3: 500kW.
   ii. Concept 4:
      1. School building: Not applicable, not required.
      2. 200kW for Fitness and Library.
   iii. Concept 5:
      1. WRDSB school building: Not applicable, not required.
      2. WCDSB school building. Not applicable, not required.
      3. 200kW for Fitness and Library.

b. The equipment shall conform to the requirements of CAN-CSA C282-15 Emergency Electrical Power Supply for Buildings.

c. For each generator set, there shall be two 600V, 3-pole, solid neutral automatic transfer switches, without bypass isolation.
   i. The first shall serve the life safety systems including the fire alarm, emergency lighting and exit signs.
   ii. The second shall serve backup (non-life safety) systems including communications equipment, elevator(s), the boiler system, etc.

d. Provisions will be included for load bank testing the generator from grade.

e. Auxiliary contacts will be provided for connection to the fire alarm system as well as BAS.

f. The water pressure available at the site is anticipated to be adequate for fire protection. A fire pump and associated emergency power provisions are not anticipated.

5. Emergency Power Supply – Unit Battery System

   a. Emergency lighting will be provided from strategically placed battery packs located throughout the school buildings in Concepts 4 and 5.

6. Power Distribution

   a. The majority of large mechanical loads are anticipated to require 600V. Remote 600/347V power distribution (panels, boards, motor control centres) are proposed near these loads.
   b. Exterior lighting will be served from 600/347V distribution.
   c. The elevators are assumed to require 600V.
   d. Step down transformers will be provided strategically throughout the building to create isolated 208/120V systems to be used for lighting, receptacle and general purpose loads.
   e. Copper-wound transformers are proposed to step down the voltage for the building loads to 120/208V distribution panels. Transformers will comply with Schedule 6 of the Green Energy Act for energy efficiency.
   f. A Surge Suppression Device (SPD) will be mounted within select 120/208V distribution boards serving critical systems.
   g. Panels shall be surface or recessed as required. All panel bus bars shall be tin plated aluminum. Each panel shall have a minimum of sixty branch circuit positions.
   h. All surface mounted distribution equipment shall be complete with drip shields, suitable for use in sprinklered environment.
   i. A Coordination and Fault Current Study (CFCS), as well as an Arc Flash Analysis are proposed to be included within the electrical scope of work.
   j. Modular Uninterruptible Power Supplies (UPS)s shall be provided where important loads such as IT equipment require ‘no break’ during a power outage.

7. Wiring Installations and Devices
a. All wiring in noncombustible areas, unless otherwise noted, shall be CSA approved soft copper, type T90/TWN75 in conduit, unless otherwise required by the Electrical Code for specific areas or environmental conditions.

b. Voltage drop shall not exceed 3% in branch circuit or 2% in any feeder in accordance with the Ontario Electrical Safety Code (OESC) and ASHRAE 90.1-13. The minimum wire size shall be #12 AWG.

c. All wiring situated in a return air plenum shall be totally enclosed in a noncombustible raceway or shall be FT6-rated (also known as Communications Media Plenum, or CMP).

d. The Contractor shall provide raceways and junction boxes for low voltage cabling associated with access controls. All electrical installations shall be in accordance with OBC 3.8 Barrier-Free Design.

e. The Contractor shall provide consoles in all teaching spaces.

f. Large spaces such as the Gymnasium, Learning Commons and Performance Commons shall be equipped with assistive listening devices in accordance with OBC 3.8.3.7.

g. Wiring, disconnect switches, motor starters, etc., shall be provided for all Owner-supplied and mechanical equipment.

h. Wiring devices shall be heavy duty specification grade. Cover plates shall also be specification grade stainless steel.

i. All 15A and 20A receptacles (CSA 5-15R and 5-20R) shall be the tamper resistant type.

j. Electric hand dryers shall be provided in the washrooms.

k. Electric hair dryers may be provided in the changerooms at fitness and pool areas.

l. Battery powered clocks are proposed with synchronization to the public address controller in school areas.

8. Interior Lighting

a. Lighting of the building interior will be solid state (LED) for efficiency and energy savings, and to reduce maintenance costs.

b. Colour temperature shall be 3,500K.

c. Target illumination in the teaching spaces is an average of 540lx at desk height.

d. Target illumination in the corridors is an average of 215lx at floor level.

e. The administrative areas, Gymnasium, Learning Commons, Performance Commons, teaching spaces, library and the Childcare will include dimming controls.

f. Wired, low voltage lighting controls as manufactured by nLight or approved alternate are recommended.

g. Night lighting will be provided in limited amounts throughout.

h. The lighting in the corridors and stairs shall conform to OBC 3.2.7.1. and be controlled with occupancy sensors.

i. Lighting power densities will be in accordance with OBC SB-10 Energy Efficiency requirements.

j. Emergency lighting shall meet or exceed the requirements of OBC 3.2.7.3. through typical lighting sourced from the emergency generator and or unit battery packs.

k. Illuminated, running-man exit signs shall be provided in accordance with OBC 3.4.5.

9. Fire Alarm and Detection System

a. An addressable, single stage, fire alarm and detection system is proposed in accordance with OBC 3.2.4 and CAN/ULC-S524-14. The system will extend throughout and shall include the following:

   i. A control panel centrally located in main electrical or main communications room.

   ii. An LCD and LED annunciator, complete with passive zoning graphic at main entrance.

   iii. An LCD annunciator, complete with passive zoning graphic, located at main administrative areas.

   iv. Initiating devices (smoke detectors, pull stations, etc.).
v. Signaling devices (horns with LED strobes).
vi. Ancillary devices as required, including magnetic hold open devices, HVAC interlocks, kitchen fire suppression system interlocks, elevator interlocks, etc.
vii. Monitoring equipment that is listed for Fire Protective Service in accordance with OBC 3.2.4.8.
viii. All accessories required to furnish a complete operational system.

b. Approved manufacturers include Chubb Edwards and Simplex.
c. For Concepts 4 and 5, a fire alarm control panel will be provided in each building and will not be networked together.

10. Communications, Information Technology (IT) and Security Systems

a. Provision of exterior requirements shall be as described in the ‘Site Servicing’ section.
b. Multiple backboards shall be provided at the demarcation in the main communications room. The backboards shall be painted with two coats of fire-retardant paint and shall include a lug bonded to electrical service ground.
c. From the backboards, conduits, cable tray, sleeves, or communications hangers shall be provided to all accessible ceiling spaces throughout the facility. Pull boxes shall be provided as required.
d. Vertical, fire-rated conduit risers shall link first and second floors in strategic locations.
e. The maximum distance between any telecommunications outlet and a horizontal cross connect shall be no more than 90 meters in accordance with ANSI/TIA/EIA 568 standards. Remote communications closets will be provided when this distance is exceeded.
f. Backbone cabling between cross connects is recommended to be 50µm multimode, laser optimized fibre within innerduct.
g. To suit the premise cabling, a 21mm or 27mm conduit shall be provided from each outlet box to the nearest accessible ceiling space.
h. Spare conduits shall be provided to accommodate potential future expansion.
i. All equipment and associated cabling for the following systems are proposed to be supplied and installed by others:
   i. Intrusion alarm.
   ii. Surveillance.
   iii. Access controls.
   iv. Assistive listening outside of code-mandated areas. It is to be determined if these systems are desired in the teaching spaces.
   v. Gym sound.
   vi. Audio/visual.
   vii. Safe Welcome. An entrance control system for each applicable program.
   viii. Computer (data).
   ix. Telephone (voice).
   x. Public address.

j. The Contractor shall coordinate to supply the proper infrastructure (rough-in work) for the installations.

If you have questions or require any additional information on the proposed systems, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Regards,

Paul Gubbels, P. Eng.
Electrical
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1

### CONSOLIDATED BUILDING CONCEPTS

| SI | DESCRIPTION | CONCEPT 1 | | CONCEPT 2 | | CONCEPT 3 | | CONCEPT 4 | | CONCEPT 5 |
|---|-------------|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | GF A | $/ m² | Amount | GF A | $/ m² | Amount | GF A | $/ m² | Amount |
| 1 | WCDSB - Waterloo Catholic District School Board | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | WCDSB - Building Cost | 40,935 | $232 | $10,963,000 | | | | | |
| 2 | WCDSB - Site Cost | 39,267 | $230 | $12,064,000 | | | | | |
| 3 | Sub-total WCDSB Construction Costs | 80,202 | $231 | $23,027,000 | | | | | |
| 4 | WCDSB - Soft Cost Allowance - 15% | 39,267 | $230 | $12,064,000 | | | | | |
| 5 | CC - Childcare Centre | 8,611 | $229 | $2,729,000 | | | | | |
| 5 | CC - Site Cost | 8,503 | $227 | $2,704,000 | | | | | |
| 6 | Sub-total CC Construction Costs | 17,114 | $228 | $5,433,000 | | | | | |
| 7 | CC - Soft Cost Allowance - 15% | 8,611 | $229 | $2,729,000 | | | | | |
| 8 | IE - Idea Exchange Construction Costs | 13,600 | $220 | $5,936,000 | | | | | |
| 9 | IE - Site Cost | 13,600 | $219 | $5,854,000 | | | | | |
| 10 | Sub-total Idea Exchange Construction Costs | 27,200 | $220 | $11,780,000 | | | | | |
| 11 | IE - Soft Cost Allowance - 15% | 13,600 | $219 | $5,854,000 | | | | | |
| 12 | REC - Recreation Centre Construction Costs | 103,670 | $227 | $56,115,000 | | | | | |
| 13 | REC - Building Cost | 103,670 | $227 | $56,115,000 | | | | | |
| 14 | REC - Site Cost | 106,375 | $227 | $56,843,000 | | | | | |
| 15 | Multi-total REC Construction Costs | 210,045 | $227 | $112,958,000 | | | | | |
| 16 | REC - Soft Cost Allowance - 15% | 103,670 | $227 | $56,115,000 | | | | | |
| 17 | IE - Idea Exchange Construction Costs | 13,600 | $220 | $5,936,000 | | | | | |
| 18 | IE - Site Cost | 13,600 | $219 | $5,854,000 | | | | | |
| 19 | Sub-total Idea Exchange Construction Costs | 27,200 | $220 | $11,780,000 | | | | | |
| 20 | IE - Soft Cost Allowance - 15% | 13,600 | $219 | $5,854,000 | | | | | |

### SEPARATED BUILDING CONCEPTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SI</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CONCEPT 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>CONCEPT 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>CONCEPT 3</th>
<th></th>
<th>CONCEPT 4</th>
<th></th>
<th>CONCEPT 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GF A</td>
<td>$/ m²</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>GF A</td>
<td>$/ m²</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>GF A</td>
<td>$/ m²</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>WCDSB - Waterloo Catholic District School Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>WCDSB - Building Cost</td>
<td>40,935</td>
<td>$232</td>
<td>$10,963,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>WCDSB - Site Cost</td>
<td>39,267</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$12,064,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sub-total WCDSB Construction Costs</td>
<td>80,202</td>
<td>$231</td>
<td>$23,027,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>WCDSB - Soft Cost Allowance - 15%</td>
<td>39,267</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$12,064,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CC - Childcare Centre</td>
<td>8,611</td>
<td>$229</td>
<td>$2,729,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CC - Site Cost</td>
<td>8,503</td>
<td>$227</td>
<td>$2,704,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sub-total CC Construction Costs</td>
<td>17,114</td>
<td>$228</td>
<td>$5,433,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CC - Soft Cost Allowance - 15%</td>
<td>8,611</td>
<td>$229</td>
<td>$2,729,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>IE - Idea Exchange Construction Costs</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$5,936,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>IE - Site Cost</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>$219</td>
<td>$5,854,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sub-total Idea Exchange Construction Costs</td>
<td>27,200</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$11,780,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>IE - Soft Cost Allowance - 15%</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>$219</td>
<td>$5,854,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL OVERALL PROJECT BUDGET (EXCL HST) 217,880 $424 $92,393,000 229,144 $419 $96,076,000 224,213 $419 $94,077,000 222,053 $419 $93,135,000 225,003 $419 $94,339,000

### TOTAL OVERALL PROJECT CONSTRUCTION COSTS 217,880 $340 $74,122,000 229,144 $335 $76,843,000 224,213 $337 $75,537,000 222,053 $336 $74,491,000 225,003 $337 $75,571,000

### TOTAL OVERALL PROJECT SOFT COST ALLOWANCE 217,880 $18,271,000 229,144 $19,233,000 224,213 $18,540,000 222,053 $18,644,000 225,003 $18,768,000

### CONSIGNMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SI</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CONCEPT 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>CONCEPT 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>CONCEPT 3</th>
<th></th>
<th>CONCEPT 4</th>
<th></th>
<th>CONCEPT 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Design Allowance</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Escalation Allowance - we recommend 4% to 5% p.a. to mid-point of construction schedule</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Construction Contingency Allowance - Post Contract -  by Owner Excluded</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL OVERALL PROJECT BUDGET (EXCL HST) 217,880 $92,393,000 229,144 $96,076,000 224,213 $94,077,000 222,053 $93,135,000 225,003 $94,339,000

### TOTAL OVERALL PROJECT CONSTRUCTION COSTS 217,880 $18,271,000 229,144 $19,233,000 224,213 $18,540,000 222,053 $18,644,000 225,003 $18,768,000

### TOTAL OVERALL PROJECT SOFT COST ALLOWANCE 217,880 $18,271,000 229,144 $19,233,000 224,213 $18,540,000 222,053 $18,644,000 225,003 $18,768,000

### CAMBRIDGE JUC FEASIBILITY STUDY

### CONCEPT COST ANALYSIS

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1
Notes:

1. The above is an opinion of Probable Cost Only. Our estimate is based on Conceptual Sketches provided. Costs will vary as design evolves and details are developed. We recommend that this estimate is updated at all design stages.

2. The above amount assumes that the project is to be procured via Stipulated Lump Sum contract.

3. We would note the current situation with COVID-19 may affect the supply of labour and material on this project. We are unable to provide an opinion of the likely impact at this time, therefore have not included for any additional costs or schedule delays. However, we will continually monitor the situation and once we become aware of any supply issues that may affect the project, we will inform you.

4. As advised by Consultants, the above estimate assumes LEED Gold is applicable only to REC and IE. Schools and CC are not to LEED Specifications and to typical school specifications.

5. For Concepts 4, 5 and 7, our estimate assumes that the Schools and CC buildings are tendered as separate projects, to typical school specifications, and will be completed by Tier 2 standard school contractors.

The following have been specifically excluded:

1. HST
2. Removal of Contaminated Material, if any
3. Construction Price Escalation Beyond 4Q 2020
4. Construction Contingency
5. Premiums for Single Sourced Materials
6. Schedule Acceleration Premium
7. LEED Premiums beyond LEED Gold (for REC and IE Only)
8. AESS Grade Steel
## ELEMENTAL ESTIMATE

### ELEMENTAL COST SUMMARY

#### CONCEPT COST ANALYSIS

**C S & P Architects Inc**  
**Cambridge JUC Feasibility Study**

---

**Project:** Concept 1 Estimate  
**Location:** Cambridge, ON  
**Date:** Feb 1, 2021  
**Owner/Client:** Cambridge JUC  
**Architect:** C S & P Architects Inc  
**Gross Floor Area:** 20,242 m²

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Ratio to GFA</th>
<th>Elemental Quantity</th>
<th>Elemental Unit Rate</th>
<th>Elemental Amount</th>
<th>Cost/m²</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A SHELL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 SUBSTRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11 Foundation</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>14,093 m²</td>
<td>$166.96</td>
<td>$2,353,000</td>
<td>$116.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12 Basement Excavation</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>3,360 m³</td>
<td>$36.61</td>
<td>$123,000</td>
<td>$6.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$122.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 STRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21 Lowest Floor Construction</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>14,093 m²</td>
<td>$76.56</td>
<td>$1,079,000</td>
<td>$53.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22 Upper Floor Construction</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>6,149 m²</td>
<td>$443.65</td>
<td>$2,728,000</td>
<td>$134.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23 Roof Construction</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>14,093 m²</td>
<td>$285.04</td>
<td>$4,017,000</td>
<td>$199.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$386.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 EXTERIOR ENCLOSURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A31 Walls Below Grade</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>400 m²</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$13.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A32 Walls Above Grade</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>6,348 m²</td>
<td>$503.94</td>
<td>$3,199,000</td>
<td>$158.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A33 Windows &amp; Entrances</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1,416 m²</td>
<td>$1,152.54</td>
<td>$1,632,000</td>
<td>$80.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A34 Roof Covering</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>14,093 m²</td>
<td>$256.37</td>
<td>$3,613,000</td>
<td>$178.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A35 Projections</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20,242 m²</td>
<td>$51.92</td>
<td>$1,051,000</td>
<td>$51.92</td>
<td>$9,775,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$482.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B INTERIORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 PARTITIONS &amp; DOORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11 Partitions</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>20,759 m²</td>
<td>$236.87</td>
<td>$4,917,000</td>
<td>$242.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12 Doors</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>329 No</td>
<td>$2,908.81</td>
<td>$957,000</td>
<td>$47.28</td>
<td>$5,874,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$283.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 FINISHES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21 Floor Finishes</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>18,342 m²</td>
<td>$128.45</td>
<td>$2,356,000</td>
<td>$116.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22 Ceiling Finishes</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>18,343 m²</td>
<td>$85.70</td>
<td>$1,572,000</td>
<td>$77.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23 Wall Finishes</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>33,146 m²</td>
<td>$22.90</td>
<td>$759,000</td>
<td>$37.50</td>
<td>$4,687,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$231.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 FITTINGS &amp; EQUIPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B31 Fittings &amp; Fixtures</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20,242 m²</td>
<td>$118.42</td>
<td>$2,379,000</td>
<td>$118.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B32 Equipment</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20,242 m²</td>
<td>$171.52</td>
<td>$3,472,000</td>
<td>$171.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B33 Conveying Systems</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7 Stp</td>
<td>$30,285.71</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$13.59</td>
<td>$6,144,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$303.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 MECHANICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11 Plumbing &amp; Drainage</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20,242 m²</td>
<td>$122.57</td>
<td>$2,481,000</td>
<td>$122.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12 Fire Protection</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20,242 m²</td>
<td>$41.45</td>
<td>$839,000</td>
<td>$41.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13 H.V.A.C.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20,242 m²</td>
<td>$389.98</td>
<td>$7,894,000</td>
<td>$389.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14 Controls</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20,242 m²</td>
<td>$36.26</td>
<td>$734,000</td>
<td>$36.26</td>
<td>$11,948,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$590.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 ELECTRICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21 Service &amp; Distribution</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20,242 m²</td>
<td>$92.93</td>
<td>$1,881,000</td>
<td>$92.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22 Lighting, Devices &amp; Heating</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20,242 m²</td>
<td>$110.27</td>
<td>$2,232,000</td>
<td>$110.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23 Systems &amp; Ancillaries</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20,242 m²</td>
<td>$93.12</td>
<td>$1,885,000</td>
<td>$93.12</td>
<td>$5,998,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$296.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET BUILDING COST (Excluding Site)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,703.59</td>
<td>$54,726,000</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D SITE &amp; ANCILLARY WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 SITE WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11 Site Development</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>103,442 m²</td>
<td>$46.69</td>
<td>$4,830,000</td>
<td>$238.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12 Mechanical Site Services</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>103,442 m²</td>
<td>$7.25</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$7.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13 Electrical Site Services</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>103,442 m²</td>
<td>$3.87</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$3.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$259.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 ANCILLARY WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D21 Demolition</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0 m²</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D22 Alterations</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0 m²</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET BUILDING COST (Including Site)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,999.01</td>
<td>$60,706,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS &amp; ALLOWANCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1 GEN. REQ. &amp; FEE</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$329.91</td>
<td>$329.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z11 General Requirements</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,464,000</td>
<td>$269.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z12 Fee</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,214,000</td>
<td>$59.97</td>
<td>$6,679,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$329.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE (Excluding Allowances)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$67,354,000</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 ALLOWANCES</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$332.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z21 Estimating Allowance</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,738,000</td>
<td>$332.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z22 Escalation Allowance</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z23 Construction Allowance</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$6,738,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ST</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE (Including Allowances)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$74,122,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Cost/unit  
- GFA: 20,242 m²  
- $3,662 m²  
- $340 sf
## ELEMENTAL COST SUMMARY
### CONCEPT COST ANALYSIS

**Project:** Concept 2 Estimate  
**Location:** Cambridge, ON  
**Date:** Feb 1, 2021  
**Architect:** C S & P Architects Inc

### ELEMENTAL COST SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Ratio to GFA</th>
<th>Elemental Quantity</th>
<th>Elemental Unit Rate</th>
<th>Elemental Amount</th>
<th>Cost/m²</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A SHELL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1 SUBSTRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11 Foundation</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>14,354 m²</td>
<td>$157.87</td>
<td>$2,266,000</td>
<td>$106.44</td>
<td>$2,389,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12 Basement Excavation</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>3,360 m³</td>
<td>$36.61</td>
<td>$123,000</td>
<td>$5.78</td>
<td>$2,389,000 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2 STRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21 Lowest Floor Construction</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>14,354 m²</td>
<td>$76.63</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$51.67</td>
<td>$395.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22 Upper Floor Construction</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>6,935 m²</td>
<td>$461.14</td>
<td>$3,198,000</td>
<td>$150.22</td>
<td>$395.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23 Roof Construction</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>14,354 m²</td>
<td>$287.79</td>
<td>$4,131,000</td>
<td>$194.04</td>
<td>$395.93 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A3 EXTERIOR ENCLOSURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A31 Walls Below Grade</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>400 m²</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$13.15</td>
<td>$464.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A32 Walls Above Grade</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>6,111 m²</td>
<td>$317.59</td>
<td>$3,163,000</td>
<td>$148.57</td>
<td>$464.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A33 Windows &amp; Entrances</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1,326 m²</td>
<td>$1,216.44</td>
<td>$1,613,000</td>
<td>$75.77</td>
<td>$464.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A34 Roof Covering</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21,289 m²</td>
<td>$257.91</td>
<td>$3,702,000</td>
<td>$173.89</td>
<td>$464.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A35 Projections</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21,289 m²</td>
<td>$53.22</td>
<td>$1,133,000</td>
<td>$53.22</td>
<td>$464.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B INTERIORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 PARTITIONS &amp; DOORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11 Partitions</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>21,792 m²</td>
<td>$239.58</td>
<td>$5,221,000</td>
<td>$118.56</td>
<td>$291.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12 Doors</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>339 No</td>
<td>$2,899.71</td>
<td>$983,000</td>
<td>$46.17</td>
<td>$291.42 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B2 FINISHES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21 Floor Finishes</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>19,308 m²</td>
<td>$126.95</td>
<td>$2,451,000</td>
<td>$115.13</td>
<td>$230.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22 Ceiling Finishes</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>19,308 m²</td>
<td>$84.99</td>
<td>$1,641,000</td>
<td>$77.08</td>
<td>$230.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23 Wall Finishes</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>34,821 m²</td>
<td>$23.58</td>
<td>$821,000</td>
<td>$38.56</td>
<td>$230.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B3 FITTINGS &amp; EQUIPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B31 Fixtures &amp; Fixtures</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21,289 m²</td>
<td>$118.56</td>
<td>$2,524,000</td>
<td>$118.56</td>
<td>$294.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B32 Equipment</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21,289 m²</td>
<td>$163.09</td>
<td>$3,472,000</td>
<td>$163.09</td>
<td>$294.57 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B33 Conveying Systems</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7 Stp</td>
<td>$39,285.71</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$12.92</td>
<td>$294.57 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 MECHANICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11 Plumbing &amp; Drainage</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21,289 m²</td>
<td>$123.82</td>
<td>$2,636,000</td>
<td>$123.82</td>
<td>$598.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12 Fire Protection</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21,289 m²</td>
<td>$41.76</td>
<td>$889,000</td>
<td>$41.76</td>
<td>$598.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13 H.V.A.C.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21,289 m²</td>
<td>$396.03</td>
<td>$8,431,000</td>
<td>$396.03</td>
<td>$598.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14 Controls</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21,289 m²</td>
<td>$36.54</td>
<td>$778,000</td>
<td>$36.54</td>
<td>$598.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2 ELECTRICAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21 Service &amp; Distribution</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21,289 m²</td>
<td>$94.74</td>
<td>$2,017,000</td>
<td>$94.74</td>
<td>$298.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22 Lighting, Devices &amp; Heating</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21,289 m²</td>
<td>$110.48</td>
<td>$2,352,000</td>
<td>$110.48</td>
<td>$298.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23 Systems &amp; Ancillaries</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21,289 m²</td>
<td>$93.71</td>
<td>$1,995,000</td>
<td>$93.71</td>
<td>$298.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D SITE &amp; ANCILLARY WORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 SITE WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11 Site Development</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>103,442 m²</td>
<td>$44.36</td>
<td>$4,589,000</td>
<td>$215.56</td>
<td>$698.15 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12 Mechanical Site Services</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>103,442 m²</td>
<td>$126.95</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$698.15 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13 Electrical Site Services</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>103,442 m²</td>
<td>$3.87</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$36.54</td>
<td>$698.15 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2 ANCILLARY WORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D21 Demolition</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0 m²</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$269.58 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D22 Alterations</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0 m²</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$269.58 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z GENERAL REQUIREMENTS &amp; ALLOWANCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1 General Requirements</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z12 Fee</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE (Excluding Allowances)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z2 ALLOWANCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z21 Estimating Allowance</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z22 Escalation Allowance</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z23 Construction Allowance</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HST</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE (Including Allowances)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Ratio to GFA</th>
<th>Elemental Quantity</th>
<th>Elemental Unit Rate</th>
<th>Elemental Amount</th>
<th>Cost/m²</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A SHELL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B INTERIORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D SITE &amp; ANCILLARY WORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z GENERAL REQUIREMENTS &amp; ALLOWANCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE (Excluding Allowances)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE (Including Allowances)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Building Cost (Excluding Site):** $2,686.60

**Net Building Cost (Including Site):** $2,956.17

**Total Construction Estimate (Excluding Allowances):** $69,857,000

**Total Construction Estimate (Including Allowances):** $76,843,000
## ELEMENTAL COST SUMMARY
### CONCEPT COST ANALYSIS

**Project:** Concept 3 Estimate  
**Location:** Cambridge, ON  
**Owner/Client:** Cambridge JUC  
**Architect:** C S & P Architects Inc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Ratio to GFA</th>
<th>Elemental Quantity</th>
<th>Elemental Unit Rate</th>
<th>Elemental Amount</th>
<th>Cost/m²</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A SHELL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 SUBSTRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11 Foundation</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>12,347 m²</td>
<td>$190.01</td>
<td>$2,346,000</td>
<td>$112.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12 Basement Excavation</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>3,360 m³</td>
<td>$36.61</td>
<td>$123,000</td>
<td>$5.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **A2 STRUCTURE** | | | | | | | $393,64
| A21 Lowest Floor Construction | 0.59 | 12,347 m² | $75.73 | $935,000 | $44.89 | |
| A22 Upper Floor Construction | 0.41 | 8,484 m² | $468.41 | $3,974,000 | $190.77 | |
| A23 Roof Construction | 0.59 | 12,347 m² | $266.54 | $3,291,000 | $157.99 | |
| **A3 EXTERIOR ENCLOSURE** | | | | | | | $453.84
| A31 Walls Below Grade | 0.02 | 400 m² | $700.00 | $280,000 | $13.44 | |
| A32 Walls Above Grade | 0.32 | 6,656 m² | $504.81 | $3,360,000 | $161.30 | |
| A33 Windows & Entrances | 0.07 | 1,473 m² | $1,148.00 | $1,691,000 | $81.18 | |
| A34 Roof Covering | 0.59 | 12,347 m² | $246.62 | $3,045,000 | $146.18 | |
| A35 Projections | 1.00 | 20,831 m² | $51.75 | $1,078,000 | $51.75 | |
| **B INTERIORS** | | | | | | | $288.94
| B1 PARTITIONS & DOORS | | | | | | |
| B11 Partitions | 1.03 | 21,359 m² | $236.25 | $5,046,000 | $242.24 | |
| B12 Doors | 0.02 | 338 No | $2,878.70 | $973,000 | $46.71 | |
| **B2 FINISHES** | | | | | | | $229.99
| B21 Floor Finishes | 0.91 | 18,874 m² | $127.42 | $2,405,000 | $115.45 | |
| B22 Ceiling Finishes | 0.91 | 18,873 m² | $85.10 | $1,606,000 | $77.10 | |
| B23 Wall Finishes | 1.64 | 34,088 m² | $22.88 | $780,000 | $37.44 | |
| **B3 FITTINGS & EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | $297.83
| B31 Fittings & Fixtures | 1.00 | 20,831 m² | $117.95 | $2,457,000 | $117.95 | |
| B32 Equipment | 1.00 | 20,831 m² | $166.67 | $3,472,000 | $166.67 | |
| **B33 CONVEYING SYSTEMS** | | | | | | | $39,285.71
| C SERVICES | | | | | | | $589.22
| C1 MECHANICAL | | | | | | |
| C11 Plumbing & Drainage | 1.00 | 20,831 m² | $122.13 | $2,544,000 | $122.13 | |
| C12 Fire Protection | 1.00 | 20,831 m² | $41.43 | $863,000 | $41.43 | |
| C13 H.V.A.C. | 1.00 | 20,831 m² | $389.47 | $8,113,000 | $389.47 | |
| C14 Controls | 1.00 | 20,831 m² | $36.20 | $754,000 | $36.20 | |
| **C2 ELECTRICAL** | | | | | | | $285.91
| C21 Service & Distribution | 1.00 | 20,831 m² | $92.75 | $1,932,000 | $92.75 | |
| C22 Lighting, Devices & Heating | 1.00 | 20,831 m² | $110.12 | $2,294,000 | $110.12 | |
| **C3 SYSTEMS & ANCILLARIES** | | | | | | | $93.03
| C33 Conveying Systems | 0.00 | 7 Stp | $39,285.71 | $275,000 | $13.20 | |
| **D SITE & ANCILLARY WORK** | | | | | | | $2,667.90
| D1 SITE WORK | | | | | | |
| D11 Site Development | 4.97 | 103,442 m² | $49.69 | $5,140,000 | $246.75 | |
| D12 Mechanical Site Services | 4.97 | 103,442 m² | $7.25 | $750,000 | $36.00 | |
| D13 Electrical Site Services | 4.97 | 103,442 m² | $3.87 | $400,000 | $19.20 | |
| **D2 ANCILLARY WORK** | | | | | | | $0.00
| D21 Demolition | 0.00 | 0 m² | $0.00 | $0 | $0.00 | |
| D22 Alterations | 0.00 | 0 m² | $0.00 | $0 | $0.00 | |

