Corporation of the City of Cambridge
Special Council Meeting
Agenda

Date: January 30, 2024
Location: Council Chambers

The Special Council Meeting will occur immediately following the Planning - Statutory Public Meeting on January 30th, 2024.

1. Meeting Called to Order
2. Indigenous Territory Acknowledgement
3. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest
4. Presentations
   4.1 Brandon Flewwelling, GSP Group re: 24-014-CD – Recommendation Report for Zoning By-law Amendment – 65 Ripplewood Road
   4.2 Jacqueline Hannemann, Senior Planner re: 24-014-CD – Recommendation Report for Zoning By-law Amendment – 65 Ripplewood Road
5. Consideration of Reports
   5.1 Community Development
      5.1.1 24-014-CD – Recommendation Report for Zoning By-law Amendment – 65 Ripplewood Road
6. Motion to Receive
7. Confirmatory By-law
8. Adjournment
65 & 105 Ripplewood Road
Application for Zoning By-law Amendment

Treasure Hill Homes
Proposed Development

Proposed Residential Plan of Subdivision

752 Total Dwelling Units
- 278 Single Detached
- 474 Street and Cluster Townhouses
- 4 Natural Open Space Protected Blocks
- 2 Neighbourhood Park Blocks
- 5 stormwater management blocks
- Neighbourhood trail system
- Local road network with connections to west
Zoning By-law Amendment Request

The purposes of the Zoning By-law Amendment application are two-fold:
(1) to remove the holding symbol “(H)”
(2) to change the zoning from “R4” (“Low Density Residential”) and “M7 (S.4.1.15)” (“Industrial” with special provisions) to an appropriate zones to facilitate development of the proposed plan of subdivision

- Street townhouse blocks and condominium townhouse blocks are to be re-zoned as “RM4,”

- Remaining residential lots are to be re-zoned as a combination of site specific “R5” and “R6”, to accommodate single detached dwellings at varying densities

- Five blocks containing the proposed stormwater management facilities and the open space blocks proposed to protect the natural heritage features are to be re-zoned as “OS1,”

- Park blocks are to be re-zoned as “OS4”
## Zoning By-law Amendment Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required:</th>
<th>Proposed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single Detached:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Front Yard</td>
<td>6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Interior Side Yard</td>
<td>1.2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Exterior Side Yard</td>
<td>6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Townhouse Dwellings:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Front Yard</td>
<td>6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Interior Side Yard</td>
<td>1.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Exterior Side Yard</td>
<td>6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. # Attached Units</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Density per block</td>
<td>40uph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Proposed values are generally higher than required values.
Staff Comments

Points of concern include:
• Uncertainty about the road network (connecting to lands outside the draft plan of subdivision)
• Sizing of buffers around the proposed Open Space Blocks
• Need for a school site within the draft plan of subdivision

In support of the Proposed Development the following documents were submitted (among others):
• Environmental Impact Study
• Traffic Impact Study
• Functional Servicing Report
• Stormwater Management Report
Staff Comments

Uncertainty about the road network (connecting to lands outside the draft plan of subdivision)

Traffic Impact Study Recommendations:
• Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that:
  • The development application be approved with no provision for off-site transportation network improvements; and
  • That the Region of Waterloo and City of Cambridge monitor the future traffic volumes at the intersection of Dundas Street South and Maple Bush Drive and update the traffic control measures when required.
  • That the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) monitor the future traffic volumes at the intersections of Dundas Street South at Vanier Drive and Dundas Street South and Attwater Drive and update the traffic control measures when required.
Staff Comments

Sizing of buffers around the proposed Open Space Blocks

Environmental Impact Study Conclusions:

• This scoped EIS demonstrates that the Powerplay North proposal will not result in net negative impacts to natural heritage features and functions as long as the avoidance, mitigation and enhancement recommendations within this report are appropriately carried out.

• **Avoidance**: Avoid development and site alteration within minimum 10 m of PSW and 10 m of significant woodlands.

• **Mitigation**: Mitigate impacts to PSW and Significant Woodlands by applying appropriate buffers for PSW and Significant Woodland. No site alteration is permitted within buffers except where minor encroachments are identified.

• **Enhancement**: Wetland enhancement: Restore 0.7 ha of wetland habitat. Woodland enhancement: Restore approximately 1.95 ha of woodland habitat. Install enhanced wildlife crossings. Install 3 bat boxes within proposed enhancement areas.
Staff Comments

Need for a school site within the draft plan of subdivision

South East Galt Community Plan:
• The identification of a future school site on the City-owned lands in the Secondary Plan highlights that the Subject Lands are not identified as the preferred site for a future school block that is intended to service expected population beyond the Subject Lands.

• While it is noted that the Region of Waterloo’s future East Boundary Road will make connectivity to the new school challenging from the Subject Lands, the WRDSB notes that, if required, the WRDSB is committed to working with the City of Cambridge and Region of Waterloo on safe pedestrian crossings of this road.

• The demand for a school site arises because of the growth expected on all lands within the planned community and not solely because of growth on the Subject Lands.
Conclusions

A number of technical studies were completed to evaluate the proposed development and to ensure an appropriate and safe community is developed.

The proposed zoning by-law amendment will implement the findings of the technical studies as submitted.

A separate Draft Plan of Subdivision Application is currently under review by the Region of Waterloo.

Should the Draft Plan of Subdivision require future amendments to the Zoning By-law a follow-up application could be submitted.
65 Ripplewood Road
R16/23 – Recommendation

January 30, 2024
Zoning request to facilitate the development of a residential subdivision.
Existing Zoning: (H) R4 and M7 s.4.1.15

Proposed Zoning: R5, R6, RM4, OS1 and OS4 with site specific provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singles</td>
<td>R5 and R6</td>
<td>R5 and R6 - site specific requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Front Yard Setback</td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Interior Side Yard setback</td>
<td>1.2m</td>
<td>0.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Exterior Side Yard Setback</td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Townhomes</td>
<td>RM4</td>
<td>RM4 – site specific requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Front Yard Setback</td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Interior Side Yard setback</td>
<td>1.5m</td>
<td>0.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Exterior Side Yard Setback</td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Number of Attached Units</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density per Block</td>
<td>40 units per hectare</td>
<td>41.7 unit per hectare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An application for draft plan of subdivision and an application for zoning by-law amendment are required to develop the residential subdivision.

The draft plan of subdivision needs to be finalized so that zoning can be applied accurately to all lots and blocks.

The draft plan of subdivision proposed for 65 Ripplewood Road is currently under review and has not been finalized yet. There are a number of issues that need to be addressed prior to finalizing the site design.
Recommendation

Planning staff recommend refusal of the zoning by-law amendment application as it is premature until the draft plan of subdivision has been reviewed and finalized.
To: COUNCIL

Meeting Date: 1/30/2024

Subject: 24-014-CD – Recommendation Report for Zoning By-law Amendment – 65 Ripplewood Road

Submitted By: Sylvia Rafalski Misch, MCIP, RPP – Manager of Development Planning

Prepared By: Jacqueline Hannemann, MCIP, RPP – Senior Planner – Development

Report No.: 24-014-CD

File No.: R16/23

Wards Affected: Ward 7

RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 24-014-CD Recommendation Report for Zoning By-law Amendment – 65 Ripplewood Road be received;

AND FURTHER THAT Cambridge Council refuse the Zoning By-law Amendment application to rezone the subject property from (H)R4 and M7 s.4.1.15 to R5, R6, RM4, OS1 and OS4 to permit the development of a residential subdivision for the reasons set out in Report 24-014-CD.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide a recommendation for refusal of the zoning by-law amendment application to rezone the lands to facilitate the development of a plan of subdivision with 752 residential dwelling units for the reasons set out in this report.

Key Findings

- The application for a site-specific zoning by-law amendment is premature at this time as the associated proposed draft plan of subdivision is currently under review.
• Key issues to be addressed include uncertainty about the road network (connecting to lands outside the draft plan of subdivision), inadequate buffers around the natural heritage features which will form part of the Open Space blocks, size and location of stormwater management blocks and adequate grading and the lack of a school site within the proposed subdivision. These items need to be addressed before zoning can be accurately applied to the lands.

• As per the Planning Act changes resulting from Bill 109, the zoning by-law amendment application is subject to fee refunds if a decision has not been made by Council within the 90-day required timeframe, which would be by February 4, 2024.

Financial Implications

• A planning application fee in the amount of $25,200 has been paid to the City of Cambridge to process the zoning by-law amendment application.

• Any further costs associated with the development of the site are to be borne by the applicant.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action

OR

☒ Core Service

Program: Development Approvals

Core Service: Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments

BACKGROUND:

Property

The subject property is known by the municipal address of 65 Ripplewood Road and described legally as Part of Lot 1, Concession 10, North Dumfries (Part 1 of Reference Plan 58R-17686). The property is situated on the north side of Ripplewood Road in the southeasterly corner of the City of Cambridge, directly adjacent to the municipal boundary with the Township of North Dumfries. The property has an area of approximately 38.98 hectares, with about 200 metres of frontage along Ripplewood Road.
There are two existing driveways, which extend about 350 metres from Ripplewood Road to the sites of former buildings that occupied the lands. The former buildings which were associated with the agricultural use of the subject property, have been demolished. The subject property currently comprises agricultural fields interspersed with scattered woodlots and wetland features.

Figure 1 provides an aerial view of the subject lands.

![Aerial Map of the Subject Lands](image)

**Figure 1 – Aerial Map of the Subject Lands**

**Surrounding Land Uses**

The land uses surrounding the subject property predominantly consist of agricultural and low-density residential uses, including to the east and south in the Township of North Dumfries. A hydro corridor runs along the westerly boundary of the subject property, with the lands directly to the west being used for agricultural purposes. Two
residential dwellings are situated on parcels abutting the subject property on the north side of Ripplewood Road. To the north, is an auto wreckers’ yard. South of Ripplewood Road is the newly registered Hazel Glenn Subdivision, which is currently under construction by the same developer seeking approval of this zoning by-law amendment application.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 2 – Surrounding Land Uses and Environmental Constraints on the Subject Lands**

**ANALYSIS**

**Proposal**

The applicant is proposing to redevelop the site with a low-to-medium density residential subdivision with a total of 752 dwelling units. Approximately, one-third of the proposed
units would be single detached dwellings (278 units), with the remaining 474 dwelling units being a mix of street townhouse dwellings and cluster townhouse dwellings. The proposed development proposes two park blocks as well as a number of open space areas for the protection of existing natural heritage features. Municipal water and municipal sewer services will be provided by existing or planned systems in the vicinity of the subject property, which include a sanitary pumping station in the Hazel Glenn Subdivision south of Ripplewood Road, opposite the subject property, which has been designed with sufficient capacity for the proposed development.

An application for zoning by-law amendment was submitted to the City of Cambridge (deemed complete on November 6, 2023) to remove the existing holding related to the provision of servicing and to request zoning that will facilitate the development of the proposed draft plan of subdivision.

The applicant has submitted an application for the draft plan of subdivision to the Region of Waterloo (deemed complete and circulated December 14, 2023) after the application for zoning by-law amendment was submitted to the City. A draft copy of the proposed draft plan of subdivision is provided in Appendix A. Currently, the draft plan of subdivision is in its early stages of review by the Region, City and outside agency staff and therefore it would be premature at this time to approve a corresponding zoning by-law amendment application. The draft plan of subdivision must be finalized so that zoning can be accurately applied to the blocks and lots in the subdivision.

Policy Analysis

The proposal has been reviewed against the policies of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2020) (Growth Plan), Region of Waterloo Official Plan (ROP) City of Cambridge Official Plan (OP).

