Corporation of the City of Cambridge
Council Meeting
Agenda

Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2024, 6:30 p.m.
Location: Council Chambers

To increase delegate accessibility, this meeting will be held as a hybrid meeting with both in-person and virtual attendance options. Register to appear as a delegation by visiting: https://forms.cambridge.ca/Delegation-Request-Form. Members of the public can choose to delegate in-person or by telephone. Alternative formats and communication supports are available upon request.

Closed Session will occur at 4:30 p.m.

Members of the public wishing to speak at Council may complete the Delegation Request Form no later than 12:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting for Council Meetings occurring at 6:30 p.m.

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

1. Meeting Called to Order
2. Indigenous Territory Acknowledgement
3. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest
4. Presentations
5. Delegations and Consideration of Related Reports
6. Closed Session
   That in accordance with section 239 (2) (d), (f), and (j) of the Municipal Act, 2001, Council to convene in Closed Session to consider the following subject matters:
   
   (d) labour relations or employee negotiations (Confidential Verbal Update re: Labour Relations);

   (f) advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose (Confidential Litigation Update) (Confidential Legal Opinion);
7. Rise from Closed Session

8. Consent Agenda
The Consent Agenda groups reports together that are of a routine nature and provides opportunity to vote on one motion rather than separate motions. However, Staff may not be in attendance to respond to queries on items contained in the Consent Agenda. Council Members wishing to pull an item from Consent Procedure should notify the City Clerk. Members will also have the opportunity to pull the item at the Meeting.

8.1 Council Information Package - April 5, 2024 4 - 56

9. Consideration of Reports

9.1 Corporate Services

9.1.1 24-021-CRS Integrity Commissioner Agreement Renewal 57 - 87

9.2 Corporate Enterprise

9.3 Community Development

9.3.1 24-053-CD – Addendum – Proposed Official Plan Amendment for Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan 88 - 269

9.3.2 24-042-CD 2024 Speed Management Program Action Plan 270 - 280

9.3.3 24-049-CD Black Bridge Road and CN Railway Crossing Agreements 281 - 301

9.3.4 24-052-CD City Owned Sites – Affordable Housing Concepts 302 - 381

9.3.5 24-028-CD Mill Race Park Pedestrian Bridge Replacement and Decommissioning 382 - 506

9.4 Infrastructure Services

9.5 Office of the City Manager

10. Other Business

11. Motions

11.1 Motion re: Leasing & Licensing Review
This Motion was introduced at the April 16, 2024, Council Meeting and will be discussed at the April 23, 2024, Council Meeting.

12. Notices of Motion

13. Correspondence

14. Motion to Receive and File

15. Consideration of By-laws

THAT the following by-laws listed under the heading of Introduction and Consideration of By-laws be enacted and passed:
• 24-038 Being a by-law of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge to adopt Amendment No. 65 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012), as amended with respect to the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan

16. Confirmatory By-law

17. Adjournment
# COUNCIL INFORMATION PACKAGE

**April 5, 2024**

**City of Cambridge Correspondence**

*includes City of Cambridge memos and meeting minutes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>Cambridge Cultural Awards Advisory Committee February 21, 2024 Meeting Minutes</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>Cambridge Accessibility Advisory Committee February 26, 2024 Meeting Minutes</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jurisdictional Motions**

*means a matter that lies within the scope of Council’s powers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Township of Terrace Bay</td>
<td>Expansion of the Life Span of Fire Apparatus</td>
<td>9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tay Valley Township</td>
<td>Expansion of the Life Span of Fire Apparatus</td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Owen Sound</td>
<td>Expansion of the Life Span of Fire Apparatus</td>
<td>13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Township of McMurrich/Monteith</td>
<td>Municipal Equipment Operator Course</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Township of Greater Madawaska</td>
<td>Funding for the 2024 Municipal Equipment Operator Course</td>
<td>16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Municipality of Huron Shores</td>
<td>Municipal Equipment Operator Course</td>
<td>18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Township of Terrace Bay</td>
<td>Occupational Health and Safety Act Definition of “Employer”</td>
<td>20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Township of Greater Madawaska</td>
<td>Occupational Health and Safety Act Definition of “Employer”</td>
<td>22-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Township of Terrace Bay</td>
<td>Social and Economic Prosperity Review</td>
<td>25-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Township of Adelaide Metcalfe</td>
<td>Request to Increase Tile Drain Loan Limit</td>
<td>27-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Township of Alnwick/Haldimand</td>
<td>Municipalities Retaining Surplus Proceeds from Tax Sales</td>
<td>29-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Township of Alnwick/Haldimand</td>
<td>Highway Traffic Act Amendments, Automated Speed Enforcement Systems</td>
<td>31-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Prince Edward County</td>
<td>Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA)</td>
<td>33-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Northumberland County</td>
<td>Ontario Works and Ontario Disability Support Program Finance Assistance Rates</td>
<td>35-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Township of Tay</td>
<td>Provincial Cemetery Management Support Request</td>
<td>41-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Township of Greater Madawaska</td>
<td>Cemetery Transfer/Abandonment Administration &amp; Management Support</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Township of McMurrich/Monteith</td>
<td>Cemetery Transfer/Abandonment Administration &amp; Management Support</td>
<td>44-53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Called to Order:
The meeting of the Cultural Awards Committee of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge was held by Zoom Video Conferencing. Evelina, Chair welcomed everyone present and called the meeting to order at 7:25 p.m.