**NET BUILDING COST (Including Site):** $2,969.85

**TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE (Including Allowances):** $75,537,000

**HST:** 0.0%

**TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE (Including Allowances):** $75,537,000

---

**Gross Floor Area:** 20,831 m²
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Ratio to GFA</th>
<th>Elemental Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Cost/m²</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A SHELL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 SUBSTRUCTURE</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>14,018 m²</td>
<td>$171.85</td>
<td>$2,409,000</td>
<td>$116.78</td>
<td>$2,502,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 Foundation</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>14,018 m²</td>
<td>$171.85</td>
<td>$2,409,000</td>
<td>$116.78</td>
<td>$2,502,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Basement Excavation</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2,171 m³</td>
<td>$42.83</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
<td>$4.51</td>
<td>$2,502,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2 STRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Lowest Floor Construction</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>14,018 m²</td>
<td>$76.69</td>
<td>$1,075,000</td>
<td>$52.11</td>
<td>$386.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Upper Floor Construction</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>6,611 m²</td>
<td>$425.35</td>
<td>$2,812,000</td>
<td>$136.31</td>
<td>$386.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Roof Construction</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>14,018 m²</td>
<td>$292.05</td>
<td>$4,094,000</td>
<td>$198.46</td>
<td>$386.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A3 EXTERIOR ENCLOSURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Walls Below Grade</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>400 m²</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$13.57</td>
<td>$490.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A32 Above Grade</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>6,442 m²</td>
<td>$515.83</td>
<td>$3,323,000</td>
<td>$161.08</td>
<td>$490.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A33 Windows &amp; Entrances</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1,458 m²</td>
<td>$1,224.97</td>
<td>$1,786,000</td>
<td>$86.58</td>
<td>$490.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A34 Roof Covering</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>14,018 m²</td>
<td>$260.88</td>
<td>$3,657,000</td>
<td>$177.27</td>
<td>$490.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A35 Projections</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20,629 m²</td>
<td>$51.92</td>
<td>$1,071,000</td>
<td>$51.92</td>
<td>$490.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B INTERIORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 PARTITIONS &amp; DOORS</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>21,152 m²</td>
<td>$236.67</td>
<td>$5,006,000</td>
<td>$242.67</td>
<td>$290.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Partitions</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>21,152 m²</td>
<td>$236.67</td>
<td>$5,006,000</td>
<td>$242.67</td>
<td>$290.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Doors</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>342 No</td>
<td>$2,883.04</td>
<td>$986,000</td>
<td>$47.80</td>
<td>$5,992,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B2 FINISHES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21 Floor Finishes</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>18,693 m²</td>
<td>$127.80</td>
<td>$2,389,000</td>
<td>$115.81</td>
<td>$230.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22 Ceiling Finishes</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>18,693 m²</td>
<td>$85.33</td>
<td>$1,595,000</td>
<td>$77.32</td>
<td>$230.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23 Wall Finishes</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>33,765 m²</td>
<td>$22.92</td>
<td>$774,000</td>
<td>$37.52</td>
<td>$230.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B3 FITTINGS &amp; EQUIPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B31 Fittings &amp; Fixtures</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20,629 m²</td>
<td>$118.13</td>
<td>$2,437,000</td>
<td>$242.67</td>
<td>$299.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B32 Equipment</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20,629 m²</td>
<td>$168.31</td>
<td>$3,472,000</td>
<td>$242.67</td>
<td>$299.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B33 Conveying Systems</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7 Stp</td>
<td>$39,285.71</td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
<td>$13.33</td>
<td>$299.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 MECHANICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11 Plumbing &amp; Drainage</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20,629 m²</td>
<td>$122.30</td>
<td>$2,523,000</td>
<td>$122.30</td>
<td>$589.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12 Fire Protection</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20,629 m²</td>
<td>$41.45</td>
<td>$855,000</td>
<td>$41.45</td>
<td>$589.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13 H.V.A.C.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20,629 m²</td>
<td>$399.94</td>
<td>$8,044,000</td>
<td>$399.94</td>
<td>$589.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14 Controls</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20,629 m²</td>
<td>$36.21</td>
<td>$747,000</td>
<td>$36.21</td>
<td>$589.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2 ELECTRICAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21 Service &amp; Distribution</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20,629 m²</td>
<td>$92.93</td>
<td>$1,917,000</td>
<td>$92.93</td>
<td>$296.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22 Lighting, Devices &amp; Heating</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20,629 m²</td>
<td>$110.14</td>
<td>$2,272,000</td>
<td>$110.14</td>
<td>$296.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23 Systems &amp; Ancillaries</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20,629 m²</td>
<td>$93.07</td>
<td>$1,920,000</td>
<td>$93.07</td>
<td>$296.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D SITE &amp; ANCILLARY WORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 SITE WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11 Site Development</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>103,442 m²</td>
<td>$44.55</td>
<td>$4,608,000</td>
<td>$223.37</td>
<td>$589.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12 Mechanical Site Services</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>103,442 m²</td>
<td>$7.25</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$36.32</td>
<td>$589.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13 Electrical Site Services</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>103,442 m²</td>
<td>$3.87</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$19.39</td>
<td>$589.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2 ANCILLARY WORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D21 Demolition</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0 m²</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D22 Alterations</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0 m²</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET BUILDING COST (Excluding Site)</strong></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>$2,705.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E GENERAL REQUIREMENTS &amp; ALLOWANCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1 GEN. REQ. &amp; FEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1 General Requirements</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,149,000</td>
<td>$298.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z2 Fee</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE (Excluding Allowances)</strong></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>$67,719,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HST</strong></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>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE (Including Allowances)</strong></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>$74,491,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Elemental Cost Summary

**Concept Cost Analysis**

**Project:** Concept 5 Estimate  
**Location:** Cambridge, ON  
**Owner/Client:** Cambridge JUC  
**Architect:** C S & P Architects Inc  
**Date:** Feb 1, 2021  
**Project Number:** can21291

### A1 Shell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Ratio to GFA</th>
<th>Elemental Quantity</th>
<th>Elemental Unit Rate</th>
<th>Elemental Amount</th>
<th>Cost/m²</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Cost/Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Substructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$128.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11 Foundation</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>14,400 m²</td>
<td>$179.38</td>
<td>$2,583,000</td>
<td>$123.56</td>
<td>$2,676,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12 Basement Excavation</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2,171 m³</td>
<td>$42.83</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
<td>$4.45</td>
<td>$428,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A2 Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Ratio to GFA</th>
<th>Elemental Quantity</th>
<th>Elemental Unit Rate</th>
<th>Elemental Amount</th>
<th>Cost/m²</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Cost/Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A21 Lowest Floor Construction</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>14,400 m²</td>
<td>$76.67</td>
<td>$1,104,000</td>
<td>$52.81</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22 Upper Floor Construction</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>6,504 m²</td>
<td>$428.04</td>
<td>$2,784,000</td>
<td>$133.18</td>
<td>$8,145,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23 Roof Construction</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>14,400 m²</td>
<td>$295.63</td>
<td>$4,257,000</td>
<td>$203.65</td>
<td>$8,145,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A3 Exterior Enclosure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Ratio to GFA</th>
<th>Elemental Quantity</th>
<th>Elemental Unit Rate</th>
<th>Elemental Amount</th>
<th>Cost/m²</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Cost/Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A31 Walls Below Grade</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>400 m²</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$13.39</td>
<td>$10,538,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A32 Walls Above Grade</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>6,995 m²</td>
<td>$509.51</td>
<td>$3,564,000</td>
<td>$170.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A33 Windows &amp; Entrances</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1,596 m²</td>
<td>$1,186.72</td>
<td>$1,894,000</td>
<td>$90.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A34 Roof Covering</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>14,400 m²</td>
<td>$258.54</td>
<td>$3,723,000</td>
<td>$178.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A5 General Requirements & Allowances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Ratio to GFA</th>
<th>Elemental Quantity</th>
<th>Elemental Unit Rate</th>
<th>Elemental Amount</th>
<th>Cost/m²</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Cost/Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z1 General Requirements</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$297.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z11 Schools and CC 6%, REC and JE</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,216,000</td>
<td>$6,216,000</td>
<td>$91%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z12 Fee</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$912,000</td>
<td>$912,000</td>
<td>$91%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Construction Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXCLUDED</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GFA 20,904 m²</td>
<td>$3,615</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFA 225,011 sf</td>
<td>$336</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Building Cost (Including Site): $6,874,000

Net Building Cost (Excluding Site): $6,248,000

**HST:**

- **$0.00**

**TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE (Including Allowances):**

- **$75,571,000**

- **$100%**

- **$3,615 m²**

- **$336 sf**
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City of Cambridge Zoning By-Law No 150-85 (Consolidation January 2012 and Interactive Online Mapping)
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RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 22-047-CD (Recommendation Report – Zoning By-law Amendment – 40 Albert Street) be received;

AND THAT Cambridge Council approves the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment to amend the zoning of the site from the “Residential – R4” zone to the “Residential – RS1” zone and to establish site-specific provisions for the site to permit the development of a semi-detached dwelling containing two units;

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 attached to this report be passed.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

- The purpose of this report is to provide recommendation on a Zoning By-law Amendment application for the lands municipally known as 40 Albert Street, which seeks to amend the current zoning of the subject property to the “Residential – RS1” zone to facilitate the development of a semi-detached residential building containing two dwelling units on a vacant lot.

Key Findings

- The proposed development provides an opportunity for infill development at a higher density than previously experienced on the site, while efficiently making
use of existing land within the Built-up Area and available municipal servicing infrastructure.

- The conversion of lands from an existing single detached dwelling to a proposed semi-detached dwelling is compatible with the existing built-form of the neighbourhood and is consistent with provincial policy regarding intensification.
- The proposed development would contribute to an appropriate range and mix of housing options through the proposed residential intensification and would support the City’s objective of directing 45 percent of all new development to the Built-up Area.
- The proposed development will contribute to the creation of a complete community by facilitating increased density in proximity to the Urban Growth Centre, which encourages the use and enjoyment of active transportation, public transit and surrounding public amenities.

Financial Implications

- A planning application fee has been paid to the City to process the Zoning By-law Amendment application. Should the Zoning By-law Amendment eventually be approved, a future consent application and associated fee would be required to establish the individually owned lots (total of 2 residential lots).
- City and Regional Development Charge Fees will be collected prior to building permit issuance.
- If approved, the proposed development will contribute additional tax revenue to the City. An estimate of the potential tax revenue is provided further below in this report.
- Any further costs associated with the development of the site are borne by the applicant.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☑ Strategic Action; or
☐ Core Service

Objective(s): PLANNING FOR GROWTH - Provide for a mix of development, uses and amenities in order to meet the needs of a changing and diverse population

Strategic Action: Increase housing options

Program: Not Applicable

Core Service: Not Applicable
The proposed development considers the intensification of a vacant parcel within an established residential neighbourhood in the City’s identified Built-Up Area. The proposed amendment to the Zoning By-law will facilitate an increase in density on a site that is situated in proximity to a number of public and transit services and is capable of utilizing existing municipal servicing infrastructure. The proposed residential built-form supports the City’s goal to provide a range and mix of housing within convenient distance to local amenities. Similar built-form presently exists surrounding the subject lands and the proposed density and total number of dwellings on the lot is expected to complement the established low/medium density neighbourhood.

BACKGROUND:

Property

The subject lands are municipally addressed as 40 Albert Street and are legally described as Part of Lot 43, Registered Plan 457, City of Cambridge, Regional Municipality of Waterloo. The subject property is located in the south western corner of the Albert Street and Birch Street intersection, being situated approximately 150 metres east of Ainslie Street South and the Galt Core Area. The property is currently vacant but was previously developed with a single-detached residential dwelling before being demolished as a result of fire damage. The lot has a total area of 466.3 square metres (5,019 square feet) and provides a frontage of 20.2 metres.

The image below provides an aerial view of the subject lands:

![Aerial Map of the Subject Lands](image_url)

Figure 1: Aerial Map of the Subject Lands
Surrounding Land Uses

The subject lands are situated within an existing residential neighbourhood comprised of single-detached and semi-detached residential dwellings. The lands are located within convenient walking distance of the Galt Core Area, located to the west of the lands. The Galt Core Area provides a range and mix of land uses including local commercial, institutional and recreational amenities that support the residential uses within and surrounding its boundary.

ANALYSIS:

The purpose of this report is to provide a recommendation on the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment application submitted to facilitate the development of a three-storey, semi-detached residential dwelling containing two units. The subject lands have previously been developed with a single detached dwelling, which has since been removed from the site. The below elevation provides an illustration of the semi-detached dwelling proposed for the property:

![Proposed Elevation of the Semi-Detached Dwelling](image)

*Figure 2: Proposed Elevation of the Semi-Detached Dwelling*

The proposed residential building provides frontages onto both Albert Street to the east and Birch Street to the north. The northern frontage along Birch Street will be treated as
the exterior side yard for the northern unit, while the frontage along Albert Street is considered the front yard. The proposed development has been planned with access driveways off of Albert Street on the eastern side of the property.

The proposed residential units will each provide a gross floor area of 167.2 square metres (1,800 square feet) and future residents will have access to side yard and rear yard amenity areas. Both units will have access to a second storey deck located in the rear yards.

A total of two parking spaces will be made available for each unit, where one parking space is provided in an individual single-car garage, while a second space is available in the proposed access driveway. Both the single-car garage and the access driveways provide sufficient space to accommodate a modern-day vehicle. The provided garage and driveway spaces exceed the minimum parking stall size requirements set by the City’s Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended. The provided parking also exceeds the minimum number of parking spaces required per unit in a semi-detached dwelling, which requires the provision of one space for the first four bedrooms in the unit. As the unit provides a maximum of three-bedrooms, the proposed parking is in compliance.

The subject lands are presently zoned “Residential – R4” by the City’s Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended. This residential zone does not permit semi-detached dwellings as a permitted use as-of-right. In order to develop the vacant land with the proposed semi-detached built form, the submission of a Zoning By-law Amendment application was necessary to request a rezoning of the lands from the current zone to the “Residential – RS1” zone, which provides permissions for the proposed residential development.

Furthermore, as part of the Zoning By-law Amendment application, the applicant is requesting site-specific provisions be established for the following development standards in order to facilitate the proposed residential use. The requested site-specific provisions include the following:

- To permit a minimum lot frontage for a corner lot of a semi-detached dwelling to be 20.13 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum frontage of 22 metres;
- To permit a minimum lot frontage for the corner unit of a semi-detached dwelling to be 11.13 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum frontage of 13 metres;
- To permit a minimum lot area for a corner lot of a semi-detached dwelling to be 466.3 square metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum lot area of 660 square metres;
- To permit a minimum lot area for a semi-detached dwelling to be 208.7 square metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum lot area of 270 square metres;
To permit a minimum lot area for the corner unit of a semi-detached dwelling to be 257.7 square metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum lot area of 390 square metres; and,

To permit a minimum exterior side yard of 5 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum exterior side yard of 6 metres.

Staff have given consideration to the agency comments that have been received, compatibility with the surrounding neighbourhood, and the appropriateness of the site-specific provisions requested as part of the review and formation of this recommendation.

After review of the proposed application, it is the opinion of Staff that the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment is consistent with the updated 2020 Provincial Policy Statement, which took effect on May 1, 2020 and conforms to the 2020 Provincial Growth Plan, as it will result in efficient use of land, resources, existing infrastructure and municipal servicing to accommodate residential growth and increased density in proximity to the Urban Growth Centre. The proposal conforms to the Region of Waterloo’s Official Plan, which supports intensification of residential uses within the City’s Built-up Area and helps achieve the Region’s target for intensification of a minimum of 45 percent of all new development to be directed to the Built-up Area. Finally, the proposed residential intensification is permitted by the City’s Official Plan and conforms to the Low/Medium Density Residential Designation applied to the lands.

The proposed development supports the City’s objective to accommodate new growth until the year 2031. It is of the opinion of Staff that the proposal meets the criteria outlined by the Official Plan with respect to Residential Infill Compatibility as it conforms with the following:

- The scale and density of the proposed development is compatible with the low/medium density residential development that currently exists within the neighbourhood. The proposed height of three-storeys is also comparable to existing development on Albert Street, as a three-storey apartment house already exists at 4 Albert Street, located slightly north of the subject lands;
- The proposed development will complement the existing semi-detached residential development across the road on the opposite side of Birch Street. The continued use of the property for residential uses will permit the continued viability of neighbouring uses, which are currently being used for similar purposes.
- The proposed development will have access to the local road network that will connect the property to the surrounding residential community and the Galt Core Area to the west. The site provides sufficient parking to accommodate up to two
vehicles per unit. Additionally, pedestrian sidewalks are available that connect residents to available transit infrastructure within the neighbourhood.

- Appropriate landscaping and setbacks are proposed on the site that will permit the natural transition of the built form onto the property while providing buffering to adjacent development and public streets. The two units will have comfortable front, side and rear yards for use by future residents.

Furthermore, it is the opinion of Staff that the proposed development conforms with the policies of section 8.4.3 of the City’s Official Plan, with respect to location criteria for multi-unit residential development. The City encourages the use of lands in residential designations to provide sufficient units in multi-unit residential development without an amendment to the Official Plan provided that the compatibility criteria are addressed. The subject property complies with the criteria as it:

- is directly accessible to Ainslie Street South and Water Street South to the west, which are identified as arterial roads;
- is conveniently accessible to local transit stops within the residential neighbourhood and within comfortable walking distance of Ainslie Street Terminal (approximately 11-minute walk);
- provides a suitable size and configuration to accommodate the development while providing sufficient outdoor amenity space and landscaping; and,
- provides for a compatible form of residential development with adjoining lands and the surrounding residential community.

As part of the requested zoning amendment, site-specific provisions are being requested to the existing permissions of the RS1 zone, including the following:

- To permit a minimum lot frontage for a corner lot of a semi-detached dwelling to be 20.13 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum frontage of 22 metres; and,
- To permit a minimum lot frontage for the corner unit of a semi-detached dwelling to be 11.13 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum frontage of 13 metres.
  - The “Residential – RS1” zone provides two minimum lot frontage provisions. The first minimum lot frontage provision relates to the overall frontage of a semi-detached dwelling on a corner lot. The requirement is that an overall frontage of 22 metres be provided. However, the existing lot can only provide a maximum lot frontage of 20.13 metres, which equates to a total reduction of the required frontage by 1.87 metres. Although a reduced lot frontage is proposed, the site remains fully capable of accommodating the semi-detached dwelling, access driveways and required front yard space. There are no anticipated adverse impacts to the
subject property or adjacent residential properties as a result of this reduction given that no change is occurring to the site as a result of approving the reduced frontage. Given that there are no concerns that a semi-detached dwelling can be accommodated on the existing property, the reduced frontage by 1.87 metres is considered minor as the proposed residential built-form capitalizes on an existing vacant property by intensifying the site, as is directed by the provincial, regional and local planning policies for the Built-up Area.

- The second minimum lot frontage provision of the RS1 zone requires that the lot frontage for a corner unit of a semi-detached dwelling be a minimum of 13 metres. The applicant is proposing that the corner unit of the semi-detached dwelling provide a minimum lot frontage of 11.13 metres, which equates to a reduction of 1.87 metres. As described above, it is the opinion of staff that this reduction is minor and would not create any adverse impacts on the subject property or adjacent lots. The corner unit of the semi-detached building remains capable of accommodating the required development and continues to meet the intent of the By-law, which is to provide a lot that can accommodate the necessary development, access driveway and front yard.

Furthermore, the requested site-specific provisions include:

- To permit a minimum lot area for a corner lot of a semi-detached dwelling to be 466.3 square metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum lot area of 660 square metres;
- To permit a minimum lot area for a semi-detached dwelling to be 208.7 square metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum lot area of 270 square metres; and,
- To permit a minimum lot area for the corner unit of a semi-detached dwelling to be 257.7 square metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum lot area of 390 square metres;
- The RS1 zone of the City’s Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended, includes a number of specific minimum requirements that are to be complied with regarding minimum lot area. As outlined through the requested site-specific provisions above, it is evident that the By-law provides for varying minimum lot area requirements when considering the development of a semi-detached residential building. With respect to the proposed semi-detached dwelling on the subject lands, the proposed built-form does not achieve the minimum requirements of any of the minimum lot areas required by the By-law. The intent of the minimum lot area provisions outlined in the RS1 zone is to ensure that sufficient space is
provided on a lot that will permit future residents to enjoy a viable size
dwelling that can accommodate a family, while providing sufficient space
to accommodate outdoor private amenity spaces, parking, and required
setbacks.

- The planned development is proposed to provide two dwelling units with
total gross floor areas of 167.2 square metres (1,800 square feet), which
is well above the minimum required gross floor area for dwelling units
within the RS1 zone, being a minimum of 75 square metres (807 square
feet). As such, the proposed dwelling units provide unit sizes of almost
1000 square feet above the minimum size requirement. In addition, the
subject property is capable of providing the required parking necessary for
the two units, as well as provides front, side and rear yard amenity spaces
for both units. With the exception of the exterior side yard setback on one
end of the unit, the proposed development remains in compliance with the
minimum setback requirements from all surrounding property lines.
Although the applicant is requesting a reduction in the permitted minimum
lot areas, they are continuing to meet the intent of the By-law, which is to
provide sufficient size lots that can provide space for parking, private
amenity areas and comfortable buffers between adjacent developments. It
is the opinion of staff that the proposed lot is appropriate in size to
accommodate the proposed development.

- Furthermore, the applicant is proposing to increase the density on the site
by adding an additional dwelling unit than previously experienced on the
property. The intensification of the site with multi-residential uses supports
the growth policies that have been set by the province and that are
encouraged by both the Region and the City. It is a site that is well-
situated to accommodate this residential growth and the proposed
increase by one additional unit is a respectful and compatible infill
development that should be supported and encouraged on this lot size.

- As such, it is the opinion of staff that the request to reduce the minimum
lot area to facilitate the proposed intensification of the lot for a semi-
detached dwelling will allow for important residential development that will
assist in combating the current housing crisis and lack of housing units in
the province.

- To permit a minimum exterior side yard of 5 metres, whereas the By-law requires
a minimum exterior side yard of 6 metres.

- Finally, the applicant is also requesting a reduction in the minimum
exterior side yard by 1 metre on one end of the northern most unit. The
applicant has been able to successfully satisfy all other minimum setback
requirements set out by the proposed RS1 zone, including the minimum front, interior side and rear yard setbacks on the subject lands. The northern unit, who’s side yard abuts the frontage onto Birch Street, is required to provide a minimum exterior side yard setback of 6 metres as it is located adjacent to a public street. Due to the natural shape of the existing lot, which was created decades ago and is not being changed as part of this application, the proposed semi-detached dwelling is capable of meeting the minimum setback of 6 metres when measured from its rear corner, however, due to the property line being slightly uneven, the front corner of the unit is one metre closer to the property line than at the rear. As such, if the property line was even along the frontage, the proposed building would be able to comply with the minimum requirement, but given the current site boundary, the applicant was required to include this request. As is seen in the image below, the proposed building is not providing an unordinary design that is resulting in a reduced setback. It is simply the existing lot boundary that results in the property line being closer to the building as it is measured closer to Albert Street.

It is the opinion of staff that the proposed reduction in one metre will not result in any type of negative impact on the subject property, the proposed development or its relationship with the street. A sufficient side yard will continue to be provided.
If Council does not support the recommendation, the project 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 with Cambridge Council.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

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 Attachment No.3). 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 and semi-detached dwellings, townhouses and walk up apartments.

The proposal conforms to the City of Cambridge Official Plan and an amendment is not required.

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

The subject lands are currently zoned R4 by the City of Cambridge Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended. The existing zoning solely permits the development of single detached dwellings and does not permit semi-detached dwellings. Accordingly, a Zoning By-law Amendment is being proposed by the applicant to rezone the lands to the RS1 zone to permit the development of a semi-detached dwelling on the subject lands, along with site-specific provisions as has been described in detail in this report.

In Staff’s opinion the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment with the requested site-specific provisions comply with the intent of the City of Cambridge Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended.

A zoning map representing the current zoning of the subject lands has been included as Appendix 2 of this report.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

- A planning application fee for the Zoning By-law Amendment in the amount of $8,500 was paid (2021) representing the City’s fee to process the application;
- City and Regional Development Charge Fees for the proposed development is estimated at $55,615 and $62,752, respectively.
• The potential tax revenue from the proposed development is as follows:
  o The value of the two semi-detached dwellings is estimated between $1,100,000 and $1,200,000. The potential tax revenue from the development will fall between $4,717 and $5,146 using the 2021 City tax portion rate.
• A future severance application will be required to create the two separate properties. A future consent fee of $1,600 will be required to process the consent application.
• Any further costs associated with the development of the site are borne by the applicant.

PUBLIC VALUE:

Engagement:

Public involvement was encouraged through the planning review process. This process provided the community with the ability to share their opinions and views openly and allowed for active and direct communication between residents, staff, the applicant and members of Council.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:

• Not applicable.

PUBLIC INPUT:

• The statutory public meeting required under the Planning Act was held on November 23, 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 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.

Staff have received comments from the applicable City departments and outside agencies in regards to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment. The staff comments have been addressed by the applicant.

CONCLUSION:

City of Cambridge Development Planning Staff is recommending approval of a Zoning By-law Amendment application submitted for 40 Albert Street that seeks to facilitate the development of a semi-detached dwelling containing two units. This application
represents the intensification of a vacant site within the City’s Built-up Area, which is located in proximity to the Galt Core Area and the City’s Urban Growth Centre. The site is walkable, within convenient distance of public transit and represents an appropriate property to accommodate the minor increase in density that will help achieve the City’s residential growth objectives and intensification targets. The proposed development provides for additional housing and supports both the Region’s and City’s target to achieve a minimum of 45 percent of all new development within the Built-up Area. Additionally, the proposed development provides for a mix of housing and unit types in an existing residential neighbourhood, which will help provide attainable housing for a diverse range of potential buyers.

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, as amended. The proposal represents the efficient and appropriate intensification of vacant residential land within an existing low/medium density residential neighbourhood and is considered good planning. As such, staff recommend approval of the Zoning By-law Amendment to allow the development of a semi-detached dwelling.

REPORT IMPACTS:

Agreement: No
By-law: Yes
Budget Amendment: No
Policy: Yes
APPROVALS:

This report has gone through the appropriate workflow and has been reviewed and or approved by the following as required:

Director
Deputy City Manager
Chief Financial Officer
City Solicitor
City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

When naming attachments please use the following format:

1. 22-047-CD Appendix A – Proposed Site Plan
2. 22-047-CD Appendix B – Existing Zoning Map
3. 22-047-CD Appendix C – Existing Official Plan Map
4. 22-047-CD Appendix D – Public Meeting Minutes
5. 22-047-CD Appendix E – External/Internal Comments Received and List of Supporting Documents
6. 22-047-CD Appendix F – Draft Zoning By-law Amendment
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
22-047-CD Appendix E – External/Internal Comments Received and List of Supporting Documents

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 amendment.

- 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
- Canadian Pacific Rail and Canadian National Rail
- Grand River Conservation Authority
- Ministry of Transportation

List of Supporting Studies/Documents

- Planning Justification Report;
- Site Plan;
- Elevation and Floor Plans
- Landscape Plan
22-047-CD Appendix F – Draft Zoning By-law Amendment

Purpose and Effect of By-law No. 22-XXX

40 Albert Street

The Purpose of the By-law is to amend the zoning for the lands legally described as Part of Lot 43, Registered Plan 457, City of Cambridge, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (“subject lands”). The proposed amendment will facilitate the development of a semi-detached dwelling containing two residential units. In order to develop the subject lands with the above proposed development, the subject lands are required to be rezoned to the “Residential – RS1” zone, along with site-specific provisions to permit the following:

- To permit a minimum lot frontage for a corner lot of a semi-detached dwelling to be 20.13 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum frontage of 22 metres;
- To permit a minimum lot frontage for the corner unit of a semi-detached dwelling to be 11.13 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum frontage of 13 metres;
- To permit a minimum lot area for a corner lot of a semi-detached dwelling to be 466.3 square metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum lot area of 660 square metres;
- To permit a minimum lot area for a semi-detached dwelling to be 208.7 square metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum lot area of 270 square metres;
- To permit a minimum lot area for the corner unit of a semi-detached dwelling to be 257.7 square metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum lot area of 390 square metres; and,
- To permit a minimum exterior side yard of 5 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum exterior side yard of 6 metres.

The Effect of the By-law will permit the development of the subject lands for a semi-detached dwelling containing two units.
BY-LAW. 22-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 40 Albert Street (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 November 23rd, 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 43, Registered Plan 457, City of Cambridge, 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 R4 to the RS1 – 4.1.423 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:
“4.1.423 – 40 Albert Street, legally described as Part of Lot 43, Registered Plan 457, City of Cambridge, Regional Municipality of Waterloo, the following regulations shall apply to the lands in the RS1 zone to which reference “s.4.1.423 is made on Schedule A and located at 40 Albert Street:

- To permit a minimum lot frontage for a corner lot of a semi-detached dwelling to be 20.13 metres;
- To permit a minimum lot frontage for the corner unit of a semi-detached dwelling to be 11.13 metres;
- To permit a minimum lot area for a corner lot of a semi-detached dwelling to be 466.3 square metres;
- To permit a minimum lot area for a semi-detached dwelling to be 208.7 square metres;
- To permit a minimum lot area for the corner unit of a semi-detached dwelling to be 257.7 square metres; and,
- To permit a minimum exterior side yard of 5 metres.

4. THAT geothermal energy systems (including vertical open and closed loop geothermal energy systems) be prohibited on the subject lands in accordance with Chapter 8 of the Regional Official Plan.

5. 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 17th day of May 2022.

____________________
Mayor

____________________
Clerk
Schedule A – Proposed Zoning Map

This is Schedule A attached to and forming part of By-law __________
To: SPECIAL COUNCIL
Meeting Date: 5/17/2022
Subject: 637 King Street East Property Acquisition
Submitted By: Lisa Shields, City Solicitor
Prepared By: Paul Kan, Manager of Realty Services
Report No.: 22-011-OCM
File No.: RS-05-22
Wards Affected: Ward 3

RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 22-011-OCM (637 King Street East – Property Acquisition) be received as information;

AND THAT Council authorize the purchase of the property municipally known as 637 King Street East, Cambridge, Ontario in accordance with the terms and conditions as set out in the Agreement of Purchase and Sale at a purchase price of $1,200,000, and at a total cost inclusive of applicable taxes and ancillary costs of approximately $1,250,000;

AND FURTHER THAT a capital project be established for the property acquisition and be funded from the Core Areas Transformation Reserve Fund;

AND FURTHER THAT a transfer of $1,250,000 from the Core Areas Transformation Reserve Fund be approved;

AND FURTHER THAT $25,000 be added to the 2022 operating budget to fund the maintenance and operations of the newly acquired asset for the year 2022;

AND FURTHER THAT the Mayor and Clerk be authorized to execute all documentation required to implement and give effect to the adopted recommendations as set out in this report, subject to the satisfaction of the City Solicitor.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

The City has the opportunity to acquire 637 King Street East (the “Property”). City staff has negotiated a conditional Agreement of Purchase and Sale (the “Agreement”) for the
Property at a purchase price of $1,200,000 plus applicable taxes. The Agreement has been signed by the property owner and is irrevocable until June 7, 2022. The City will need to sign back the Agreement by June 7, 2022 in order to secure the Property under contract.