1. Provincial Policy Statement

The Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 (PPS) provides policy direction provincewide on land use planning and development to promote strong communities, a strong economy, and a clean and healthy environment. It includes policies on key issues that affect communities, such as:

- the efficient use and management of land and infrastructure;
- ensuring the sufficient provision of housing to meet changing needs including affordable housing;
- ensuring the appropriate transportation, water, sewer and other infrastructure is available to accommodate current and future needs;
• protecting people, property and community resources by directing development away from natural hazards.

2. A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe

The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, through its policies, supports the achievement of complete communities, supports active transportation and the integration of transit services, and protects and enhances the natural heritage features.

The above Provincial policies of the PPS and the Growth Plan would be addressed through the completion of the review of the associated draft plan of subdivision application. The proposed zoning by-law amendment application is required to facilitate the proposed draft plan of subdivision and must correspond with the proposed subdivision design, layout and uses. Staff anticipate changes to the proposed plan of subdivision and therefore the zoning by-law amendment application as proposed is premature at this time.

3. Regional Official Plan

The property is designated as ‘Designated Greenfield Area’ in the Regional Official Plan (ROP). Future development in ‘Designated Greenfield Areas’ will contribute to the creation of complete communities with a greater mix of land uses and development patterns that support trips by walking, cycling, and where available, transit services.

Chapter 7 of the ROP contains policies relating to the Greenlands Network which aim to ensure protection of environmental features, ecological functions of the Greenlands Network and species at risk. The property contains multiple Provincially Significant Wetlands and unevaluated wetlands. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) submitted in support of the zoning by-law amendment application and draft plan of subdivision has not sufficiently addressed policies contained in Chapter 7 and requires revision before regional and city staff can assure the development is in conformity with the applicable ROP policies.

4. City Official Plan

The subject lands are designated ‘Low/Medium Density Residential’ in the City’s Official Plan (City OP) which permits a range of residential uses, including single detached dwellings, townhomes and walk-up apartments to a maximum residential density of 40 units per gross hectare. ‘Gross hectare’ includes all lands except for provincially constrained environmental areas. Due to the numerous wetlands located on the site, the development conforms to the density limits of the ‘Low/Medium Density Residential’ designation, providing for an overall density of 22.7 units per hectare.
There are pockets of the subject lands that are designated ‘Natural Open Space System’ in the City OP. These natural areas, including appropriate buffers will be zoned as ‘Open Space’ once the Environmental Impact Statement has been updated by the applicant and approved by City staff and appropriate agency staff.

**General Comments Regarding the Application**

Comments for the zoning by-law amendment application were provided in advance of the City receiving the formal application for draft plan of subdivision review and comment. The draft plan of subdivision should be reviewed in advance or alongside the zoning by-law amendment application to ensure that the blocks and lots and road network are finalized prior to applying the zoning to the subject site. This will ensure the ‘location’ of the zoning is consistent with the final subdivision design.

The following issues were raised through the review and commenting period for the zoning by-law amendment application which also relate to the proposed plan of subdivision and need to be addressed before zoning can be finalized for the lands.

- The subdivision registration will not be supported by Transportation Engineering staff until Wesley Boulevard is extended from Bastien Street to this development and the East Boundary Road is completed from Wesley Boulevard to Dundas Street.
  - Without the Wesley Boulevard east/west connection Dundas Street remains the only access to this entire neighbourhood consisting of the existing Hazel Glenn subdivision and this proposed subdivision.
  - Vanier Drive which is a 6m wide rural cross section local road with no sidewalks or other active transportation facilities, is not suitable to accommodate the majority of trips projected to be generated by the proposed development. It has very limited right-of-way width and a constrained corridor leaving no feasible options for expansion.
  - The onus is on the owner/developer to pursue the Wesley Boulevard connection through adjacent private property and the Hydro One corridor.

- Full review of the draft plan of subdivision is required to determine if the grading and stormwater management blocks are of sufficient size.

- City staff are of the opinion that 10 metre buffers proposed around environmentally sensitive areas are insufficient and require larger buffers to be proposed to provide more protection and to accommodate any proposed trails.
Staff have suggested some small-scale commercial uses be incorporated into the draft plan to achieve a more complete community.

The limited availability of alternative school site locations within the area has resulted in the Waterloo Region District School Board requesting an elementary school block within this subdivision which has not been addressed by the applicant.

A number of revisions and/or clarifications are required to the noise study to ensure that noise (road noise and noise from adjacent industrial uses) is considered to be mitigated appropriately. A revised Noise Study, to the satisfaction of the Region will be required prior to City of Cambridge Council considering the zoning bylaw amendment application.

The above noted key issues will require changes to the draft plan of subdivision and the corresponding zoning by-law amendment application.

Due to Provincially legislated 90-day timeline for a Council decision, staff are recommending refusal of the zoning by-law amendment application at this time based on the information available to date.

Planning staff have communicated to the owner/applicant that staff are not in a position to support the zoning by-law amendment application at this time. Planning staff gave the applicant the option of voluntarily withdrawing the zoning by-law amendment application with a fee refund, to provide additional time to review and finalize the draft plan of subdivision, and to reapply for the zoning by-law amendment at a time when the subdivision is further along in the process. This was to ensure that the proposed zoning would be consistent with the final draft plan of subdivision.

**Staff Recommendation**

Given the foregoing reasons outlined in this report, Planning staff recommend refusal of the zoning by-law amendment application as it is premature until the draft plan of subdivision has been reviewed and finalized.

Staff gave consideration to Provincial, Regional and City policies, agency comments, and the appropriateness of the zoning and site-specific provisions that were requested by the applicant. It is the opinion of Planning staff that the proposed application is premature at this time since the zoning cannot be accurately applied to the lands in absence of a complete and finalized draft plan of subdivision.

The review and analysis of the proposed draft plan of subdivision is ongoing and could result in changes to the overall design of the site (i.e. potential to have a school block added to the site, location and size of residential lots and blocks, location and size of
stormwater management, park and natural heritage feature open space blocks, road layout, trail network, etc.).

Planning decisions are subject to appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT). An appeal may be filed if the applications are refused, approved, or if a decision is not made within the timeline for processing the applications set out in the Planning Act.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

City of Cambridge Official Plan, 2012, as amended

Existing Land Use Designations: Designated Greenfield Area, Low/Medium Density Residential and Natural Open Space System on Maps 1A and 2 of the City’s Official Plan.

Proposed Land Use Designation: There is no change proposed to the Official Plan designations.

The existing Official Plan designations are shown on Figures 3 and 4.

Existing Zoning: (H) R4 and M7 s.4.1.15

Proposed Zoning: R5, R6, RM4, OS1 and OS4 with site specific provisions
The existing and proposed zoning is shown in Figure 5 and 6. A larger copy of the proposed zoning figure has been provided in Appendix B.

**Proposed Site-Specific Provisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singles</td>
<td>R5 and R6</td>
<td>R5 and R6 - site specific requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Front Yard Setback</td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Interior Side Yard Setback</td>
<td>1.2m</td>
<td>0.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Exterior Side Yard Setback</td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Townhomes</td>
<td>RM4</td>
<td>RM4 – site specific requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Front Yard Setback</td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>3m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minimum Interior Side Yard Setback | 1.5m | 0.6m
---|---|---
Minimum Exterior Side Yard Setback | 6m | 3m
Maximum Number of Attached Units | 6 | 8
Maximum Density per Block | 40 units per hectare | 41.7 unit per hectare

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

- A planning application fee in the amount of $25,200 has been paid to the City of Cambridge to process zoning by-law amendment application.

- City and Regional Development Charge fees will be collected prior to building permit issuance. Development Charges collected for the proposed development will be used for the construction of new infrastructure required to support growth of the City.

- Any further costs associated with the development of the site are to be borne by the applicant.

PUBLIC VALUE:

A statutory Public Meeting required under the Planning Act was held on December 12, 2023. Following the Public Meeting, members of the public/residents that provided their information on the sign-in registry at the meeting or have requested to be included on the mailing list were notified of this Recommendation Report being presented to Council on January 30, 2024.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:

Advisory Committees Consulted:

Not applicable.

PUBLIC INPUT:

Comments received at the public meeting include:
• Concerns with removal of trees on or near existing property
• Question related to the need for widening of Ripplewood Road to accommodate new traffic from the proposed subdivision.
• Safety of existing well water
• Connections to municipal services for existing homeowners
• Sufficient on-site parking for residents and visitors

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

Staff has received comments from applicable city departments and outside agencies in regard to the zoning by-law amendment application. Staff and agency comments have been provided to the applicant but have not yet been addressed. The first submission comments on the zoning by-law amendment application provided to the applicant are included in Appendix D.

CONCLUSION:
Until the applicant finalizes the draft plan of subdivision and updates the proposed zoning accordingly (as required), the proposed zoning by-law amendment application in its current form cannot be supported by Planning staff as it would introduce new zoning regulations to the subject property which may not correspond with the final draft plan of subdivision. As such, at this time the zoning by-law amendment application, as submitted, does not represent good planning and is not in the public interest as there are outstanding key issues that need to be addressed.

Staff recommend refusal of the zoning by-law amendment application for the reasons outlined in this report.

Staff will continue to work with the applicant and other agencies on the proposed draft plan of subdivision application. Once all issues have been resolved, and the draft plan of subdivision has been finalized, the applicant can request appropriate zoning through a future zoning by-law amendment application.

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. 24-014-CD Appendix A – Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision
2. 24-014-CD Appendix B – Proposed Zoning Figure
3. 24-014-CD Appendix C – Departments and Commenting Agencies Circulated
4. 24-014-CD Appendix D – First Submission Staff and Agency Comments
Appendix C – Internal/External Consultation and List of Supporting Studies

This application has been circulated to the departments and agencies listed below.

- City of Cambridge Engineering Division;
- City of Cambridge Transportation Engineering Division;
- City of Cambridge Recreation and Cultural Division;
- City of Cambridge Fire Department;
- City of Cambridge Building Services Division;
- City of Cambridge Accessibility Coordinator;
- City of Cambridge Economic Development Division;
- City of Cambridge Senior Planner Reurbanization;
- City of Cambridge Senior Planner of Policy;
- Regional Municipality of Waterloo;
- Grand River Conservation Authority;
- Energy+ Inc;
- Waterloo Region District School Board; and
- Waterloo Catholic District School Board

List of Supporting Studies submitted:
- Planning Justification Report
- Archaeological Assessment
- Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment
- Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment
- Environmental Impact Study
- Stormwater Management Plan/Functional Servicing Report
- Geotechnical Report
- Hydrogeological Report
- Noise Study
- Traffic Impact Study
- Tree Management/Vegetation Plan (included in Environment Impact Study)
- Architectural and Urban Design Guidelines
- Section 59 Notice of Source Water Protection
Please note that the comments are based on the most recent submission. Please prepare a detailed response letter indicating how each of the following comments have been addressed with your next submission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application File No.</th>
<th>R16/23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Applicant:</td>
<td>Powerplay Equity Capital (Bt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Address of Subject Property:</td>
<td>65 Ripplewood Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Proposal:</td>
<td>Proposal for rezoning of the property to facilitate the development of a low/medium density residential subdivision approximately 752 dwelling units, road network, parks and stormwater management facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Plan Designation:</td>
<td>Low / Medium Density Residential; Natural Open Space System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Classification:</td>
<td>(H)R4 residential and M7 industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Date:</td>
<td>December 19, 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**City of Cambridge, Policy Planning Section**

**Contact:** Bryan Cooper  
**Phone:** (519) 621-1340 Ext. 4598  
**Email:** CooperB@cambridge.ca

I have reviewed the Planning Justification Report (PJR), draft zoning by-law amendment and draft plan of subdivision. Please see the following:

1. Density – ROPA No.6 is now in effect which requires an overall designated greenfield area (DGA) density of 59 people and jobs per
hectare in the City. This is an overall density number and is calculated across the entire DGA and includes lands developed, draft approved and vacant. For vacant DGA lands such as the subject property, an incremental density of 66 people/jobs per hectare is required and therefore this draft plan should increase the density from the 62.2 people noted in the PJR to 66 people.