Approval of Agenda
Moved by: Kellea Corriveau  
Seconded by: Bill Ashwell  
THAT the meeting agenda items be approved as presented.  
CARRIED

Disclosure of Interest
No disclosure of interest

Approval of Cultural Awards Committee Minutes – Wednesday January 17, 2024
Moved by: Paige Corriveau
Seconded by: Shannon McKinnon

THAT the minutes of the Cultural Awards Committee of Wednesday January 17, 2024, be approved.

CARRIED

Correspondence
No correspondence.

Treasurer’s Report
The treasurer’s report was shared, total trust fund amount is $68,493.22.

Bursary and Scholarships
Nancy received one bursary.

The March meeting will start approximately 20 minutes early to review bursary received, this meeting will be in person.

Business Arising from the minutes.

• Event:
Shannon shared her interview with Mike Farwell will be next Tuesday February 27.
A recording of the interview will be good.
Bill updated he has a few possibilities for sponsorship, he has contacted Waterloo airport centre but has not heard back.
Evelina will finalize the colour for the charcutier board for Juneyt and R. D.
Entertainment is not finalized.
Technology support is not finalized; Shannon will investigate this. (schools & colleges)
Paige will check with the church stage mgmt.
Nancy spoke with Bee Elegant/Four Father will share menu and answers regarding options for the food menu(platers), drinks, water coffee, tea, glassware.
Turks and Hobbit will be the entertainment $450.00.
Charcutier boards will be $60.00.
Discussion around free tickets, past winners who present awards receive a free ticket, this will be discussed at the meeting.

• Nominations (deadline is February 28)
Communications – 0
Literary - 1 (Also Nom for Heart of the Arts
Music - 2
Outstanding Youth - 0
Performing Arts - 3 (1 also Nom for the Heart of the Arts and 1 Nom for Heart of the Arts
Bill will gather information from newspapers/articles (Cambridge Today)

If the committee needs to extend the deadline, it will be extended the day before the deadline.

**New Business**
- **Selections meeting**
  Nomination meeting March 9, 9-12.

**City Updates**
No city updates.

**Other Business**
- Cambridge Studio Tour artist application deadline Feb. 28
- Cookies and Kids March 17, The Ben Show.
  The Arts Guild fund raiser is in June, called Art Attic which helps to subsidize Cookies and Kids performances.

**Next meeting:**
Wednesday, March 20, 7 P.M. Donaldson Room

**Close of Meeting**

Moved by: Kellea Corriveau

Seconded by: Bill Ashwell

**THAT** the Cultural Awards Advisory Committee meeting does now adjourn at 8:46pm

CARRIED

Chairperson-Evelina Turney
Recording Secretary-Zita Tavares
Committee Members in Attendance: Devin Sisak, Gary Racine, Sarah Dodds, Shannon Adshade, Sue Ricketts

Regrets: Michele Gilman, Barb Schutz

Staff Members in Attendance: Michael Oliveri, Council Committee Services Coordinator; Stephen Aboagye, Supervisor of Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Accessibility; Shane Taylor, Project Manager

Meeting Called to Order

The meeting of the Accessibility Advisory Committee of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge was held virtually via zoom. The meeting was called to order at 1:03 p.m. and the meeting adjourned at 2:26 p.m.

Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

There are no declarations of pecuniary interest.

Approval of November 27, 2023 Advisory Committee Minutes

Moved by: Gary Racine

Seconded by: Shannon Adshade

THAT the minutes of the November 27, 2023 Cambridge Accessibility Advisory Committee be approved.

Carried
6.1 Recreation Complex

Moved by: Gary Racine

Seconded by: Sue Ricketts

THAT the CAAC send correspondence to Council supporting staff’s proposal outlined in council report 24-012-CD Recreation Complex – Consultation Update, Washroom and Changeroom Design.

Carried

6.2 Langs Drive Redevelopment Project

Chair’s Report

Staff Liaison Update

Other Business

Adjournment

Moved by: Sue Ricketts

Seconded by: Gary Racine

THAT the Cambridge Accessibility Advisory Committee meeting of February 26, 2024 be adjourned at 2:26 pm.