**Key Findings**

**637 King Street East**

Property details are as follows:

- **Location:** Preston Towne Centre Core Area abutting Central Park
- **Lot size:** 8,665 square feet
- **Building size:** 4,553 square feet
- **Ownership:** The Property is owned by a subsidiary of the RBC Royal Bank.
- **Levels:** single storey plus basement and second level mezzanine
- **Zoning:** C1RM2
- **Current Use:** Vacant (former RBC branch)
- **Current listing price:** The Property is currently listed for sale on the Multiple Listing Service for $1,200,000.

**Key Business Terms of the Agreement of Purchase and Sale**

An Agreement of Purchase and Sale has been negotiated and signed by the property owner and is conditional on Council approval and City sign-back.

The key business terms are as follows:

- The purchase price is $1,200,000 plus applicable taxes.
- The Agreement of Purchase and Sale has been signed by the property owner and is irrevocable until June 7, 2022.
- The Agreement of Purchase and Sale is conditional on Council approval and City sign-back.
- The Agreement of Purchase and Sale is conditional on the City, at its sole discretion, undertaking and being satisfied with its due diligence investigations such as tenant lease review, environmental site assessments, heritage and architectural assessments, building condition assessments, appraisal, and any other investigations that the City deems necessary. The City will have 30 days from date of sign-back to undertake due diligence investigations and waive conditions.

**Due Diligence**

Due diligence findings include the following:

- **Appraisal:** The purchase price of $1,200,000 is supported by an appraisal.
• Building Condition: Structural Assessment and Building Condition reports were undertaken indicating that the condition of the building components range from fair to good condition, and no projects or work orders were recommended. A building condition assessment report will also be undertaken to supplement the existing reports.
• Environmental Site Assessment: Phase 1 and 2 ESA were undertaken indicating that no soil or ground water impacts of concern were found.
• Asbestos Material survey: An asbestos material survey was undertaken indicating that asbestos-containing materials were found within the building however these were in good condition and poses no immediate health risks and requiring no immediate action. However, as the building is renovated over time, the asbestos will be required to be removed under a process that meets prescribed standards.
• Encumbrances: There are no material encumbrances registered on title.
• Leases: The Property is currently vacant and there are no leases in connection with the Property.
• Cultural Heritage considerations: The Property is not on the heritage register.

Financial Implications

The acquisition of 637 King Street East will have the following financial implications:

• The total acquisition cost is estimated to be $1,250,000 comprised of a purchase price of $1,200,000 plus applicable taxes and ancillary expenditures. It is recommended that the acquisition costs be funded from the Core Area Transformation Reserve Fund.
• There will be a funding requirement of approximately $47,000 per year for operating costs if the Property is utilized by the City for its own or for community purposes, OR there will be a funding surplus of approximately $35,000 per year if the Property is leased to generate rental revenue.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☑ Strategic Action; or
☐ Core Service

Objective(s): PLANNING FOR GROWTH - Provide for a mix of development, uses and amenities in order to meet the needs of a changing and diverse population.

Strategic Action: Create and activate spaces that offer things for people to do.

Program: Not Applicable

Core Service: Not Applicable
Located within the Preston Towne Centre Core Area and next to Central Park (see Appendix B – Aerial View), the City’s acquisition of 637 King Street East creates opportunities to enhance placemaking at and around Central Park.

BACKGROUND:

Former RBC Royal Bank Branch

637 King Street East is located within the Preston Towne Centre Core Area next to Central Park. The Property is owned by Global Realty Holdings Ltd. which is a subsidiary of RBC Royal Bank ("RBC"), and was the site of an RBC branch for over 25 years. The Property is currently vacant due to RBC consolidating its branches. Recently, the Property was put on the market for sale through RBC’s real estate broker Cushman & Wakefield.

Central Park (Preston)

Central Park is located in the heart of Preston Towne Centre Core Area fronting King Street and features open green space, floral displays, and the Preston Legion Cenotaph. The Park is approximately one acre in size and is a popular meeting place in Preston. Central Park hosts outdoor events such as concerts, Christmas Candyland, and the Preston Towne Farmer’s Market.

ANALYSIS:

Strategic Land Acquisition

City acquisition of 637 King Street East creates many opportunities to support local businesses and the community.

1) Support local businesses:
   - The Property can be used to help support and expand the Preston Towne Farmer’s Market (indoor market, storage, power supply, water supply, etc.).
   - The Property can be used as a venue for events such as antique fairs, food fairs, art fairs, and pop-up shops in support of local small businesses.
   - The Property is currently vacant, and the City “activating” the Property will help increase business activity in the local area.

2) Support community programs:
• The Property can be used to accommodate program overflows from the Allan Reuter Centre.
• The Property can be used as a makerspace for the community.
• The Property can be used as an event space for local community groups and clubs.

3) Complements Central Park:
• The Property can be leased to vendors such as an eatery or coffee shop that would cater to visitors to Central Park.
• The Property adds an indoor setting to complement Central Park.

In recent years, the City has made several property acquisitions considered to be strategic land acquisitions.

In these instances, the properties became available, and were either:

(a) Located between two city-owned properties in which the acquisition of the available property would fill out City land-holdings thereby increasing land value as well as optimizing land use opportunities; OR
(b) Located next to an important city-owned property in which the acquisition of the available property would complement the city-owned property as well as optimize land use opportunities.

The acquisition of the property at 637 King Street East would be considered a scenario “b” acquisition.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

By-law 74-95 sets out provisions, procedures, and guidelines with respect to authority and due diligence for property acquisitions.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Initial Acquisition Costs

The acquisition of the Property will require initial funding of approximately $1,250,000. The expenditure items and estimated costs are outlined in Table A. It is recommended that the funding source be the Core Area Transformation Reserve Fund.
Table A - Acquisition Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Price</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Transfer Tax</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-refundable HST</td>
<td>21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acquisition Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,250,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating Budget Impact

Impact to the operating budget will depend on the business model used for the Property.

- City use only: In this model, the Property is used for City and community purposes only and does not generate any rental revenue. Analysis indicates that there would be a funding requirement of approximately $47,000 per year for property operating expenses. See Table B.

- Leased to third party: In this model, the Property is leased to a third party paying fair market rent. Analysis indicates that there would be a funding surplus generated from rental revenue of approximately $35,000. See Table B.

- City use and space rental: In this model, use of the Property is allocated to both City use (non-revenue generating) and space rental (revenue generating) which could potentially make the Property cost neutral for the City to operate.

Should the City proceed with acquiring the Property, it is expected that the City will have possession by end of June 2022. As such, it is recommended that $25,000 be added to the 2022 operating budget to fund the operations and maintenance of the Property for the six-month period from July to December. The $25,000 funding estimate is based on
the 12-month budget forecast for City use as outlined in Table B and rounded up to $25,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table B - Operating Budget Impact Forecast</th>
<th>City Use</th>
<th>Leased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rental Revenue</td>
<td>12-month period</td>
<td>12-month period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Rent (based on $13.00 psf)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Rent (operating costs recovered)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Taxes (estimated)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and Utilities</td>
<td>22,765</td>
<td>22,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Reserve Contribution</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Net Operating Budget Impact               | $(46,765) | $35,189 |

**Capital Budget Impact**

The Structural Assessment and Building Condition reports conclude that the building components are in fair to good condition, and that no projects or work orders were recommended. A building condition assessment report will also be undertaken to supplement these existing reports. In the interim, it is recommended that $70,000 be budgeted for capital work in connection with any initial set up and preparatory work for the Property.

It was noted earlier that asbestos-containing materials were found within the building however the asbestos material survey report concluded that these materials were in good condition and posed no immediate health risks or immediate action. It should also be noted that should these materials be damaged or disturbed, that these materials be removed and disposed of under a process that meets prescribed standards. The total cost to remove all asbestos-containing materials is estimated to be $100,000 and should be budgeted for.
A capital reserve contribution in the amount of $24,000 per year is recommended as part of the annual operating budget as outlined in Table B. City staff will reassess future capital work and funding requirements on an annual basis as part of the annual budgeting and forecasting process.

PUBLIC VALUE:

Leadership:

The acquisition of 637 King Street East supports the City’s placemaking initiative and further demonstrates the City’s commitment to making investments to support local businesses and the community.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:

Advisory Committees Consulted:

Future consultation will be undertaken with committees such as the Accessibility Advisory Committee and the Space Utilization Committee.

PUBLIC INPUT:

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

Internal Stakeholders


External Stakeholders

Antec Appraisal Group was commissioned to prepare an appraisal for the Property.

CONCLUSION:

The acquisition of 637 King Street East is considered a strategic land acquisition that complements Central Park. City ownership of the Property will create opportunities to support local businesses and the community.
REPORT IMPACTS:
Agreement: No
By-law: No
Budget Amendment: No
Policy: No

APPROVALS:

This report has gone through the appropriate workflow and has been reviewed and or approved by the following as required:

Director
Deputy City Manager
Chief Financial Officer
City Solicitor
City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:
1. 22-011-OCM Appendix A – Street View
2. 22-011-OCM Appendix B – Aerial View
3. 22-011-OCM Appendix C – Ground Floor View
4. 22-006-OCM Appendix D – Floor Plan
Appendix A – Street View

Photo of the front of 637 King Street East at street level.
Appendix B – Aerial View

Aerial map identifying 637 King St E shaded in yellow, and Central Park outlined in red.
Appendix C – Ground Floor View

Photo of interior of the building at ground level.
Appendix D – Floor Plan

Floor plan of the building at 637 King Street E.
To: SPECIAL COUNCIL
Meeting Date: 5/17/2022
Subject: 4910 Townline Road Property Acquisition
Submitted By: Lisa Shields, City Solicitor
Prepared By: Paul Kan, Manager of Realty Services
Report No.: 22-012-OCM
File No.: RS-06-22
Wards Affected: Ward 2

RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 22-012-OCM (4910 Townline Road – Property Acquisition) be received as information;

AND THAT Council authorize the purchase of the property municipally known as 4910 Townline Road, Cambridge, Ontario (the “Property”) at a purchase price not to exceed $1,250,000, and at a total cost inclusive of applicable taxes, ancillary costs, and owner’s costs compensable under the Expropriation Act not to exceed $1,380,000;

AND FURTHER THAT the Mayor and Clerk be authorized to execute all documentation required to implement and give effect to the completion of the Agreement of Purchase and Sale, subject to the satisfaction of the City Solicitor;

AND FURTHER THAT Council authorize staff to continue with the acquisition of the Property by way of the expropriation process, if necessary;

AND FURTHER THAT Council authorize the Mayor and Clerk to certify Council’s approval for staff to continue with the expropriation process in the prescribed form of a Certificate of Approval in accordance with the Expropriation Act;

AND FURTHER THAT Council authorize the Manager of Realty Services to execute all documentation and forms to be served on the owners of the Property in accordance with the Expropriation Act;

AND FURTHER THAT an additional $100,000 be added to the budget for Project A/00666-10 (Black Bridge Road/Townline Road property acquisition) in order to accommodate funding requirements to complete the acquisition either by way of an agreement of purchase and sale or by way of expropriation;
AND THAT the additional $100,000 be funded through a transfer of 33,000 from the Capital Works Reserve Fund and $67,000 from the Development Charges – Roads Reserve Fund.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

4910 Townline Road is required for the Black Bridge Road Project (the “Project”). City staff has negotiated the key business terms of an agreement of purchase and sale. The agreement of purchase and sale is currently being finalized for the property owners’ signatures. In parallel to the processing of the agreement of purchase and sale, City staff is seeking authorization to continue with the expropriation process until such time that the City has acquired the Property by way of either expropriation or an agreement of purchase and sale.

Key Findings

The Black Bridge Road Project

1. The Project involves:
   a. Constructing a new two-lane bridge over the Speed River to accommodate two-way traffic on Black Bridge Road;
   b. Converting the existing one-lane bridge to be part of a multi-use path;
   c. Constructing a multi-use path including canoe launch and cycling amenities;
   d. Reconstructing a portion of Townline Road, Black Bridge Road, and the intersection of Townline Road, Black Bridge Road, and Roszell Road;
   e. Removal of the house located at 4910 Townline Road to accommodate the new road alignment at Black Bridge Road.

2. The Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Study (the “EA”) which included the recommendation for the whole property acquisitions of 4910 Townline Road and 1000 Black Bridge Road was completed and accepted in June 2016.

3. Public Information Centres (“PIC”) were held during preliminary design in which comments were received from the community, as well as hiking and canoeing groups confirming the need for parking in the area.

4. The Preliminary Concept Design was completed in July 2020.

5. Detailed Design work commenced in 2021 and is currently ongoing.
6. Utility relocation work is scheduled to commence in Fall 2022.

7. The acquisition of properties required for the Project commenced in late 2019, and 4910 Townline Road remains as the only property owned by private land owners still to be acquired.

**4910 Townline Road**

1. 4910 Townline Road is located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Black Bridge Road and Townline Road, and is a critical path to the successful delivery of the Project. See Appendix “A” – Aerial Location Map.

2. The Property is approximately .664 acres (2,687 m²) and is improved with a 1,560 sf (145 m²) house and a two-bay detached garage / workshop.

3. The house on the Property is listed on the heritage register but is not designated.

4. The Property is currently not occupied however it is possible that it is being used by the property owner for storage purposes.

5. The environmental assessment study for the Project identifies the Property as a whole property acquisition, and the house located on the Property will be need to be removed to accommodate the new road alignment.

**Key Business Terms of the Agreement of Purchase and Sale**

The key business terms for an agreement of purchase and sale were agreed upon as a condition for the property owners to withdraw from the Hearing of Necessity.

The key business terms are as follows:

1. The Agreement of Purchase and Sale is conditional on Council approval and City sign-back by May 25, 2022.

2. The closing date for the transaction is June 20, 2022.

3. The purchase/settlement price is $1,250,000 plus applicable taxes.

4. The property owners’ costs such as legal, accountant, and appraisals costs are to be reimbursed in accordance with the Expropriation Act.

5. The Property will be acquired on an as-is where-is basis as if the Property was expropriated.

6. In the event that the agreement of purchase and sale is not approved or completed, the City will continue with the expropriation process to acquire the Property without objection from the property owners.
The Expropriation Process

1. The Municipal Act grants municipalities the power to acquire land including the power to expropriate land in accordance with the Expropriation Act.

2. The Expropriation Act sets out prescribed steps and timelines to be taken as part of the expropriation process. Appendix “C” is a high-level flowchart outlining the expropriation process up to the time of possession of a property.

3. Possession of a property by way of expropriation will generally take between 9 and 12 months depending on if the property owner requests a Hearing of Necessity. Possession could also occur anytime during the expropriation process if a negotiated settlement is achieved. In this instance, the property owners requested a Hearing of Necessity and subsequently withdrew their request on the date of the hearing. With the withdrawal from the hearing, next steps would be that Council certify its approval to complete the expropriation, if necessary, in the prescribed form of a Certificate of Approval.

4. Expropriating authorities generally follow an approach referred to as the “parallel expropriation-negotiation” approach whereby the expropriation process is initiated and followed through its prescribed steps as set out in the Expropriation Act while negotiations continue concurrently with the property owner(s) with the goal of achieving a negotiated settlement.

Financial Implications

The total acquisition cost is estimated to be $1,380,000 comprised of the purchase/settlement price, applicable taxes, owner’s costs compensable under the Expropriation Act, and ancillary expenditures. Currently, there is approximately $1,280,000 available funding in Project A00666-10 (Black Bridge Road/Townline Road property acquisition). As such, an additional $100,000 is required to complete the acquisition. The recommended sources of funding are $33,000 from the Capital Works Reserve Fund and $67,000 from DC Roads.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☒ Strategic Action; or
☐ Core Service

Objective(s): PLANNING FOR GROWTH - Provide for a mix of development, uses and amenities in order to meet the needs of a changing and diverse population.
Strategic Action: Lay the foundation for future community-building

Program: Not Applicable

Core Service: Not Applicable

Infrastructure improvements along Black Bridge Road are necessary to accommodate increasing traffic flow at Black Bridge Road and Townline Road. The acquisition of 4910 Townline Road is a critical path to the delivery of the Black Bridge Road and Townline Road infrastructure projects.

BACKGROUND:

The City completed the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment study (the “EA”) in June 2016 that determined a preferred infrastructure management plan for Black Bridge Road and Townline Road. In the EA, the property municipally known as 4910 Townline Road was identified as a whole property acquisition necessary for the new road and bridge alignment, and for ancillary infrastructure.

A timeline of key events is outlined below:

- Preliminary design for the Project was completed in July 2020 which enabled City staff to move forward with securing property requirements for the Project.
- On August 25, 2020, Council approved an increase in budget for project number A00666-10 (Black Bridge Road/Townline Road property acquisition) from $1,750,000 to $3,375,000 required to fund the acquisition of all property requirements for the Project.
- On November 16, 2020 all privately-owned properties, with the exception of 4910 Townline Road, were secured for the Project.
- On June 29, 2021 Council approved initiating the expropriation process to acquire 4910 Townline Road.
- On August 20, 2021, the property owners requested a Hearing of Necessity.
- On February 9, 2022, the Ontario Land Tribunal advised the parties that a Hearing of Necessity was scheduled for March 14, 2022.
- On March 14, 2022, the property owners agreed to withdraw from the Hearing of Necessity on condition that the parties work towards completion of an agreement of purchase and sale to be completed by June 20, 2022, and failing which the City would acquire the property by way of expropriation.

ANALYSIS:
The acquisition of the property at 4910 Townline Road is a critical path for the successful delivery of the Black Bridge Road Project. City staff has undertaken a property acquisition approach commonly referred to as the “parallel expropriation-negotiation” process in which the expropriation process is undertaken concurrently with negotiations with the property owner(s). This approach is commonly used by the public sector to ensure schedule certainty for delivery of property requirements for projects.

In this instance, while the key business terms for an agreement of purchase and sale have been agreed to, it is still recommended that the expropriation process continue until such time that the City has possession of the Property. Delivery of the Property is expected to be June 2022 if by way of an agreement of purchase and sale, and October 2022 if by way of expropriation.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):
By-law 74-95 sets out provisions, procedures, and guidelines with respect to authority and due diligence for property acquisitions.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Acquisition Costs

The acquisition of the Property will require total funding of up to $1,380,000. There is approximately $1,280,000 available in Project A/00666-10 (Black Bridge Road/Townline Road property acquisition). As such, an additional $100,000 is required to complete the acquisition of 4910 Townline Road. The additional $100,000 funding requirement is due to the unprecedented and unforeseen escalation in residential real estate prices over the past two years.

Table A outlines the cost items and funding requirements for the acquisition of 4910 Townline Road. Financial Services has recommended that the funding sources for the $100,000 be comprised of $33,000 from the Capital Works Reserve Fund, and $67,000 from DC Roads.
### Table A - Acquisition Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds Available from A0666-10 at April 25, 2022</td>
<td>$1,280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Acquisition Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase / settlement price</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Transfer Tax</td>
<td>21,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-refundable HST</td>
<td>21,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner’s Costs Compensable Under the Expropriation Act</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Costs</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Consulting Fees</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contingency Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan of Expropriation</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 25 Appraisal</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funds Required</strong></td>
<td>$1,380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Funds Required</strong></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUBLIC VALUE:**

**Leadership:**
The acquisition of properties including 4910 Townline Road are to support the Black Bridge Road Project. Infrastructure improvements delivered by the Project will improve traffic flow for the area as well as add new amenities that will benefit the local community and the City in general.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:**

Engineering and Transportation Services is project managing the Black Bridge Road Project and will be consulting with the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee in connection with work to be undertaken at 4910 Townline Road.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

**INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:**

The following internal stakeholders were consulted:

- Engineering and Transportation Services in regards to identification and justification of property interests required.
- Financial Services in regards to budget and funding.

The following external stakeholders were consulted:

- Antec Appraisal Group in regards to property valuation.
- BT Engineering in regards to identification and justification of property interests required.
- Public Information Centres (“PIC”) were held during preliminary design to receive comments from the community, including comments identifying the need for parking.

**CONCLUSION:**

The acquisition of the property municipally known as 4910 Townline Road is a critical path to the delivery of the Black Bridge Road Project. A parallel expropriation-negotiation process is underway to secure the property with schedule certainty. It is recommended that City staff be authorized to continue with the next steps of the expropriation process while continuing to work with the property owners to achieve completion of an agreement of purchase and sale.
REPORT IMPACTS:
Agreement: No
By-law: No
Budget Amendment: Yes
Policy: No

APPROVALS:
This report has gone through the appropriate workflow and has been reviewed and or approved by the following as required:
Director
Deputy City Manager
Chief Financial Officer
City Solicitor
City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Appendix A – Area Location Map
2. Appendix B – Preliminary Concept Design at 4910 Townline Road
3. Appendix C – Expropriation Process Flow Chart
Appendix A – Area Location Map

Aerial photo outlining the property 4910 Townline Road in blue.
Appendix B – Preliminary Design Concept at 4910 Townline Road

Preliminary Concept Design ONLY

Preliminary concept design drawing for 4910 Townline Road.
Councillor Hamilton Motion Re: Request to the Region of Waterloo to Consider Free Public Transportation on Election Days

Moved by: Councillor Hamilton
Seconded by: Councillor Mann

WHEREAS there has been an overall and consistent decline in voter turnout for municipal, provincial, and federal elections in Canada and in Waterloo Region, despite the act of voting being essential to the proper functioning of the democratic process;

WHEREAS many residents struggle to access transportation to polling stations on election days, due to a lack of transportation available, physical mobility or accessibility issues, and/or socioeconomic status;

WHEREAS any initiative to boost attention and incentives to vote on election days warrants attention and exploration in order to assist the democratic process and increase voter turnout;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT correspondence be sent to the Region of Waterloo on behalf of Cambridge Council to request free public transportation on election day for the Municipal and School Board Election, as well as for the Provincial, and Federal Election days, so as to generate more attention about elections and polling station locations, and to encourage and make it possible for more residents to vote, that would otherwise be unable to access their polling stations.
Motion – Councillor Liggett
Seconder – Councillor Ermeta
Re: Ontario Land Tribunal dissolution

Whereas Municipalities across this province collectively spend millions of dollars of taxpayer money and municipal resources developing Official Plans that meet current Provincial Planning Policy; and

Whereas an Official Plan is developed through months of public consultation to ensure, “that future planning and development will meet the specific needs of (our) community”; and

Whereas our Official Plan includes zoning provisions that encourage development of the “missing middle” or “gentle density” to meet the need for attainable housing in our community; and

Whereas our Official Plan is ultimately approved by the province; and

Whereas it is within the legislative purview of Municipal Council to approve Official Plan amendments or Zoning By-law changes that better the community or fit within the vision of the City of Cambridge Official Plan; and

Whereas it is also within the legislative purview of Municipal Council to deny Official Plan amendments or Zoning By-law changes that do not better the community or do not fit within the vision of the City of Cambridge Official Plan; and

Whereas municipal planning decisions may be appealed to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT; formerly the Ontario Municipal Board or “OMB”), an unelected, appointed body that is not accountable to the residents of the City of Cambridge; and

Whereas the OLT has the authority to make a final decision on planning matters based on a “best planning outcome” and not whether the proposed development is in compliance with municipal Official Plans and Provincial Planning Policy; and

Whereas all decisions—save planning decisions—made by Municipal Council are only subject to appeal by judicial review and such appeals are limited to questions of law and or process; and

Whereas Ontario is the only province in Canada that empowers a separate adjudicative tribunal to review and overrule local decisions applying provincially approved plans; and

Whereas towns and cities across this Province are repeatedly forced to spend millions of dollars defending Official Plans that have already been approved by the province in expensive, time consuming and ultimately futile OLT hearings; and
Whereas lengthy, costly OLT hearings act as a barrier to the development of attainable housing;

Therefore, Be It Resolved that the City of Cambridge requests the Government of Ontario to dissolve the OLT immediately thereby eliminating one of the most significant sources of red tape delaying the development of more attainable housing in Ontario; and

Be It Further Resolved that a copy of this motion be sent to the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the Leader of the Opposition, the Leaders of the Liberal and Green Party, all MPPs in the Province of Ontario; the Large Urban Mayors’ Caucus of Ontario, the Small Urban GTHA Mayors and Regional Chairs of Ontario; and

Be It Further Resolved that a copy of this motion be sent to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) and all Ontario municipalities for their consideration.
Notice of Motion – Councillor Liggett Re: Ontario Must Build it Right the First Time

WHEREAS the Province of Ontario adopted greenhouse gas reduction targets of 30% by 2030, and emissions from buildings represented 22% of the province’s 2017 emissions,

WHEREAS all Waterloo Region municipalities, including the City of Cambridge, adopted greenhouse gas reduction targets of 80% below 2012 levels by 2050 and endorsed in principle a 50% reduction by 2030 interim target with the support of bold and immediate provincial and federal actions,

WHEREAS greenhouse gas emissions from buildings represent 45% of all emissions in Waterloo Region, and an important strategy in the TransformWR community climate action strategy, adopted by all Councils in Waterloo Region, targets new buildings to be net-zero carbon or able to transition to net-zero carbon using region-wide building standards and building capacity and expertise of building operators, property managers, and in the design and construction sector,

WHEREAS the draft National Model Building Code proposes energy performance tiers for new buildings and a pathway to requiring net zero ready construction in new buildings, allowing the building industry, skilled trades, and suppliers to adapt on a predictable and reasonable timeline while encouraging innovation;

WHEREAS the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing consulted on changes for the next edition of the Ontario Building Code (ERO #: 019-4974) that generally aligns with the draft National Model Building Code except it does not propose adopting energy performance tiers, it does not propose timelines for increasing minimum energy performance standards step-by-step to the highest energy performance tier, and, according to Efficiency Canada and The Atmospheric Fund, it proposes adopting minimum energy performance standards that do not materially improve on the requirements in the current Ontario Building code;

WHEREAS energy efficient buildings provide owners and occupants with lower energy bills, improved building comfort, and resilience from power disruptions that are expected to be more common in a changing climate, tackling both inequality and energy poverty;

WHEREAS the City of Cambridge in partnership with area municipalities and utility companies in the Region of Waterloo are actively exploring developing Green Building Standards;

WHEREAS while expensive retrofits of the current building stock to achieve future net zero requirements could be aligned with end-of-life replacement cycles to be more cost-efficient, new buildings that are not constructed to be net zero ready will require substantial retrofits before end-of-life replacement cycles at significantly more cost, making it more cost-efficient to build it right the first time.
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council request the Province of Ontario to include in the next edition of the Ontario Building Code tiered energy efficiency standards and a timeframe for when higher tiers would become the minimum energy efficiency requirements in the Code, consistent with the draft Tiered National Model Building Code;

THAT Council request the Province of Ontario to adopt a more ambitious tier of the draft Tiered National Model Building Code as a minimum energy efficiency requirement than the tiers currently proposed for the next edition of the Ontario Building Code;

THAT Council request the Province of Ontario provide authority to municipalities to require increased performance in energy efficiency through the implementation of tiered Green Development Standards;

THAT Council request the Province of Ontario to facilitate capacity, education and training in the implementation of the Tiered National Model Building Code for municipal planning and building inspection staff, developers, and homebuilders to help build capacity; and

AND FURTHER THAT this resolution be provided to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, to area MPPs, and to all Ontario Municipalities.
Dear Mayor McGarry and councillors,

I was very distressed to hear that Flagraiders had appeared in front of council to once again get a permit to operate on Kossuth Road in Cambridge. This was a nightmare for us neighbours when we opposed them years ago. We were not given notice as we were last time with the opportunity to express our concerns at a council meeting. They were turned down last time after their two or three temporary permits expired. Several neighbours that are affected presented at council. It went all the way to the OMB and they were turned down.

I would like to request that they be denied permission to reopen. Every neighbour, except one who is a relative, is against this intrusion on our rural lifestyle. The noise, pollution, intrusion on protected wetlands, and increased traffic are just some of our complaints.

We have been living two properties down since 1982 and our enjoyment of our property in the warmer months is severely affected by the constant gunshots every weekend and more. I have spoken to another neighbour who is devastated at this being a possibility again.

Please follow protocol by providing us affected neighbours our right to protest. It is setting a dangerous precedent to allow this commercial operation to skirt the zoning laws.

I would appreciate a timely response.

Thank you,
Brenda Anderson

Sent from my iPad
To All, please take the time to read this email.

To anyone of you that can help and have the Ability to do so, As a Business Owner In the Waterloo Region I'm Personally asking you to help these folks. I have never written an email like this before for any other business, not because I don't care, But because I've never been involved in anyone else's business like I have been with Flag Raiders.

As you read through this email please remember the year 1983. The year this Business was Established, with an incredible story line behind it that everyone should take the time to learn. Not only is it incredibly hard to take the leap into self employment, to maintain it and build on it as well as give back to the community is a massive accomplishment for any of our local businesses and we should all be proud to have these types of establishments within our communities. (Since 1983)

I met these Owners though my Son originally as he used to play Paintball with his buddies at their field. I quickly realized how great of a business this was for the community and or anyone looking to Bond, Build Team leadership programs or simply just forget about the stress in life and have some hands on Fun! (Since 1983)

Besides this Great Business is the Unbelievable People behind it that not only own and Operate it, But train there staff in a way like no other. Every Single Person that works from them feels like one of there family Members, this to me was a huge sign of a successful ownership, leading there people to respect and help the public as they would themselves. As a Business owner i understand how important this is, as well as how hard this is to do. (Since 1983)

This Business that has been around in our tri cities for 40 years, providing an exceptional service, Employment, as well as countless hours they have put into helping our community surpasses most in this area. And they Absolutely deserve and need your help!! (Since 1983)
I realize we're all being faced with difficult times right now, but please recognize the urgency required in this case to help save an amazing business in our community run by the amazing people that own it. Below is a quick summary of just one of my short memories of Flag raiders. *(Since 1983)*

Thank you for taking the time to read my email

Respectfully

Jeff Heffernan

I have personally spent some bonding time with my son at Flag raiders Paintball when he was younger as well as when he was a young adult. He introduced it to me and I was instantly hooked. The memories we created we still laugh about today. It's the most fun we have had and exercise in 1 full day. We have brought many family members as well as friends and then they go on to do the same! Joe and Team have always gone out of their way to make sure everyone is looked after in all aspects of the day or game you're playing. It would be an absolute shame to see such a great organization be put out of business after so many years of serving their community. I urge anyone out there that is reading this to take 2 minutes out of their day and sign the petition [https://lnkd.in/eF2UtRZ](https://lnkd.in/eF2UtRZ) and help spread the word. This is a community business that has brought many family, friends, businesses, wedding parties, etc. closer together that needs a helping hand.