2. 15 Minute neighbourhoods – As noted in the PJR, ROPA No. 6 requires the development of 15 minute neighbourhoods. In keeping with this concept, some commercial or mixed use space should be provided within the draft plan so that residents are able to access commercial services without having to drive. Mixed use was proposed at the preconsultation and should be re-instated.

3. Draft Zoning By-law – see below comments:

- Requested reduced front yard setback to 3.0 m – provision should be made to ensure that the garage is setback 6.0 m to accommodate a parking space in the driveway.

- Requested reduced interior side yard setback of 0.6 m – ensure that provision is made in the by-law amendment to require, in cases of a 0.6 m side yard, that the lot opposite of the reduced side yard has a minimum 1.2 m setback to provide a total distance of 1.8 m between buildings. This will prevent two singles being sited side by side with 0.6 m setbacks which can be a challenge for access, utility servicing, air conditioners and potential ARU units.

- ARUS – the applicant is encouraged to review the City’s ARU by-law in the event that the developer is proposing ARUs to be constructed or roughed in within the singles and street townhouses in this subdivision.

- Townhouse regulations – the draft by-law only amends the regulations relating to street townhouses (section 3.1.2.5). The applicant should confirm whether relief from section 3.1.2.6 for site development standards for cluster townhouses is also required. The proposed site specific reference for private roads should apply only to cluster townhouses and not street fronting townhouses.
Development Planning - Comments:

Comments for the Zoning By-law amendment were provided in advance of the City having the formal application for draft plan of subdivision. The draft plan of subdivisions should be reviewed alongside the Zoning By-law Amendment to ensure that the blocks and lots and road network are finalized to ensure the proposed zoning is consistent with the final subdivision design.

Staff are not in a position to provide a recommendation for approval of the Zoning By-law Amendment and offer the following comments on the zoning by-law amendment application.

The subject lands are designated within the Region’s Official Plan as “Designated Greenfield Area” (DGA) and are within the Urban Area. Lands within the DGA are intended to be developed to accommodate future population and employment growth to the year 2051. These areas will need to be planned to be compact, well-connected mixed-use communities containing a range of housing and employment opportunities, while providing convenient access to other community services.

Staff commend the applicant on providing varying housing types within the subdivision.

The pre-consultation comments requested that there be some commercial uses provided within the subdivision. Planning Staff do not want to see big-box retail locations on these lands, however, would like to see smaller neighbourhood convenience/grocery shops that can be incorporated into the future development. The applicant should consider increased density on these Blocks with special attention to apartment style housing with combination of commercial and service uses.

According to the Planning Justification Report the density provided within
the subdivision is 22.7 units per hectare. Is there an opportunity to increase the density on the site on the townhouse blocks?

Please provide clarification as to whether the proposed community will purpose-built rental units. Planning Staff encourages the applicant to consider this as part of the development.

An on-street parking plan is requested with a future submission.

Is the developer willing to front the cost of connecting existing neighbouring properties to municipal services (paying for the private connections to municipal services)?

It appears that the proposal meets policy 8.4.1.2 of the City Official Plan which requires a minimum of 30% of units to be in other forms such as townhomes and multi-unit residential buildings. Policy 8.4.1.3 requires that new residential development include a minimum number of affordable housing units based on the targets established by the Region’s Community Action Plan on Housing. Details on how affordable housing is being addressed should be provided, including a contribution to the City’s Affordable Housing Contribution Fund.
Region of Waterloo, Community Planning
Contact: Region of Waterloo
Phone: 519-575-4400
Email: PlanningApplications@regionofwaterloo.ca

Regional comments are attached to this email.

City of Cambridge, Planner - Heritage
Contact: Laura Waldie
Phone: (519) 623-1340 Ext. 4788
Email: waldiel@cambridge.ca

Comments pending.

City of Cambridge, Senior Planner - Environmental
Contact: Kathy Padgett
Phone: (519) 623-1340 Ext. 4826
Email: padgettk@cambridge.ca

The following documents were submitted in support of the application and have been reviewed:

1. Draft Plan of Subdivision. Part of Lot 1 Concession 10, City of Cambridge (prepared by GSP Group Inc. and dated April 12, 2023);
2. Planning Justification Report. Powerplay North Subdivision, Ripplewood Road (prepared by GSP Group Inc. and dated August 2023); and

My comments are as follows:
1. Locally Significant Natural Areas (LSNAs)

a) While Section 1.1 correctly states that the EIS was triggered due to GRCA-regulated wetlands, it does not state that the EIS was also triggered by Locally Significant Natural Area (LSNA) Wooded Areas located on the subject lands, which are primarily hedgerows. City staff provided this comment on the EIS TOR for 65 and 105 Ripplewood Road via email dated August 23, 2021. City staff also provided the map below identifying the LSNAs as marked in red. Please refer to LSNAs in Section 1.1 of the EIS.

b) The EIS does not speak to the removal of the LSNA hedgerows on the subject lands. Since hedgerows are considered LSNAs, which are a wooded area identified by the Ministry of Natural Resources but which does not qualify as a Core Environmental Feature (Cambridge OP Policy 3.A.4 b)), the removal of these features must be justified through an EIS. The Cambridge OP states that the form of LSNAs may be modified thorough development or site alteration provided it is demonstrated through an EIS that the ecological function of the natural feature is maintained, enhanced, or where feasible, restored (Policy 3.A.4.5). Please provided an analysis of the ecological function of the LNSAs on site under Section 3.6.5.2.
2. Recommended Buffers

a) The EIS recommends 10 metre buffers for both Provincially Significant Wetlands (PWSs) and Significant Woodlands on the subject lands. City staff are of the opinion that 10 metre buffers around PWSs are insufficient and require larger buffers to be proposed. This comment is in line with the development pre-consultation comments provided by the GRCA dated April 19, 2021 that are found in Appendix J of the EIS.

b) Based on aerial mapping, wetlands and wooded areas appear to be located immediately east of the subject lands along the shared property line or in close proximity to the shared property line. While staff understand the applicant did not have access to the adjacent property to delineate features, it does not appear attempts have been made to provide buffers on the subject lands for all of these adjacent features. Staff would like to see this addressed.

3. Map 4: Ecological Constraints & Enhancement Opportunities

a) The ‘Limit of Disturbance’ noted in the legend doesn’t appear to be on the map.

b) Unsure of if the ‘Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW)’ blue crisscross in the legend was applied to the map. Would this colouring need to be applied to the features that have the blue buffer around them (Polygon 12, 13, 14 and 45)? Please review to ensure the map is easy to read in correspondence with the legend.

c) For the buffers, the legend identifies PSWs (1.35 ha) and Significant Woodlands (0.08 ha). What do the hectares correspond to as the numbers don’t appear to line up with the text of the EIS (Page 188 of the EIS notes that buffer widths equal 1.95 ha of land).

d) Please label the buffer widths on this map, either on the legend or the map itself.

4. Trails

a) City staff provided comments on the EIS TOR dated August 23, 2021 that if trails are proposed as part of the development to assess their location and impacts to any Natural Heritage Features and any mitigation measures. Trails appear to be proposed in the 10 metre buffer around PWSs, which have not been assessed in the EIS. Staff will require a larger buffer to
support a trail in proximity to a PSW; a 10 metre buffer is not suitable to provide the necessary distance from the feature to the trail. Please revise and provide an assessment of the trail and proposed mitigation measures.

5. General Comments

a) Indicate the dates in which site visits with City and GRCA staff were held to review dripline and wetland limits.

b) Typically in the appendices a copy of the EIS TOR along with agency comments on the TOR are included for ease of reference and transparency.

c) Page 27 of the EIS regarding Enhancement notes that the woodland enhancement will include planting the required replacement trees in accordance with the City’s tree by-law. Please be aware that buffer plantings identified through an EIS do not qualify as compensation trees and this reference should be revised accordingly in the EIS.

d) Staff require a revision to the EIS with these comments addressed in the next submission.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please contact me with any questions.

City of Cambridge Development Engineering and Transportation Engineering

Contact: Adam Ripper / Jason Leach
Phone: (519) 623-1340 Ext. 4778 / (519) 621-0740 Ext. 4268
Email: rippera@cambridge.ca / LeachJ@cambridge.ca

As requested, Engineering Staff has completed a review of the R16/23 Zoning By-law Amendment application. Based on our review of the application, Staff is not in a position to support the Zoning By-law Amendment at this time. The applicant is to address the following comments to the satisfaction of Engineering Staff prior to approval:

Development Engineering

- Review the grading of the proposed stormwater management facilities as it could impact the SWM block sizing.
- Specifically, the minimum requirements of the City’s Engineering
Standards and MOE Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual 2003 are to be adhered to.

- This includes providing a maximum 5:1 slope for a minimum 3.0m above and below the permanent pool.

- Is the Hydro One tower location shown on general plan 1 and Street B plan and Street B Plan & Profile Drawing 18? If so Staff questions whether the proposed Street B and trunk sewer alignment to the future development lands to the west would be feasible in this location?

- Detailed review of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Design Report and associated preliminary engineering design drawings will be completed through the draft plan of subdivision circulation and comments will be provided through the draft plan of subdivision circulation.

**Transportation Engineering – Action Items**

- The Southeast Galt Community Plan identifies the need and justification for inter-neighbourhood roadway continuity and resident mobility within the Southeast Galt Community area. Reasons include improved access/egress flexibility, better internal transit routing, enhanced active transportation opportunities and more responsive emergency services timing. These are all objectives of integrated land use/transportation planning, transit-supportive land use planning and sustainable transportation planning. From a technical perspective, the traffic assessment also shows that this internal development traffic, without the east/west connection, would add level of service deterioration within the Franklin Boulevard corridor and the Franklin Boulevard at Dundas Street intersection.

- Without the Wesley Boulevard east/west connection Dundas Street remains the only access to this entire neighbourhood consisting of the existing subdivision and this proposed subdivision. This would have a significant negative impact on emergency response in the event of a blockage or closure of Dundas Street.

- Vanier Drive is not a suitable option to accommodate the majority of trips projected to be generated by this site. It is a 6m wide rural cross-section local road with no sidewalks or other active transportation facilities. It has very limited right-of-way width and a constrained corridor leaving no feasible options for expansion.

- For the reasons noted above, this subdivision will not be permitted to register until such time as Wesley Boulevard is extended from Bastien...
Street to this development and the East Boundary Road is completed from Wesley Boulevard to Dundas Street.

- The onus is on the owner/developer to pursue the Wesley Boulevard connection through adjacent properties including discussions with Hydro One and the ability for roads proposed in this development to cross the Hydro One corridor/property.

- A road widening of 3.0m along the Ripplewood Road frontage of the development is required.

**Transportation Engineering General Comments**

- Further comments regarding trail connections, right-of-way widths, street layout and design will be provided through review of the draft plan of subdivision. These comments will impact the current plan as proposed.

**Summary**

The above comments will need to be addressed prior to providing a recommendation for approval of the Zoning By-law Amendment. If you have any questions, or require further details, please do not hesitate to contact us.