CARRIED

Next Meeting:

Monday March 25, 2024, 1:00pm-3:00pm Zoom
If you require any accommodations to participate in this meeting, please email torresy@cambridge.ca

____________________________  ________________________________
Chair                           Council Committee Services Coordinator
Devin Sisak                     Michael Oliveri
WHEREAS the Council of Prince Edward County (PEC) passed the following resolution at their January 16, 2024 regular meeting:

WHEREAS By-Law 3256-2013, being a By-Law to Establish, Maintain, and Operate a Fire Department established service level standards for the Corporation of the County of Prince Edward Fire Department;

AND WHEREAS apparatus and equipment are directly tied to the delivery of fire protection services authorized by Council in By-Law 3256-2013, and a safe, reliable and diverse fleet is required to serve operational needs;

AND WHEREAS fire Apparatus is governed by industry best practices, the application of law and recognized industry partners, including the Ontario Fire Service Section 21 Guidance Notes, National Fire Protection Association Standards, The Occupational Health and Safety Act, and Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS);

AND WHEREAS Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) is a provider of data, underwriting, risk management and legal/regulatory services focusing on community fire-protection and fire prevention systems in Canada, establishing apparatus replacement schedules based on safety and risk mitigation practices;

AND WHEREAS on November 16, 2023, Council, received report FD-06-2023 regarding asset Management - Fire Apparatus Fleet Report and noted the budgetary pressures of meeting FUS replacement schedules;

AND WHEREAS no provincial funding is available for new fire trucks, yet, small and rural municipalities must meet the same standards set by FUS as larger municipalities for fire equipment, including additional pressure to move fire trucks out when they reach a specific age, even though they can still meet the safety regulations;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Corporation of Prince Edward County direct the Mayor to draft a letter to MPP Minister Todd Smith requesting a meeting to discuss the life span of fire apparatus, specifically pertaining to the replacement of fire trucks due to insurance requirements; and

THAT the Mayor draft a letter to FUS requesting the creation of a new community fire-protection and fire prevention insurance system that does not put all municipalities under the same umbrella, with distinct categories for rural and urban municipalities;
THAT this resolution be sent to Premier Doug Ford, the Honourable David Piccini, Minister of Labour, Immigration, Training and Skills Development, Paul Calandra, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing requesting a response on this matter within 30 days of receipt; and

THAT this resolution be shared with all 444 municipalities in Ontario, The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM), The Association of Municipalities Ontario (AMO), and The Eastern Ontario Wardens’ Caucus (EOWC).

AND WHEREAS the Township of Terrace Bay supports the resolution and initiative of Prince Edward County;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT this resolution of support be sent to Premier Doug Ford, the Honourable David Piccini, Minister of Labour, Immigration, Training and Skills Development, Paul Calandra, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing;

THAT this resolution of support be shared with all 444 municipalities in Ontario, The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM), The Association of Municipalities Ontario (AMO), The Eastern Ontario Wardens’ Caucus (EOWC) and, the Northwestern Ontario Municipal Association

☐ Carried ☐ Defeated ☐ Recorded Vote

Recorded Vote:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes /</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Paul Malashewski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Gary Adduono</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Chris Dube</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Bert Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Rick St. Louis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_________________________
Mayor
Resolution in Support of the Expansion of the Life Span of Fire Apparatus.

RESOLUTION #C-2024-03-20

MOVED BY: Korrine Jordan
SECONDED BY: Andrew Kendrick

“WHEREAS, the Council of the Corporation of Tay Valley Township support Prince Edward County’s resolution regarding Expansion of the Life Span of Fire Apparatus;

AND WHEREAS, By-Law No. 2012-042, being a By-Law to Establish and Regulate the Fire Department (Drummond/North Elmsley Tay Valley Fire Rescue) established service level standards for the Drummond/North Elmsley Tay Valley Fire Rescue;

AND WHEREAS, apparatus and equipment are directly tied to the delivery of fire protection services authorized by Council in By-Law No. 2012-042, and a safe, reliable and diverse fleet is required to serve operations needs;

AND WHEREAS, fire Apparatus is governed by industry best practices, the application of law and recognized industry partners, including the Ontario Fire Service Section 21 Guidance Notes, National Fire Protection Association Standards, The Occupational Health and Safety Act, and Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS);

AND WHEREAS, Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) is a provider of data, underwriting, risk management and legal/regulatory services focusing on community fire-protection and fire prevention systems in Canada, establishing apparatus replacement schedules based on safety and risk mitigation practices;

AND WHEREAS, no provincial funding is available for new fire trucks, yet, small and rural municipalities must meet the same standards set by FUS as larger municipalities for fire equipment, including additional pressure to move fire trucks out when they reach a specific age, even though they can still meet the safety regulations;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the Reeve send a letter to FUS requesting the creation of a new community fire-protection and fire prevention insurance system that does not put all municipalities under the same umbrella, with distinct categories for rural and urban municipalities;
THAT, this resolution be sent to Premier Doug Ford, the Honourable David Piccini, Minister of Labour, Immigration, Training and Skills Development, Paul Calandra, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing requesting a response on this matter within 30 days of receipt;

AND THAT, this resolution be shared with all 444 municipalities in Ontario, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FMC), the Association of Municipalities Ontario (AMO) and the Eastern Ontario Wardens’ Caucus (EOWC).”