*(Since 1983)*
Please note: In light of the current COVID-19 situation, our Offices and Plant are NOT open to visitors. We strongly encourage you to reach us by phone or email instead. We continue to closely monitor the situation and will update our COVID-19 measures as required to address the ongoing situation. Please stay safe.
Good Afternoon;

**I know you have numerous submissions on this matter (and so many others in your role) and appreciate in advance your taking the time to read this. **

I understand that Flag Raiders continues to work hard to bring their amazing sense of fun, family and community back to active operation since their unexpected closure last year.

I would like to share my thoughts in support of their efforts to bring such an exceptional life experience back to the region.

I live in Guelph and was personally introduced to Flag Raiders in the late 80's originally as a recreational endeavor. It was a huge part of my younger life having shared some of my best life experiences through connections made directly on Flag Raiders soil. Through those connections I was able to travel in support of the sport and bring others back to our community to share in the Flag Raiders experience. In my professional roles after university I have brought numerous work and social groups to the field to share in the unique team building opportunities the game allows. I have played the game with multiple generations of my own family in celebration of life events. I also recall a time Joe gave me a uniform for my son when he was young to help support his Halloween costume; a small thing but a statement in Joe’s commitment to his community.

I was also privileged to work for a period with Flag Raiders through the 90's. Joe and the teams leadership and commitment to one another has stayed with me throughout my professional life as an example to follow.

Flag Raiders has been a pioneer in the sport virtually since its inception here in Canada. Having been a founder with a keen focus on delivering an exceptional experience and constantly innovating the game to expand its reach and inclusivity they have garnered not only an incredible local following but bring into our region countless participants from around the province and beyond. They run weekly events, support tournament and league play, and run specialty events and corporate team building functions unlike any found anywhere else in the province. The diversity in events brings together all walks of life, from all ages (often shared amongst family generations) and backgrounds to come together in the mutual pursuit of a unique sporting activity and entertainment.

That commitment to their paintball community and its hugely beneficial impact on the sports and tourism industry on general of course spills over to significant impact in our local economy.

Joe and the Flag Raiders team’s community commitment supports our local economy by introducing people to our region; making use of our local restaurants, hotels, and shops. The many that come from out of town then have the opportunity to be introduced to the other aspects of our region to then come back and enjoy - from our farmers markets, the butterfly conservatory, micro breweries and other sporting ventures.
The pandemic has been hard on everyone. The community connection that the sport of paintball brings is exactly what our community needs. Get people outside, together, in a unique and naturally distanced setting, with a single goal of enjoyment, camaraderie and family fun.

Equally so the pandemic has been hard on business, especially in the sports and tourism sector. Flag Raiders clearly being no exception having lost the ability to operate from their previous location as a direct result. A family run business with such deep and long standing roots in the community needs its community leaders support. It would truly be a tragedy to have such a business continue to fall prey to the roadblocks it has been facing. They have suitably adaptable property that they can use. I know that they are committed to solutions and deserve City councils shared commitment to same.

At a bare minimum Flag Raiders should be permitted a suitable temporary exemption to allow for the business to continue to operate and so strongly support our local economy should longer term discussions be necessary in ongoing planning. It would be a shame for all those tourism dollars to be lost from our local businesses, worse yet our own community taking their tourism dollars elsewhere in pursuit of play that can no longer be found in their “own backyard”.

I would implore you to do your part to help Flag Raiders get back on track in delivering the fabulously unique experience it has delivered for decades. It’s a heritage our community can be proud to have within our community borders.

I trust all best efforts on your part can and will be made. I would be more than happy to discuss with you personally any further just how important this organization has been in my life and the lives of so many others.

Regards;

Shawn Roberts
Hello Cambridge/Waterloo decision makers,

I am joining the Ontario paintball community asking for your support to allow recreational zoning for Flag Raiders paintball to operate their outdoor field at the Kossuth Rd location.

I am from Windsor and have attended many events at Flag Raiders’ various locations over the past 15 years, and the experience and hospitality by their team is among the best in Ontario. They are welcoming to people of all backgrounds and experience levels, ensuring that everyone is safe and enjoys themselves.

The Flag Raiders business is great for the economy of Cambridge/Kitchener/Waterloo as it brings visitors from across Ontario and beyond to visit the region, staying in your hotels, campgrounds and visiting other local businesses. Some events have hundreds of players in attendance who require local accommodation and food from your hospitality industry. Many players will bring their family for the trip - for example while I am playing paintball, my wife and children may be shopping at Conestoga Mall and visiting the water park at Bingemans. For the younger generation of paintball players, their parents are also travelling with them and spending money in the region.

Please allow proper zoning of the Kossuth Road property to allow Flag Raiders to operate their business for recreational use in your meeting today.

Thanks in advance from myself and the entire Ontario Paintball community

Shane Carter
https://flag raiders.com/
Good morning

I am writing to you today as a member of the community in Cambridge Ontario. My family has lived here for the past 14 years and have enjoyed many outings and events to Flag Raiders over the years.

We have enjoyed many Saturday afternoon paintball sessions with friends and family, both local and from out of town, as well as multiple birthday parties and other events through the years.

Whenever our out of town friends/family visit, our after paintball traditions include an enjoyable dinner out at one of many local establishments within the community, not to mention any shopping done by those who decided not to join in on the paintball field.

Flag Raiders is centrally located in the province, and it is quite easy to meet up with friends and family coming from other cities. We have even enjoyed some paintball sessions with out of province visitors too!

We are anxiously awaiting the return of Flag Raiders within our community, and hope to see them re-open very soon.

Thank you for your time

Sincerely

Jodi Hallett
Hello, My name is Jacob Fonseca, I am 15 years old, and live at home with my parents and two siblings in Kitchener. I currently play indoor soccer for Kitchener and competitive soccer for Waterloo. I’ve been saving up money to buy equipment in hopes of playing a new sport with my friends.

Paintball is a sport that we were hoping to get involved with this year. I watched a few tournaments and games at Flag Raiders before COVID and it looked like a lot of fun. It’s another sport that does not conflict with other activities, keeps me active and out of trouble, while meeting new friends. Through some research I found that Kitchener/Waterloo/Cambridge has very good competitive players and leagues, attracting a lot of business to the area. Unfortunately I also learned that the places available to play at are either closed due to COVID or are facing zoning restrictions.

It’s my hope that Flag Raiders are given a fair opportunity to resume operations.

Thank you,

Jacob Fonseca
Good Afternoon,
I am writing to you after reading the most recent story regarding Flag Raiders in local media. It was mentioned that Councillor Liggett and Councillor Mann suggested a temporary exemption be considered. I would ask the council to educate themselves on the history of this property. It was sold (by my father in law as executor of his uncle’s estate) to the Kimpsons on the understanding that they were looking for agricultural land. Shortly after the sale the Kimpson’s requested a rezoning to allow them to open a Paintball business. The request was denied and instead Council allowed a temporary use exemption. This temporary use exemption was renewed at least 3 times – over and over again – until the neighbours successfully argued that this business should not be operating here. It has only ever operated here under temporary use allowances. We reiterate our request to the City and Council to be kept informed of any and all actions related to this subject.
Thank you
Michele Dickinson

Sent from [redacted] for Windows
I've seen notifications and posts regarding tourism in Cambridge and I want to suggest taking a very long look at Flag Raiders Paintball.
I've played at Flag Raiders for over a decade and met a lot of friends through my time at the field. It has been a tradition for my cousins from Parry Sound to come down for a yearly games day with me and I have met people from around the world who travelled to play at Raiders. My father was a Kitchener Minor Hockey Association coach and paintball has long been a team building activity that was beloved by everyone I played with. I cannot properly stress how many people have enjoyed Flag Raiders, whether it's locals going out and spending money or travellers being brought in for tournaments.
I also want to ask you to look at how many unique attractions the tri-cities actually have: food and drink is fine every once in awhile, there are occasionally small events in parks, bowling, pools, and what else? Paintball is a great monthly activity to get people out of their houses and into the city doing stuff.
If you are in any way looking to encourage tourism and stimulate our economy then please find a way to help reopen Flag Raiders.
Your Honour
This is in regards to Flag Raiders Paintball. As I personally have been a part of the Paintball community for over 35 years, and now well into my 50's, I have a great love of this sport.

In a day where most people sit at home, glued to their phones, gaming systems, and other electronic devices we are losing what truly makes life enjoyable. Paintball represents an amazing experience outdoors, in fresh air, with large groups of people. It removes the modern electronic devices we have been grafted too, and truly brings back personal interaction. It creates real bonds of friendships, team building, communication, and social etiquette skills.

Flag Raiders has been a corner stone in this magnificent sport for this region of Ontario. It brings out people of all ages, young and old. People of all races and religions to enjoy together the love of the sport, being outdoors, and being active. It is truly something we as a community need more of.

With the pandemic of the last few years, several facilities have closed within Ontario. The fight to have Flag Raiders is more important to us, the sporting community, now more than ever, as it truly does bring in people not only from the local community, but as far as Windsor and Ottawa for their games. It truly is considered a beacon in the sport and the ownership does so much for everyone to feel welcome, have fun, be safe, and support businesses in the local community.

I thank you for your time
Colin S. Greig
Good morning All,

As a long standing employee of Flag Raiders Paintball I have been eagerly awaiting the opportunity to reopen and get back to what so many of us enjoyed for such a long time! Ahead of the critical discussions taking place this week, I would like to share one final thought with you all. I know many have already touched on the economic value of Flag Raiders operating in our community and the boost it gives to our local tourism sector, so I would like to speak on the role I've seen Flag Raiders play for so many people as a home or a safe place to have fun, get some fresh air, and make new friends!

Over my tenure working for Flag Raiders, I have seen such a diverse group of people come through the proverbial doors of our field. Paintball is a unique sport in that it doesn't require a great deal of athleticism from the participants and it is very accessible to people requiring special accommodations (all ages, all shapes, all abilities). This means it appeals to people who otherwise wouldn't be inclined to go out and play community sports like hockey or baseball for example. It also incorporates a host of niche interests such as live action role play, history, and strategy games. All of this culminating in Flag Raiders being a welcoming place to many people who may otherwise feel outcast in their schools, workplaces, or community. Flag Raiders is a home to many.

Miraculously, when people have a home they grow. Many who approached me nervously as newcomers have since developed confidence as they've spent more time at the field interacting with new people. Many who began coming alone now bring their whole squad/team with them. Many who were used to always standing on the outside of the group now lead the charge and offer to share their knowledge with newcomers. Many who thought they just didn't fit in have found their place.

Flag Raiders Paintball Games is not only important FOR our community, as per its economic value, but is also very important TO the community and its citizens! This week, as you all discuss implementing provisions to allow Flag Raiders to reopen, I plead that you consider this value and the values that have been raised by so many others in support of Flag Raiders!

Thank you for your time,
Eric Entz
Dear Mayor McGarry

I am writing to you today to express my concern about the lengthy challenges that Flag Raiders Paintball Games continues to experience with the City of Cambridge and the Region. I had written you once on this matter & felt compelled to reach out and ask, once again, for your assistance to save this small business and a historic sports entertainment venue. I do not doubt that you have received much correspondence from inside the Region & Province, regarding Flag Raiders. It is that important to many people in our community and beyond. I ask, as a lifetime resident, that you indulge me; please read and respond accordingly.

Flag Raiders Paintball is a 30+ year business of Waterloo Region. It had operated in Cambridge for most of that time. It is an important and popular field that is known and respected world wide. People from all over the globe have specifically planned trips to play at Flag Raiders.

There are no other outdoor paintball facilities in Waterloo Region. The closest outdoor fields are more than an hours drive away (London & Toronto). This leaves a significant gap in sports entertainment for (local) regulars players. In addition to the (local) regular players, the occasional players, birthday parties, stag and doe events etc. need to take their money out of Region to participate. Outside of the customer base and venue, Flag Raiders Paintball Games fund raises and provides 1000’s of pounds of food every year, to the Cambridge Self Help Food Bank. Since their cease of operations, they have not been able to
do so. We also know the strain the Food Bank has with the increase in demand for their services.

I’m surprised that there has been so much delay with allowing Flag Raiders Paintball games to open. With the results of the youth impact study, it clearly demonstrates the need for offering of youth activities. Flag Raiders is a youth friendly venue that provides a legal, structured and safe form of entertainment which is extremely popular with youth ages 14 - 25. This is an outdoor activity that gets them out of the house and engaging others in nature.

If the zoning change does not occur, then optically, nothing happens. The property remains vacant and traffic goes by. If the zoning does get approved, the economic and entertainment impact is significant and will be welcomed by all the businesses in Waterloo Region! As we rebuild our Region from the damage of COVID, we need opportunities to inject money into our local economy. When Flag Raiders was open, on a typical day of play, I would spend money in our Region in the following ways: I would stop at my corner store to buy ice, beverages and snacks for the day. Once my cooler was packed, I would travel to a local fast food establishment for breakfast and a coffee. From there I would travel to the field for the day. At lunch I would either get delivery (pizza or Skip The Dishes) or take a drive to a restaurant close by. After the end of the day, my family and I would go out for dinner to share stories from our day at the field. This pattern was repeated 2 times a week! That was just my family of 4. Others at the field do the exact same thing. On large events, that brings 100’s of people into our Region, participants do the same thing (and now adding hotels to their spending). The economic benefits are tremendous! The impact of the social benefit is also significant. There are no other outdoor paintball
venues in Waterloo Region. No place for the casual player, budding pro athlete, church group, sports teams, youth groups etc. to participate. By approving the zone change, it allows Flag Raiders to operate and provide a venue for the groups that I mentioned.

I have been a paintball enthusiast for over 25 years. I started as a much younger man, but the sport still appeals to me. I have played at Flag Raiders locations for the majority of that time. I have played at the site in question, as well as their others. Paintball has been the only form of physical exercise for me over that time. I have greatly missed the opportunity to play for my physical and mental wellness. I play this fun activity because it is a safe and inclusive activity that I can play WITH my family; we can all play together (on the same team or opposing). That is a unique experience and has greatly benefit my partner and I’s opportunities to connect with our teens.

As of March 1st, the Province has lifted restrictions and we are returning to life as we previously enjoyed. There is a part of my life, paintball, that can not enjoy. This is not due to the virus or Public Health orders, but due to Regional red tape.

We lost many businesses and jobs over the last few years. Many that we could not help to succeed. In the case of Flag Raiders, you have it in your power to salvage a business. As the Region looks to rebuild, all energy and authority should be invested into keeping businesses alive. Remove the beaucratic nonsense and allow this much needed sport entertainment venue to operate.

I ask that you work with Flag Raiders to approve the site at 1500 Kossuth Rd. so that they can continue to serve our community
and the paintball community for many more years. It is within the city & Region’s power to do so. They operated on that site for many years under a temporary permit. At minimum, that should be done again. We need to think differently and work differently to rebuild our city & Region. I need your help to save Flag Raiders I need your help to save Flag Raiders and not perish simply because of bureaucracy. Please use your appointment and office to save this much needed sports entertainment venue. The city & Region should not allow another business to close, when it is well within its power to approve it to open. Use your office. Please connect with Joe Kimpson and Corey Kimpson to work with them to get Flag Raiders open in our Region.

Thank you for hearing me out; I look forward to your response.

Kind regards,

Gavin Sharma
Hello Mayor McGarry,

I’m reaching out with my concerns about Flag Raiders Paintball finding a place in the Cambridge community. It’s important to share how much the Kimpson’s endeavor means to me and my family.

Almost two decades ago, one of the first dates my wife and I went on was to play paintball with friends. Through this physical activity, we were able to get a good sense of each other’s character and prepared to bring our children together to form a large family. Since we married, our kids join us for regular paintball games and time together as well. It really has become a family hobby.

In addition to getting to know the Kimpsons, we have also enjoyed getting to meet paintball players from all over the world who have traveled to play at Flag Raiders’ old location. We established solid friendships with people from the UK, Poland, German, and many states in the US.

Now I’d like to do what I can to help find a new home for Flag Raiders. The zoning and boundaries that are in place were set by people who were planning for the future of our community based on what they knew at the time. Now we’ve had time to see how the properties have been used and how they can be used.

Please help to re-evaluate the usage of the land for the Kimpsons so we can continue to have the well established Flag Raiders as a part of our community.

Thank you for your time,

Joe Szilvagyi
Dear Mayor McGarry, Cambridge and Region of Waterloo Councillors and Staff,

I am writing to ask that you support Flag Raiders and allow them to operate their paintball business at 1500 Kossuth Rd. in Cambridge.

I am a paintball team owner that competes in the Ontario Paintball League that has five events all through Ontario. Flag Raiders used to be one of our event hosts and my teams home practice field. Many local teams relied on Flag Raiders to have their teams’ practices and join many others on their open play days.

The team I own and play for is Eh?Team and we have 16 players and two coaches. I travel from Stoney Creek to play at Flag Raiders and the many other fields involved in OPL. Some of my fellow teammates travel from Windsor, North York, Toronto, Guelph and Hamilton. We have been playing competitively for 5 years in the tournament series and many others have played recreational paintball for 10+ years.

I think that Flag Raiders should be allowed to open because this local field is one of the only fields that use to have two speedball fields in Southern Ontario. This would allow multiple teams to come and practice for the big event weekends. The location of Flag Raiders was perfect for multiple teams we compete against because of how close it was to the highway, and it took only 45 minutes for most people to attend. It was the middle ground for most of us and it helped us conserve gas and money to practice and play big events.

We also loved how its location was so close to multiple restaurants so when we had a long day of playing, we could all go and eat lunch or dinner and discuss how our day went. Some of our players would also get a hotel room if they were playing back-to-back days. This way they could shower and rest up for another early morning and not have to worry about commuting again. I myself with owning the team I must stay for both days and usually have my children with me. I will get a hotel room in the same hotel that my friends are staying in so we have multiple rooms, and our families will hang out together for the weekend. They will go shopping at the local mall and play at the trampoline park during the day while we play. They stop back in to see how we are doing and watch our games but most the time they are out adventuring around the city. My children have played recreational paintball and invited their friends to come play with them while I’m out practicing with the team. Flag Raiders is great for growing the sport with younger children as they have walk on days that new people can learn how to play with other players on their recreational paintball field. This is so important for the paintball community and really helps to grow the sport.

Paintball to me is how some feel about hockey or soccer….

Paintball is how I relieve my week of stress, how I take all the burden off my shoulders of working two jobs and raising two children on my own. The physical activity of the sport alone has helped me loose over 30lbs. This sport has helped me grow my own paintball family and we now call each other brothers and sisters. Some of my teammates have had weddings and baby showers and we all attend as a family. Our children are like our nieces and nephews, and
we all watch out for each other. The paintball community at big games or tournament weekends is amazing. So many big hugs and smiles on everyone’s faces. Children running and playing with other friend’s children that they haven’t seen in a few weeks. If you forget something or something of yours breaks there is always a fellow player there that can help you out or lend you whatever it is you need to use for the day. I remember one weekend I forgot my cleats and with being one of the few ladies who plays another teammate introduced me to another girl and we shared shoes all day and had to swap shoes in between points. We are now good friends and have team practices together.

When we have big events or tournaments it is so nice to see the vendor tents being set up. These people travel all over Ontario to tech peoples paintball markers, sell gear players may need and offer out words of advice if you’re having any issues with the paintball gear. My team has used the vendor and tech tents many times over the course of our five years of playing. They will often stay in local hotels so they can attend both days of the big events.

Thank you for reading my lengthy email and I hope your reconsider helping to support Flag Raiders and get them open as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Jennifer

VanBlaricu

Ontario

Paintball Owner

Eh?Team
To whom it may concern,

My name is Marc Sutherland and I currently live in Toronto. For the past ten years I had been visiting Cambridge/Kitchener/Waterloo are to play paintball at Flagraiders Paintball. I’ve brought friends, family members and have even attracted people from the US, UK and Germany to Flag Raiders to play due to my large paintball YouTube channel. Afterwards we would also go out for food and drinks (places like Waterloo Brewing or Moose Winooskies).

The time I’ve spent in the region has even turned me onto other activities, like Chickopee Tube Park where I took my family, kids and friends this winter. Flag Raiders has been an essential attraction and something that’s brought me back to the area time and time again. I miss the field dearly and look forward to it re-opening so I can visit with my friends again.

--

Marc Sutherland
To whom it may concern.

My name is Oliver Powell, and I am writing to you in regard to Flag Raiders Paint Ball.

I am writing you tonight to consider changing and allowing Flag Raiders to open.

Flag Raiders has been a haven for all those that enjoy the sport of paintball. People have come from far and wide to play at the field when it was open at its previous locations. This would bring in people from around Ontario into Kitchener and contribute their hard-earned money to the local economy.

Paintball is an outstanding sport than can unite people and provide an excellent full-body workout. It is an outstanding team-building experience. I have been to many fields and locations throughout Ontario and have had similar experiences. However, the staff and atmosphere of Flag Raiders are second to none.

In conclusion, re-opening Flag Raiders would revitalize a post COVID economy at a time when Cambridge and the surrounding communities are desperate for a new source of revenue. It would allow many people on a regular basis a chance to improve not only their physical health but their mental health as well. Please consider allowing Flag Raiders to open.

Thank you.

Yours truly

Oliver Powell
Dear Mayor McGarry, Councillors and Staff:

I've known the Kimpson family for more than 50 years, having grown up across the street from them in Preston where they and my mother still live. My husband and I now reside in Toronto with our 16 year old son Tommy who has become a Paintball and Airsoft enthusiast. For many years Flag Raiders has given kids, like Tommy, a reason to get off his computer and enjoy an outdoor sport. Many of the players he meets at the facility travel from other regions of the province to participate in games and activities together. I've always felt confident dropping him off at Flag Raiders as the games are conducted in a safe, organized and respectful manner. I've taken Tommy to several Paintball and Airsoft Facilities in Ontario and as he puts it "Flag Raiders has the coolest facility and the players there are chill and a lot of fun!"

My husband and I would travel from our home in the GTA with Tommy and his friends. We'd make a day of it, dropping the boys off to play while we had a meal, did some shopping and visited my mother. On several occasions we would stay overnight in a hotel and make a mini-holiday of it. As you see, our trips to Flag Raiders created an economic spin-off to surrounding businesses as well.

As a long-time broadcaster with CBC Sports, I've had the opportunity to cover sporting events around the globe. In my opinion, Paintball and Airsoft, should be considered a sport just like baseball, hockey and soccer. It too teaches sporting values such as Fair Play, Teamwork and Discipline.

I believe Flag Raiders would be an asset to the City of Cambridge and I respectfully ask for your support of the facility and allow the Kimpson's to operate on their Kossuth Rd. property.

Sincerely,

Brenda Irving
CBC Sports
Hello. I am writing in support of Flag Raiders' bid to find a new location to call home and ask to bring the game of paintball back to the Region.

Paintball is a sport that gets my family of 5 outside to play together as a team. We have fun achieving goals within the game, playing a version of hide and seek, and enjoy laughs as we retell our stories of accomplishments from time on the field. We are away from screens and electronics, and getting exercise while forming memories.

Paintball is a community building game. When we were new players years ago, Flag Raiders was a welcoming and encouraging environment. They introduced us to players from across the local and surrounding region, as well as hosting large events and tournaments that created a draw of paintball teams from England, Germany, and the USA. As our confidence grew in the sport, we in turn helped new players and have formed lifelong friendships.

The past few years have been trying, and we are over being indoors. Let's get behind Flag Raiders so we can get outside and play!

Thank you,
Victoria Brown
To all city of Cambridge council,

Flag raiders saved my life. A profound statement, but true in both the metaphorical and the literal. Eight years ago I went through a separation with my ex, this caused me to have issues mentally and relationship issues with my two children. My son asked repeatedly for me to take him paint balling, as a father that wanted to try to make as much as I could with an already rocky relationship with my children.

Recently Joe and an individual that I have become good friends with after meeting and playing at Flagraiders saved my life from a diabetic low, both found me unresponsive on a Saturday morning when I should have been at a prearranged gathering. If it was not for Flagraiders and the friendliness I can tell you honestly, I would not still be alive today. Joe and the team at Flagraiders has had a profound impact on more lives in the southern Ontario, then anyone can imagine. With the denial of operation. Would alter the community. The people that are saying that they are unable to sit in their backyards. Should also file for the airport to have a similar outcome due to accused noise. As for land use, the land that is being used for field, that portion of the property is not conducive for farming. The land at the road is the only soil for growing anything worthy of harvest.

Over the next few years the employees and owners of Flagraiders with their positive and helpful attitudes Ali mg with the world class fields. Helped build new relationships and mend old ones.

Over the past four years I have been actively involved with the Canada day parade and Santa clause parade with the addition of the CP holiday trains collecting food for the Cambridge self help food bank and helping with the maintenance of the grounds and ensuring the continued safety and enjoyable experience that other fields do not always provide.

With the location at 1500 Kossuth rd, in the last three month the large number of larger aircraft and helicopters flying over the field an surrounding residential areas, along with the vehicular traffic on Kossuth rd. The ambient noise from those seem more disruptive then the sound of play from an active paintball field. As the field of play does not operate before 9:30 and finishes before 4 o’clock. The aircraft and vehicles that are on the road and in the air before 7am and well into the evening hours, cause more disruption then a low disable game.

With our Flagraiders I would have to travel 1-2 hours in one direction to play a sport I have come to love. Please take a moment to consider the assumptions and false statements made by people that are effected more by the road and airport then a local business that is trying to survive.

Local company is being targeted by people uneducated and unaware of the real low level of noise from play and the distance the objects can travel. There is no way noise or objects would effect surrounding properties or residents unless they trespass onto the property at 1500 Kossuth.

I look forward to the acknowledgment of receiving this email.

Thank you
Mathew Logan
Sent from my iPhone not a blackberry
I'm writing in support of allowing Flagraiders to once again be part of our community in the Cambridge area. It has been too long since they have been open, and contributing to the local economy and outdoor activity options.

We have lived and worked in Cambridge for 24 years now. The sport of Paintball has been part of so many special memories for our family. Our son, Kevin, tried all the usual sports when he was young, Baseball, Hockey, Soccer, Snowboarding, but it wasn’t until he turned 10, and tried Paintball for the first time, that he found his true passion. I was all for it, as it was an activity that we could enjoy together. We played in many “Big Games” together, along with hundreds of other Men, boys and women. We had several birthday parties at both indoor and outdoor fields.

When he turned 15, Kevin started playing “Speedball” on an organized team and we travelled to Ottawa several times as a family to take part in tournaments and make family vacation plans around his events.

Kevin is now 24 and lives and works in our community and still takes part in organized paintball events.

We need a local Paintball field, just like we need Arenas, Theatres, Soccer Fields and Pools.
The field supports the local economy and is a tremendous family friendly activity.

Regards,

Steve Juranics
Cambridge, ON
Hello, my name is Jason Bailey, I have known Joe Kimpson and his family for several years. They have been a pillar in his community for well over 30 years.

Donations, fundraisers, charities, and various employment opportunities. I had one of these opportunities. I was able to work between my seasonal job thanks to Flagraiders.

I have been playing paintball on and off since 2007. I have had to pleasure and honor to meet so many like-minded individuals. Many have gotten married and had kids (who play paintball). I and 100s of others look forward every March to the season opener.

Yes, it requires players to propel gell paint-filled balls at one another. I have worked at Flagraiders, and I can tell you firsthand, that Joe and his team take safety and safety measures very seriously. I have never, ever been there and felt unsafe.

Please take the time, to read the reviews from YOUR community, and speak to the numerous charities that they have been a part of. And ask the self-help food bank how many people they have been able to help over the past 15 years. Ask How many high school students have completed their recommended hours to graduate, and how many colleges have Mr. Kimpson spoke at regarding entrepreneurs.

How many people have been saved yes saved by turning to paintball? It has made introverts who would have never been able to take any control of their situation and while playing paintball have an opportunity to become extroverts and take control.

Here are just a few examples of the above: I work with adults with disabilities. One client a few years ago loved the idea of paintball. Former ranger and reserve. But restricted to a wheelchair. I agreed to have him come out and play. I met him and another staff and we figured out a way to attach his paintball marker to his wheelchair so he could aim and shoot. While I pushed him from place to place. I understood the risk I knew I would be the target. But the sheer joy and experience and excitement the individual had that day lasted him for 10 years.

Thank you!!
Hi there!

My name is Nick Miller. I live in the Chicopee neighbourhood in Kitchener. I’m writing this letter in support of Flag Raiders Paintball in Cambridge.

I first started playing Paintball at Flagraiders almost 25 years ago when I was a teenager. I now own a few businesses in Kitchener and until the pandemic began I would still play once a week. Flag Raiders has been an integral part of our corporate team building events. My staff, the majority of which are female, love playing paintball at Flagraiders. The location on Kossuth Road could not be any more convenient for us. We love that the field is only 5 minutes away from a variety of great restaurants that we can enjoy when we are done playing!

I hope that the City of Cambridge will make the right decision and allow Flag Raiders to once again open their incredible business for all of us to enjoy.

Thank you in advance,

Nick Miller
Hello - writing from North Bay On

I am writing this email to help one of our favorite businesses to reopen.

Flagraiders Paintball is one of a few premier paintball operations in Ontario and Canada.

The experience that they offer is a clear reflection of the dedication that the owners have to offering a superb gaming experience for local as well as playing tourists like myself, my wife and my children. We have travelled many times from northern Ontario (6 hours) to just play at Flagraiders.

In fact, there has been weekends that we had a convoy of four completely filled vehicles that left on Friday afternoon to travel the distance, stayed at the local Holiday Inn Friday and Saturday night and ate out at a variety of breakfast and dinner establishments.

You might not comprehend the amount of activists a small “niche” sport business might generate for itself but car loads of paintball and airsoft players spend a good chunk of change to play at Flagraiders and a bigger chunk of change at the local hotels, and restaurants and breweries.

It’s time to let Flagraiders open again ASAP. It’s time to let out money flow back into the businesses that we supported when we drove hours to stay and play in your community.

We support the quick reopening of Flagraiders.

Zane Smith
48 year old paintball player.
Husband of a paintball player
Father of two paintball players
Friend to a community of paintballers
Business owner
Good Afternoon to whom it may concern,

I am writing in my support for Flag Raiders Paintball.