---

**Energy+ Inc.**

**Contact:** Helen Robinson  
**Phone:** 519621-3530  
**Email:** hrobinson@grandbridgeenergy.com

**Action Items:**

GBE has no objection to the request for a Zoning By-law amendment to facilitate the construction of a mixed residential development consisting of 752 units. The Applicant/Owner will be required to enter into a Service Agreement with GBE, to establish the terms and conditions of electrical service at 100% cost. If relocation or upgrade of hydro plant is required as a result of this Application, the Applicant/Owner will be responsible for 100% cost. If easements are required as a result of this application, the Applicant/Owner will be responsible for 100% cost.
Comments:

Our comments for the Service Agreement will include (but will not be limited to):

1) The Service Agreement with GBE will establish the conditions and costs to provide electrical service at 100% Owner/Applicant cost.
2) The Owner/Applicant will be responsible for all costs associated with the relocation and/or upgrade of the existing electrical plant, if required as a result of this proposal.
3) The Owner/Applicant will be required to grant easements to the satisfaction of GBE, if required as a result of this proposal at 100% cost.

Refer to GBE Residential Spec book at (GBE) [www.grandbridgeenergy.com](http://www.grandbridgeenergy.com). Hydro poles/guy wires and anchors/padmount transformers/switching units/service pits/street light poles to be 1.5m from driveway entrances/curbs. Relocation at 100% owners’ expense.

All planting near GBE owned overhead power lines and padmount equipment must be installed in accordance with [http://www.esasafe.com/assets/image/Tree-Planting.pdf](http://www.esasafe.com/assets/image/Tree-Planting.pdf) Must maintain required clearances (ESA & GBE) from existing electrical plant. Owner/Applicant may be required to provide ESA clearance calculations to existing overhead electrical distribution equipment. Calculations must be signed off by a P.Eng.

As per GBE, Current Conditions to Service, latest edition, only one service per property is permitted.

---

**Grand River Conservation Authority**

**Contact:** John Brum  
**Phone:** 519621-27632233  
**Email:** planning@Grandriver.ca

Comments are outstanding - application is still under review.
Waterloo Region District School Board

Contact: WRDSB Planners
Phone: (519) 570-0003 Ext. 4308
Email: planning@wrdsb.on.ca

The Waterloo Region District School Board (WRDSB) has reviewed the above application. This plan is situated in the southeast corner of Cambridge, north of the Lakeview subdivision, which fronts onto Dundas Street South.

The concept that has been circulated proposes the development of 752 dwelling units in the form of single detached units and various forms of townhouses.

The WRDSB submitted comments in 2021 (attached) on the then circulated concept identifying the need for an elementary school block located within this application.

The Planning Justification Report submitted states that;

“The identification of a future school site on the City-owned lands in the Secondary Plan highlights that the Subject Lands are not identified as the preferred site for a future school block that is intended to service expected population beyond the Subject Lands. While it is noted that the Region of Waterloo’s future East Boundary Road will make connectivity to the new school challenging from the Subject Lands, the WRDSB notes that, if required, the WRDSB is committed to working with the City of Cambridge and Region of Waterloo on safe pedestrian crossings of this road.

The Pre-consultation comments further note that the Educational Development Charges Background Study completed by Watson and Associates projects a sizeable pupil place deficiency over the 15-year planning horizon, and as such a school site is needed within the larger planned community to service this future demand.

The demand for a school site arises because of the growth expected on all lands within the planned community and not solely because of...
growth on the Subject Lands. Thus, all efforts should be made to secure the planned location for the future school site as identified in the Secondary Plan as the Southeast Cambridge Joint Use Elementary Site within the Bosdale subdivision, as this preferred location helps to support growth generally in the area as it occurs and is ideally situated to support that growth without the limitations that would exist if a school site were located on the Subject Lands.”

The WRDSB challenges the consultant’s assertion that “efforts should be made to secure the planned location for the future school site as identified in the Secondary Plan as the Southeast Cambridge Joint Use Elementary Site within the Bosdale subdivision.” In fact, there were two elementary school sites identified in the Southeast Galt Community Plan. Due to the changing landscape, namely the alignment of the East Boundary Road, the WRDSB abandoned its plans to acquire a school block off of Greengate Boulevard in favour of expediting its joint public/catholic elementary school and identifying a future site on the east side of the new Regional Road.

This section of the PJR ignores the WRDSB’s May 28, 2021 (response to Pre-Consultation Application D17-21) request to identify a school block within this application. If a site is not identified within this application, there is no assurance to the WRDSB that an alternate site will materialize in a subsequent development or that it would be a better location or site. The possible yield arising from this subdivision, together with the underway community to the south, could prove to be a critical mass for opening a new elementary school. As we said originally, while the Southeast Galt Community Plan contemplates development in this area, several factors make comprehensive accommodation planning challenging. The WRDSB expressed connectivity concerns when commenting on the Lakeview application (30T-14102). These concerns are also relevant to the above-noted application. This area is not walkable to any existing school (currently in the Moffat Creek Public School boundary) based on the existing infrastructure. In the future, this development will connect to 30T-14102 to the south, but its connectivity to the Bosdale subdivision (30T-13103) is unknown. There are no development applications submitted for the lands that connect Bosdale to this plan.
The planned new joint use school has no opening date, and no boundary review has been completed to establish updated enrolment and utilization forecasts. The preliminary understanding is that this new facility cannot accommodate all of the growth potential in Southeast Cambridge. The existing schools are all full.

Developments in this area of Cambridge have been designated as Development Areas (DAs) by the WRDSB. Given the current lack of accommodation, the same is likely to apply to these lands. Every effort is made to ensure that purchasers moving into Development Areas know the status of the DA and designated holding schools, where applicable. Information regarding the WRDSB’s Development Areas is available online at www.wrdsb.ca/planning/holding-schools/.

WRDSB Elementary School Site Needs
The limited availability of alternative school site locations within the area has resulted in the WRDSB requesting an elementary school block within this application. The WRDSB cannot support this Official Plan/Zoning Bylaw Amendment application given this missing requirement.

WRDSB requests a meeting with the City of Cambridge and the Developer/Consultant to identify potential sites within this plan that meet the minimum requirements for a new JK-8 public elementary school. The WRDSB’s New School Site Selection and Assessment Criteria is attached for reference.

Transportation Comments
The WRDSB supports school travel planning. Pedestrian needs and accessibility are considered in reviewing all development applications to support improving pedestrian safety and connectivity for current and prospective students.

Given this area will require transportation until a local school can be constructed or pedestrian access provided to another school, consideration should be given to the placement of future congregated bus pick up points. Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region (STSWR) should be consulted for their input on the ideal location and number of bus stops within this subdivision plan.
WRDSB Conditions (for Draft Plan Approval)

When an appropriate school site has been identified, the WRDSB will be submitting conditions in line with the draft conditions of draft plan approval as follows (conditions are subject to change):

1. That an elementary school site (the “School Site”) be set aside and designated in the Plan, (location to-be-determined), being comprised of approximately 3.25 hectares;

2. That the School Site be appropriately zoned (NI – Institutional) in accordance with the City of Cambridge Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended, or any successor thereof;

3. That prior to final approval of any phase of Plan development that is registrable at the same time as or later than the phase, including the School Site, the Owner shall have entered into an Agreement with the Waterloo Region District School Board regarding the transfer of the School Site;

4. That the Owner agrees to submit to the satisfaction of the Waterloo Region District School Board appropriate soil and environmental investigations, site grading plans, stormwater management plans, site servicing plans (sanitary, water and utilities) and archaeological investigations and pipeline details (if necessary). In the event of an identified concern, the WRDSB may commission its own studies at the Owner's cost. Prior to registration of the Plan, the Owner shall certify that all properties to be conveyed to the Waterloo Region District School Board are free of contamination;

5. That prior to final approval, the Owner shall submit to the Waterloo Region District School Board for review a copy of the final engineering plans as approved by the City of Cambridge, which indicates the storm drainage system which will service the School Site and the overall grading plans for the complete subdivision area;

6. That the Owner agrees to rough grade the School Site to the satisfaction
of the Waterloo Region District School Board to ensure that it, too, meets the grades of adjacent lots/blocks;

7. That the Owner agrees to erect a fence in accordance with required municipal zoning and/or planning guidelines, and where none exist, erect a fence to WRDSB standards. The fence shall be located along the School Site boundaries as determined by the Waterloo Region District School Board and shall be erected at such time as the adjacent development proceeds;

8. That the Owner obtains written permission from the Waterloo Region District School Board prior to placing any fill on the School Site;

9. That if, prior to final approval, the Waterloo Region District School Board has elected to waive its interest in the School Site, the Waterloo Catholic District School Board, Conseil Scolaire Viamonde, and/or Conseil Scolaire Catholique MonAvenir shall also have the opportunity to acquire the School Site, subject to the same terms and conditions of approval, unless it has given notification in writing that its interest in the School Site has similarly been waived;

10. That the City of Cambridge and prospective purchasers of property within the Plan be advised that, notwithstanding the designation of a School Site, there can be no assurance as to the timing of new school construction nor a guarantee that elementary school accommodation will be provided within the subject Plan;

11. That the Owner supply, erect and maintain a sign (at the Owner’s expense and according to the Waterloo Region District School Board’s specifications) affixed to the permanent development sign for the Plan advising prospective residents that students may be directed to schools outside the neighbourhood(s) within the Plan;

12. That the Owner agrees in the Subdivision Agreement/Condo Declarations to notify all purchasers of residential units and/or renters of same, by inserting the following clauses in all offers of Purchase and Sale/Lease:

   a) Whereas the Waterloo Region District School Board has
designated this subdivision as a Development Area for the purposes of school accommodation, and despite the best efforts of the Waterloo Region District School Board, sufficient accommodation may not be available for all anticipated students. You are hereby notified that students may be accommodated in temporary facilities and/or bussed to a school outside the area, and further, that students may, in future, be transferred to another school. For information on which schools currently serve this area, contact the WRDSB Planning Department at 519-570-0003 ext. 4419, or email planning@wrdsb.ca. Information from any other source cannot be guaranteed to reflect current school assignment information.

b) “That the designated School Site represents a potential site and that other land uses may result if the relevant school board determines that a school will not be required”;

c) “In order to limit liability, public school buses operated by the Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region (STSWR), or its assigns or successors, will not travel on privately owned or maintained right-of-ways to pick up students, and potential busing students will be required to meet the bus at a congregated bus pick-up point”;

13. That, in cases where Agreements of Purchase and Sale have already been executed, the Owner sends a letter to all purchasers, including the above statements;

14. That all proposed pedestrian facilities be secured by letters of credit or other municipal agreements to ensure that installation occurs prior to demand (i.e., hard-surfaced municipally maintained pedestrian walks);

15. That prior to final approval, Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region be contacted to provide any relevant comments on transportation requirements, including school vehicle routes and infrastructure needs (including pedestrian facilities) and requests for school travel plans to area schools;
16. That the Waterloo Region District School Board shall advise the Approval Authority that these conditions have been met to its satisfaction. The clearance letter shall include a brief statement detailing how each condition has been satisfied or carried out.

Please be advised that any development on the subject lands is subject to the provisions of the Waterloo Region District School Board’s Education Development Charges By-law 2021 as amended, or any successor thereof, and may require the payment of Education Development Charges for these developments prior to issuance of a building permit.

The WRDSB reserves the right to comment further on this application at the time of re-submission. If you have any questions about the comments provided, please contact Sarah Galliher, Senior Planner.

**Waterloo Catholic District School Board**

**Contact:** WCDSB Planners  
**Phone:** (519) 578-3677  
**Email:** planning@wcdsb.ca

**WCDSB Action Items**

That any Education Development Charges shall be collected prior to the issuance of a building permit(s).