ADOPTED

Brad Swayne
Administrative Assistant – Corporate
Tay Valley Township
217 Harper Road, Perth, ON  K7H 3C6
T: 613-267-5353 ext. 110  or 1-800-810-0161
F: 613-264-8516
E: corporateassistant@tayvalleytwp.ca
www.tayvalleytwp.ca
March 28, 2024

Via Email

Re: Support for the Province to Expand the Life Span of Fire Apparatus

The City of Owen Sound’s Corporate Services Committee, at its meeting held on February 8, 2024, considered correspondence from the County of Prince Edward respecting support for the Province to expand the life span of fire apparatus, specifically pertaining to the replacement of fire trucks due to insurance requirements. As a result, Resolution No. 2024-46 CR-240208-008 was carried:

"THAT in consideration of correspondence provided for information purposes listed on the February 8th Corporate Services Committee agenda, the Corporate Services Committee recommends that City Council request that the Mayor send a letter in support of the Prince Edward County resolution to the 444 municipalities in Ontario, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM), the Association of Municipalities Ontario (AMO), the Eastern Ontario Wardens’ Caucus (EOWC), Premier Doug Ford, Rick Byers, Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound MPP, the Honourable David Piccini, Minister of Labour, Immigration, Training and Skills Development, and Paul Calandra, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing."

Owen Sound City Council at its meeting held on February 26, 2024, considered the minutes of the Corporate Services Committee meeting held on February 8, 2024, and passed Resolution No. R-240226-014:

"THAT the minutes of the Corporate Services Committee meeting held on February 8, 2024 be received and the recommendations contained therein be approved."

A safe, reliable, and diverse fleet of fire apparatus is required to serve the operational needs of all our communities.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Sincerely,

Ian C. Boddy  
Mayor

cc: 444 Municipalities in Ontario  
Owen Sound City Council  
Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM)  
Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO)  
Eastern Ontario Wardens’ Caucus (EOWC)  
Premier Doug Ford  
Rick Byers, Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound MPP  
The Honourable David Piccini, Minister of Labour, Immigration, Training & Skills Development  
Paul Calandra, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing  
Bonnie Crombie, Leader of the Ontario Liberal Party  
Marit Stiles, Leader of the Ontario New Democratic Party  
Mike Schreiner, Leader of the Ontario Green Party
Good afternoon,

Please see the resolution below that was passed by the Council of the Township of McMurrich/Monteith at their Regular meeting held March 5, 2024 supporting the Municipality of St. Charles calling on the Provincial Government to fully fund the Municipal Equipment Operator Course in 2024 through the Skills Development Fund.

Resolution 2024-89

Moved by: Dan O'Halloran
Seconded by: Terry Currie

Be It Resolved that council supports Resolution 2024-043 from Municipality of St. Charles calling on the Province of Ontario’s Ministry of Labour, Training, Immigration and Skilled Trades to fully fund the Municipal Equipment Operator Course in 2024 through the Skills Development Fund. Carried

Best regards,
Cheryl Marshall,
Clerk/Treasurer
Township of McMurrich/Monteith
P.O. Box 70, 31 William Street
Sprucedale, Ontario P0A 1Y0
Phone: 705-685-7901 Fax: 705-685-7393
www.mcmurrichmonteith.com
Council Resolution Form

Date: 21 Mar 2024
Moved By: Councillor Tripp
Seconded by Councillor Popkie

No: Resolution No.63-24
Disposition: CARRIED.

Item No: 12.3

Description: Funding for the 2024 Municipal Equipment Operator Course

RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS, municipal public works departments from across the Province of Ontario provide invaluable services to our communities ensuring the health and safety of all residents;

AND WHEREAS, if it was not for our municipal public works employees from across the Province of Ontario maintaining our public roads systems, our communities would not be able to function as emergency personnel could not respond to calls, school buses could not get our children to school, residents would not be able to get to work, school or appointments and many more basic functions would not be able to happen;

AND WHEREAS, municipal public works departments are already feeling the impacts of a labour shortage, which will only be exasperated over the next three to five years, which will cause levels of service municipalities are able to provide to ensure the health and safety of our residents to decrease;

AND WHEREAS, there is currently no provincial-wide course that properly trains potential municipal public works employees, specifically relating to municipal heavy equipment.

THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED, that the Township of Greater Madawaska supports the work of the Association of Ontario Road Supervisors to develop a Municipal Equipment Operator Course to address this issue;

Recorded Vote Requested by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Yea</th>
<th>Nay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Levesque</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Popkie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Thomson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Tripp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Weir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Declaration of Pecuniary Interest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pecuniary Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disclosed his/her/their interest(s), vacated he/her/their seat(s), abstained from discussion and did not vote.
AND THAT, the Township of Greater Madawaska calls on the Province of Ontario’s Ministry of Labour, Training, Immigration and Skilled Trades to fully fund the Municipal Equipment Operator Course in 2024 through the Skills Development Fund;

AND THAT, a copy of this resolution be sent to the Minister of Labour, Training, Immigration and Skilled Trades David Piccini, MPP John Yakabuski, the Association of Ontario Road Supervisors, and all Ontario Municipalities.
March 25, 2024

Re: Res. #24-08-23 – Potential Equipment Operator Course

The Council of the Corporation of the Municipality of Huron Shores passed Resolution #24-08-23 at the Regular Meeting held Wednesday, March 13th, 2024, as follows:

“WHEREAS municipal public works departments from across the Province of Ontario provide invaluable services to our communities ensuring the health and safety of all residents;

AND WHEREAS, if it was not for our municipal public works employees from across the Province of Ontario maintaining our public roads systems, our communities would not be able to function as emergency personnel could not respond to calls, school buses could not get our children to school, residents would not be able to get to work, school or appointments, and many more basic functions would not be able to happen;

AND WHEREAS, municipal public works departments are already feeling the impacts of a labour storage, which will only be exasperated over the next three (3) to five (5) years, which will cause the levels of service that municipalities are able to provide to ensure the health and safety of our residents to decrease;

AND WHEREAS there is currently no provincial-wide course that properly trains potential municipal public works employees, specifically relating to municipal heavy equipment;

NOW THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED THAT the Corporation of the Municipality of Huron Shores supports the work of the Association of Ontario Road Supervisors to develop a Municipal Equipment Operator Course to address this issue;

AND THAT Council for the Corporation of the Municipality of Huron Shores calls on the Province of Ontario’s Ministry of Labour, Training, immigration and Skilled Trades to fully fund the Municipal Equipment Operator Course in 2024 through the Skills Development Fund;

AND THAT a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the Minister of Labour, Training, Immigration and Skilled Trades, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO), the Association of Ontario Road Supervisors (AORS); and all Ontario Municipalities.”

Should you require anything further in order to address the above-noted resolution, please contact the undersigned
Yours truly,

[Signature]

Natashia Roberts
CAO/Clerk
NR/KN

Cc: Minister of Labour, Training, Immigration and Skilled Trades, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO), the Association of Ontario Road Supervisors (AORS); and all Ontario Municipalities
WHEREAS the following resolution was passed by Council of the City of Greater Sudbury on December 5, 2023: CC2023-303:

WHEREAS in 2015 the City of Greater Sudbury (the "City") entered into a contract with a contractor experienced in road construction projects to complete a project on Elgin Street in the City’s downtown core;

AND WHEREAS the contract provided that the contractor would be the constructor for the project as that term is defined in the Occupational Health and Safety Act (the "Act");

AND WHEREAS an employee of the constructor operating a grader on the project struck and killed a pedestrian;

AND WHEREAS the City was charged with offences under the Act as the constructor and the employer;

AND WHEREAS after being acquitted at trial and on appeal, the Ontario Court of Appeal, in a decision issued on April 23, 2021, found the City to be liable for contraventions of the Construction Regulations as an employer as it employed quality control inspectors to monitor the quality of work on the project from time-to-time;

AND WHEREAS the Supreme Court of Canada, in a decision issued on November 10, 2023, was evenly divided 4-4 on the issue resulting in dismissal of the City’s appeal;

AND WHEREAS the consequence of this decision is that municipalities in Ontario, as well as all other owners of property in the province, who wish to undertake construction, are subject to being charged and convicted as an employer for offences in relation to project sites for which they have no control and have, in accordance with the Act, contracted with an entity to assume plenary oversight and authority over the work on such site as the constructor;

AND WHEREAS the potential of an owner being charged as an employer as that term is defined in the Act in circumstances where it has engaged a constructor disregards and renders meaningless the owner-constructor provisions contained in the Act and presents an unacceptable level of increased risk and confusion for owners and contractors throughout the province;

AND WHEREAS the City believes that the safety of workers is paramount however the safety of workers on construction projects in Ontario is not increased by placing liability on parties that do not have control of and are not responsible for the conduct of the work on such sites;
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council for the City of Greater Sudbury requests that the province amend the Occupational Health and Safety Act to clarify the definition of "employer" to exclude owners that have contracted with a constructor for a project;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this motion be provided to the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario, the Honourable David Piccini, Minister of Labour, Immigration, Training and Skills Development, the Honourable Paul Calandra, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, France Gélinas, MPP for Nickel Belt, Jamie West, MPP for Sudbury, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, the Federation of Northern Ontario Municipalities, Ontario's Big City Mayors, Mayors and Regional Chairs of Ontario, Northern Ontario Large Urban Mayors, the Council of Ontario Construction Associations, the Ontario Chamber of Commerce and all Ontario municipalities.

AND WHEREAS the Township of Terrace of Terrace Bay supports the City of Greater Sudbury's request that the province amend the Occupational Health and Safety Act to clarify the definition of "employer" to exclude owners that have contracted with a constructor for a project;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council for the Township of Terrace Bay also requests that the province amend the Occupational Health and Safety Act to clarify the definition of "employer" to exclude owners that have contracted with a constructor for a project;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this motion be provided to the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario, the Honourable David Piccini, Minister of Labour, Immigration, Training and Skills Development, the Honourable Paul Calandra, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Lise Vaugeois, MPP for Thunder Bay Superior North, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, the Federation of Northern Ontario Municipalities, Ontario's Big City Mayors, Mayors and Regional Chairs of Ontario, Northern Ontario Large Urban Mayors, the Council of Ontario Construction Associations, the Ontario Chamber of Commerce and all Ontario municipalities.