My husband Max and I have been active in the Paintball community for over a decade. We currently reside in Hamilton, Ontario. Over this time, we have travelled all over North America (with plans to add Europe to the list) to play paintball and have visited countless cities (ranging from places in Gananoque, ON to Las Vegas, Nevada and everywhere between) and its fields.

And yet, none are held as dear as Flag Raiders. **Paintball is a safe and inclusive family-friendly activity.** This community is so tight knit, many have become like extended family members to us. We often joke that many players are our children as we are often called "Mom and Dad" by the community. Regardless of age, body type, political views, gender, race, socioeconomic class, able bodied or not (we’ve seen events at fields such as Flag Raiders have wheel-chaired veterans in attendance and actively playing on the field), all are seen as comrades, playing on the field. There are few activities, never mind sports, that are so inclusive and welcoming.

We have been in attendance at multiple practices and events at Flag Raiders in Kitchener over the years. Not only in attendance is our family of three (now with our 14 month old son), there are hundreds of players (with their families and friends in tow) that attend these events and practices. Despite being first time parents, we’ve never been worried about the safety of our young child at the field. Flag Raiders along with many other fields hold safety to the highest degree. We always feel safe and welcome, and you’ll often spot children cheering on their parents and siblings on the field. Our community genuinely cares for one another and will always help one another when in need. Whether it’s from a truck stuck in a ditch, a lost wallet, flying away tents from strong winds, we always rush to help. We banded together when our community lost one of its own to COVID and raised money for his children’s future due to his untimely loss. Another when a paintball couple had one of their 6 month old twins in Sick Kids Hospital Toronto for open heart surgery and we came together to collect over $15,000 to help alleviate the financial strain it was causing them while they are on leave.

Imagine to my surprise to hear that Flag Raiders were not permitted to continue operation when during the height of the Pandemic, outdoor activities were the only safe reprieve from the ongoing madness. By being located in the Tri-City area, it’s a centralized location for those attending from the Hamilton Area, Southern Ontario, as well as the GTA. We have players routinely attending events from Windsor, cross border from the US, from Wasaga, all the way to Montreal and Nova Scotia. Our sports tourism supports your municipality’s economic recovery by not only spending both time and money at the field, we also stay in your hotels, dine at your local restaurants and cafes, shop at your malls and other local businesses during our
visits. To be honest, Kitchener was not a place I personally would ever think to visit, prior to paintball. But without that initial nudge, I would never have known about Country Boy, Bingeman's, the Kitchener Farmer's Market, and many more favourites. Now those places are a MUST during our visits with stops in between.

I would strongly implore you to reconsider the zoning so that Flag Raiders is able to continue in its operation as it's been dearly missed by the community.

Sincerely,

Mina Yu-Walde, Max Waldes, and Hudson Waldes
Good Afternoon
I was happy to hear the recent support of Flag Raiders during the last council meeting, and was hoping we could do more to support.

I have been a life long supporter of the region, and the only thing I have supported longer is Flag Raiders. I first started playing there in 1987 with my father (retired Conestoga College professor), and now have had my daughter play there as the third generation. Flag Raiders has been in my life in some way for over 35 years.

Having lost my home field, and my one escape during this 2 year pandemic, I’m at a loss that a year later we can’t get them access to reopen on their own property. I and thousands of others have had to drive to Milton, London, Wasaga, and as far as Picton to play the game we love.

I often hear that the region has suffered a loss of tourism, and the pandemic surely has made that even worse the past two years. Flag Raiders is a proven draw to the region, as competitions draw players from across Ontario, and larger events even from Europe and the United States. Flag Raiders has been a leader in the sport since the early 80’s and has proven itself as a community small business that gives back, with dozens of charities benefiting locally over almost 40 years.

This brings me to my ask, and what I believe during an election year this would be a good news piece to have Council support behind. Saving a business caught up in bureaucracy, that is trying to reopen after a pandemic, and also not asking for financial support but to bring much needed tourist revenue back to the region?

The demographics of paintball is quite wide ranging from 12 - 60 years old, male and female, from all different walks of life. The competitive player bracket brings a much sought after 18-24 year old vote (and often first time voter age demographic). Paintball keeps younger kids off the couch and controllers, it provides team building activities for businesses, and a sport for thousands to enjoy throughout the province.

The recent City of Cambridge council meeting showed that the Councillors are in support, however several councillors had noted and I will also add, timing is critical for Flag Raiders to open in time for the season or sadly I don’t think they will survive. The City knows that a temporary zoning exemption would allow a reopening while the regional planning could make permanent the zoning, and operation of Flag Raiders for years to come.

Any potential opposition would be unwarranted as paintball is environmentally friendly, a healthy outdoor activity, and produces little noise during the 3-4 days a week it might be open. Need I add it’s only a few hundred metres from an International Airport which would negate any perceived noise issues. Paintball fields are significantly quieter than a ball diamond
with a crowd. In fact paintball markers operate at around 80 decibels or less for very short periods, for comparison these are items and their operating decibels…

- 70 dB: Washing machine
- 80 dB: Alarm clock
- 90 dB: Subway train
- 100 dB: Factory machinery
- 110 dB: Car horn
- 120 dB: Ambulance siren

Can we count on your help to provide a temporary exemption? It’s a feel good story we would all love to see during an election year.

Here in support
Robert Spicer
Waterloo, ON
Dear Decision Maker;

I am writing to you today in support of Todd Ancich and Corey Kimpson, and Joe and Meg Kimpson of Flag Raiders and their efforts to reopen their business on their property. I am aware of their circumstances of having to leave their Bingemans Park location in Kitchener and their desire to relocate back to the land that they own in Cambridge.

My husband, Steve, and I own and operate Wasaga Adventure Park in Wasaga Beach and will be celebrating the 30th Anniversary of our business this June. Our main attraction is paintball which is also the first adventure that we introduced to the area in 1992.

We have been supported by the Town of Wasaga Beach as a tourist attraction and an employer of several youth workers.

Paintball is a niche market which means that people will drive to a destination park such as ours, bringing tourism dollars in. We have had people from across Canada and United States visit us as well as Europe, Central America, and Australia. We have held events and tournaments which have brought guests in for extended stays, causing them to spend their money in the town on lodging, food, and goods. There is great diversity in age, race, and socio-economic status. This has great economic value to the town.

We employ a great amount of youth to work during our busiest months of May to October, providing a safe, unique, and supportive work environment. Many first jobs have been found at our park and we have been able to teach work ethic in a supportive community.

Flag Raiders also has a long history of providing employment and economic benefit to their area and it is my hope that it is recognized.

Their absence has been noticed in the paintball community and has been detrimental to our own business. Without Flag Raiders, new players are not being introduced to the sport. Players that would frequent Flag Raiders are also the players who attend our events and tournaments. The more time that passes, there is less opportunity for new players to try paintball and more old-time players drop away from the sport. They are not a competitor, we work in synergy with each other.

An Environics Report created from our waiver database shows our customers come from a very healthy mix of age, race, and socioeconomic status. As with most sports, the fun and competitive nature of paintball encourages physical fitness, a healthy lifestyle, and character building. Being a part of a community at the paintball field gives a sense of worth and belonging, building relationships with people of diverse backgrounds. This is where time, energy, and resources are put into this pastime rather than them being misspent. It benefits the participant with access to green space and an escape from the digital world. It has been an ideal outdoor activity during a pandemic. This could all be happening in your community with the reopening of Flag Raiders.

Please consider the benefits of allowing Flag Raiders to open again and make haste to assist them in reopening.

Please, contact me if you have any questions or require more information. You can reach Corey and Joe at the following:
Sincerely,

--

Donna Langman
of Wasaga Adventure Park
To whom it may concern,

My name is Zachary Logan, I am writing this to express my support for Flag Raiders Paintballs request to reopen and operate within City of Cambridge limits. Flag Raiders has been part of my life for the last 8 years, it started when I was a kid and asked my dad for months to take me to play paintball as it was something that I had never had the opportunity to experience before. We first started playing in the summer of 2014 while Flag Raiders was operating at the Bingemans location in Kitchener, the reason we chose Flag Raiders as our field was due to how close it was to where we live in Cambridge. We would play every Tuesday night during the summer and almost every other weekend spending countless hours bonding and forming friendships with the regulars at the field. That fall we had the opportunity to participate in the Flag Raiders Zombie Hunt as volunteers for Flag Raiders. We would continue our commitment to volunteering for Flag Raiders up to and including the present day.

When I started high school in 2015 I was offered the opportunity to officially become a volunteer with Flag Raiders, over the next 4 years I would accumulate over 400 community service hours. This helped me graduate with one of the highest hours accumulated almost 600. While volunteering I helped maintain and build up the field and was part of major building projects that continued to develop the field into one of the most diverse playing fields in southern Ontario. There were only a few fields back in 2015 and there are even fewer now, the closest major fields that would match the size and popularity of Flag Raiders are in London and Toronto almost 2 hours away.

In the summer of 2018 I was offered the opportunity to not only volunteer at the field but also start to learn what it meant to be a leader, referee, and team member. Then in the summer of 2019 Joe hired me on to work full time as a referee, during this time I was also working as a member of the local army reserves Royal Highland Fusiliers of Canada. I was offered a career advancement course that would take me away from Flag Raiders for about a month. Joe was very understanding and willing to accommodate and work around the training I was undertaking. When I returned from training I had a debilitating injury that caused me issues to walk and go about normal daily activities. Joe was extremely accommodating of this as well and allowed me to transition back into a voluntary role at the field that would allow me to maintain working at the field but at a reduced physical demand.

Not only has working and volunteering at Flag Raiders provided immense development it has also allowed for important time with my father. It created an environment that allowed my father to show me many things and also allowed us to have a relationship that not only was healthy but gave us both a sense that we had something in common that would strengthen that relationship.

In the spring of 2018 as well as being offered the position of referee in the summer I joined the Flag Raiders Team Task Force Raiders or TFR. This team has become like family and the field gave us a place to hang out and make friends and share stories about what was going on in our lives and when things were tough the team was always there to support one another. With the closure of the Flag Raiders field we have not been able to participate in events as a full team like we used to because travel is not an option for everyone and the field gave us an opportunity that even if we weren’t able to travel to fields outside the region we could still get out and be at the field doing something with team members wether it be play, build, or just support the daily operations of the business we were always there.

Flag Raiders is essential to the growth and maintaining of tourism in the region let alone the city. Being located right next to the very quickly expanding YKF Region of Waterloo International Airport which now has flights from right across the country coming in and being right off the 401 the major artery of this province the potential of growth to the area is undeniable.

It has been almost 3 years since I have been on a paintball field as a player due to injury and now due to the lengthy process required to allow a business that has been involved in the community for almost 40 years providing the opportunity for many youth their first jobs and bringing together family’s and cooperations in events and team building games, providing additional volunteers and collection vehicles for Canada Day and Christmas events.
collecting food and donations for the Cambridge Self Help Food Bank. What we all would like is for the field that has provided so many people with joy, and popularity to create a primer attraction once again for years to come.

So I ask please LET US PLAY!!!

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter,

Zachary Logan
To whom it may concern,

I have been a resident of Cambridge, Ontario for over 40 years. While I have grown up in this amazing community I have also been fortunate enough to raise my own family here. My 3 children have all grown up going to the local farmers market and visiting the local attractions like Bingaman’s and the butterfly conservatories on multiple occasions. Whether it has been for Christmas events or just a spur of the moment visit, they as well as myself have always loved seeing what the local community has to offer.

One of their favorite places to visit is Flag raiders; they have become regular customers as it is a fun way to immerse yourself within the community while being active as well. It is an amazing and inclusive space for children and adults and is one of our favorite places in Cambridge. It’s a great place for birthdays, or downtime for the summer and I’m happy to have found it for my family.

Having outdoor amenities are crucial not only for physical health, but mental health as well. As we have seen during COVID and being in quarantine for over 2 years, it is important now more than ever to continue to have accessibility to outdoor amenities and activities for the well being of our community.

Regards,

Hong Chau
Please consider the environment before printing this email.
To whom it may concern,

Flag Raiders Paintball has been a fixture in the paintball community for decades. They have always operated with competence while having the utmost intention of providing a safe and fun experience for paintball enthusiasts.

I have had the pleasure of playing at their facilities for many years, both while living in the area and living outside of it. Oftentimes I have traveled from across Ontario bringing friends and family to play at their field while also enjoying other activities in the area like the camping and water park, the African Lion Safari, and St. Jacob's Farmer's Market.

Flag Raiders sets a benchmark for professionalism in the industry that very few match, while being the only field centrally located in southern Ontario. The paintball community has suffered these last few years from them being closed, and I implore you to aid in allowing them to operate again.

With thanks,

Nolan Stoer
I am writing this letter in support of Flag Raiders Paintball Inc. I have been a long time staff member, starting back in 1991, washing goggles and doing odd jobs at the field. I was 12 years old and this was my first job. I continued to work for Flag Raiders all the way through high school, and made it into a career. I became the field manager, taking care of bookings and day to day work. I played for the Task Force Raiders, Flag Raiders’ very own scenario paintball team. We use to play paintball, locally, every weekend, but now, if we want to play we have to leave the Region. It’s incredibly inconvenient for us to have to travel 45min to 3 hours to play the game that we love. We were so lucky to have the most premium field in North America, right here in the Waterloo Region, but with your help, we can once again. I have played with players from Liverpool England, Wales, New Jersey, Michigan, California, New York and Pennsylvania. And from all over Canada. I have played this game for 31 years, and most of my best friends, both male and female, come from Paintball. We play the game then we get our families together and go for dinner at Moose Winooski’s in Kitchener. Or we have a family movie nights, and pot lucks at the field.

If it wasn’t for Joe, Corey and the Kimpson Family, I surely would not be here today. When I was in my last year of High school, I was on my own and had locked myself up in my basement for 2 weeks not going anywhere. Joe and Corey came with the help of my Co op Teacher Jim Crone, saved me. They have been a major part of my life ever since, from a Thanksgiving dinner with Kimpson family, to calls and text messages when I had my first son Hunter, (who is now 12). I’ve taken Hunter out to Flag Raiders for father son bonding many times. Joe was a part of my wedding and most of the people there were from paintball too. I have learned so much from Flag Raiders in general, from how to swing a hammer and building, to learning how to answer a phone and dealing with people from all walks of life. The team building events we do at Flag Raiders, with companies like Toyota, RIM, Eastside Mario’s, Cambridge Winter Hawks, Kitchener Rangers are just a few that I have personally dealt with in years past. Not having Raiders open and running is a major part of my life that is sorely missing.

Regards,

Matt Roberts

Sent from for Windows
Hello

I am concern with the closure of one of the sporting site which is Flag Raider which is in Kitchener/Waterloo where i used to go every weekend to play paintball.

I came to Canada 4 years prior and i once visited this location which encourages me to have any outdoor activity so I started playing paintball at this location every weekend.

However, since the covid hits everything was under lockdown but after lifting off the restrictions i came to know that this location is going to shut down that makes me sad and I searched other locations which are way far from the place where I live so now I can’t play this game anymore.

I request you if this location can be reopened again so that people like me can enjoy this game again at Flag Raiders location.

Thanks
To all parties concerned,

I'm Scott Amis, a business owner from Kelowna BC. I grew up in Cambridge and have been playing paintball at Flag Raiders since 1986.

My business has production 30 min drive from this field location, so I have opportunities to return from time to time.

This organization is a long-standing recreation and while playing there, I have met hundreds of tourists that travel to participate in a sport we all love. I read on line there is concerns about land use. It would be a waste to see an almost 40 year old establish business to be forced out operations due to the views of a small minority.

Scott Amis
Dear Mayor McGarry and Councillors,

I am writing with great anticipation, learning that the City of Cambridge is hearing a motion in support of allowing Flag Raiders to operate at 1500 Kossuth Road.

I have included an email I sent July 21, 2021 to a number of city, regional, and provincial leaders as it explains why Flag Raiders is so important to my family and to our community. In addition to that email I would like to provide an update about some of my observations and thoughts since sending my original email (below).

I have spent quite a bit of time on the property at 1500 Kossuth Road over the past year and am very familiar with the property. I have also spoken extensively to Corey Kimpson about the property and have read some of the concerns the neighbours have brought forward which are listed on an on-line petition (titled "NO! To paintball on Kossuth Road") and, in some cases, are wrong and misleading. The petition against the reopening lists the following issues as areas of concern: 1. Conflicting land use, 2. Adverse effects on quality of life, 3. Protection of wildlife and the environment.

Conflicting land use - I can't comment on what is and isn't allowed under the various zoning regulations, but I understand from listening to Jan Leggitt on the Mike Farwell show (April 13, 2022) that Flag Raiders likely can fit under the current zoning. In my opinion this property would be very difficult to farm due to the uneven land and the large wood lot surrounding the property.

Adverse effects on quality of life - The petition mentions noise, excessive traffic, swearing, air horns and loud music. I believe this is very misleading. In my experience this isn't a sport that attracts delinquents but instead young kids, the young at heart and families out for an afternoon of physical activity and fun. Standing in the registration area of Flag Raiders, when it operated at Bingeman's, I never had an issue carrying on a conversation at normal volume. I'm sure it can get loud with excitement at times, but this business can only operate during daylight hours and the City of Cambridge/ Region of Waterloo have ample noise and nuisance by-laws in place to protect the residents of the area.

When talking about the property and the concerns of the neighbours Corey has continually expressed her, and Joe's, desire to work with the neighbours to address their concerns. She has expressed her deep regret about how things unfolded when they previously ran the business on Kossuth Road and how they learned from those events. She and Joe have tried to meet with the neighbours, but have largely been met with silence. And while it is likely frustrating, she continues to show empathy and kindness, consistent with her personality. I strongly believe, Flag Raiders, given the opportunity, will go out of their way to ensure they can address any reasonable concerns.

Since 2008, when Flag Raiders moved to Bingemans, the area on Kossuth road has become very busy and noisy. There is a regular stream of airplanes, jets and helicopters circling, taking off and landing. Between the airport, the sod farm across the street, the golf course to the east, and people travelling between Kitchener, Cambridge and Guelph on Kossuth Road, the noise in the
area has increased substantially. To attribute this destruction of, what the petition describes as, “the current peaceful, family atmosphere, natural environment and quiet rural setting…” to Flag Raiders is unfair.

**Protection of wildlife and the environment** - The implications made by the group petitioning against Flag Raiders is just not true. The woodlot is restricted from the paintball activities and the wildlife habitats and ecosystems are well preserved and paintballs are biodegradable and non toxic.

Having Flag Raiders operating in the community again would be a boost to the economy, and lives of people looking for a positive and healthy activity.

Sincerely,
Brenda MacDonald

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Brenda MacDonald <>
**Subject:** Please help!
**Date:** July 22, 2021 at 1:21:13 PM EDT
**To:** Brenda MacDonald <>

Dear Leaders,

I am the mother of a 30 year old adult son with disabilities. His diagnoses are numerous and include Asperger’s and Cerebral Palsy. Throughout school he was unable to make or retain friends and was a magnet for bullies who made his life incredibly difficult. My son is articulate and highly intelligent, but is “different” and he never quite ‘fit in’. That was until he met the good people at Flag Raiders.

**Community** - At Flag Raiders he found a place where he belonged. The Kimpson family went to great lengths to include and encourage him. Flag Raiders provided an inclusive and healthy community for anyone interested in the sport. For the past 13 years, this is a place where my son could be **physically active** without being shamed. As a history buff, he found he had a lot in common with other players and staff.

**Employment** - Flag Raiders employed my son and tailored his work to his abilities. They gave him shifts that worked best for him and checked on him regularly to ensure he was OK. If one job was too stressful or difficult they would work with him to modify the task to ensure his success. Unfortunately Flag Raiders had to close their indoor field due to the pandemic and my son (and many others) lost his job. Flag Raiders directly employs many youth from our community and, more generally, supports the employment of many surrounding the sport.

**Location** - 1500 Kossuth Road, Cambridge. Is more suited for paintball
than agriculture.

**Noise** - It’s already incredibly noisy in the area. Between the neighbouring airport and the sod farm across the street, I imagine the sounds from Flag Raiders would go largely unnoticed. As well, there is forest surrounding 3 sides of the property and a large berm on the forth side.

**Environmental impact** - The large forest surrounding the property is not used for paintball. Left in its natural state, this forest is home to too many rare plants and species. Paintballs are biodegradable and non-toxic and the business is able to run "off-grid", using only solar power.

**Industry leaders** - Flag Raiders has been owned and operated locally for over 30 years. They are leaders in the paintball industry and known around the world. They have put Waterloo region on the map for people in the paintball community.

**Economic impact** - Seeing this group in action, particularly when they run large games, I imagine they must have a large impact on the local economy. People that travel for paintball need to stay in hotels, eat and shop. Additionally, Flag Raiders and those they employ spend money in the region.

**Fresh air and exercise** - We need our government to support and enable activities that provide fresh air and exercise. Paintball provides an opportunity for abundant amounts of both. The game is safe, fun and requires zero “screen time”. Post Covid 19, we need to find more healthy, outdoor activities. For the region, seeing Flag Raiders up and running is win/win.

**Good people, doing great things.** If you don’t know the Kimpson family, you should. This family is involved in their community. They set THE example for how we should all be. They support Cambridge and Waterloo region in so many ways. I can’t count the number of volunteer activities Todd, Corey, Joe, Meg and their children are involved in. They work with local government, advocate for the disadvantaged, volunteer at the hospital, the food bank, schools, the BIA and so many other support services and activities- the list goes on and on. Isn’t it time their community supported them? The Kimpson's (and the paintball community) need your help! These are the best kind of people and Waterloo Region/Cambridge should be honoured to have them living within the community and should be doing everything it can to help them save their business. Let’s get this done!

Thank you for reading my letter and for getting this group back up and running, as soon as possible.
Kindest regards,

Brenda MacDonald
Hello Mayor and Members of Council, Region of Waterloo and Provide of Ontario,

My family and I are residents of Cambridge Ontario. I was born here and after a decade in England, chose to return to Cambridge with my husband and family. We once again live on the street where I grew up. We know this city, and this community well.

I am writing in support of Flag Raiders, a local family owned paint ball business operated by Corey and Joe Kimpson for almost 40 years. I do not play paint ball, I have never even held a paint ball. No one in my family has ever been involved in the game. So I do not write this letter as a player or member of their group, but I know the Kimpson and I know their business ethics. I was born across the street from them. I grew up with the Kimpson family. I am pleased that our next generation of children are good friends.

The Kimpson are the best sorts of neighbours. They are the first to volunteer, the first to support local efforts. They are unflaggingly committed to create a better community. No one who knows them could question their motives or their commitment to the local area. They march in parades, they volunteer to run egg hunts for Easter, serve on school councils and help organize the local farmers market. They provide volunteer lactation support to new mothers, coordinate volunteers and patient advocacy for the hospital. When the pandemic hit they helped organize the creation and distribution of 50,000 pieces of PPE for our local community and helped everyone we know find vaccine appointments when they were scarce. They are the people who step up and pitch in where there is a local need. They are the best sorts of neighbours and the instil this attitude in everyone around them.

Their business, Flag Raiders, is a glowing example of local success. They have become nationally and internationally known for their business. The bring in tourism from all over the globe with their tournaments, they create jobs and hospitality revenue in our local economy. They provide placements for disabled members of our city. They have created a sporting community that welcomes everyone, kids, seniors, families.

Flag Raiders operated a the Kossuth Rd. location for many years. They briefly relocated to the Bingemens site, but shut down due to COVID in November of 2020 and when that area was sold by Bingemens in December 2020 they tried to return to their own land. For nearly two years they have tried to work with the local council and region to reopen. They have received nothing but mixed messages and road blocks from city staff. Contradictory instructions, illogical statements and long long delays in processing. Weeks to deliver a letter inside city hall, or get a document returned. This is not how we should treat a local business, it is certainly now how we treat good neighbours. The Flag Raiders business is desperately trying to save yet another season of play and operation in Cambridge, and they are on the verge of loosing again, because city staff have delayed this process for literally years. It is embarrassing to think Cambridge cannot find a way to support a business that has contributed so much to our community.
Other sports groups have been granted permission to operate on ecologically sensitive land with no track record of success, and no evidence of any local connection or benefit (e.g. Archery Canada has been given permission to erect semi-permanent structures at Moyer's Landing, a site notorious for ecologically sensitive species like Bald Eagles) and yet Flag Raiders, a proven local business remains blocked by city staff.

The Kimpson are deeply concerned that they remain in the area, and that they continue to contribute to our local economy and community. They have made every effort to work with neighbours on Kossuth Rd. and a great many of them are very supportive of their attempts to reopen. Their business has minimal impact on the land they use, they use biodegradable materials, and are notoriously tidy and considerate in their operation. They provide a safe and welcoming cite with mixed activities for all ages and abilities. These are the business we should be prioritizing, supporting and encouraging, not blocking and stringing along for years.

Please find a way to help them resume their operation.

Prof. Elizabeth Clare, Dr. Robin Floyd, Annie Floyd, Owen Floyd
Local Residents,
Cambridge
Hello,

My name is Sean, and I'm the founder of a company called Blackline Events. We produce a real life spy novel for clients across Ontario and Quebec. I'm writing to you today to express my support for Joe Kimpson and his bid to reopen Flag Raiders Paintball in Cambridge.

Blackline Events has been in operation for almost 6 years, but even before that, our small business was operating in a limited capacity. Flag Raiders has been instrumental in helping us grow, both with the advice that Joe has provided, and with the facility he's run. His company has fostered not only our company, but many other entrepreneurs we know. On average, we'd host several events at Flag Raiders every year, with hundreds of participants taking part.

Flag Raiders has been one of the most conveniently located facilities in Ontario. With Cambridge dropped right into the middle of Southern Ontario, Blackline has been able to host clients from Windsor to Ottawa. Even those coming from North Bay and Quebec find it a desirable site and a manageable commute. While our business has been able to attract clients from these cities, the events Joe runs at his facility bring tourists from across North America into the region.

I'm sad to say that since Flag Raiders closed (first for compliance with pandemic restrictions, then with the loss of their site), my company hasn't returned to Cambridge. We've been forced to seek other sites north of Toronto and out east towards Prince Edward County. We've not been able to celebrate after an event at Fiftys Diner, nor have we hopped over to Wellington Brewery to grab some beer on our way home.

I hope that you can find a way to allow Joe and his business to reopen in Cambridge, as my clients and I look forward to bringing our business back to the region as soon as a facility is available.

Sean Arbuthnot
To Chair and Council, Region of Waterloo  
To Mayor and Council, City of Cambridge  

Date: Monday, April 18, 2022  

This is a letter in support of a local business, Flag Raiders Paintball.  

Please note that we have no personal or financial interest in paintball, as a sport or an activity. However we are invested in supporting local Cambridge businesses that add value to our community. We also appreciate fellow Cambridge residents who demonstrate commitment to our community and who work actively to make Cambridge a better place to live, work and play.  

We are lifelong residents of Preston and now, Cambridge, Ontario. For almost fifty years we have lived across the road from the Kimpson family. We are enjoying the third generation in our connection between their family and ours. It is the second generation Kimpsons who have operated Flag Raiders Paintball since 1983 - almost forty years.  

We can attest that the Kimpsons have always been the best possible neighbors and we are certain our other neighbors would agree. The Kimpsons are well known for looking out for others in our neighborhood. Everyone knows they can be relied upon. They are the first to be called by neighbors in distress, whether it is to seek information about local services, assistance dealing with bureaucracy, or a late night request for a ride to the CMH Emergency. During the pandemic, the Kimpsons regularly called neighbors, who were older, disabled or shut-in, to offer grocery runs, home cooked dinners or just a friendly chat.  

The Kimpson sense of responsibility to the larger community is well known. During the pandemic, the Kimpsons were part of the steering group that organized the production of over 50,000 units of PPE for our local hospital. Corey Kimpson received international recognition for her work in her role as chair of Cambridge Memorial Hospital’s Patient and Family Advisory Council. Their considerable social outreach is in
addition to running several successful retail businesses over the years. The Kimpson family has given much to this community and deserves our thanks.

After having operated Flag Raiders Paintball successfully on land rented on the outskirts of town, the Kimpsons purchased property on Kossuth Road and, for a time, moved their "field" there. They have operated in several indoor and outdoor settings and, until recently, rented space from Bingeman’s Grand Experiences. Then, like many businesses responding to the multiple pressures caused by the pandemic, the Kimpsons needed to relocate. The most obvious venue to return to was the land they already own on Kossuth. Yet, rather than receiving support from their city and region, they have been hit with roadblocks. Now, when they need our support most, they are faced with new interpretations of the zoning guidelines. As a result, their business has been essentially shut down. The owners and employees are out of work. The paintball community is searching elsewhere to take their trade.

Flag Raiders Paintball is a locally owned, family business run by people who live here in Cambridge. They have a long track record of environmental responsibility and participant safety. They host national and international paintball events that draw visitors to Cambridge. They even run a weekly webTV paintball show seen all over North America. Cambridge, Ontario, is known by aficionados as the home of Flag Raiders Paintball.

We do not pretend to understand the complexities of regional zoning, but we do know that our city and region can help when they want to. For example, local government seems to have bent over backward to hand over the environmentally sensitive area of Moyer’s Landing to Archery Canada - for no rent, no connection to Cambridge and no obvious benefit to anyone, save Archery Canada. Yet, when it comes to a local business with a proven track record like Flag Raiders Paintball, we do not see a similar effort to help. We are now at the point where Flag Raiders Paintball may be shuttered permanently by that same government.

We have always trusted our local government to do the right thing for its residents and its local businesses. We urge you to support Flag Raiders Paintball and allow a Cambridge success story to continue.

Respectfully,

Ann and Mark Clare
Hello Mayor McGarry,

I'm writing to you on behalf of Flag Raiders Paintball in hopes that a solution can be found to resolve the continued zoning issue at 1500 Kossuth Road. Your support in this matter is greatly appreciated as the loss of such a business would be significant from both an economic and community leadership perspective.

Flag Raiders Paintball is more than just a renowned sport tourism venue that draws in much needed monies to Waterloo Region supporting other local businesses (restaurants, hotels, etc.). As a long-time and well-respected family run business, Flag Raiders has helped to grow the sport of paintball through the development of players who have gone on to compete provincially, nationally and internationally. They offer a safe venue to be active outdoors and help to bring people together in the community which is so critical as we take steps to learning to live safely with COVID-19.

This family business has been helping to make memories since 1983. They've been ever present at community fundraisers, parades, holiday events and maybe even part of your birthday party celebrations. Flag Raiders Paintball is the type of business we should be fighting to keep in Waterloo Region as we look ahead to economic recovery and focus on placemaking within our community. Cambridge needs places where families can participate in a recreational sport together; Flag Raiders offers that regardless of background, ability or age. These are the types of activities and business cultures that are critical to embrace and maintain in our community.

It would be very unfortunate to miss a local economic recovery opportunity as well as the occasion to support a family business that has so often generously assisted the people of this community.