That the developer and the Waterloo Catholic District School Board reach an agreement regarding the supply and erection of a sign (at the developer’s expense and according to the Board’s specifications) affixed to the development sign advising prospective residents about schools in the area. A sign specifications document can be found at the bottom of the board’s planning department web page ([https://www.wcdsb.ca/aboutus/cs/planning](https://www.wcdsb.ca/aboutus/cs/planning)).

That the developer shall include the following wording in the subdivision
agreement/site plan agreement/future condominium declaration to advise all purchasers of residential units and/or renters of same: “In order to limit risks, public school buses contracted by Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region (STSWR), or its assigns or successors, will not travel on privately owned or maintained right-of-ways to pick up and drop off students, and so bussed students will be required to meet the bus at a congregated bus pick-up point.”

**WCDSB Comments**

Further to the WCDSB's pre-consultation comments on the development of the subject property, the board remains concerned about the leap frogging of development which 65 Ripplewood Road would create. The subdivision to the south has already resulted in the development of a disconnected community with insufficient connections to future public service facilities. The WCDSB's comments with regard to connected communities should only be read as encouraging an urban fabric and phasing of development which is intended to provide for a logical extension roads and access to services, and not be construed as rationalizing or detracting from another board's interest in meeting future accommodation demands given the unique nature of each board's needs.

We continue to encourage the City to secure the extension of Wesley Boulevard to connect this area to ensure an active transportation route is available for future elementary students to the WCDSB's new Catholic elementary school. It is our understanding that there may be a partial extension of the East Boundary Road to connect at Wesley Boulevard or just beyond to provide access to the recreation complex. This could create a further opportunity to ensure another means of access to the 65 Ripplewood and 20 Ripplewood plans.

We would continue to ask the Wesley Boulevard/Attwater Drive extension and the proposed n/s collector incorporate bike lanes and a separated multi-use pathway consistent with the Wesley Boulevard cross section designed through the Bosdale subdivision. All roads should have sidewalk on both sides.

It is unclear how wide the Ripplewood Road and Vanier Drive pavement will be from the drawings accompanying the FSR or the turning radii provided at those intersections with existing and future roads on the subject property. To ensure that the subject property can be adequately serviced by Student Transportation...
Services of Waterloo Region, please provide confirming in writing that, in absence of a full 20m ROW connection at Attwater Drive, that the historically rural cross-section roads will accommodate full size yellow school buses.

Ministry of Transportation

Contact: Jeremiah Johnston
Phone: (519) 873-4580
Email: Jeremiah.Johnston@ontario.ca

Comments not yet provided – will be provided through review of draft plan of subdivision.
Jacqueline Hannemann, Senior Planner  
Planning Services Department  
City of Cambridge  
50 Dickson Street, P.O. Box 669  
Cambridge, ON, N1R 5W8

Dear Ms. Hannemann:

Re: POST CIRCULATION COMMENTS

Zoning By-law Amendment Applications R16/23  
Powerplay Equity Capital Ltd. / GSP Group  
65 and 105 Ripplewood Road  
CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

The Region of Waterloo has prepared the following comments regarding the proposed zoning by-law amendment affecting 65 and 105 Ripplewood Rd in response to the circulation received in November 2023.

Powerplay Equity Capital Ltd. is proposing to amend the zoning that applies to the lands to permit townhouse dwellings on several blocks as well as modify provisions regarding setbacks. The Zoning Bylaw Amendment has been submitted in conjunction with a Draft Plan of Subdivision application 30T-23104. The proposed application will facilitate the development of 752 residential units with 278 single detached dwellings and 474 townhouse units (combination of street townhouses and cluster townhouses), as well as several open space blocks for parks and to protect wetlands.

The lands are within the Urban Area of the City of Cambridge and designated ‘Urban Designated Greenfield Area’ as illustrated on Map 2 in the Regional Official Plan (ROP).

The subject lands are designated Low/Medium Density Residential with some areas designated Open Space where there are significant environmental features in the City of Cambridge Official Plan. The lands are currently zoned (H)R4 which permits predominantly single detached dwellings and a small portion zoned M7 – Industrial subject to special provisions in Section 4.1.15.
REGIONAL COMMENTS
Regional staff have reviewed the application for consistency with the Provincial Policy Statement, the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan) as well as conformity with the Regional Official Plan (ROP) and offer the following comments:

Community Planning

Provincial Policy Statement
The Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 (PPS) promotes building strong, healthy communities by encouraging the development of liveable and resilient neighbourhoods that protect the environment, public health and safety of Ontarians. Settlement areas are intended to accommodate the majority of growth within the province and provide a range of development opportunities to efficiently use under-utilized sites. The proposed application is consistent with the PPS.

A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe
The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan) prescribes minimum density targets for each municipality to achieve regarding residents and jobs per hectare. The proposed amendment will result in a greater residential density within the subdivision by allowing townhouse development in addition to single detached dwellings, which will contribute to the achievement of Growth Plan density target of 50 residents and jobs combined per hectare. The proposed application conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

Regional Official Plan (ROP)
As noted above, the subject lands are within the ‘Designated Greenfield Area’ as illustrated on Map 2 in the ROP. Designated Greenfield areas within the City of Cambridge are required to meet or exceed a minimum density of 59 residents and jobs per hectare. The Planning Justification Report entitled, “Planning Justification Report | Powerplay North Subdivision, Ripplewood Road” prepared by GSP Group and dated August 2023 notes that the proposed amendment will help achieve the minimum requirement of 59 residents and jobs per hectare with a proposed density of 62.2 residents per hectare. The proposed zoning by-law amendment would permit 752 dwelling units, where 278 dwelling units would be single detached dwellings and the remaining 474 units would be a combination of street townhouses and cluster townhouses.

ROP policy 2.G.1.2 notes that the Region and area municipalities will ensure that designated greenfield areas will prioritize active transportation by “establishing a network of continuous sidewalks, trails and bicycle lanes that provide direct, safe, comfortable and well maintained access to a variety of destinations for people of all ages and abilities and at all times of the year” as well as promoting compact built form and using a complete streets approach.
The amendment proposes to include 2 park blocks and several open space blocks to protect natural features and trail linkages are proposed for ease of access to the parks and open spaces. The amendment has oriented the townhouses blocks to be along the streets planned to connect to surrounding subdivisions while single detached blocks are oriented towards the outer streets and cul-de-sacs. This configuration could contribute to transit supportive development if transit services were to be extended to the area in the future.

The proposed amendment generally achieves the policy goals of ROP section 2.G.1.2 b), c), d), g) and i) as well as the density targets for designated greenfield areas set out in Table 4.

The ROP contains policies in Chapter 7 relating to the Greenlands Network which aim to ensure protection of environmental features, ecological functions of the Greenlands Network and species at risk. The subject site contains multiple Provincially Significant Wetlands and unevaluated wetlands. An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) has been completed for the proposed development, further commentary on the EIS peer review is included below. The EIS has not sufficiently addressed policies contained in Chapter 7 and requires revision before regional staff can assure the development is in conformity with the applicable policies in the ROP.

The Region will prepare and issue separate post-circulation comments letter regarding the Plan of Subdivision Application 30T-23104.

Regional Official Plan Amendment 6 (ROPA 6)
On August 18th, 2022, the Regional Municipality of Waterloo adopted ROP Amendment number 6 (ROPA 6), which came into force and effect upon approval by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing on April 11, 2023.

Key objectives contained within the amendment include a new approach to accommodate the forecasted growth within 15-minute neighbourhoods, which are compact, well-connected places where the every day needs of residents for goods, services and employment can be met. A well-designed 15-minute neighbourhood will contain a mix of land uses that provide for a variety of incomes and household sizes. The development densities will support a range of services and high quality public spaces. These policies also apply to designated greenfield areas to ensure that new neighbourhoods enable people reduce dependence on vehicle trips and are places that prioritize walking, cycling and transit.

Population and employment forecasts anticipate 214,900 people and 120,700 jobs within the City of Cambridge by 2051 and greenfield area developments are required to exceed a minimum density target of 59 residents and jobs per hectare of land as calculated using policy 2.G.1.3.

Additionally, a minimum target of 30 percent of new ownership and rental housing is to be affordable and accommodate a variety of housing options to address the needs of
range of income and household incomes, sizes and ages. All developments proposing residential uses utilizing 1 hectare or more of developable land are required to accommodate a minimum of 30% of the new residential units in forms other than single detached dwelling, semi-detached dwelling and single unit townhouse units. The Region will promote the inclusion of additional built forms including duplexes, triplexes, four-plexes, multiple dwellings and apartments. The proposed development includes several blocks of cluster townhouses for a total of approx. 392 units, equivalent to 52% of the overall units.

Housing

The following Regional policies and initiatives support the development and maintenance of affordable housing:

- Regional Strategic Plan 2023-2027
  - Strategic Priority 1 is “Homes for All”.
- 10-Year Housing and Homelessness Plan
  - contains an affordable housing target which is that 30% of all new residential development between 2019 and 2041 in Waterloo Region is to be affordable to low and moderate income households.
- Building Better Futures Framework
  - shows how the Region plans to create 2,500 units of housing affordable to people with low to moderate incomes by 2025.
- Region of Waterloo Official Plan
  - Section 3.A (Range and Mix of Housing) contains land use policies that ensure the provision of a full and diverse range and mix of permanent housing that is safe, affordable, of adequate size, and meets the accessibility requirements of all residents.

The Region supports the provision of a full range of housing options, including affordable housing. The Planning Justification Report indicates that the intention is to provide a per-door affordable housing contribution to the City of Cambridge, which will aid in the provision of new affordable units.

Staff recommend considering other ways of providing a mix of housing types on the site, such as secondary dwelling units within or accessory to the proposed single detached dwellings.

Policy 3.A.6 in the Regional Official Plan Amendment 6 applies to this site. It states:

“Where a development application proposing residential uses is submitted for a site containing one hectare or more of developable land, the Region and the area municipalities will require, a minimum of 30 percent of new residential units to be planned in forms other than single-detached, semi-detached, and street fronting and single unit condominium townhouse units. Examples of other potential housing forms
may include, but are not limited to: duplexes; tri-plexes; four-plexes; multi-plexes; stacked and back-to-back townhouses; and apartments.”

Table 5 in the Planning Justification Report (copied below) indicates that 52% of the dwelling units will be in the form of cluster row house dwellings. A clustered row house in the City of Cambridge zoning by-law is defined as “a group of three or more attached one family dwelling units all of which are held in single ownership or by participants in a condominium corporation or housing cooperative and so located on a lot that each dwelling may not have frontage on a public street or highway”. Thus the Draft Plan of Subdivision indicates that this proposal adheres to Policy 3.A.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Land Use</th>
<th>Lot/Block numbers</th>
<th>Number of dwelling units</th>
<th>Area of proposed use [ha]</th>
<th>Density [units/ha]</th>
<th>Number of parking spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single detached dwellings</td>
<td>1–278</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear row house (street townhouse) dwellings</td>
<td>279–282</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster row house (condominium townhouse) dwellings</td>
<td>283–286</td>
<td>±392</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>±40.0</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordability**

For the purposes of evaluating the affordability of an ownership unit, based on the definition in the Regional Official Plan, the purchase price is compared to the least expensive of:

| Housing for which the purchase price results in annual accommodation costs which do not exceed 30 percent of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households | $418,100 |
| Housing for which the purchase price is at least 10 percent below the average purchase price of a resale unit in the regional market area | $679,300 |

*Based on the most recent information available from the PPS Housing Tables (2022).