☑ Carried    □ Defeated    □ Recorded Vote

Recorded Vote:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Paul Malashewski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Gary Adduono</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Chris Dube</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Bert Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Rick St. Louis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mayor
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Council Resolution Form

Date: 21 Mar 2024
Moved By: Councillor Tripp
           Seconded by Councillor Popkie
No: Resolution No. 62-24
Disposition: CARRIED.
Item No: 12.2

Description: Occupational Health and Safety Act Definition of "Employer"

RESOLUTION:

That Council support Resolution CC2023-303 passed by the Council of the City of Greater Sudbury on December 5, 2023 regarding the Amendment of the Occupational Health and Safety Act to Clarify the Definition of "Employer", including that the definition of "employer" excludes owners that have contracted with a constructor for a project;

And furthermore that a copy of this resolution and a copy of the City of Greater Sudbury's resolution be circulated to the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario, the Honourable David Piccini, Minister of Labour, Immigration, Training and Skills Development, the Honourable Paul Calandra, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, John Yakabuski, MPP for Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and all Ontario Municipalities.

Recorded Vote Requested by:

.................. n/a........................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Yea</th>
<th>Nay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Levesque</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Popkie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Thomson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Tripp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Weir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Declaration of Pecuniary Interest:

..................n/a..............................

Disclosed his/her/their interest(s), vacated he/her/their seat(s), abstained from discussion and did not vote.
December 12, 2023

*Municipalities of Ontario*

Re: Amendment to the Occupational Health and Safety Act to Clarify the Definition of “Employer”

The following resolution was passed by Council of the City of Greater Sudbury on December 5, 2023:

CC2023-303: WHEREAS in 2015 the City of Greater Sudbury (the “City”) entered into a contract with a contractor experienced in road construction projects to complete a project on Elgin Street in the City’s downtown core;

AND WHEREAS the contract provided that the contractor would be the constructor for the project as that term is defined in the Occupational Health and Safety Act (the “Act”);

AND WHEREAS an employee of the constructor operating a grader on the project struck and killed a pedestrian;

AND WHEREAS the City was charged with offences under the Act as the constructor and the employer;

AND WHEREAS after being acquitted at trial and on appeal, the Ontario Court of Appeal, in a decision issued on April 23, 2021, found the City to be liable for contraventions of the Construction Regulations as an employer as it employed quality control inspectors to monitor the quality of work on the project from time-to-time;

AND WHEREAS the Supreme Court of Canada, in a decision issued on November 10, 2023, was evenly divided 4-4 on the issue resulting in dismissal of the City’s appeal;

AND WHEREAS the consequence of this decision is that municipalities in Ontario, as well as all other owners of property in the province, who wish to undertake construction, are subject to being charged and convicted as an employer for offences in relation to project sites for which they have no control and have, in accordance with the Act, contracted with an entity to assume plenary oversight and authority over the work on such site as the constructor;

AND WHEREAS the potential of an owner being charged as an employer as that term is defined in the Act in circumstances where it has engaged a constructor disregards and renders meaningless the owner-constructor provisions contained in the Act and presents an unacceptable level of increased risk and confusion for owners and contractors throughout the province;
AND WHEREAS the City believes that the safety of workers is paramount however the safety of workers on construction projects in Ontario is not increased by placing liability on parties that do not have control of and are not responsible for the conduct of the work on such sites;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council for the City of Greater Sudbury requests that the province amend the Occupational Health and Safety Act to clarify the definition of “employer” to exclude owners that have contracted with a constructor for a project;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this motion be provided to the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario, the Honourable David Piccini, Minister of Labour, Immigration, Training and Skills Development, the Honourable Paul Calandra, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, France Gelinas, MPP for Nickel Belt, Jamie West, MPP for Sudbury, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, the Federation of Northern Ontario Municipalities, Ontario’s Big City Mayors, Mayors and Regional Chairs of Ontario, Northern Ontario Large Urban Mayors, the Council of Ontario Construction Associations, the Ontario Chamber of Commerce and all Ontario municipalities.

Yours truly,

Brigitte Sobush
Manager of Clerk’s Services/Deputy City Clerk

c. Members of City Council
   Eric Labelle, City Solicitor and Clerk
WHEREAS current provincial-municipal fiscal arrangements are undermining Ontario's economic prosperity and quality of life

WHEREAS nearly a third of municipal spending in Ontario is for services in areas of provincial responsibility and expenditures are outpacing provincial contributions by nearly $4 billion a year

WHEREAS municipal revenues, such as property taxes, do not grow with the economy or inflation

WHEREAS unprecedented population and housing growth will require significant investments in municipal infrastructure

WHEREAS municipalities are being asked to take on complex health and social challenges – like homelessness, supporting asylum seekers and addressing the mental health and addictions crises

WHEREAS inflation, rising interest rates, and provincial policy decisions are sharply constraining municipal fiscal capacity

WHEREAS property taxpayers – including people on fixed incomes and small businesses – can’t afford to subsidize income re-distribution programs for those most in need