Please find a way to allow your citizens to continue to make memories at Flag Raiders Paintball. Seek to understand what the family-friendly sport of paintball has to offer our community by reaching out to either Joe or Corey Kimpson:

[Contact information]

Thanks in advance for your attention and support in this matter.

Kindest regards,

Krista Jackson

Cambridge, ON
Dear City of Cambridge, Region of Waterloo, and Province of Ontario Representatives,

I am Sue Alexander, and I own and operate Dogs in the Park, a local dog training company. For the past twenty years, Flag Raiders has generously donated the use of their property to my business for the purpose of training dogs. Over that time, we have had the opportunity to see Flag Raiders from a vantage point that few others do.

When we first got to know the Flag Raiders, we came with a lack of understanding for the sport. We expected teens looking for violent outlets. We were wrong. We did not find what we expected. We have come to know the entire Flag Raider family. We have watched many young people move from being joiners and hangers on, to becoming contributing members of the community. We have watched babies born, grow up and begin to find their potential as young adults. We have seen communities evolve and find ways to support those less fortunate. Flag Raiders participates in the region’s Canada Day celebrations in the parade, supporting veterans who want to be a part of the activities. They raise funds and food for the food bank. Informally, they provide unexpected connections between those who are able and those who are in need on a regular basis. We have felt the love and generosity that is necessary to make our region blossom.

There are many who look to they myths surrounding paintball. They miss so much. They miss the physical aspect of the sport; running, twisting, and leaping all contribute to physical fitness that is sorely lacking in many members of our community. Team games teach co-operation, strategy, and planning. Tournaments bring friends from all over the continent, providing players with vast supportive networks that will serve them well when they leave home and enter the wider world. Increasingly, women and girls are finding a foothold within this sport, and often they are not only playing on par with men and boys, but they are bringing new challenges and challengers to the activity; this is a sport that can be played by whole families. It has been claimed that the paintballs themselves are toxic; and when I first used the property, I was concerned about this too. As it turns out, paintballs are made of edible components; my own dogs have eaten many of them and come to no harm. After several months there is not even dye left from paint balls that are left after the games. The paintballs biodegrade completely.

Paintball brings economic opportunities to the region. Aside from employment directly generated by the activities that are held on a regular basis, when tournaments are run, tourism dollars come to our area. Plane tickets are purchased, cars are rented, and hotels are booked. Fast food and slow dining happens. Inevitably, families are introduced to the region and our many opportunities, and some will return for other activities here.

On a personal note, without Flag Raiders, I would not have a business. Through the pandemic, when things were at their darkest, Corey reached out to me and offered us even more access to the property, at no charge to my business. When the province shut down, but dog training was open for business if it happened outdoors, we had a safe place to run our classes.
Flag Raiders needs to be able to continue to operate. For all the years I have known Joe and Corey, they have given more than they have taken. They have worked hard to build a business that has contributed in a very positive way to our community. Last summer, one of my students showed up to the outdoor classroom, and said, “this place looks really familiar” and I shared that it was the Flag Raider field. “Oh” he said and got a little bit quiet. “Flag Raiders is why I did not end up on the street” he told me. He had been on the verge of quitting high school and leaving home when he by chance was invited to play paintball. He found a place where he was accepted and nurtured, and someone helped him to find what he needed to continue to finish high school and go on to finish college and then go to university. He was really nostalgic about how important Flag Raiders had been to his development.

When an organization such as Flag Raiders contributes so much, it is hard to understand why the zoning exception would be denied. There are those in the neighbourhood who have made bizarre claims without evidence about the activities that occur on the property. In social media, at one point, Dogs in the Park was misidentified as a “fake business” created to support the use of the land. I would like to assure those who made such an accusation, that we are far from fake. We have been in business for over twenty years, and we have been out on the land every year. With the high berms on the west side of the property, and the dense forest on the north, east and south of the property, our barking dogs, and loud clients have never been detected.

I encourage you to consider permitting the zoning changes necessary to bring this important business back to the property it has owned and used for so many years. And I encourage the neighbours who oppose this to come out and meet the people involved in the activities. My experience has been that the Kimpson family is very open to answering any questions about their activities. Those opposed may even find some common ground in the very things they value most; peaceful activities that support our community.

Sincerely,

Sue Alexander CPDT-KSA CBCC-KA CDBC
Dogs in the Park
Guelph Ontario
To whomever this concerns,

Hello my name is Tristan Silva. As someone who has been associated with Flag Raiders for the last 4 year I have been worried about its reopening in the Tri-city area. Knowing about the difficulties they have been dealing with when trying to reopen their paintball field, I believe we need the help of representatives like you to support Flag Raiders.

Flag Raiders has been a place where kids and adults have safely come together to enjoy the sports of paintball and airsoft. It has helped to educate and build relationships within its community and others outside of it. As someone who lives outside of the Tri-city area, I travel most weekends to participate in matches when they are open, and I am often inviting my friends and family to join me as well. If given the opportunity to open and build, Flag Raiders could be a great source of income for the community.

I ask you to please take a closer look into helping Flag Raiders reopen.
Sincerely,
Tristan Silva
Dear Councillor,

I’m writing you regarding the many appeals for zoning change that Flag Raiders has been making. Please consider the need for such a business in the region and city of Cambridge.

This established community business has been servicing my friends and family for many years. Many people came from regions all over Ontario and the United States for events at Flag Raiders. Even though I’m a resident of Kitchener I have travelled outside of the region for paintball in the past and miss the opportunity to engage locally in the sport with my children.

Flag Raiders provided a great service for many people across many regions and brings in a great deal of tourism to the region. Event goers often spend weekends in the region, visiting many other attractions such as Bingemans, Farmers Market, and the Butterfly Conservatory amongst others. They also spend money on restaurants and souvenirs in the area. These not only include big weekend tournaments but regularly weekly play. Flag Raiders Paintball is centrally located in the province, closely located to key highways, making it convenient to meet up with friends coming from other cities.

During a period of economic recovery for many business in the region, Flag Raiders capacity to draw in tourism make it an asset to the region’s growth. Please consider all the positive elements that Flag Raiders brings to our community and kindly expedite their zoning needs so that we may all benefit.

With kindest regards,

Hebron Gebre-Mariam
Please find attached our letter regarding the proposal being put forward by Flagraiders. Would like this to be entered into the minutes for the meeting.

Thanks

Chris and Yvonne Day
April 28, 2022

Re: Special Council Meeting - May 17 re Flag Raiders

We reside at [redacted] and have many issues with re-zoning and/or temporary proposals to allow the Flag Raiders to once again occupy the agriculture zoned land. Although no re-zoning has been approved it should be noted that the land has been developed with buildings, and other items in the last year that makes it look as if they have already gotten approval to re-open. Have permits or anything been issued or approved for the renovations to take place on the agriculture land? Is the OMB aware of these changes made without approval? Is there something we don’t know? What is their tax base with all these new additions?

**NOISE**

Having lived through the first installment of these war games before the OMB’s ruling, the noise level is unacceptable. The citizens and new property owners pay a lot of taxes to the city. We do not live in the area to listen to the sound of automatic weapons, yelling, swearing, air horns and loud music. In the past the by-law enforcement was called numerous times because of the noise.

Please note that Bingham’s did not renew their lease. Has anyone checked with them, or the mayor of Kitchener as to whether or not they received noise complaints or as to why the lease was not renewed?

**VIOLENCE**

If you have watched the video of the Flag Raiders, it is nothing but a war activity. (War games is an oxymoron) The purpose of the activity is to shoot as many people as possible as fast as you can. I asked a lady who did this activity and she said it was great fun. “The best part was shooting my husband!” Speaks volumes in a time where we are trying to stop bullying, domestic violence, and be a caring and inclusive society.

Our neighborhood is from different ethnic groups. One has recently moved to Beaverdale Road and has family in the Ukraine. Others have families that fled El Salvador during the civil war. Imagine them sitting in their backyard and listening to automatic weapons and people yelling. How do they explain the noise to their small children and grandchildren?

We have heard that schools endorse this activity. As elected officials can you please check what school boards or schools endorse this type of activity in this day and age. I am sure we know the answer.

Can you please also check with the regional Police and OPP and get their input on this war activity? Also please note that most of the automatic paintball weapons are on the list of banned
items under Bill C-21 as they are considered replica guns. The police are in favour of banning them as they have to make split second decisions if confronted.

Everything we have read says you must be 18 years old to buy paintball guns and paintballs. Anyone under 18 must have written consent to participate in this activity. How is the city going to ensure these rules are followed? Will the police do spot checks?

ENVIRONMENT

This agricultural land is currently full of deer, coyotes, foxes, turkeys and many birds. Have any studies been done on the impact of a war zone on the habitat of the land? Ducks also inhabit this area as parts of the land is protected wetland.

Has an archaeological assessment been prepared by a licensed person on the subject land? This was required when lots were severed on Beaverdale Road.

Has the Indigenous community been advised of this proposed activity as the wetlands flow into the Grand River?

Can you be positive no contamination of the land or water will occur?

LOGISTICS

Kossuth Road is already a busy road not only with automobiles but bicyclists, walkers, and runners. Where are “all” these people that are coming to the community going to park their cars? The shoulders are used by walkers, runners, and bicyclists and it would be too dangerous to park there. When participants leave en masse at the end of the war activities is someone going to direct traffic? Think of all the accidents at Beaverdale and Kossuth before lights were put in. The same thing will inevitably happen as impatient drivers pull out onto Kossuth.

One other thought. If this war activity is going to create all these jobs and business for the community, why did Bingemans not renew their lease and why has no community opened their arms to them.

How many T-4’s did the Flag Raiders Company generate before covid? Check it out. Get facts not reports. Remember tobacco companies, for years, had reports that cigarettes didn’t cause cancer.

Chris and Yvonne Day
Dear Mayor McGarry, Members of Cambridge City Council, Mr. Goodram and Ms. Hogue;

Please find attached a letter of support/inquiry from Guelph based Possibility Films.

Flag Raiders has partnered with Mr. Szabo in the past for film projects and would like to be able to continue this relationship.

As we have discussed, our facility has been used for many movie and still photoshoots, in addition to the main recreational use, further increasing the benefits to the City of Cambridge and surrounding area.

Joe and I look forward to working with you to find an opportunity that would allow us to operate at our Kossuth Rd. location. As you are aware, we have been trying to work with the City and other partners for over a year now, since January of 2021.

Sincerely,

Corey Kimpson
Flag Raiders
April 5, 2022

Dear Mr. Kimpson,

You might recall that we used your Flag Raiders Adventure Park as a location set in June 2016 for filming scenes that were used in our feature-length action film, DEFECTIVE. The film has since been released on Blu-ray and streaming services in markets across the world, including its current North American streaming release on Amazon Prime.

Our film production company, Possibility Films, is currently developing a science-fiction film project for which your Flag Raiders Park would be an ideal location for the post-apocalyptic look of key scenes in the film. We are still in the process of securing funding for the film but it would help if we could secure your intention to let us film at your park, pending mutually agreeable scheduling dates and financial terms.

We are Guelph-based filmmakers and prefer to support local crews and businesses. The current location of Flag Raiders Adventure Park is close to Cambridge, ON, which is known for its active support of the film and television industry. It would be convenient and cost-effective for us to use resources from the City of Cambridge while shooting at Flag Raiders, including food and accommodations for cast and crew, and equipment rentals. We would also consider scouting for other filming locations within Cambridge and its surrounding area.

As a producer and director of several films, I value the contributions of our collaborators including location set owners. Please confirm if you are open to letting us use Flag Raiders Adventure Park as a location for filming our upcoming project. I will, of course, keep you apprised of our production development effort and notify you when we have funding and tentative shoot dates.

Thanks again for your past support and feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Yours truly,

Peter Szabo
Producer/Owner, POSSIBILITY FILMS

POSSIBILITY FILMS and 2474608 ONTARIO INC.
Thank you
Warren Ibbotson
Hello!

My name is Warren Ibbotson

I writing to you as a concerned Waterloo resident of 52 years.

We have owned a family operated business Biba Boutique in Kitchener/Waterloo area for 55 years!

My concern deals with another family owned business of 39 years!

Flagraiders paintball lost its home in the Covid era.

I have played paintball since 1991..In 1994 I injured myself and was left paralyzed from the waist down!

Fortunately I recovered and could walk with cane!

I played wheelchair basketball at the Team Canada level and have competed all over the world with many other teams!

I also like to participate in other activities such as the sport of paintball. Paintball has allowed me to participate with my family. My son and my father!

We have all played together! Which I am forever greatful for that time and memories! Flagraiders has allowed this to happen! There field designs are one of the only to allow me to participate with my injury! Flagraiders has always gone above any other field to help me play!

The sport of paintball allows people to play as individuals or family unlike any other sport!

I encourage you to take a deeper evaluation of the loss of this family business that has impacted so many lives!

Thank you!

Warren Ibbotson
Please review attached Letter of Support for Flag Raiders Adventure Park and Mr. Joe Kimpson.

Please reach out if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,
Andrew

Andrew Norgate
April 15, 2022

To: Mayor Kathryn McGarry
City of Cambridge
50 Dickson Street
Cambridge ON
N1R 5W8

RE:

Letter of Support For:
Flag Raiders Adventure Park
Joe Kimpson
Cambridge ON

Dear Mayor McGarry,

I am writing this letter on behalf of Mr. Joe Kimpson of Flag Raiders Adventure Park (Flag Raiders), to show my support for their endeavor to reopen this well-established business venture. I believe this organization is deserving of approval by city council because it provides social and economic benefit to the City of Cambridge and extends further to envelop residents within Ontario.

I have been participating in the adventure sport of paintball since 1986 when it was first forming within the province. Flag Raiders was one of the early adopters to be involved in establishing a successful business and actively promoting its awareness and growth now spanning almost 40 years.

I have been fortunate over the past years to not only introduce one of my sons to the sport of paintball, but to have created a much stronger bond with him because of the regular outings we would have at Flag Raiders. We attend outings and events every month (outdoor and indoor) which provided an opportunity for social and physical participation. Both my son and I actively volunteer in the multiple events organized by Flag Raiders for community outreach in support of the City of Cambridge.

I would add that I am not a resident of the Cambridge area but live in Hamilton Ontario. Even though it is a one-hour drive away, I choose to be a member of, and attend exclusively, Flag Raiders because of the supportive and family focused environment that the Flag Raiders group has created. My son and I have met many other families through our outings, all of whom express the same views, that we support Flag Raiders because of their family friendly environment and professionalism towards customers, the sport, and their extensive community involvement.

There are some who would question the environmental impact of the sport (use of “paint” in the paintball fill) and leverage the assumption that it is harmful to the ecosystem. This has been proven false as paintballs are biodegradable, water soluble and non-toxic food quality filling inside a round gelatin capsule like those used in vitamins or bath beads. They are completely non-toxic, non-caustic, water-soluble, and clean up with soap and water.
The sport of paintball has, and is, environmentally conscious with a large focus on addressing their footprint and impact ecologically. Many paintball parks and websites communicate and enforce the “Leave No Trace Principles” similar to what is among camping and outdoor enthusiasts.

Since the commercial aspect of Flag Raiders would be through their previous location, there is an existing understanding of land use and can be considered more of a playing area like a small ski hill or golf course. A place where players use their equipment in structured, organized games. The environmental impact compared to the highlighted activities is far less. The land is used “as is” and not reformed as in a Golf Course, or any other large area sporting activity center.

Some individuals oppose the sport and offer views that contradict and can create a divide between interested parties hindering discussion with opinions and unsubstantiated claims. I will reserve comment as this division can be expected and part of the due process and consideration that City Council will deliberate on. My intent is not to disprove views and opinions brought forth against Flag Raiders but support and offer that the focus of consideration should be applicable to the social and economic benefit to the City of Cambridge and its constituents.

Currently, the City of Cambridge and surrounding area has a void for adolescent and family collaborative sports. Flag Raiders has established for decades, an overwhelming acceptance for adventure sports facilities in the area. They are known in the paintball community as a provincial and Pan-Canadian “must experience” location, bringing in more tourist dollars to the Cambridge community in hospitality and general revenue, while serving the local populace with new and exciting experiences. Flag Raiders has extensive backing from multiple groups including the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce, Greater Kitchener Waterloo Chamber of Commerce, Explore Waterloo Region Tourism, and the Cambridge Food Bank proving their commitment to community involvement.

Flag Raiders have helped make the sport more accessible, safer (especially with Covid now prevalent and part of the “new normal”), and more enjoyable for all players and offer services that are inclusive and accepting of all ages and sexes. They are a truly family run facility focused on the unique experience of adventure sports that can be shared by all.

For these reasons, I hope you and city council consider the re-opening of Flag Raiders Adventure Park.

Sincerely,

Andrew Norgate
Hi there,

Please see attached Letter of Support for the reopening of Flag Raiders Paintball. I’d be more than happy to answer any questions you might have and I hope you find the time to review my letter.

Thanks in advance for your time.

Best Regards,

--

Cody Chong
Marketing Major & Entrepreneur
Hello all,

I am writing this letter to demonstrate my support for the reopening of Flag Raiders Paintball. I have lived in the Durham Region my whole life, and while other paintball locations were closer to home, I always elected to travel to Flag Raiders as their commitment to the community is unprecedented. To offer some background on myself, I’m now 25 years old and I’ve been playing paintball for 15 consecutive years. I first got into the sport as my father played, so naturally, I wanted to follow in his footsteps. My father played with Joe Kimpson, owner of Flag Raiders paintball, and I can personally attest to the positive impact paintball has on an individual, so the number of lives that Joe has positively impacted over the years must be astronomical.

Paintball is a game that doesn’t discriminate. Regardless of age, gender, or physical ability, paintball provides an outlet where almost anyone can partake. Some of the benefits of this game involve outdoor physical exercise, community building, and teamwork. Like other tight-knit communities, paintball builds relationships where individuals seek out the opportunity to spend more time with each other, often resulting in a visit to other local attractions, which is particularly true for Bingemans.

Throughout my years in this game, I have reached a competitive level where I now travel internationally for competitive tournaments that are aired to tens of thousands of subscribed viewers. The number of attendees at these international events is likely also in the tens of thousands, and I can only imagine the revenue this brings to the host cities. From hotels and restaurants to tourist attractions, there is no doubt that major paintball tournaments stimulate local economies.

With the closing of Flag Raiders, I have been forced to take the teams that I run to a different location, one that is further away from most players. The teams used to make regular visits to Flag Raiders, even including some weekdays. Similarly, local leagues have been forced to choose other venues. As such, the paintball community has actively witnessed tourism dollars leave the Cambridge area and transfer to other Canadian cities.

I write this letter to not only demonstrate my support for the reopening of Flag Raiders but to reassure you that having Flag Raiders operational at Bingemans is unquestionably a significant financial stimulation for the community. I would be more than willing to answer any questions you might have, and I would strive to be as unbiased as possible.

Thank you for your time.

Cody Chong
Bowmanville, ON
Hello,

Please see the attached letter of support.

Take care and have a lovely long weekend,
Stacey

--

April 15, 2022

Dear Mayor McGarry and City Council Members,

We are writing today in support of Flag Raiders Paintball. Our family has been members of the Cambridge community for over 75 years, family members have played at the field for 30 years and we have personally known the owners of Flag Raiders for 18.

We are deeply saddened by the displacement of Flag Raiders Paintball and the many obstacles they have faced in keeping their business viable throughout the pandemic. While the pandemic has certainly played a role in their ability to keep the business afloat, the challenges they have faced with regards to relocating their business are beyond comprehendible. We are in full support of Flag Raiders Paintball operating at the property in which they own at 1500 Kossuth Rd. as they did, without incident for 8 years.

We would like to share a little bit about our experiences and observations of Flag Raiders Paintball:

1. We have observed that every single staff member is professional, serious when need be, and exemplifies responsibility to each other within the player community.

2. We have observed the owner Joe, being consistently present; talking to players, asking parents if they have any questions, leading by example, cleaning up any wrappers that have accidentally blown away in the wind, asking people getting ready if he can help at all etc., etc.

3. The professional members of the Flag Raiders Paintball community are ALWAYS ready and willing to help others - without expectation of anything in return!
   - We have witnessed them helping someone remove a big tree that fell in front of a house and across the street.
   - They have offered their truck to help a family in need.
   - They are in the parade every year taking donations to help others.
   - They are a general source of a plethora of community information to help others whenever and however they possibly can.
   - We are quite certain there is much more that can be added to this list!

4. While waiting for our sons playing in the field, we have observed people of all ages participating and showing respect for one another. We have been there on a sunny Saturday and wow, the number of people there was incredible! We have heard many people talking about being from other areas of Ontario because, quite simply, Flag Raiders is the best place to play!

5. We have been there during a scheduled event. Halloween to be exact. This was planned impeccably and we can only imagine how far people traveled to attend this epic event. We believe they also had to add days because there were so many people wanting to attend. We are certain their regular tournaments attract even more people than this Halloween event.
6. We had a Nerf Birthday party for our son (age 6) at Flag Raiders several years ago. The owners were not involved in the active party, however the person who was in charge was fantastic!
   - Everything was well organized.
   - The staff were available to talk to parents.
   - The staff ensured all of the kids knew the rules and 100% stuck to them.
   - It was also a lot of fun!

In summary, the owners of Flag Raiders are upstanding, responsible members of our community. They have been active members of our community for over 30 years and have never hesitated to lend support and help to our community wherever it is needed. Their tournaments, as well as their daily operations bring many people to our City! This tourism contributes significantly from a financial standpoint; staying in hotels, eating in our local restaurants and enjoying our beautiful Grand River areas. All of the above spreads the word about our great City!

In our experience, all of the staff at Flag Raiders are kind, professional and take their jobs very seriously. Flag Raiders is operated with integrity and a community focus in mind. Flag Raiders fosters the importance of community building, team work, strategizing, physical exercise and responsibility in the sport. This is an important outlet for people of all ages, particularly for teenagers to get outside and be physically active in a safe and caring environment.

It is time for the City of Cambridge to step up and fully support this long standing family owned business who has never wavered in their support of the Cambridge community. They deserve the right to continue their legacy surrounded by continued support from our community, the City of Cambridge and surrounding regions!

Sincerely,

Stacey & Brendan Bauer
Cambridge, Ontario
Please see the attached document.
Thank you for your consideration,

Campbell Bauer
Cambridge, Ontario
April 15, 2022

Dear Mayor McGarry and City Council Members,

My name is Campbell Bauer and I am 16 years old. I am writing to you in support of Flag Raiders Paintball. I have been playing paintball at Flag Raiders since 2019. When businesses started to reopen after the shut down due to the pandemic, paintball was a great way to get people out of their homes and into the outdoors after some of the restrictions were lifted.

When I started playing Paintball at Flag Raiders I personally saw the staff and owners being extremely professional and making sure that everyone was following rules. They always enforced the safety protocols while maintaining a fun and enjoyable environment for everyone. All of the people at Flag Raiders go out of their way to help new and old players to make sure their gear is ready, make sure they have everything they need to play and that they understand the rules.

During my time playing everyone was super respectful and kind to everyone on the field. There is lots of team building and strategizing that goes into playing this game especially when you're playing on a field that is as big as the one at Flag Raiders. The game requires communication and teamwork to win. I have brought some of my friends to play paintball at Flag Raiders for the first time and they have repeatedly asked me if we could go back because of how much they enjoyed playing on the field.

Overall, Flag Raiders is a fantastic business that is extremely professional in what they do. I have always enjoyed going there whether it is during a birthday party or even if I’m just playing by myself. I have really missed the Flag Raiders community and have had very few choices in what I can do during the pandemic that is safe. I know that many of my friends feel the same way. It would be amazing when Flag Raiders opens again so that my friends and I have a safe and fun place to go again. I also know that many go to Flag Raiders on a regular basis to play and also for tournaments from outside the KW community; It will be a big help to Cambridge to have these people back in our city!

It is time for the City of Cambridge to get onboard and help reopen this family run business. The reputation they have built brings people from all over Canada and The United States, this will be amazing for the City of Cambridge! THE only way to accomplish this is if we have a field to play on!

Sincerely,

Campbell Bauer
I have attached a letter of support for Flag Raiders Paintball.

We believe it is a business that the community needs to get behind.

Thanks,
Dave Allen
Honorary Past President PLBC
The Preston Lawn Bowling Club would like to offer its support for Flag Raiders Paintball.

As with so many other not-for-profit organizations, such as ours finances were stretched while trying our best effort to remain open and supply a valuable recreational opportunity not only for the citizens of Cambridge, but also throughout Ontario.

While the lawn bowling club only host four or five tournaments a year, we feel we still bring people into the community and expose them to other aspects of Cambridge. They all contribute in some way to the economy of the city. Likewise I am sure that by getting Flag Raiders Paintball back up and running there will be several benefits for Cambridge and the Waterloo Region.

Prior to COVID problems and the hardships imposed by closing their facility, Flag Raiders Paintball demonstrated what good corporate citizens they were by donating prizes to the 1st Responder Appreciation event held at the Preston Lawn Bowling Club.

If you have any questions regarding this letter please contact me at [redacted] or telephone Dave at [redacted].

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

DAllen

Dave Allen
Honorary Past President
Councillors, City and Regional administrators,

I am writing to request your renewed attention to assist in getting a reputable local business, Flag Raiders Paintball back in action. All must be familiar with the issue at hand regarding their inability to operate in the Region of Waterloo / City of Cambridge due to zoning by-laws. I have reached out previously along with hundreds of others. I find it hard to understand this issue is still not resolved. Now is the time to act. Let’s get our residents and guests to the region back outside participating in healthy activities.

I am a lifetime resident of Cambridge, 58 year old business professional and active voter. I am a Preston High School Alumni and very active volunteer (Cambridge Football).

I have known Joe Kimpson and his family for longer than the 39 years he has been in business. They operate a world class facility and have an international reputation as one of the best Paintball venues in the country. Folks travel from all over to visit our fair city and participate in his events. The benefits to the community at large, especially during these times, far out weighs any logic for a small patch of unfarmable land being zoned Prime Agricultural. There are 10’s of thousands of constituents in Waterloo region that own Paintball gear and frequently participate in the sport. Not having a local venue forces them to take their dollars elsewhere.

Speaking first hand, over many years of personal experience, the Region and most especially the City of Cambridge have been very pro sport, healthy active lifestyle and diversity, very conscientious of the physical and mental health of their constituents. You guys have always jumped through hoops to provide your residents with diverse outdoor and indoor spaces for relaxation, entertainment and recreation. This is a successful, well established proven business providing a unique service that puts Cambridge on the map. Please do everything in your collective powers to find a way for Flag Raiders to operate as it has for decades.

If you have any questions, need a better understanding of their business, please feel free to reach out. I appreciate your consideration and hope to hear of a favourable result.

Best regards,

Steve

Steve Amis
May 9, 2022

To Her Worship, Mayor McGarry and Cambridge City Council,

File: R06/22- 1500 Kossuth Rd

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I write to you today to convey my strong and passionate disagreement with the proposed MZO application, Temporary Use Zoning By-law amendment or Zoning change application for the property located at 1500 Kossuth Road in the City of Cambridge, Ontario. My wife Linda and I have lived at [redacted] for over a decade and we directly abut the subject property on the west side. I will outline our concern with Joe and Corey Kimpson operating a recreational Flag Raiders operation and will break it down into 4 points.

First a little about us. Linda and I are long time residents of Cambridge. We initially purchased a home in a subdivision on McCormick Drive in Cambridge but after having two children, we realized we wanted a more quiet, spacious place to raise our family. After months of searching and visiting prospective properties we fell in love with the property at [redacted]. Even though we loved the property, we of course did our due diligence. I personally went to city hall and reviewed the property with a city planner. The planner pulled up the property on the computer and confirmed that the entire area was zoned A1 agricultural and the 25 year plan was to keep it that way. I then went to the Grand River Conservation Authority office and met with their staff and they did confirm that the neighbouring property (the subject property) and mine were Class 1 woodlot. With these facts in hand we enthusiastically purchased our dream property. My wife and I work very hard and enjoy our weekends sitting out on our deck by the pool and relaxing. We watch as the rabbits run around and will often see deer and wild turkeys running in the field behind us. We love it.

Point 1 current quality of life: After doing our due diligence our dream is now being threatened by an extreme business wanting to open up less than 100 meters from our back patio. We are not anti-business being next to us. We just want and expect that that business operate within the zoning restrictions in place for the property and indeed all the properties surrounding it. Clearly Flag Raiders does not conform thus their attempts to amend the acts. The Kimpsons can open many businesses that conform to the restrictions but are attempting to shoehorn this business into that property. The gunfire noise, traffic, yelling and screaming obscenities will absolutely disrupt our current quality of life especially on weekends all summer long. This is completely unacceptable at this location and we are asking council to please not allow this.

Point 2 present and future value of the homes in the neighbourhood: As I stated above my wife and I did extensive research on our property prior to purchasing it. At the time it was a large investment for us and we wanted to make sure it was everything we wanted. It was. If Flag Raiders is allowed to change the usage rules any prospective purchaser of a quiet, rural property will now consider my property and my neighbours’ for miles around, to be “less desirable”.
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While he cannot quantify the financial impact, my realtor, with over 15 years experience in Cambridge, tells me this will absolutely lower the value of my home. The Kimpsons have admitted that when they bought the subject property they were “naïve” and “just didn’t know” what the zoning restrictions were or even what city the property was in. I understand that it must be a financial hardship for the Kimpsons to be paying property taxes on a property that is not being used. But I also trust that Council can understand the unfairness of myself and other neighbours actually losing value in our properties to, in effect, help offset the losses of two individuals who made a bad business decision based on poor due diligence. If not using their property to generate income is an issue the Kimpsons should sell the property.

Point 3, setting a precedent: While I do understand that Council has the absolute authority to approve/disapprove any zoning amendment requests in the future, it seems to me that once such an extreme business is allowed to operate in an agricultural community it will be more difficult to say no to subsequent applications. Surely my neighbour can now apply for a similar amendment? This process already cost my neighbours money and time back in 2008, is costing us all money and time now and will cost money and time to fight all future applications. Allowing this change now will make future applications more likely. Please don’t allow this.

Point 4, environmental impact: Berms, 20 foot high fences, vehicle traffic, human traffic will all impact the current environment on the property that agricultural operations would not. The agricultural restrictions are there to prevent just that. The subject property is designated Class 1 (significant natural features) which is to protect the wetlands. Having a hundred people run around daily firing weapons is obviously not going to be conducive to the wildlife currently living on the property. Please do not allow this.