In order for an owned unit to be deemed affordable, the maximum affordable house price is $418,100.
For the purposes of evaluating the affordability of a rental unit, based on the definition of affordable housing in the Regional Official Plan, the average rent is compared to the least expensive of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A unit for which the rent does not exceed 30 per cent of the gross annual household income for low and moderate income renter households</td>
<td>$1,960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A unit for which the rent is at or below the average market rent (AMR) in the regional market area | Bachelor: $1,075  
                  1-Bedroom: $1,245  
                  2-Bedroom: $1,469  
                  3-Bedroom: $1,631  
                  4+ Bedroom: n/a |

*Based on the most recent information available from the PPS Housing Tables (2022)*

In order for a rental unit to be deemed affordable, the average rent for the proposed units must be at or below the average market rent in the regional market area as shown above.

**Environmental Threats/Record of Site Condition**

Phase 1 and 2 Environmental Site Assessments have been completed for the site indicating there is known environmental contamination on the site. As a sensitive land use has been proposed on the subject lands, a Record of Site Condition and Ministry Acknowledgement letter are required for the entirety of the subject lands in accordance with the Region of Waterloo’s Implementation Guideline for the Review of Development Applications on or Adjacent to Known and Potentially Contaminated Sites.

The Record of Site Condition and Ministry Acknowledgement Letter were not received as part of the Complete Application for the Zoning By-law Amendment and as a result, **the Region shall require a Holding Provision to be implemented as part of the Zoning By-law Amendment. The Holding Provision shall prohibit the proposed development until the submission of the RSC and the Ministry’s Acknowledgement Letter have been received to the satisfaction of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo.** The following wording is required for the holding provision:

*That a holding provision shall apply to the entirety of the subject lands until a Record of Site Condition (RSC) in accordance with O. Reg. 153/04, as amended, has been filed on the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) Environmental Site Registry and the RSC and Ministry’s Acknowledgement letter is received to the satisfaction of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo.*

**Hydrogeology and Water Services**

Hydrogeology and Water Programs (HWP) reviewed the Functional Servicing and Hydrogeological Report as part of the zoning by law amendment for 65 to 105
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Ripplewood Rd, Cambridge. HWP finds these reports satisfactory for the subject property.

Regional staff require a prohibition on geothermal energy to be written into the zoning by-law. The required wording for the prohibition is:

*Geothermal Wells are prohibited on site. A geothermal well is defined as a vertical well, borehole or pipe installation used for geothermal systems, ground-source heat pump systems, geo-exchange systems or earth energy systems for heating or cooling; including open-loop and closed-loop vertical borehole systems. A geothermal well does not include a horizontal system where construction or excavation occurs to depths less than five meters unless the protective geologic layers overlaying a vulnerable aquifer have been removed through construction or excavation.*

In addition, as a condition of draft approval for the related draft plan of subdivision application, Regional staff with require that the developer enter into an agreement to complete Salt Management Plan (SMP), to the satisfaction of the Region, as part of a future Site Plan application.

**Noise Study Peer Review**

The Region obtained a third-party to conduct a peer review of the noise study submitted titled Environmental Noise Assessment Vanier Drive & Ripplewood Road prepared by Valcoastics Canada Ltd. dated July 27, 2023. The peer review identified several revisions and/or clarifications required to the noise study before the noise study can be accepted by the Region. A copy of the peer review comments have been attached to this letter. A revised Noise Study, to the satisfaction of the Region will be required prior to City of Cambridge Council considering the Zoning Bylaw Amendment application.

**Environmental Impact Study**

The Region obtained a third-party to conduct a peer review of the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) titled Powerplay North Scoped EIS prepared by Dougan & Associates Ecological Consulting & Design dated August 28, 2023 which was submitted in support of the Zoning Bylaw Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision application. The peer review comments identified several revisions and/or clarifications required to the Environmental Impact Study before the study can be accepted by the Region. A revised EIS, to the satisfaction of the Region will be required prior to City of Cambridge Council considering the Zoning Bylaw Amendment application.

**Risk Management/Part 4 Area of the Clean Water Act**

Please be advised that the Section 59 Notices submitted with the application are invalid and Regional staff are working with the applicant to obtain an updated Risk Management Plan and Valid Section 59 Notices for each of the properties. This must be completed before City of Cambridge Council considers the applications.

Document Number: 4525841  Version: 1
Fees:

Regional staff acknowledge receipt of the Zoning By-law Amendment review fee of $3,000. Payment of the peer review fees is still outstanding, peer review fees are $4600 + HST for the EIS and $4500 + HST for the Noise Study. Additionally, resubmission review fees will apply to both the Noise Study and EIS, the EIS resubmission peer review fee is $2300 + HST (50% of the original fee). Payment will be required prior to consideration of draft plan approval.

Conclusions:

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo will require revision and resubmission of the following items prior to City of Cambridge Council considering the application:

1. Complete a Provisional Risk Management Plan to the satisfaction of the Region’s Risk Management Official and submit a valid s.59 notice to the Region.

2. Submit a revised Noise Study to address revisions and clarifications noted in the peer review comments.

3. Submit a revised Environmental Impact Study to address revisions and clarifications noted in the peer review comments.

Once the above items have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, the following shall be implemented within the site-specific Zoning By-law Amendment to the satisfaction of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:

1. The implementation of a holding provision to obtain a Record of Site Condition and Ministry Acknowledgement Letter for the entirety of the subject lands. The required wording for the holding provision is:

   That a holding provision shall apply to the entirety of the subject lands until a Record of Site Condition (RSC) in accordance with O. Reg. 153/04, as amended, has been filed on the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) Environmental Site Registry and the RSC and Ministry’s Acknowledgement letter is received to the satisfaction of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo.

2. Regional staff require a prohibition on geothermal energy to be written into the zoning by-law. The required wording for the prohibition is:

   Geothermal Wells are prohibited on site. A geothermal well is defined as a vertical well, borehole or pipe installation used for geothermal systems, ground-source heat pump systems, geo-exchange systems or earth energy systems for heating or cooling; including open-loop and closed-loop vertical borehole systems. A geothermal well does not include a horizontal system where construction or excavation occurs to depths less than five meters unless the
protective geologic layers overlaying a vulnerable aquifer have been removed through construction or excavation.

**Next Steps**

Any issuance of a building permit for future development on this property will be subject to provisions of Regional Development Charge By-law 19-037 or any successor thereof.

Please accept this letter as the Region of Waterloo's request for a copy of the staff report, decision and minutes pertaining the above-noted application.

The Region is in receipt of an application for draft plan of subdivision which will be circulated upon being deemed complete and the Region will issue separate post-circulation comments on the draft plan of subdivision at a later date.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Janine Fletcher, BES
Senior Planner

cc. Brandon Flewwelling, GSP Group
November 24, 2023

Janine Fletcher
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 8th Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
jfletcher@regionofwaterloo.ca

Re: Peer Review – Noise
65 & 105 Ripplewood Road, Cambridge
RWDI Reference No. 2300540.34

Dear Janine,

The Region of Waterloo has retained RWDI to conduct a peer review of a Noise Study for the proposed development located at 65 & 105 Ripplewood Road in Cambridge, as part of a Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision application. The applicant is proposing 278 single detached lots, 8 blocks for townhouse development, 2 parks, 5 stormwater management ponds, and open space/wooded lots. The review considered the Valcoustics (VCL) report titled “Environmental Noise Assessment, Vanier Drive and Ripplewood Road, Proposed Residential Development, Cambridge, Ontario”, Valcoustics file 121-0388, and dated July 27, 2023 (Noise Study). The report is version 2.0, which was prepared to address changes to the Draft Plan of Subdivision, the latest grading plan, transportation impact study and sample floor plan/elevation drawings.

This review reflects best practices for land-use planning, as well as guidelines and policies mandated by the Regional Municipality of Waterloo (RMOW) and, where applicable, the Province of Ontario. Where differences in guidance may exist, the RMOW has provided direct guidance to this peer reviewer on their expectations. In all cases, the direction and policies of the RMOW take precedence. Comments requiring action by the applicant are highlighted throughout this document for ease of identification.

Assessment Approach

1. The Noise Study reviews the potential sources of environmental noise in the area.
   a. Road traffic noise from the following:
      i. existing roadways surrounding the development, including Main Street, Dundas Street and Shellard Side Road;
      ii. future roadways surrounding the development, including East Boundary Road and Wesely Boulevard; and
      iii. future Street A, within the development.

   The assessment of the above roads is considered appropriate.
b. Offsite stationary sources were assessed from surrounding industrial facilities, including Cambridge Auto Parts & Wreckers, A&P Auto Wreckers, Millennium Recycling and Bomet Recycling Inc, which is considered appropriate.

2. Noise assessment guidance and limits are cited from Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) publication NPC-300 in the Noise Study. The Region has developed and published local guidance. Since the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Noise Policy Implementation Guideline has some variation from NPC-300, this published local guidance would be applicable in preference to the MECP guidance where there are differences. In general, these variations are minor and have no effect on the technical analysis as the criteria are the same, and application of NPC-300 is considered appropriate. Regardless, reference to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Noise Policy is required to be included in revisions or addendums to the Noise Study.

3. The submission package includes the declaration statements for the Consultant and Owner, as required by the Region. The Consultant's Declaration Statement is required to be commissioned by a Commissioner of Oaths (or notarized by a Notary Public).

**Surface Transportation Noise**

4. Indoor sound level limits for road traffic noise are summarized in Section 2.2 of the Noise Study, which appropriately align with the guidance documents for roadway noise.

5. Road traffic noise is evaluated at 8 locations within the proposed development, which includes:
   a. Lot 60 West Façade
   b. Lot 60 OLA
   c. Lot 61 South Façade
   d. Lot 26 West Façade
   e. Lot 26 OLA
   f. Block 284 Northwest Corner, North Façade
   g. Block 284 Northeast Corner, North Façade
   h. Block 284 Southwest Corner, South Façade

The above locations are considered appropriate representations of impacts for the development.

6. LRT noise was excluded from the assessment, as the separation distance is approximately 3 km. This exclusion is considered appropriate.

7. Façade Sound Levels
   a. An assessment of façade sound levels was completed based on a receptor height of 4.5 m for single detached homes and 7.5 m for townhouse blocks, which is considered acceptable.
b. Single detached home facades were assessed based on a separation distance of 15 m from the Street A centreline, which is considered appropriate based on the lot lines alone.

c. Façade levels within blocks of townhouses were also assessed based on a 15 m separation distance from the closest roadway centreline which is considered acceptable, as block layouts were not available at the time of the assessment. **Once block layouts are available, a revised assessment is recommended.**

8. OLAs were assessed as follows:
   a. Single detached home rear yard of lot 60 was assessed at a distance of 21 m from the Street A centreline, which is considered appropriate as a representative receptor for the worst-case lots with side-exposure to Street A.
   
   b. An assessment of townhouse OLAs was not completed, as block layouts were not available. This is considered appropriate at this stage of the development plans. It’s noted that a conservative assumption on rear yard location along the roadway could be assessed to determine preliminary barrier requirements.

9. Road Data is summarized in **Table 1** of the Noise Study.
   a. The future road traffic information for Main Street was provided by the Region. The data remains valid at this time.
   
   b. Future Main Street traffic volumes were extrapolated to the year 2033, based on a 2% annual growth rate. Growth for the additional 2 yrs is considered acceptable. However, on review of the RMOW data, a 3.1% growth rate would result in the 2031 traffic volumes. Future revisions/submissions are required to correct this inconsistency and apply an annual growth rate of 3.1%, or provide a justification for the applied 2%.
   
   c. Shellard Side Road was excluded from the transportation assessment. Although acceptable, justification should be included in future revisions/submissions of the Noise Study to support the exclusion.
   
   d. Traffic data from other sources:
      i. Roadway Volumes
         1. East Boundary Road traffic data was obtained from Transportation Impact Study (TIS), completed for the development. The higher of the TIS and RMOW data was applied in this assessment, which is considered acceptable.
         