WHEREAS the province can, and should, invest more in the prosperity of communities

WHEREAS municipalities and the provincial government have a strong history of collaboration

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Province of Ontario commit to undertaking with the Association of Municipalities of Ontario a comprehensive social and economic prosperity review to promote the stability and sustainability of municipal finances across Ontario

AND FURTHER THAT a copy of this motion be sent to the Premier of Ontario (premier@ontario.ca); Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (minister.mah@ontario.ca); the Minister of Finance (minister.fin@ontario.ca); and to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (amo@amo.on.ca).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor Gary Adduono</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Chris Dube</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Bert Johnson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Rick St. Louis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mayor
March 22nd, 2024

The Honourable Lisa Thompson
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs
11th Floor
77 Grenville St.
Toronto, ON M5S 1B3

RE: Township of Adelaide Metcalfe – Request to Increase Tile Drain Loan Limit

Dear Minister Thompson,

On March 18, 2024, the Township of Adelaide Metcalfe Council approved the following resolution:

WHEREAS farm drainage is of paramount importance in Ontario due to its significant impact on agricultural productivity and sustainability. Effective drainage systems help mitigate waterlogging, control soil moisture levels, and enhance soil structure, thereby optimizing growing conditions for crops;

WHEREAS improved drainage also facilitates timely field operations, reduces erosion, and minimizes nutrient runoff, contributing to environmental conservation efforts;

WHEREAS Ontario’s diverse agricultural landscape, where weather variability is common, well-maintained drainage systems play a crucial role in ensuring stable yields, economic viability, and long-term resilience for farmers across the Province;

WHEREAS the Tile Loan Drainage Act, R.S.O 1990, c. T.8 allows for the borrowing of money for the purpose of constructing drainage works;

WHEREAS the maximum annual limit for these loans, unchanged since 2004, is currently set at $50,000.

WHEREAS costs for Tile Drainage has increased markedly since 2004;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Township of Adelaide Metcalfe requests that the Province through the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) consider increasing the maximum annual Tile Loan limit to a minimum of $100,000.

AND THAT this resolution be circulated the Honourable Lisa Thompson – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA), the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO), the Rural Ontario Municipal Association (ROMA), and all Ontario municipalities.
Your consideration of Council's request is appreciated.

Kind regards,

Michael Barnier  
Clerk & Manager of Legislative Services  
Township of Adelaide Metcalfe  
mbarnier@adelaidemetcalfe.on.ca

Cc: Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO)  
Rural Ontario Municipal Association (ROMA)  
All Ontario Municipalities
March 27, 2024

Tammy J. Godden, Clerk (Clerks@stcharlesontario.ca)
The Municipality of St. Charles
2 King Street East, P.O. Box 70
St. Charles, ON P0M 2W0

Dear Ms. Godden:

RE: Support of Resolution – Municipalities Retaining Surplus Proceeds from Tax Sales

This is to advise that the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Alnwick/Haldimand at their Regular Council Meeting on September 5th, 2023, passed the following resolution supporting the Municipality of St. Charles Resolution and the Town of Essex in the reinstatement of previous legislation that permitted municipalities to apply for and retain surplus proceeds from tax sales in their jurisdictions:

Moved by Councillor Greg Booth, seconded by Councillor Mike Ainsworth;

"Be it resolved that Council support the correspondence from the Municipality of St. Charles regarding retention of surplus proceeds from tax sales; and

Further that Council direct staff to forward a copy of this resolution to the County of Northumberland and all Ontario municipalities."

CARRIED

Yours truly,

Yolanda Melburn, Deputy Clerk
Township of Alnwick/Haldimand
905-349-2822 ext. 32
ymelburn@ahtrp.ca
Encl.
WHEREAS prior to being repealed by the Modernizing Ontario's Municipal Legislation Act, 2017, Section 380(6) of the Municipal Act, 2001, allowed for a municipality to retain surplus proceeds from tax sales within their jurisdiction;

AND WHEREAS the current Public Tax Sale process is a burdensome process to a municipality that invests a considerable amount of time and money recovering these proceeds for the potential sole benefit of the Crown in Right of Ontario;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council for the Corporation of the Municipality of St.-Charles supports the Corporation of the Town of Essex in the reinstatement of previous legislation that permitted municipalities to apply for and retain surplus proceeds from tax sales in their jurisdictions;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this Resolution be circulated to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH); the Ministry of Finance (MOF); the Ontario Municipal Tax & Revenue Association (OMTRA); the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO), the local Member of Provincial Parliament (MPP); and, all Ontario Municipalities.