To summarize, my wife and I are not anti business in our back yard or against the Kimpsons personally, we are just opposed to this extreme business on a property that is meant for uses that are so different from the proposed use. The Kimpsons are welcome to operate any business on their property that conforms to the restrictions or alternatively to operate the Flag Raider business on any property that is currently zoned for that purpose. I am not anti paintball and I can appreciate that there is a demand in our community for this type of operation. There is no demonstrable reason that this extreme business has to operate on this particular property. The Kimpsons have had years to secure a property to operate this extreme business since being shut down by the City of Cambridge and subsequently the Ontario Municipal Board. They have not done so and this implies that they have either not tried hard enough or no one in Waterloo region wants them in their back yard. Forcing this business into this quiet rural property just because the Kimpsons already own it is not the solution. Please do not allow this.

With all due respect,

Bruce Martens
My name is Edward Christopher Sponder, I am a co-owner and reside at [redacted] which abuts 1500 Kossuth Road.

I strongly oppose the MZO application by the Flag Raiders Organization to proceed with a paintball gaming operation on the subject property. This issue has already been adjudicated by the Ontario Municipal Board (renamed the Ontario Land Tribunal) in a written ruling dated May 28, 2008. The ruling states that all paintball operations must cease on August 31, 2008. There has been no significant change to the zoning or Official Plan (OP) which would warrant overruling this decision.

My property, as well as the subject property, has extensive environmentally protected wetlands. The release of millions of paintball projectiles into this area will have a detrimental effect on wildlife, the ecosystem and the Grand River watershed. The noise created by this activity will most certainly aggravate the community. This is a community where several multi-million dollar homes have been built since the 2008 ruling. The construction of a bridge across the Grand River has increased the traffic on both Kossuth and Beaverdale Roads and supporting a business which would require hundreds of cars doing a left turn into the property in an 80 kilometer zone would be unwise.

In my opinion any counselor who supports this MZO has a total disregard for the 2008 ruling and the recommendations of the city staff which has always opposed this proposal, does not care about the local ecosystem and will be doing an extreme disservice to a significant number of municipal taxpayers only to support a group whose primary goal is to make money for themselves.

I hope the city council will do the right thing and turn down this proposal immediately as a positive vote for this MZO will result in appeals and potential legal actions which will be costly and and most likely have the same result as the 2008 ruling.

Please acknowledge receipt of this e-mail and that my views will be expressed to the Council on the May 17 meeting on this issue.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Chris Sponder
Please find attached our submission including our input that we wish to be placed before Council for their review with reference to the Public Meeting regarding Temporary Use Bylaw request for 1500 Kossuth Road.

Sent from Mail for Windows
May 3, 2022

To the City Council for the City of Cambridge

In Reference to Special Meeting – May 17 – Flag Raiders 1500 Kossuth Road

Dear Councillors,

We are writing to provide you our perspective on the latest request from Flag Raider for a Temporary Use Bylaw to allow them to operate their War Games business at 1500 Kossuth Road.

The property at 1500 Kossuth Road used to belong to the estate of E G Snyder. My Father-in-Law John W Snyder was the executor of the estate. He was approached by the Kimpsons in or around 1999 to purchase the land which was and is still zoned as Prime Agricultural. They indicated to Mr Snyder that their plan was to build a house. Up until that time they had been operating their War Games business ‘illegally’ on a property on Shantz Station Road which was also zoned as Agricultural. In their own words they thought that because they had gotten away with this at that property that they would be allowed to operate illegally at 1500 Kossuth Road.

Once the Kimpsons realized that they would not be able to operate their War Games business on this property they requested a Temporary Use Bylaw (TUB) to operate on a temporary basis while they shopped for an appropriate site to operate legally. Three years later they were back at City Hall requesting another TUB as they were unable (apparently) to locate any property. During these 3 years they continued to market and build the business. Another TUB was granted. Lo and behold another 3 years go by of neighbours being subjected to noise of warfare, firearms, smoke bombs, air horns, rap music, yelling and profanity. Another 3 years of picking up paint balls from their property. Another 3 years of disappearing deer, ducks and wildlife. Apparently the Kimpsons still could not find another property.

At this time (2008) a group of neighbours got together to fight this at city hall – retaining the services of a lawyer and an environmental planner at their own expense. Mr. Bruce Brown, who is representing our delegation can go into more detail with his presentation but the TUB case was taken to the OMB who ruled that another TUB would be against all recommendations and planning guidelines and was denied. The ruling allowed the Kimpsons 3 months to wrap up their business and clean up the property based on Mr. Kimpson’s statement that we would never come back asking for another TUB again if he was granted the 3 month extension.

Unbelievably 14 years later we are back in the same position after the Flag Raiders leaving Bingemans. Mr. Kimpson said he left Bingemans because they wanted to use the property for another use. When I spoke with Bingemans they indicated the Kimpsons left because Covid had hit their business hard and they planned to reopen at Kossuth. It has been suggested that the reason they left was due to noise complaints from nearby residents. Perhaps some or one of the City Council members might have some
insight into that? Fourteen years and the Kimpsons still have not found an appropriate site for their War Games business.

I have read with interest the very one sided media stories that paint the Kimpsons as being the victims of an angry mob of neighbours who are being unreasonable about allowing them to operate this wonderful Family Recreational business that will bring 100’s of thousands of dollars to the City. Let us be very clear – this is not a round of golf. This is full out warfare complete with detonating smoke bombs, automatic gun fire and all of the adrenaline that goes with live combat. The land that was once farmed by my husband’s family has now been littered with derelict buildings, burnt out buses and vehicles. The terrain has been altered with berms and trenches. This land is still very farmable despite the claims by the Kimpsons. It simply needs to be taken back to the state it was in when they purchased it.

The claim of all of the tourist dollars seems a little far fetched to me too. On any given weekend the players will drive in for the day and then drive home at the end of the day. On the weekends when they hold their tournaments (which basically drive all neighbours within half a kilometre into their houses due to the noise) may have some participants stay in hotels but I would question how many are going to drive to highway 24 when they can stay just down the road in Kitchener.

At the previous Council Meeting direction was given asking Flag Raiders to meet with the neighbours to outline the positive changes they have made. Instead the Kimpsons advertised the proposed meeting as a Public Meeting and invited all of their supporters to attend. They circulated a letter to the residents on Kossuth indicating some changes they proposed. Instead of any positive changes they are proposing increased hours of operation (including Saturday evenings), midweek games and the occasional winter game. They are suggesting 20’ high netting around the playing fields. We then found out they have applied for an MZO. Given the lack of good faith in their meeting invitation and the lack of any positive changes we decided to decline the invitation to attend their public meeting.

It needs to be very clear that the Flag Raiders War Games business as it exists today is a much larger enterprise than it was when they began and even since they left their property in 2008 and will bring even more disturbance to both neighbours and environment than it has in the past.

Speaking for ourselves we have approached the City on occasion for lot line adjustments to our properties to allow us to sever our house and a couple of acres and add all the farm land to an adjacent property. There would be no loss of farm land whatsoever. The request was denied due to the fact that we are zoned as Prime Agricultural. We respectfully ask the City to hold the Kimpsons to the same metrics and deny this most recent request and ensure that we do not have to revisit this again.

Respectfully,

John (Jed) Snyder and Michele Dickinson

– 500 Metres from 1500 Kossuth Road
ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD

In the matter of s. 34(25) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P. 13, as amended (Dismissal Without Hearing); and

In the matter of appeals by Flag Raiders Inc. from the refusal of The Corporation of the City of Cambridge, to enact a Temporary Use By-law;

AFFIDAVIT OF JOSEPH KIMPSON

I, JOSEPH KIMPSON, of the City of Cambridge, MAKE OATH AND SAY:

1. I am the Owner and Operator of Flag Raiders Paintball Inc. located at 1500 Kossuth Road in the City of Cambridge. As such, I am familiar with the matters hereinafter deposed to.

2. Flag Raiders Paintball Inc. was established in 1983 and first operated on the Hagey Property located on Kossuth Road in the Township of Woolwich on Agricultural land without issue until 2001.

3. I purchased the land at 1500 Kossuth Road in the City of Cambridge in August 1999 with the intention of relocating Flag Raiders Paintball Inc. The property at 1500 Kossuth Road property was zoned the same as our former site and, therefore, I believed that paintball would be permitted.
4. I began making preparations to relocate the business to 1500 Kossuth Road and began building a structure to use as a staging building. I received a stop work order from the City of Cambridge and upon further inquiry I learned that I would need a zone change to legally operate Flag Raiders Paintball Inc. at that site.

5. Tim McCabe, a planner at the firm of Green Scheels Pidgeon, made application to the City of Cambridge for a Temporary By-Law Amendment. I was told at that time that in order to obtain permanent zoning I would have to make application to the City of Cambridge and the Region of Waterloo for Official Plan Amendments and that it was highly unlikely that such a change would be granted. It was discussed that the temporary zone change would allow for time to investigate our options, seek another location or to find a way to continue operating at the 1500 Kossuth Road location. This application was approved by Council of the City of Cambridge, a Site Plan was approved and the Region of Waterloo took approximately one acre of frontage for future road widening as a condition of Site Plan Approval.

6. I continued to search for an alternate location and as such was not found, we re-applied and were granted a second Three Year Temporary By-Law Amendment.
7. During this process we contacted the neighbours on February 4, 2004 by letter and invited them to meet with us in an effort to better understand their concerns and try and work with them to mitigate them where possible. This meeting was attended by three neighbours, representing two households. One neighbour responded by email and identified her concerns.

8. Following this meeting, steps were taken in an effort to maintain a positive relationship with the neighbours. An 8-10 ft high berm was constructed along the western boundary of the property line to shield the view of the property and 300 white cedars were planted on top which will provide a natural barrier. Staff are assigned to monitor the parking area and on busy days are stationed at the road to ensure vehicles are entering and exiting safely. I stressed my desire for an open relationship with any concerns being brought to my attention so they may be addressed promptly.

9. Our immediate neighbours, Dennis and Linda Brox, attended both the Public Meeting and Council Meeting to speak in support of our application. Our neighbour, Ness Leskovar, directly across the road, also wrote a letter of support. I am in contact with them on a regular basis and both indicate Flag Raiders Paintball does not negatively affect them in any way.
10. My sister and I have been actively seeking an alternate location for Flag Raiders. We have been in contact with a number of Real Estate Agents, search MLS listings online on a weekly basis, have taken out a classified ad in a local newspaper seeking land, distributed flyers bi-annually throughout rural areas in Cambridge, Woolwich Township, Guelph, Wellington County, Puslinch, North Dumfries and Kitchener. I have contacted the GRCA regarding surplus land, Canada's Technology Triangle, The Cambridge Chamber of Commerce, Regional Tourism Initiative, the Townships of North Dumfries, Woolwich, Puslinch, the Cities of Hamilton, Waterloo, Kitchener, Lafarge regarding abandoned pits and quarries, a number of local developers and private investors who are currently land banking as well.

11. We have been unable to find any property that has zoning that would allow our use and felt if a zone change is needed it may as well be for property that I own.

12. During our last Council meeting on December 10, 2007 City Staff were directed by Council to assist in our search for a new location and to allow time, up to one year, to wind down operations at our current location as they recognized that Flag Raiders is a popular recreational and tourist attraction, good corporate citizen and employer of approximately 60 individuals.
13. My sister Corey and I met with Hardy Bromberg, Director of By-Law and Building Enforcement and Don Smith, CAO of the City of Cambridge on January 9, 2008 and were advised that operations must cease as of May 24, 2008. During this meeting we expressed our concern that May 24, was not a reasonable date as it did not allow time to find a location and mitigate through the appropriate channels if needed. Mr. Smith suggested we would have to close in the interim.

14. We have located an alternate location with OS2 Zoning (Major Recreation) in the City of Cambridge (on our own with no assistance from the City) yet the municipality is suggesting that it is not zoned appropriately as well. The zoning seems to suggest that our use is allowed, yet the City does not agree with the interpretation. Our Solicitor has suggested that, in view of the City's failure to agree that the use is permitted in the OS2 Zone, we may need to make an application to the courts for an interpretation of the zoning.

15. Flag Raiders is, for the most part, operated only on weekends, during daylight, on a seasonal basis from March to November, weather permitting. Hours of operation are from 8:30 am to 4:00 pm with actual game play not beginning until approximately 9:30 am with the exception of two special events where gates open at 7:30 am and play begins at 8:00 am.
16. Flag Raiders Paintball is a good corporate citizen. We make regular
donations to the Food Bank and many other charities. Local police forces train at
Flag Raiders free of charge, teachers bring their students and we employ
approximately 60 full time, part time and seasonal employees.

17. I make this Affidavit in response to the motion to dismiss our appeal to the
Ontario Municipal Board, and for no improper purpose.

SWORN BEFORE ME at the
City of Kitchener
on May 5, 2008

A Commissioner, etc.

Joseph Kimpson

PAUL RONALD BRITTON, A Commissioner, etc.,
Regional Municipality of Waterloo, for MacNaughton
Hersman Britton Clarkson Planning Limited.
Expires April 24, 2010.
Wednesday May 7, 2008 at 10:00 a.m.

MOTION RECORDED

Temporary Use By-law of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge, to erect a

In the matter of appeals by The Kedron Inc. from the refusal

and

C.P. 13, as amended (dismissed without hearing)

In the matter of s.34(2) of the Planning Act R.S.O. 1990,

Ontario Municipal Board

OMB Case No.: PL080074
Dear Mayor McGarry, Members of Cambridge City Council and City of Cambridge Staff,

As you know, when Flag Raiders left the Kossuth Road property at the end of August 2008, we relocated to property owned by Bingemans located at 425 Bingemans Centre Drive in Kitchener, adjacent to their Kingpin Bowl and FunWorx Indoor Playground. We were fortunate to have a large amount of property fronting Bingemans Centre Drive, providing excellent exposure for our business. This prominent location also required that we implement a number of measures to ensure that our activities had no negative impact on Bingemans or any of the surrounding businesses. Flag Raiders worked collaboratively with Bingemans participating in their summer day camp programs for children starting at age ten, Oktoberfest and the popular Screampark, with our Paintball Zombie Hunt. A letter of support from Mark Bingeman is attached for your review.

This past summer Joe and I attempted to connect with the Kossuth Road neighbours to discuss their concerns about our possible return. We were able to speak with our immediate neighbour to the West, Bruce Martens who was not a resident in 2008. Mr. Martens stated that based on what he had been told by the others, he does not support our use. We did continue a conversation to explain how the sport of paintball has changed over time and how we would work to mitigate any concerns. We did leave our contact information and ask that he contact us directly if he had any questions or concerns in the future. We also spoke to Linda and Dennis Brox, the immediate neighbours to the East, who have always have been and continue to be supportive of Flag Raiders operating as their neighbour. An introductory letter was hand delivered to the mailboxes of the other Kossuth Road neighbours that afternoon, inviting them to contact us to discuss our possible return to the property. This letter is attached as well for your review. Since this time we have also connected with Sowsan Hafuth, a Kossuth Road neighbour located on the North side, who has met with us and visited the property. She has provided a letter of support that is also attached. We are very interested in speaking directly with the neighbours and working towards a solution where we can address their concerns and mitigate any impact.

When we learned that our lease was not being renewed at Bingemans and we began considering alternate locations, including our property on Kossuth Road, we began thinking
of what our operation would look like at Kossuth Road. How would it be different given the many changes to the sport of paintball as well our consumers, and most importantly, how could we do this in a way that takes into consideration any known concerns of the Kossuth Road neighbours? There are many ways that we can modify our activities to minimize any impact we may have. Please see the table below where we have identified some of the concerns previously shared by the neighbours and how we have and/or would address them.

In the twelve years since we left Kossuth Road there have been many changes to the surrounding area as you are well aware. The Compact Sod Distribution Centre and Retail Store is located across the street, and operates six days per week with constant dump trucks and heavy equipment sifting the soil. There is now a traffic light at Kossuth and Shantz Station Road, roundabouts at Hwy 24 and Fountain Street. Fairway Road extends over the Grand River and Kossuth is a major arterial road scheduled to be widened. Most notably is the expansion of the Waterloo Region International Airport, now Canada’s 6th busiest airport with a 245% increase in air traffic since 2019.

We invite you to come and visit the property for yourself to better understand how it is shielded from the neighbours and to share our vision for how we could continue to operate a world-class paintball facility and tourism destination in harmony with our surroundings.

Sincerely,

Corey Kimpson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Mitigation Strategy/ Changes since 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise (sound of guns, yelling, bullhorn,</td>
<td>In 2007 we hosted a tournament at the request of the National League</td>
<td>No further tournament events on the front portion of the property (subsequent CXBL events were cancelled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>music)</td>
<td>(CXBL). This event was the first of its kind in Canada and it combined two</td>
<td>Paintball markers are now much lower pressure and run off of compressed air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>divisions, bringing together players from across the country.</td>
<td>as opposed to C02. They are quieter and make less noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To accommodate this event, two (2) temporary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Playing fields were erected on the portion of the property closest to the North property line, immediately parallel to Kossuth Road. These two playing fields were out in the open and did not have any of the natural landscape to buffer any of the activity or noise.

- There was also a DJ playing music and the start and end of the games was marked with a loud bullhorn/buzzer noise.

- The game format was designed to encourage spectator involvement and allowed for “sideline coaching” where spectators could run alongside the playing field and yell the location of the players, cheer them on, heckle, etc.

- Location of tournament fields would be buffered by natural landscape (trees and berm), and staging area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appearance</th>
<th>Concerns about “messy”-appearance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tournament field was set up parallel to Bingemans Centre Drive in Kitchener and maintained to a professional standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Errant paintballs</th>
<th>Reports of paintballs on neighbouring property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-10 foot high earth berm runs the entire length of West side of the property. This was</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CXBL paintball league no longer exists. Current leagues do not allow for sideline coaching.

Tournament games start and stop with a much quieter electronic countdown.

No on-site DJ with loud music.
extended at the request of neighbours at the February 2004 Public Meeting. Trees and shrubs planted on the top of the berm have grown over the past 12 years and provide significant coverage.

- Boundary lines demark the designated playing areas as well as staging areas. These are located at the base of the berm preventing players from accessing the top and significantly decreasing the risk of any paintballs going above the berm and treeline.

- The other three sides of the playing area are surrounded by the woodlot, buffering any activity from neighbouring property.

- The direction of play can be modified to run from front to back as opposed to side to side. This would further decrease the chance of any paintball leaving the property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garbage</th>
<th>Reports of garbage and waste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Garbage and recycling are collected and sorted throughout the business day and contained in secure “dumpster” bins. Garbage and recycling are emptied by a private company on a weekly basis. Local not-for-profit groups collect the aluminum cans for fundraising purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- At this time, we do not
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Concerns about adverse effects on the environment</th>
<th>Paintballs are completely biodegradable and non-toxic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toxic paint seeping into the group</td>
<td>No long-term impact on the property as evidenced by the ability to pack up and relocate 3X now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Cars parked on side of the road</td>
<td>Additional parking area to be provided in staging area within area shielded by berm and trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concerns about ability to enter/exit driveways safely</td>
<td>Guests now book a specific session time that allows us to stagger the arrival/departure times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespassing</td>
<td>Reports of people trespassing on neighbouring properties</td>
<td>Well-defined boundary lines with clear signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of Operation</td>
<td>Typically daylight hours (9 am to 4 pm) with Saturday evenings until dusk during July and August</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usually one weeknight from 5 pm until dusk during summer months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primarily weekends with exceptions for mid-week corporate events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We do not have lights on any of the playing areas so play cannot continue after dark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extended hours for special events and tournaments. Guests may arrive as early as 7 am but play would not typically begin until 8 am, to be determined based on scheduling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear Kossuth Road Neighbour,

As you may have heard, Flag Raiders Paintball has had to move from Bingemans and is looking for a new location. We learned early this year that our lease was not being renewed due to the Covid 19 pandemic. Since this time, we have been working with the City of Cambridge and the Region of Waterloo to find a new location. One of the options we have been looking into is to relocate back to the Kossuth Rd. property.

We would like to take this opportunity to reach out and have an open discussion about any comments or concerns that you may have.

We can be reached by phone or email at the following:

Corey
Joe

Kind regards,

Corey and Joe
Dear Councillor Donna Reid,

I am writing this letter in support of Flag Raiders reopening their business on the Kossuth Road property. My family and I reside at [redacted], right across from where Flag Raiders has operated in the past. On behalf of my entire household, who have lived here for about 20 years, we support Corey Kimpson, Joe Kimpson, and Todd Ancich moving forward with reopening Flag Raiders’ paintball program and projects on the property that allow our community to come together.

The family that owns the Flag Raiders property is one of the most genuine families I have ever met. Their determination to bring our community together through all-age recreational activities, dog training, and acceptance is something I have a great appreciation for. I have learned that they want to be as accommodating as possible to the people who use their land and to their neighbors. Something that stuck with me from my meeting with the owner of Flag Raiders is how they want to learn from any previous mistakes they made that will better their business and build a stronger bond with their community. In addition, I would like to let it be known that my property reaches directly across from Flag Raiders and noise has never been an issue for us when their business was operating in the past.

I appreciate you reading this letter. If you would like to chat about anything or where I stand with supporting Flag Raiders, I am open to discussion. My email is [redacted] and my phone number is [redacted].

Regards,

Sowsan Hafuth
July 26, 2021

To Whom It May Concern,

I am pleased to provide this reference letter in support of Flag Raiders paintball operation to be permitted to operate in Cambridge.

We have been fortunate to have had a 12-year relationship with Flag Raiders operating at our facility. Their entire team and operation during this time had been nothing but professional and supportive as business operators and neighbors to us and the other businesses along Bingemans Centre Drive. From their professional appearance to how they handle their events they host from time to time they have shown themselves to be true tourism and economic ambassadors for our region in how they operate.

We have had no issues from them such as noise, traffic or any other issues that was distracting or bothersome to us or any of our guests using our other facilities.

I can assure you they will be positive contributors to the Cambridge tourism and economic growth initiatives, while being an asset to the residents.

I would be happy to provide any additional comments that you may request.

Sincerely,

Mark Bingeman
President
Your Worship and Members of Council,

I am the Owner of a property that directly flanks 1500 Kossuth Road, Cambridge. Again, and as in 2007, I am communicating my concern over the direct impact of Flag Raiders Inc., when they previously operated in conflict with the then and present zoning of these Class 2 agricultural lands. I am opposed to the use of 1500 Kossuth Road property as a Flag Raiders operation; the use is incompatible with farm operations on good agricultural lands.

We farm with rotating crops immediately abutting 1500 Kossuth Road. When Flag Raiders were operating, THOUSANDS of paint balls were in our field after each and every game. We had to manually go through our crops and pick up these paint balls by hand otherwise our crops would not be viable for sale. This was a hardship for our family. We cannot do this again. No amount of berming or fencing will resolve the issue of airborne paintballs.

When the City of Cambridge Counsel was considering granting of a temporary land use in 2007, the surrounding community of property owners retained counsel, Steven J. O’Melia, Lawyer at Miller Thomson LLP, a specialist in planning and development law, to address concerns. Flag Raiders first applied to the city for a “temporary” use, when ongoing operations were found to be in conflict with both the Regional and City Official Plans, and by-law enforcement was receiving complaints from the surrounding community.

Mr. O’Melia represented our position to the Mayor and Members of the Cambridge Council with the attached letter.

In support of his original 2008 submissions, Mr. Kimson provided an affidavit stating that the only reason he was applying for a temporary permit was to provide time to explore options for finding an alternative permanent site for Flag Raiders, since he realized that the use was in contravention of the Regional Official Plan. I submit, that Mr. Kimson has had more than amble opportunity to explore his options and find a suitable location, as have other paintball facilities in Ontario. Please see his Affidavit attached.

Attached is Witness Statement from Bruce Brown, Prof. Engineer and Prof. Planner, Bruce Brown & Asso. with site recommendations.
For your convenience, also attached is the OMB Decision May 28, 2008.

Again, I am asking Members of Cambridge City Council and Regional Counsil not to allow either a temporary or permanent use of the 1500 Kossuth Road property for Flag Raiders as the paint balls from their operation contaminate our crops. We are farming our land and following the Official Regional Plans for our property.

Sincerely,
Carla Stachowski
Witness Statement for Bruce Alan Brown

1. I am a Professional Engineer and a Professional Planner with 48 years Ontario experience as principal of Brown Associates Limited.

2. I have been recognized as an expert in planning, environmental planning and site characterization matters before the Ontario Municipal Board, Consolidated Hearing Board, Environmental Assessment Board, Environmental Appeal Board, Ontario Mining Commissioner, the Federal Courts and the Ontario Superior Court. As chair of Planning Board and Planning Advisory Committee in the then City of North York from 1981 to 1987 I also had opportunity to preside at about a thousand public hearings regarding land-use decision-making and deal with compatibility issues.

3. I visited the Stachowski property on the afternoon of Sunday, July 22, 2007 at a time when there was a high level of activity at 1500 Kossuth Road. I heard loud music and voice-overs on a public address system, frequent use of air horns, much shouting and profanity as well as discharge of guns. I estimated sound levels at 110-115 decibels at source from the public address system and air horns. The nuisance level was sufficient that outdoor enjoyment at Ms. Stachowski’s patio area was impossible, in spite of a strong west wind. At 6:30 PM when activities ceased, I walked with Ms. Stachowski and her daughter and picked up hundreds of paint balls in her field in a very short time. I estimated a density of freshly deposited balls at around 100 balls per 10 square meters in the 30m strip along the common lotline. In spite of strong contrary winds, fresh paint balls were frequently found at 40m from the lotline. A berm up to 2m in crest height extended about a third of the way along the common lotline. No evidence of older planting out of the berm (ie 300 cedars reputed to have been planed in 2004). There was evidence of trampling of vegetation to the common lotline and no buffering of any kind in the south half of the property.

4. I was retained by 25 individuals representing twelve properties surrounding Flag
Raiders to advise them of planning issues and assisted with community input into the plans approvals process when the third Flag Raiders application came forward to the City of Cambridge. My efforts included review of regional and local staff reports, discussion of matters of temporary zoning with several legal counsel, including counsel from Miller Thompson retained formally by the community, and attendance at the public meeting in December 2007.

5. I have reviewed the locational and layout characteristics of other paint ball operations in Ontario and elsewhere to determine what adjacent property uses are found with comparable sites. I found at least 101 operations in Ontario of which about 60 were out of doors. I have considered the planning criteria for siting paint ball operations with respect to compatibility with other uses and the types of buffering which may be effective.

6. I believe that there are other appropriate sites in the south Waterloo Region in which a paint ball facility could be operated without conflict with surrounding uses, and that securing such a site and implementing the required approvals should be a 12 to 24 month effort, if appropriate due diligence is applied. Location is not critical since the client base is mainly young males with strong interests in their personal automobiles; participants travel from widely disbursed points of origin. Reasonable criteria for siting should include access to an arterial or paved road constructed to a similar standard, a buffering distance from residential or similar sensitive uses of at the very least 300 metres and an effective topographical or mature forest buffer of at least 30m to contain vectors and limit sight lines from the exterior. Larger sites in the United States typically have individual activity areas carved out of mature forest lands on large acreages. Rock outcrops, steep slopes and other physical features which would limit agricultural capability are to an advantage for paint ball games.

7. By way of example, a depleted gravel pit has high potential for such use because it is usually depressed relative to surrounding grades, may have stripping materials in the form of perimeter berms, should have appropriate perimeter fencing and planting already in place, usually has a varied terrain in which disturbed soils can be reworked, and development of the activity areas can be integrated with a certain level of site rehabilitation, such as additional berming and tree planting. Although counsel for the appellant stated his client had approached Lafarge without success, I do not consider that fact as a serious effort to find a site, because that is a large, sophisticated Multinational operator which engages professionals, including me, to design for successive rehabilitation and higher end uses, such as estate residential development. Going to Lafarge for
a site would be like calling the Toyota plant in Cambridge and asking to buy a 10 year old used car.

8. From review of available documents, I believe that it was always recognized that 1500 Kossuth Road was not an appropriate permanent location for Flag Raiders and the purpose of a temporary zoning was to provide an opportunity to find a permanent location. With a serious effort, I believe that should have been possible within the initial three years as granted.

9. During the seven years previous to the time of my inspection, the operations had increased significantly in scale, spilling outside of the approved use envelope, including intrusion into wetlands, parking on agriculturally zoned lands, and expansion and intensification of the playing fields into areas designated as future development on the approved site plan. Works which were promised, including a berm with appropriate vegetation were never installed. Although there may have been little initial neighbourhood concern, it is not surprising that calls to police and by-law enforcement staff have steadily increased over the years as the operations have intensified.

10. Regular events with more than two hundred persons present for entire days with service of lunches offered, has sanitary requirements, including provision of proper toilets, wash facilities and food handling facilities. There is no evidence such facilities were ever constructed.

11. The playing fields are directly in sight lines from adjacent lands, constituting a nuisance which would be comparable to such uses as a motor vehicle wrecking yard- a use which would certainly never be considered for a rural area which is effectively a hamlet, given the proximity of rural residences in the immediate area. I believe an auto wrecker would probably be much less intrusive since there would not be significant peak traffic, especially on weekends when people are at their homes, and there would not be significant noise issues in evenings and on weekends.

12. Ms Stachowski, in particular, has issues with nuisance and trespass. At time of my inspection she had a four year old daughter and was concerned about personal safety. I am aware of people losing eyesight from paint ball impacts, and am advised that a local police officer who recently responded to a Flag Raiders noise complaint said she had lost sight in one eye from a paint ball incident. More potentially serious is the finding of large numbers of pellets on the Stachowski lands, since these have even greater potential for personal damage and can
travel further with the same limiting mussel velocity. I have experienced noise levels on the Stachowski patio which prevent its use for conversation and constitute an extreme nuisance. Although Brown Associates has noise measurement equipment capable of precise determination of noise levels, the levels which are experienced when there are events on at Flag raiders are so “over the top” that they were not worth taking measurement, in my opinion.

13. I am aware that geese historically nested on an island in the Stachowski pond, in a location specifically created to encourage wildfowl nesting. Although breeding pairs continue to show interest in the location in each spring, they disappear after the first weekend of paint ball activity.

14. Although there is some evidence that paint balls are not toxic, all of the WHMIS and forensic data relate to a single paint ball and not to an accumulation of more than one. I have found Internet sites hosted by veterinarians confirming deaths from paint ball ingestion and listing emergency instructions following their ingestion by animals. I have also noted that external pigments do not simply wash away with the first rainfall, nor do casings dissolve on contact with precipitation or soil.

Dr. Bruce A. Brown, P.Eng.
Project 07*3256
ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD

In the matter of s. 34(25) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P. 13, as amended (Dismissal Without Hearing); and

In the matter of appeals by Flag Raiders Inc. from the refusal of The Corporation of the City of Cambridge, to enact a Temporary Use By-law;

AFFIDAVIT OF JOSEPH KIMPSON

I, JOSEPH KIMPSON, of the City of Cambridge, MAKE OATH AND SAY:

1. I am the Owner and Operator of Flag Raiders Paintball Inc. located at 1500 Kossuth Road in the City of Cambridge. As such, I am familiar with the matters hereinafter deposed to.