         2. Wesley Boulevard and Street A volumes were obtained from the TIS, which is considered acceptable, in the absence of data from the RMOW.
         
         3. Dundas Street ultimate traffic data was obtained from the MTO and applied as the SADT, which is considered acceptable.
4. Future year 2038 data was applied for the East Boundary Road, Wesley Boulevard and Street A, which is considered conservative and acceptable.

ii. Truck percentages
   1. East Boundary Road truck percentages were applied based on the RMOW data provided, which is considered appropriate.
   2. Truck percentages for Wesley Boulevard and Street A were assumed to be 3%/2% for medium/heavy trucks, without a justification. Although considered reasonable, future revisions to the report are required to include a justification for the assumed truck percentages.
   3. Dundas Street medium/heavy truck breakdown was assumed to be 60%/40% of the overall truck percentage, which is considered an appropriate default for highways.

iii. The Daytime/Night-time split
   1. Application of 90%/10% for East Boundary Road, Wesely Boulevard and Street A are considered appropriate.
   2. The daytime/night-time split of 85%/15% for Dundas Street is considered appropriate for a highway.

iv. Speed limits applied:
   1. Main Street, East Boundary Road and Dundas Street speed limits are consistent with the RMOW data provided.
   2. Wesley Boulevard and Street A speed limits are assumed, as indicated in the Table 1 notes. Although reasonable, the speed limits are expected to be available in the TIS completed for the project, and are required to be confirmed. If speed limits are identified to differ, future revisions/submissions of the Noise Study are required to apply the TIS speed limits.

10. Modelling of road traffic noise was completed using the STAMSON software package. The following is noted:
   a. One sample calculation is provided for the Block 284 townhouse, northeast corner.
   b. The calculations include impacts from the worst-case roads (Wesely Boulevard and Street A) and is considered acceptable.
   c. Road traffic data (volumes, speeds, truck percentages, etc.) for all roadways align with the data applied.
   d. Modelled source-receiver-distances were assumed and considered to be acceptable, as the block layouts were not available at the time of the assessment.
   e. Reflective ground was applied in the noise modelling, which is considered conservative and acceptable.
f. A flat-gently slope topography was applied and considered appropriate.
g. An acoustic barrier requirement is outlined in Section 2.4.2 of the Noise Study. As barrier modelling is not covered in the Noise Study sample calculation, an additional sample calculation is required to cover this condition for future submissions/revisions.

11. Grading plans are referenced in the Noise Study. As a copy of the grading plans were not provided, the application of grading could not be confirmed. Regardless, topography is not expected to be a significant factor in the transportation noise modelling for the area as the lands appear to be generally flat from available internet imagery. Future submissions/revisions to the Noise Study are required to include reference drawings that are applicable to the noise modelling.

12. Inherent screening of each building was included in the assessment, with other development buildings and surrounding buildings excluded. This approach is considered appropriate.

13. Table 2 summarizes the transportation modelling results for all predicted locations of facades and OLAs. As the sample STAMSON file is for the northeast corner of Block 284 only, a review could not be completed for all results. Regardless, all results seem reasonable.

14. Architectural elements were assessed based on sample floor plans and elevations drawings. As a copy of the floor plans and elevation drawings were not included in the report, the worst-case wall/window to floor areas could not be confirmed. Regardless, the assumed percentages are considered reasonable. Future revisions/submissions are required to include a copy of referenced drawings.

15. The Noise Study indicates minimum requirements of OBC construction is anticipated to be sufficient. Although a reasonable conclusion, additional discussion on the calculation methods are required to support the recommendation as the predicted sound levels along Wesely Boulevard are 66 dBA and triggers an in-room assessment.

16. The final sound isolation requirements are recommended to be reviewed when architectural drawings are further developed. This recommendation is considered appropriate.

17. Ventilation requirements are summarized in Section 2.4.1.2 Ventilation Requirements and Table 2 of the Noise study. The ventilation requirements are considered appropriate.

18. OLA Acoustic Barriers
    a. An L-shaped acoustic barrier, with height of 1.8 m is recommended for lots 1, 9 and 60, as outlined in Figure 2. As a STAMSON output file was not included in the Noise Study, a review could not be completed. Regardless, the barrier requirement is considered reasonable.
    b. The acoustic barriers construction requirements are outlined in Section 2.4.2 Outdoors of the Noise Study are considered appropriate.
    c. An assessment of noise impacts within outdoor amenity areas for townhouse block siding onto Street A and Wesley Boulevard (blocks 280, 281, and 283 to 285) is
recommended once block plans are available. This recommendation is considered appropriate.

19. Transportation Warning Clause Requirements are summarized in Table 3 for lots 10 to 25, 47 to 52, 58, 59, Lots 1,9 and 60, Townhouse buildings adjacent to Street A, and Townhouse buildings adjacent to Wesley Boulevard. Recommendations include Warning Clause A (NPC-300 Type B), Warning Clause B (NPC-300 Type D), Warning Clause C (NPC-300 Type C), and Warning Clause D (no NPC-300 equivalence). The warning clause recommendations are considered acceptable for these locations.

**Surrounding Stationary Source Noise**

20. The Noise Study initially identifies the development lands as a Class 3 (rural) area, which is considered appropriate. With the inclusion of the development and future road network, the Noise Study considers the development lands a Class 2 area, which is also considered appropriate.

21. The default NPC-300 Class 2 guideline limits were applied in the initial assessment, which is considered appropriate.

22. Eight receptors were included in the stationary analysis, covering 4 locations on the building façade and yard (OPOR), as outlined in Section 3.3 of the Noise study. The placement, number of receptors, and receptor heights are considered appropriate as worst-case locations.

23. Stationary noise sources with the potential for significant noise impacts on the development were identified as Cambridge Auto Parts & Wreckers, A&P Auto Wreckers, Millennium Recycling, and Bomet Recycling. This is considered appropriate for the surrounding area. Future revisions/submissions to the report should include a general discussion regarding the exclusion of other facilities typically considered to be significant noise sources, such as Cambridge Meat Packers (1678 Morrison Road) or Andex Kitchens & Custom Woodworking Inc (1661 Morrison Road), etc.

24. A summary of operations during the various times of day for each facility are summarized in Table 4 of the Noise Study.

a. Operations are based on site observations and discussions with Cambridge Auto Parts & Wreckers, which is considered appropriate.

b. For all other facilities, operations were determined based on-site observations, VCL experience with similar facilities, and review of available photography. The operations identified are considered acceptable.

c. Operations identified in Table 4 of the Noise Study are consistent with the End-of-Life EASR registration for Cambridge Auto Parts & Wreckers and A&P Auto Wreckers.
25. Source sound level data, modelling inputs (source types, operating times, etc.) are included in Appendix E of the Noise Study. On review, the reference sound levels and operating times are considered acceptable.

26. Sound level measurements were completed by VCL of the Cambridge Auto Parts & Wreckers operations. **A confirmation is required regarding noise measurements and completion in accordance with MECP NPC-102 Instrumentation and NPC-103 Procedures.** Future revisions/submissions of the Noise Study are required to include a discussion of measurements in relation to NPC-102 and NPC-103 documents. In addition, weather conditions during measurements are to be discussed in future revisions/submissions of the Noise Study.

27. **Confirmation is required to confirm annoyance characteristics (tonality or quasi-steady impulsive) are not applicable in the noise modelling.** Future revisions/submissions of the Noise Study are required to include a general discussion of NPC-104, and any applicability in the noise modelling.

28. The report completes an assessment based on the individual facility noise impacts. **An assessment of combined impacts from all facilities is required, based on the Region’s position to consider stationary source noise impacts cumulatively.**

29. Modelling was completed in the Cadna/A software package. The ISO 9613 sound propagation algorithms in Cadna/A are a suitable model.

30. Noise modelling parameters outlined in Section 3.5 of the Noise Study include ground absorption, reflection order, and grading, and considered generally appropriate. The following is noted:
   a. Reflection coefficients for the various buildings were not provided. **As the majority of buildings and fencing are expected to be constructed with metal siding, confirmation is required regarding application of the appropriate building reflection coefficients in the noise modelling.**
   b. A copy of the Grading Plan was not provided, and could not be reviewed. Prior to final review of noise control measures, a copy of the development grading plans are to be provided.
   c. Application of foliage for the wooded area is not considered appropriate for the entire forested area. Based on our experiences, foliage with a depth greater than 50 m was shown to provide no reduction in noise. **Additional justification is required, such as site pictures, showing sufficient density of the treed area to confirm the foliage adjustment is considered applicable.** Otherwise, foliage should be excluded as a worst-case assessment of impacts.

31. Class 2 limits are currently predicted to be met in the Noise Study, including a 9 m high acoustic barrier and an 11 m high acoustic barrier. Such acoustic barrier heights will be challenging and while they can be constructed, they may not be appropriate.
32. Based on the acoustic barrier height requirements, a Class 4 area designation was considered in the Noise Study. However, the Noise Study only considered the impracticality of the acoustic barrier as a justification for a Class 4 area designation. Although a Class 4 area designation can be considered applicable in this situation, additional support is required to confirm the Class 2 area limits cannot be met with a reasonable effort/cost. This may include, but is not limited to the following:

   a. Increasing set back distances between the single detached homes/townhouses to the industries to provide a buffer zone for noise are to be considered. Alternatively, a justification is required regarding the infeasibility of separating the industries with the use of landscaped areas and/or stormwater management ponds, or other non-noise sensitive uses.

   b. Site layout arrangement with the consideration of blank façade townhouse blocks acting as a barrier for the remainder of the development are to be discussed.

   c. Industry specific considerations to reduce noise impacts are to be considered. The crusher appears to be the dominant noise source contributing to the excess. As source specific noise controls are generally preferred and Cambridge Auto Parts & Wreckers is engaged, a discussion on possible options to control noise at the source is required. Items to be covered include, but are not limited to individual and combination of the following:

      i. re-location of the crusher further from the development;

      ii. feasibility/infeasibility of any noise controls, including the possibility of localized barriers for the crusher operations;

      iii. practicality/impracticality of enclosing the crushing operations;

      iv. quieter equipment or process alternatives to crushing; and/or

      v. applicability of a property line barrier for the Cambridge Auto Parts & Wreckers site.

33. It's strongly recommended that Cambridge Auto Parts & Wreckers be fully engaged, as construction of this development will likely impact their MECP End-of-Life Vehicle EASR registration (Registration No, R-007-4666860942).

Conclusions

34. The report provides no specific concluding statement concerning feasibility of the development. A concluding statement regarding feasibility of the development is needed.

35. Future submission/revisions to the Noise Study are required to include a brief summary of the requirements for feasibility, in particular, the Class 4 Area designation.
Summary

The environmental noise study provided for the 65 & 105 Ripplewood Road development in Cambridge presents an assessment for roadway transportation noise and surrounding stationary noise sources, with a consideration for a Class 4 area designation to address industry noise. The Region of Waterloo seeks assurance that the sound levels and impacts are accurate and complete. Comments provided in this review have the potential to change the outcomes and conclusions of the Noise Study. Revised analysis, additional information, clarification and supporting justification is required. Key items with the potential to affect the results and conclusions of the Noise Study include the following:

- An assessment of combined stationary noise impacts from all facilities is required, based on the Region's position to consider stationary source noise impacts cumulatively.
- Confirmation annoyance penalties are not applicable to the noise modelling.
- Further analysis and support is required to confirm Class 2 limits cannot be met with reasonable effort/cost or changes to the development design, and Class 4 is the best option forward.
- It's strongly recommended that Cambridge Auto Parts & Wreckers be fully engaged, as construction of this development will likely impact their MECP End-of-Life Vehicle EASR registration (Registration No, R-007-4666860942).

Without addressing these items, it is not possible to provide assurance that the values, results, and conclusions are reasonable.

As additional analysis and reporting is required for the Class 4 designation, a revised Noise Study or addendum is currently required.

Yours truly,

RWDI

Marcus Li, P.Eng.
Technical Director, Noise & Vibration
Statement of Limitations

This report entitled Peer Review – Noise, 65 &105 Ripplewood Road, Cambridge, dated November 24, 2023, was prepared by RWDI AIR Inc. (“RWDI”) for the Region of Waterloo (“Client”). The findings and conclusions presented in this report have been prepared for the Client and are specific to the peer review described herein (“Project”). The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based on the information available to RWDI when this report was prepared. Because the contents of this report may not reflect the final design of the Project or subsequent changes made after the date of this report, RWDI recommends that it be retained by Client during the final stages of the project to verify that the results and recommendations provided in this report have been correctly interpreted in the final design of the Project.

The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report have also been made for the specific purpose(s) set out herein. Should the Client or any other third party utilize the report and/or implement the conclusions and recommendations contained therein for any other purpose or project without the involvement of RWDI, the Client or such third party assumes any and all risk of any and all consequences arising from such use and RWDI accepts no responsibility for any liability, loss, or damage of any kind suffered by Client or any other third party arising therefrom.
Natural Heritage Review

Region of Waterloo

Item: Powerplay North Scoped EIS
LGL File: TA9369
Proposal Type: Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment
Location: City of Cambridge

Background

The proposed development is a Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment for approximately 600-700 new homes, commercial space, parks, stormwater management ponds, and open space.

An EIS was triggered due to the GRCA-regulated (Ontario Regulation 150/06) features on the subject lands, including portions of both the Moffat Creek Swamp and Sheffield Rockton Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) complexes and their regulated allowances. The subject lands also contain three smaller, unevaluated wetland areas and their regulated allowances.

Date of Review: November 22, 2023

LGL Scope of Review: Application Documents Reviewed
- Powerplay North EIS, August 28, 2023, Dougan & Associates
- Planning Justification Report, Powerplay North Subdivision, Ripplewood Road, August 2023, GSP Group

Additional Information Sources reviewed with the EIS and Planning Justification Report
- Google Earth Air Photography (image date 5/9/2023)
- MNRF NHIC database and mapping (November 2023, pers. Comm. November 15, 2023, to confirm specific record date/relevance to application)
- Region of Waterloo Official Plan 2015
- Region of Waterloo Greenlands Network Implementation Guideline 2016
- City of Cambridge Official Plan 2018
- Provincial Policy Statement 2020

Review Comments

1. The proposed Terms of Reference (ToR) provided a level of detail sufficient to proceed with an EIS/ZBA of this magnitude. It is unclear whether the ToR was approved by GRCA, Region and the City of Cambridge.

2. GRCA comments in response to the proposed Terms of Reference regarding the proposed 10 m buffer and its inadequacy of mitigating harmful effects does not seem to be addressed in the EIS. Please address to the satisfaction of GRCA.

3. The EIS seems to have omitted portions of the work plan proposed in the Terms of Reference; the limits of all wetlands and regional core features were not identified on site with representatives from the
GRCA and were not surveyed by a professional surveyor. Please coordinate GRCA review and endorsement of the boundaries of PSW's, particularly Polygon 12 and Polygons 2 and 4. Determine if a surface hydrologic connection exists between Polygon 12 and Polygon 9.

4. The EIS proposes removals of unevaluated wetland. These features should be assessed as per the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System (4th Edition, 2022) to determine if they are PSW or Core Environmental Features. The EIS refers to them as unevaluated and also as non-PSW – it is not clear if an assessment has been undertaken as per OWES. The ToR indicates OWES was applied to boundary delineation only.

5. The EIS would benefit from illustration of endorsed and labelled PSW boundaries. Page 3/Figure 2 - NHIC mapping identifies 5 Provincially Significant Wetlands. Page 11 of the EIS states “Provincial mapping indicates that Polygons 12, 13, 14, and 45 are components of Moffat Creek Swamp and Sheffield Rockton PSW”. Figure 2 illustrates PSW's with a different extent of wetlands shown in Map 1. If PSW limits have changed (from NHIC mapping) please confirm with MNRF that the limits of MNRF-evaluated wetlands have changed and provide correspondence.

6. In review of digitally available air photography (Google Earth, image date 5/9/2023) it appears that mapping on Map 1 might be inconsistent with site (wetland) conditions. For instance, does a MAM2 community exist between Polygon 12 and 9?

7. Page 2 - NHIC records have been provided in Table 1 but seem to exclude Eastern Meadowlark which is found in Atlas squares 17NJ6000 (subject property), 17NJ5900 (subject property), and several adjacent Atlas squares. NHIC has confirmed the record is dated 2020-04-20. Please assess the potential for Eastern Meadowlark to occur on the subject lands.

8. Page 2 of the EIS states “There is no suitable basking, movement, or foraging habitat on site” regarding Midland Painted Turtle, yet page 16 states “Turtle-Wintering Areas – Potential suitable habitat is present on site and adjacent lands to the east including Polygons 9, 12, and 45”, and Appendix F Species at Risk Screening states, in relation to Midland Painted Turtle “Potential suitable habitat within PSW/ESL and adjacent lands (Polygons 3, 12/13, 45). Please provide turtle habitat assessment of Polygon 9 and determine relation to Cambridge OP policy Section 3.A.4.6 and revise Appendix G, if warranted.

9. Polygon 9 should be assessed for fish habitat potential using active or passive capture techniques, and the result compared against Cambridge OP policy Section 3.A.4.6.

10. Page 8 of the EIS summarizes nocturnal amphibian calls but does not report on polygons 9/10 or 11. Please provide a summary of amphibian call surveys, call levels for each monitoring site and assessment of SWH.

11. Anuran calling shown on Table A-1, indicates the first visit at temperature 13C. This may have missed early calling frog species.
which are reported for the general area and may also indicate the potential for SWH. Note it is difficult to follow the results of the frog surveys, and the reviewer would benefit from a clear summary table that references monitoring stations shown on Map 1.

12. It is noted that salamander surveys were not undertaken for Jefferson salamander. Blue-spotted and Spotted salamander are also criteria species under the SWH framework. Please provide discussion or rational for potential habitat use on or adjacent to the site or elsewhere where suitable habitat may exist.

13. Page 17 assessment of suitable habitat for SAR bats excludes discussion of polygons 10 and 11. Based on tree resources reported in the arborist inventory, apparently suitable habitat may be present. As per MECP guidance for assessing habitat for SAR bats (2021 Survey Standard Note) “Ecological Land Classification (ELC) codes listed are meant to provide guidance, however any area with suitable roost trees should be considered potential maternity or day roost habitat”. It is further noted that trees less than 25cm DBH should be assessed.

14. Page 20 confirms that a portion of the site is part of the Beverly Environmentally Sensitive Landscape (ESL) and Core Environmental Feature, and that development or site alteration is generally not permitted within Core Features and only permitted within the ESL under certain conditions. How was the boundary of the ESL and CEFs determined. Have relevant reviewing agencies with jurisdiction accepted boundary delineations?

15. Map 1/Draft Plan Drawings - In review of Draft Plan drawings, it seems Polygon 19 may be partially removed to facilitate grading of Block 287. Is the adjacent offsite woodland considered Significant, and if so, has a buffer or edge management been considered to mitigate effects of site preparation?

16. Appendix I - The EIS suggests changes in hydrology, without mitigation, would be of permanent duration, moderate magnitude of impact, and ongoing frequency. Reduce site permeability and infiltration would be of permanent duration, high magnitude of impact, and ongoing frequency of impact. Section 2.2.4 suggests the infiltration deficit could be 39,491.3 m³/yr. It further states that runoff volumes are anticipated to increase by 127,887.3 m³/yr under post-development conditions. This seems to be a notable increase in runoff – will this result in prolonged inundation/flooding, changes to vegetation communities? Further, section 2.2.4.2 suggests the difference in ponding for North Wetland 1/Polygon 3/4 (stated to be relatively sensitive to hydrologic change) pre- vs post-development will be 17cm depth and an extra 24 days of ponding, and “the difference is somewhat significant”. If the difference is significant and the feature is sensitive to hydrologic change, additional mitigation should be explored to ensure no negative impacts will occur and ensure compliance with the PPS.
17. The “West Wetland 1” is expected to incur a decrease in runoff contribution of 592m$^3$/yr – will this result in a change in the wetland species?

18. The “South Wetland” is mentioned in Appendix I but doesn’t seem to appear illustrated in Map 1. Please provide mapping and assessment of the South Wetland.

19. ELC mapping of adjacent off-site habitats would help to determine whether proposed activities in/near Polygon 19 are appropriate to protect adjacent natural heritage features/ functions.

20. The reviewer would benefit from vascular plant list that reports plants according to the ELC community association.

21. The reviewer would benefit from clear mapping that depicts documented and newly identified information on the variety of natural heritage features, functions and designations where appropriate and identified, including Species at Risk habitat where identified. Environmental features on and continuous to the proposed site development should be mapped. Regionally significant species observations should be mapped.

22. The reviewer would benefit from a summary figure comparing with NHS constraints, buffer widths and draft plan components and any areas clearly illustrated where buffer encroachment is proposed, and whether restoration areas balance the encroachments.

23. A trail appears to be proposed through the 10m buffer of Polygon 14 (Block 293). Is there a possibility of redesigning the trail to the Enhancement Area adjacent to the 10m buffer to maximize distance between the trail and wetland?

24. Page 18 confirms that features qualify for Locally Significant Natural Area (LSNA), including Polygons 9, 10, 11, 22, 49, 47 yet development is proposed in some of these Polygons. Please provide discussion of how the policies for LSNA protection are addressed.

25. Additional detail is requested for wetland restoration. Other than tree/shrub planting, what is proposed?

26. Additional detail is requested regarding the linkage assessment within the property and exploring opportunities to link Core Environmental Features, as per the Greenlands Network Implementation Guideline.

27. Additional detail is requested for rationale for buffers and suitability to protect natural heritage features and functions, as per the Greenland Network Implementation Guideline. It appears some natural features are not afforded any buffer in the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision. As currently proposed, buffers are considered inadequate for some features, and completely absent for other features.

28. Has the EIS considered recommendations contained withing relevant planning documents for implementation? These may include: The Moffat Creek Watershed Plan and Comprehensive EIS (1996); The Southeast Galt Community Master Drainage Plan (1998); The Southeast Galt Community Servicing Study Class EA (1999); and The Southeast Galt Community Plan (1999; Revised 2005)?
**Key Review Concerns**

The draft plan layout is dependent on demonstration that there will be no negative impacts on natural heritage features/functions. Based on a review of available digital air photography and interpretation, it seems that some wetland communities or designated natural heritage features may not be adequately delineated or assessed. In addition, the Terms of Reference require that the City/GRCA endorse the wetland boundaries—this does not appear to have been completed.

Maintaining a hydrologic balance between pre- and post-development is integral to avoiding changes in wetland hydrology, vegetation type, and habitat function. The EIS suggests that there will be a significant difference in hydrology pre-/post-construction. To meet the test of relevant policy, the EIS needs to confirm that the proposed development will not have a negative effect on the natural heritage system, or redesign to meet that objective.

It is our recommendation that the EIS be updated to address deficiencies identified.
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

BY-LAW 24-001

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;

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 30th day of January 2024, 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 30th day of January 2024

_________________________________
MAYOR

_________________________________
CLERK