2. Flag Raiders Paintball Inc. was established in 1983 and first operated on the Hagey Property located on Kossuth Road in the Township of Woolwich on Agricultural land without issue until 2001.

3. I purchased the land at 1500 Kossuth Road in the City of Cambridge in August 1999 with the intention of relocating Flag Raiders Paintball Inc. The property at 1500 Kossuth Road property was zoned the same as our former site and, therefore, I believed that paintball would be permitted.
4. I began making preparations to relocate the business to 1500 Kossuth Road and began building a structure to use as a staging building. I received a stop work order from the City of Cambridge and upon further inquiry I learned that I would need a zone change to legally operate Flag Raiders Paintball Inc. at that site.

5. Tim McCabe, a planner at the firm of Green Scheels Pidgeon, made application to the City of Cambridge for a Temporary By-Law Amendment. I was told at that time that in order to obtain permanent zoning I would have to make application to the City of Cambridge and the Region of Waterloo for Official Plan Amendments and that it was highly unlikely that such a change would be granted. It was discussed that the temporary zone change would allow for time to investigate our options, seek another location or to find a way to continue operating at the 1500 Kossuth Road location. This application was approved by Council of the City of Cambridge, a Site Plan was approved and the Region of Waterloo took approximately one acre of frontage for future road widening as a condition of Site Plan Approval.

6. I continued to search for an alternate location and as such was not found, we re-applied and were granted a second Three Year Temporary By-Law Amendment.
7. During this process we contacted the neighbours on February 4, 2004 by letter and invited them to meet with us in an effort to better understand their concerns and try and work with them to mitigate them where possible. This meeting was attended by three neighbours, representing two households. One neighbour responded by email and identified her concerns.

8. Following this meeting, steps were taken in an effort to maintain a positive relationship with the neighbours. An 8-10 ft high berm was constructed along the western boundary of the property line to shield the view of the property and 300 white cedars were planted on top which will provide a natural barrier. Staff are assigned to monitor the parking area and on busy days are stationed at the road to ensure vehicles are entering and exiting safely. I stressed my desire for an open relationship with any concerns being brought to my attention so they may be addressed promptly.

9. Our immediate neighbours, Dennis and Linda Brox, attended both the Public Meeting and Council Meeting to speak in support of our application. Our neighbour, Ness Leskowar, directly across the road, also wrote a letter of support. I am in contact with them on a regular basis and both indicate Flag Raiders Paintball does not negatively affect them in any way.
10. My sister and I have been actively seeking an alternate location for Flag Raiders. We have been in contact with a number of Real Estate Agents, search MLS listings online on a weekly basis, have taken out a classified ad in a local newspaper seeking land, distributed flyers bi-annually throughout rural areas in Cambridge, Woolwich Township, Guelph, Wellington County, Puslinch, North Dumfries and Kitchener. I have contacted the GRCA regarding surplus land, Canada’s Technology Triangle, The Cambridge Chamber of Commerce, Regional Tourism Initiative, the Townships of North Dumfries, Woolwich, Puslinch, the Cities of Hamilton, Waterloo, Kitchener, Lafarge regarding abandoned pits and quarries, a number of local developers and private investors who are currently land banking as well.

11. We have been unable to find any property that has zoning that would allow our use and felt if a zone change is needed it may as well be for property that I own.

12. During our last Council meeting on December 10, 2007 City Staff were directed by Council to assist in our search for a new location and to allow time, up to one year, to wind down operations at our current location as they recognized that Flag Raiders is a popular recreational and tourist attraction, good corporate citizen and employer of approximately 60 individuals.
13. My sister Corey and I met with Hardy Bromberg, Director of By-Law and Building Enforcement and Don Smith, CAO of the City of Cambridge on January 9, 2008 and were advised that operations must cease as of May 24, 2008. During this meeting we expressed our concern that May 24, was not a reasonable date as it did not allow time to find a location and mitigate through the appropriate channels if needed. Mr. Smith suggested we would have to close in the interim.

14. We have located an alternate location with OS2 Zoning (Major Recreation) in the City of Cambridge (on our own with no assistance from the City) yet the municipality is suggesting that it is not zoned appropriately as well. The zoning seems to suggest that our use is allowed, yet the City does not agree with the interpretation. Our Solicitor has suggested that, in view of the City’s failure to agree that the use is permitted in the OS2 Zone, we may need to make an application to the courts for an interpretation of the zoning.

15. Flag Raiders is, for the most part, operated only on weekends, during daylight, on a seasonal basis from March to November, weather permitting. Hours of operation are from 8:30 am to 4:00 pm with actual game play not beginning until approximately 9:30 am with the exception of two special events where gates open at 7:30 am and play begins at 8:00 am.
16. Flag Raiders Paintball is a good corporate citizen. We make regular donations to the Food Bank and many other charities. Local police forces train at Flag Raiders free of charge, teachers bring their students and we employ approximately 60 full time, part time and seasonal employees.

17. I make this Affidavit in response to the motion to dismiss our appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board, and for no improper purpose.

SWORN BEFORE ME at the City of Kitchener on May 5, 2008

A Commissioner, etc.

Joseph Kimpson
Wednesday May 7, 2008 at 10:00 a.m.

MOTION RECORD

Temporary Use By-law

of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge, to cancel a
In the matter of appeals by F.J.E. Henderson Inc. from the refusal
and

CP.13 as amended (Dismissed Without Hearing)
In the matter of s.34(25) of the Planning Act R.S.O. 1990.

Ontario Municipal Board

OMB Case No.: PLO80074
December 10, 2007

E-MAIL: council@city.cambridge.on.ca

Mayor Doug Craig and
Members of Cambridge Council
The Corporation of the City of Cambridge
Cambridge Place, 73 Water Street North
Cambridge ON N1R 7L6

Your Worship and Members of Council:

Re: Flag Raiders Inc. – Application for Temporary Use By-law
1500 Kossuth Road, Cambridge
Report Nos. P-98-07 and P-117-07

We are the solicitors for Carla Stachowski and five other property owners who reside within the vicinity of 1500 Kossuth Road, Cambridge. We are writing to express our clients’ opposition to the application by Flag Raiders Inc. for a further temporary use by-law to permit it to continue its commercial operations at 1500 Kossuth Road.

We have reviewed the report on this matter prepared by the City’s Planning Services staff for the December 3, 2007 meeting of the City’s General Committee, which recommends that the application not be approved. We have also reviewed the supplementary report dated December 10, 2007, which attaches the legal opinion of the City’s Solicitor, John Cosman. Pursuant to the General Committee’s request, Mr. Cosman has clarified that Council does not have the legal authority to enact a temporary use by-law in this instance because the Flag Raiders use does not conform to either the Regional Official Policies Plan or the Cambridge Official Plan. We are in full agreement with the opinions expressed in those reports.

It is our submission that the law is clear that a municipal council may not permit a use which contravenes the applicable Official Plans by way of a temporary use by-law. It is unfortunate that the Flag Raiders use was ever allowed to exist on this property, and it is clear that it cannot continue. The applicant has had many years to find a suitable location for its use and has chosen not to pursue that lawful route.

For almost eight years, our clients have been subjected to loud noises from the firing of guns, amplified music, horns going off and profanity. Each year, thousands of paintballs escape the limits of the Flag Raiders property and wind up on neighbouring lands, littering those areas with coloured dye and spent pellet skins. The operation creates adverse parking and traffic...
issues on Kossuth Road and is simply not compatible with the abutting residential, agricultural and rural uses in this area.

Our clients have been disappointed that, although the most recent temporary use by-law expired much earlier this year, the City has allowed the use to continue. We trust that should this application not be approved, the City will take action to ensure that the unlawful use ceases immediately and permanently. Although there are mechanisms for the private enforcement of municipal by-laws, our clients should not have to incur that expense to enforce such an obvious and persistent infraction of the City’s zoning by-law.

We also question whether many of the structures derelict vehicles that have been constructed or placed on the property are or will be in compliance with the Building Code Act and the City’s Property Standards By-law. We trust that the City will take appropriate investigation and enforcement actions in that regard.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. By way of a copy of this letter to the City Clerk’s office, we request that we be provided with a certified copy of the resolution that Council passes in respect of this matter.

Yours truly,

MILLER THOMSON LLP

per: [Signature]

Steven J. O’Melia
SJO/dms

Enclosure

c. Carla Stachowski (via e-mail: [redacted])
Alex Mitchell, City Clerk (via e-mail: mitchella@city.cambridge.on.ca)
Susan Wysman, Council Committee Coordinator (via e-mail: wysmans@city.cambridge.on.ca)
Joe Kimpson has appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board under subsection 34(11) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13 as amended, from Council’s refusal or neglect to enact a proposed amendment to Zoning By-law 150-85 of the City of Cambridge to rezone lands respecting 1500 Kossuth Rd to approve a temporary use by-law for a period of three years.

(OMB File PL080074)

APPEARANCES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parties</th>
<th>Counsel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>John Cosman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flag Raiders Inc.</td>
<td>Harold Elston and D. Berney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td>D. Leggett</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEMORANDUM OF ORAL DECISION DELIVERED BY S. J. SUTHERLAND ON MAY 13, 2008 AND ORDER OF THE BOARD

Joe Kimpson (Applicant/Appellant) owns a property at 1500 Kossuth Road in the City of Cambridge (subject property). He is requesting an amendment to Zoning By-law 150-85 in the form of a Temporary Use By-law (TUB) to permit the continued use of approximately 4.3 ha (10.6a) of the 24.6 ha (60.8a) site for the purpose of operating commercial/recreational establishment for a period of three years. The existing commercial/recreational use (outdoor paintball games) was first permitted for a period of three years in a TUB in 2001, and for a further three years in 2004. The current application seeks to extend the temporary use for another three years. The application was denied by the Council of the City of Cambridge (City).

The Applicant/Appellant is appealing Council’s decision on the basis that:

- Council previously approved TUBs for the subject property.
- The recreational/commercial use was site plan approved by the City.
- The existing Agricultural use will be maintained except for the portion previously designated under the TUB as recreational/commercial.

At the commencement of the hearing, Mr. Elston, counsel for the applicant/appellant, told the Board that he was coming forward with an amended application requesting an extension of the TUB for a period of three months rather than three years because his client believed he had found a property to which he could re-locate his operation. Mr. Elston requested a short adjournment for the purpose of discussing this amended application with the City and Region of Waterloo (Region). Counsel for the City replied that his instructions were to oppose any TUB for the subject property, and that the paintball operation had, in fact, been operating illegally on the property since February of 2007, when the second extension to the TUB expired and now will be closed down on May 24, 2008. That being the case, the Board found no purpose would be served by an adjournment.

David Aston gave expert land-use planning evidence on behalf of the applicant/appellant. The core of Mr. Aston’s testimony was that there is nothing different in the current application from the two previous applications, which were approved by Council. He pointed to Section 24(1) of the Planning Act, which requires all by-laws to conform to the Official Plan (OP). He also stated that a TUB may be passed under Sections 34 and 39 of the Planning Act. He maintained that the TUB being sought conforms to Sections 11.5.1 and 11.5.2 of the OP, and maintained that 11.5.2 of the OP authorizes Council to pass a temporary use by-law for any use in any District that is otherwise prohibited by law. He stated that approval of the requested TUB conformed to the City’s OP as it meets the intent of 11.5.2 of the OP.

Mr. Aston introduced a letter from lawyer David R. Sunday, of the firm of Gowling LaFleur Henderson, on the subject of whether Council has the authority to enact a TUB where there is debate as to whether the proposed use complies with the OP or the Regional Planning Policies (ROPP). In his reply, which stated that Council did indeed have such authority, Mr. Sunday stated “Council’s earlier decisions followed municipal staff’s advice that the proposed temporary use by-law was in conformity with the OP and ROPP by virtue of Policy 11.5.2” (Exhibit 10).
The open portions of the site are designated Class 1 (Prime) Agricultural in the Official Plan, which permits agricultural, and agricultural-related uses and recreation activities that existed when the OP was enacted. The paintball operation did not exist at that time. The woodlot and wetland portions of the property are designated Class 1 (Significant Natural Features) Open Space, which permits limited uses, including passive recreational activities and outdoor education and research. The wooded portions of the property include a wetland that is classified by the Ministry of Natural Resources as a Provincially Significant Wetland.

Janet Babcock, Commissioner of Planning Services for the City, gave expert testimony on behalf of the City. Ms Babcock stated that neither planning staff at the City nor the Region had ever supported a TUB for the site precisely because they did not believe that it was in conformity with the OP or the ROPP. She directed the Board’s attention to reports in Exhibit 11 dating back to 2000 which state categorically that the use does not comply with the OP. In her expert testimony on behalf of the Region, planner Brenna MacKinnon said the same applied to the ROPP.

Ms. Babcock told the Board that previous Councils had approved the TUB despite staff’s advice that the use did not comply with the OP, which it must under the Planning Act, but those decisions had never been challenged at the Board. This time, she said, Council refused the TUB on the basis that the use did not comply with the OP. She also stated that both 11.5.1 and 11.5.2 of the OP state that “by-laws may be passed in accordance with the Planning Act” and added, “that is where you have to start.” This does not, in her opinion, allow for “any use in any District that is otherwise prohibited by law.”

She also stated that the use does not conform to the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS).

It was her expert opinion that the application does not represent good planning, and is contrary to the Planning Act as it is not in conformity with the OP or the ROPP.

Ms MacKinnon also stated that the use is not in conformity with the PPS.

Corey Kimpson, sister of the Applicant/Appellant, told the Board that she and her brother have been trying very hard to find another site for the paintball operation and
believe they have found one. She said they have already taken measures to move Flag Raiders Inc., although they may have to make an application to rezone the target property. She said paintball is growing in popularity and that Flag Raiders Inc. will need more space in any event. She said they have “absolutely no intention” of applying for another TUB.

It is the Board’s opinion that there has been, from the first application for a TUB, consistency in the opinion of successive professional planning staffs at both City and the Region that the use does not conform with either the City’s OP or the Region’s ROPP. The Board does not accept the position of Mr. Aston that Section 11.5.2 of the City’s OP would permit “any use in any District that is otherwise permitted by law”. To accept this argument would be ignoring the words “It is the policy of the City that by-law may be passed in accordance with the Planning Act”. As Mr. Aston himself acknowledged, Section 24.1 of the Planning Act requires conformity with the OP.

That previous Councils ignored the advice of staff that the use was not in accordance with the OP is not the issue. Councils do not always take the professional advice of their staffs, sometimes at Council’s peril. The current Council did take staff’s advice and refused a further extension of the TUB.

When rendering the oral decision, the Board was working under the assumption that what was being sought was a new TUB. Upon reviewing evidence and notes, the Board now realizes that it is not a new TUB, but on extension of the current TUB that is being asked for. Under the amended application, the extension is for three months, not the three years of the original application. Were it for three years, the Board would dismiss the appeal. The Board finds the expert testimony of Ms Babcock convincing and compelling, and accepts that the use is not in accordance with either the OP or the ROPP.

The Board, however, has no desire to close down Flag Raiders Inc. immediately when there may be a possibility of it relocating in the near future. It does not, at this point, seem reasonable to do so, given the undoubted importance of the summer season to the operation. The Board reminds the Applicant/Appellant of Ms Kimpson’s statement that Flag Raiders Inc. has “absolutely no intention” of seeking a further
extension to the TUB. In any event, the Board feels that such an extension would be, to say the least, difficult to come by given the evidence heard at this hearing.

The Board therefore Orders that the appeal is allowed and that Zoning By-law 150-85 be amended in the form of a Temporary Use By-law to expire on August 31, 2008, at which time the operation of Flag Raiders Inc. at its current location under By-law 150-85 shall cease.

The Board so Orders.

“S. J. Sutherland”

S. J. SUTHERLAND
MEMBER
Good Morning,

I wish to have my letter (below) read at the May 17/22 Cambridge Council Meeting

Additionally, I wish to speak at the meeting at well.

Please let me know if you require additional information from me.

Thank you,

Carla Stachowski

May 8, 2022

Your Worship and Members of Council,

I am the Owner of a property that directly flanks 1500 Kossuth Road, Cambridge. Again, and as in 2007, I am communicating my concern over the direct impact of Flag Raiders Inc., when they previously operated in conflict with the then and present zoning of these Class 2 agricultural lands. I am opposed to the use of 1500 Kossuth Road property as a Flag Raiders operation; the use is incompatible with farm operations on good agricultural lands.

We farm with rotating crops immediately abutting 1500 Kossuth Road. When Flag Raiders were operating, **Thousands of paint balls** were in our field after each and every game. We had to manually go through our crops and pick up these paint balls by hand otherwise our crops would not be viable for sale. This was a hardship for our family. We cannot do this again. No amount of berming or fencing or netting will resolve the issue of airborne paint balls in our very large field.

Not only did we have to listen to shouting, swearing, guns, loud voices all weekend, then we had to clean up their paint balls in our fields every Sunday evening.

When the City of Cambridge Counsel was considering granting of a temporary land use in 2007, the surrounding community of property owners retained counsel, Steven J. O’Melia, Lawyer at Miller Thomson LLP, a specialist in planning and development law, to address concerns. Flag Raiders first applied to the city for a “temporary” use, when ongoing
operations were found to be in conflict with both the Regional and City Official Plans, and by-
law enforcement was receiving complaints from the surrounding community.

Please see attached letter from Steven J. O'Melia.

In support his original 2008 submissions, Mr. Kimson provided an affidavit stating that the only 
reason he was applying for a temporary permit was to provide time to explore options for 
finding an alternative permanent site for Flag Raiders, since he realized that the use was in 
contravention of the Regional Official Plan. I submit, that Mr. Kimson has had more than 
amble opportunity to explore his options and find a suitable location, as have other paintball 
facilities in Ontario.

Again, I am asking Members of Cambridge City Council not to allow either a temporary or 
permanent use of the 1500 Kossuth Road property for Flag Raiders as the paint balls from 
their operation contaminate our crops. We are farming our land and following the Official 
Regional Plans for our property.

Sincerely,

Carla Stachowski

[Redacted], Cambridge
December 10, 2007

E-MAIL: council@city.cambridge.on.ca

Mayor Doug Craig and
Members of Cambridge Council
The Corporation of the City of Cambridge
Cambridge Place, 73 Water Street North
Cambridge ON N1R 7L6

Your Worship and Members of Council:

Re: Flag Raiders Inc. – Application for Temporary Use By-law
1500 Kossuth Road, Cambridge
Report Nos. P-98-07 and P-117-07

We are the solicitors for Carla Stachowski and five other property owners who reside within the vicinity of 1500 Kossuth Road, Cambridge. We are writing to express our clients’ opposition to the application by Flag Raiders Inc. for a further temporary use by-law to permit it to continue its commercial operations at 1500 Kossuth Road.

We have reviewed the report on this matter prepared by the City’s Planning Services staff for the December 3, 2007 meeting of the City’s General Committee, which recommends that the application not be approved. We have also reviewed the supplementary report dated December 10, 2007, which attaches the legal opinion of the City’s Solicitor, John Cosman. Pursuant to the General Committee’s request, Mr. Cosman has clarified that Council does not have the legal authority to enact a temporary use by-law in this instance because the Flag Raiders use does not conform to either the Regional Official Policies Plan or the Cambridge Official Plan. We are in full agreement with the opinions expressed in those reports.

It is our submission that the law is clear that a municipal council may not permit a use which contravenes the applicable Official Plans by way of a temporary use by-law. It is unfortunate that the Flag Raiders use was ever allowed to exist on this property, and it is clear that it cannot continue. The applicant has had many years to find a suitable location for its use and has chosen not to pursue that lawful route.

For almost eight years, our clients have been subjected to loud noises from the firing of guns, amplified music, horns going off and profanity. Each year, thousands of paintballs escape the limits of the Flag Raiders property and wind up on neighbouring lands, littering those areas with coloured dye and spent pellet skins. The operation creates adverse parking and traffic...
issues on Kossuth Road and is simply not compatible with the abutting residential, agricultural and rural uses in this area.

Our clients have been disappointed that, although the most recent temporary use by-law expired much earlier this year, the City has allowed the use to continue. We trust that should this application not be approved, the City will take action to ensure that the unlawful use ceases immediately and permanently. Although there are mechanisms for the private enforcement of municipal by-laws, our clients should not have to incur that expense to enforce such an obvious and persistent infraction of the City's zoning by-law.

We also question whether many of the structures derelict vehicles that have been constructed or placed on the property are or will be in compliance with the Building Code Act and the City's Property Standards By-law. We trust that the City will take appropriate investigation and enforcement actions in that regard.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. By way of a copy of this letter to the City Clerk's office, we request that we be provided with a certified copy of the resolution that Council passes in respect of this matter.

Yours truly,

MILLER THOMSON LLP

per:

Steven J. O'Melia
SJO/dms

Enclosure

c. Carla Stachowski (via e-mail: [REDACTED])
   Alex Mitchell, City Clerk (via e-mail: mitchella@city.cambridge.on.ca)
   Susan Wysman, Council Committee Coordinator (via e-mail: wysmans@city.cambridge.on.ca)
BY-LAW 22-029

Being a by-law to amend Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended with respect to land municipally known as
40 Albert Street (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 November 23rd, 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 43,
   Registered Plan 457, City of Cambridge, 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 R4 to the RS1 –
   4.1.423 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:

   “4.1.423 – 40 Albert Street, legally described as Part of Lot 43, Registered Plan
   457, City of Cambridge, Regional Municipality of Waterloo, the following
   regulations shall apply to the lands in the RS1 zone to which reference “s.4.1.423
   is made on Schedule A and located at 40 Albert Street:

   o To permit a minimum lot frontage for a corner lot of a semi-detached
     dwelling to be 20.13 metres;
   o To permit a minimum lot frontage for the corner unit of a semi-detached
     dwelling to be 11.13 metres;
   o To permit a minimum lot area for a corner lot of a semi-detached dwelling
     to be 466.3 square metres;
To permit a minimum lot area for a semi-detached dwelling to be 208.7 square metres;

To permit a minimum lot area for the corner unit of a semi-detached dwelling to be 257.7 square metres; and,

To permit a minimum exterior side yard of 5 metres.

4. **THAT** geothermal energy systems (including vertical open and closed loop geothermal energy systems) be prohibited on the subject lands in accordance with Chapter 8 of the Regional Official Plan.

5. **AND 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 17th day of May, 2022.

_________________________________
MAYOR

_________________________________
CLERK
Schedule A – Proposed Zoning Map
Purpose and Effect of By-law No. 22-029

40 Albert Street

The Purpose of the by-law is to amend the zoning for the lands legally described as Part of Lot 43, Registered Plan 457, City of Cambridge, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (“subject lands”). The proposed amendment will facilitate the development of a semi-detached dwelling containing two residential units. In order to develop the subject lands with the above proposed development, the subject lands are required to be rezoned to the "Residential – RS1" zone, along with site-specific provisions to permit the following:

- To permit a minimum lot frontage for a corner lot of a semi-detached dwelling to be 20.13 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum frontage of 22 metres;
- To permit a minimum lot frontage for the corner unit of a semi-detached dwelling to be 11.13 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum frontage of 13 metres;
- To permit a minimum lot area for a corner lot of a semi-detached dwelling to be 466.3 square metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum lot area of 660 square metres;
- To permit a minimum lot area for a semi-detached dwelling to be 208.7 square metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum lot area of 270 square metres;
- To permit a minimum lot area for the corner unit of a semi-detached dwelling to be 257.7 square metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum lot area of 390 square metres; and,
- To permit a minimum exterior side yard of 5 metres, whereas the by-law requires a minimum exterior side yard of 6 metres.

The Effect of the by-law will permit the development of the subject lands for a semi-detached dwelling containing two units.
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

BY-LAW 22-030

Being a by-law to designate the building at 1001 Franklin Boulevard as a Municipal Capital Facility ("MCF Building")

WHEREAS Subsection 110(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25, as amended (the “Municipal Act, 2001”) permits a municipality to enter into agreements for the provision of municipal capital facilities;

WHEREAS Subsection 110(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001 permits a Council of a municipality to designate lands within the classes of lands described in section 6 of Ontario Regulation 603/06, as amended, as a municipal capital facility and to exempt that facility from taxation for municipal and school purposes;

WHEREAS the proposed addition to the existing facility on the lands located at 1001 Franklin Boulevard, Cambridge, Ontario, N1R 8B5, described in Schedule “A” to this by-law (the "Lands"), being the plan of the proposed addition in Schedule “B” to this by-law (the “MCF Building”) shall be used for the provision of municipal community centre services, for the purposes of the municipality and for public use, being a permitted class under section 6 of Ontario Regulation 603/06 as amended;

AND WHEREAS in accordance with the authorization of the Council on January 6, 2022, the City of Cambridge and Buckingham Sports Properties Company will enter into an agreement, conditional on the passage of this by-law, in the form attached as Schedule “C” that provides for the use the MCF Building as a municipal capital facility for a term of twenty years commencing on September 1, 2023 (the “Municipal Capital Facility Agreement”),

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

1. THAT Council hereby designates the MCF Building as a municipal capital facility used for and all present and future improvements thereto as a municipal capital facility for the provision of municipal community centre services, for the purposes of the municipality and for public use, and the implementation of such designation by way of a Municipal Capital Facility Agreement in the form attached hereto as Schedule “C”.

2. THAT the MCF Building and all present and future related improvements thereto are hereby exempt from the payment of taxation for municipal and school purposes and shall be so exempt until the earliest of:

   a. the termination date of the Municipal Capital Facilities Agreement between the City of Cambridge and Buckingham Sports Properties Company;
b. the day that the Municipal Act, 2001 or such other applicable or successor legislation is repealed or amended such that the designation of the MCF Building as a municipal capital facility is no longer available to be made or applicable; and,

   c. the day the MCF Building cease to be used as a municipal capital facility as that term is defined in Ontario Regulation 603/06, as amended, from time to time.

3. **THAT** the City shall cause its Clerk to give written notice of the by-law permitting the City to enter into this agreement to the Minister of Education as provided for in subsection 110(5) of the Municipal Act, 2001.

4. **THAT** the City shall cause its Clerk to give written notice of the contents of this by-law to the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation, the Clerk of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and the secretary of any school board if the area of jurisdiction of any such board included the land that is exempted by this by-law, as required under section 110(8) of the Municipal Act, 2001.

5. **AND THAT** this by-law shall be effective as of the date of passing.

Enacted and Passed this 17th day of May, 2022.

_________________________________
MAYOR

_________________________________
CLERK
SCHEDULE “A”

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF THE LANDS

ALL AND SINGULAR that certain parcel or tract of land and premises situated, lying and being in the City of Cambridge, in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, being compromised of:

PT LT 1 RCP 1380 CAMBRIDGE PT 17-21, 27 & 28 67R2899, PT 2, 67R1684 EXCEPT PT 1, 58R8109 & PT 1, 58R10305; CAMBRIDGE

PIN: 03796-0121 (LT)

LRO: #58
SCHEDULE “B”

PLAN OF THE MCF BUILDING
FORM OF AGREEMENT FOR MUNICIPAL CAPITAL FACILITY

MUNICIPAL CAPITAL FACILITY AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT dated the 18th day of May, 2022.

BETWEEN:

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

(the “City”)

AND:

BUCKINGHAM SPORTS PROPERTIES COMPANY

(“Buckingham Sports”)

WHEREAS:

A. The City owns the lands known municipally as 1001 Franklin Boulevard, Cambridge, Ontario, N1R 8B5, described in Schedule “A” to this agreement (the “Lands”);

B. Buckingham Sports leases, operates and pays property taxes on an existing facility on the Lands;

C. Buckingham Sports wishes, pursuant to Section 110(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001 to enter into an agreement with the City for the use of a proposed addition to the existing facility on the Lands, being the plan of the proposed addition in Schedule “B” to this agreement (the “MCF Building”) as a municipal capital facility;

D. The City wishes, pursuant to Section 110(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001, to exempt the MCF Building from taxation for municipal and school purposes;

E. The MCF Building shall be a municipal community centre to serve the community of the City of Cambridge being qualified as a class of municipal capital facility described in subsections 2(1)(14) of Ontario Regulation 603/06;

THEREFORE, in consideration of the making of this Agreement and the mutual covenants contained herein, the parties undertake, covenant and agree as follows:

DESIGNATION
1. The City will by by-law, designate the MCF Building as a municipal capital facility and exempt the MCF Building from taxation for municipal and school purposes.

TERM

2. The term of this Agreement and the designation of the MCF Building as a municipal capital facility shall be from September 1, 2023 to the earliest of:
   
a. August 31, 2043;
   
b. the day that the Municipal Act, 2001 or such other applicable or successor legislation is repealed or amended such that the designation of the MCF Building as a municipal capital facility is no longer available to be made or applicable; and,
   
c. the day the MCF Building ceases to be used as a municipal capital facility as that term is defined in Ontario Regulation 603/06, as amended, from time to time.

TAX EXEMPTION

3. The City shall, pursuant to subsection 110(6) of the Municipal Act, 2001, exempt the MCF Building from property taxation for municipal and school purposes.

ZONING

4. For the purposes of clarity, the City acknowledges and agrees that neither this Agreement nor the by-law shall in any way affect the zoning of the MCF Building or the permitted uses of the MCF Building under applicable laws.

REGISTRATION

5. The by-law referred to in section 1 of this Agreement may be registered by the City on title to the Lands.

OBLIGATIONS AS COVENANTS

6. Each obligation expressed in this Agreement, even though not expressed as a covenant, is considered to be a covenant for all purposes.

ENTIRE AGREEMENT

7. This Agreement contains all the covenants, agreements and understandings between the parties concerning its subject matter.
ENUREMENT

8. This Agreement shall enure to the benefit of and be binding upon the parties hereto and their respective successors and assigns.

PARTIAL INVALIDITY

9. If any provision of this Agreement or the application of it to any person or circumstances is held to any extent invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this Agreement or the application of the provisions to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid or unenforceable is not affected.

FURTHER ASSURANCES

10. The parties shall do and execute all such further acts, deeds, instruments or things as may be necessary or desirable for the purpose of carrying out the intent of this Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties hereto have duly executed this Agreement.

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Per: ________________________________
Kathryn McGarry
Mayor

Per: ________________________________
Danielle Manton
City Clerk
We have the authority to bind the corporation.

BUCKINGHAM SPORTS PROPERTIES COMPANY

Per: ________________________________
John Cook
Vice President

Per: ________________________________
Paul Campoli
Chief Financial Officer
We have the authority to bind the corporation
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

BY-LAW 22-031

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 17th day of May, 2022, 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 17\textsuperscript{th} day of May, 2022.

________________________

MAYOR

________________________

CLERK