CARRIED
March 28, 2024

David Piccini, MPP
Northumberland-Peterborough South
Minister of Labour, Immigration, Training and Skills Development
117 Peter Street,
Port Hope, ON L1A 1C5

Dear Sir:

RE: Support of Resolution – Highway Traffic Act Amendments, Automated Speed Enforcement Systems

This is to advise that the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Alnwick/Haldimand at their Regular Council Meeting on September 5th, 2023, passed the following resolution supporting the resolutions of the Municipality of St. Charles and City of Cambridge regarding Highway Traffic Act Amendments:

Moved by Councillor Greg Booth, seconded by Councillor Mary Catherine O’Neill;

"Whereas Council reviewed the correspondence "Highway Traffic Act Amendments, Automated Speed Enforcement (ASE) Systems" from the Municipality of St. Charles, and the Resolution from the City of Cambridge;

Be it resolved that the Council of the Township of Alnwick/Haldimand support amendments to the Highway Traffic Act that would allow municipalities to locate an ASE system permanently or temporarily on any roadway under the jurisdiction of municipalities, and as determined by municipalities, and not be restricted to only community safety zones and school safety zones; and

Further that Council direct staff to forward a copy of this resolution to local MPP David Piccini, the Minister of Transportation, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, AMO, and all Ontario municipalities."

CARRIED
A copy of the above noted resolution from both the Municipality of St. Charles and the City of Cambridge is attached for your reference.

Yours truly,

Yolanda Melburn, Deputy Clerk
Township of Alnwick/Haldimand
905-349-2822 ext. 32
ymelburn@ahwtwp.ca

Encl.

Cc: (via email)
Clerk, City of Cambridge
Clerk, Municipality of St. Charles
Prabmeet Sarkaria, Minister of Transportation
Paul Calandra, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO)
All Ontario Municipalities
March 28, 2024

Please be advised that during the regular Council meeting of March 26, 2024 the following resolution regarding support for 'a call to action' to meet the deadline of an Accessible Ontario by 2025 was carried.

RESOLUTION NO. 2024-151

DATE: March 26, 2024

MOVED BY: Councillor MacNaughton

SECONDED BY: Councillor Pennell

WHEREAS the Accessibility for Ontarians With Disabilities Act (AODA) is ground-breaking legislation, created to help people with disabilities fully participate in society, bring them to the table in crafting regulations, and build mechanisms to enforce standards;

WHEREAS Rich Donovan, an expert in accessibility issues, was appointed as the Independent Reviewer of the Act in 2022, and in his 2023 legislative review declared a crisis as a necessary catalyst to get Ontario back on track for accessibility;

WHEREAS at least 2.9 million Ontarians currently live with a disability, representing at least 22% of the consumer base and the workforce, but due to barriers, Ontarians with disabilities are too often falling short of their full potential;

WHEREAS the AODA aims to develop, implement and enforce standards related to goods, services, accommodation, employment and buildings before Jan. 1, 2025, and municipalities, as the level of government closest to the people are at the front lines, developing, implementing and enforcing these standards without meaningful guidance on its implementation and/or enforcement by the Province;

WHEREAS people with disabilities and advocates, including Prince Edward County’s Accessibility Advisory Committee, note the slow pace of current and previous Ontario governments in implementing the AODA and there are growing concerns there will be no renewed push to keep accessibility issues at the forefront after 2025;

WHEREAS Prince Edward County is dedicated and committed to creating a welcoming environment so that all people may have equitable access to programs, goods, services and facilities, but making investments to achieve the AODA
standards has been challenging given the lack of consistent and stable funding for municipalities to remove accessibility barriers;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Council of Prince Edward County strongly encourages action on the part of the Provincial Government to urgently:

a) create a "Municipal Accessibility Fund" for municipalities to develop, implement and enforce AODA standards related to goods, services, accommodation, employment and buildings. Such a fund could be modeled after the Canada Community-Building Fund or the Ontario Cannabis Legalization Implementation Fund on a per household basis;

b) to commit to working with municipalities to implement the Donovan Review immediate crisis recommendations;

**AND FURTHER THAT** the Mayor write a letter in support of this resolution to the Minister of Seniors and Accessibility, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Premier of Ontario, the Minister of Seniors and Accessibility, the Minister of Children, Community, and Social Services, the Minister of Health, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, and the Eastern Ontario Wardens Caucus, and all Ontario Municipalities.

**CARRIED**

Yours truly,

Catalina Blumenberg, **CLERK**

cc: Mayor Steve Ferguson, Councillor MacNaughton, Councillor Pennell, and Marcia Wallace, CAO
Northumberland County Council Resolution

SENT VIA EMAIL

Hon. Doug Ford (Premier of Ontario)
Hon. Michael Parsa (Minister of Children, Community, and Social Services)
Hon. Paul Calandra (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing)
Hon. Sylvia Jones (Minister of Health)
Hon. David Piccini (Minister of Labour, Immigration, Training and Skills Development and MPP for Northumberland-Peterborough South)
Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO)
Ontario Municipal Social Services Association
Eastern Ontario Wardens' Caucus
All Ontario Municipalities


At a meeting held on March 20, 2024 Northumberland County Council approved the following Council Resolution # 2024-03-20-190 adopting the below recommendation from the March 6, 2024 Social Services Committee meeting.

Moved by: Councillor Robert Crate
Seconded by: Councillor Scott Jibb

“That the Social Services Committee, having considered the correspondence from the County of Prince Edward regarding ‘Review of Ontario Works and Ontario Disability Support Program Financial Assistance Rates’, recommend that County Council support this correspondence and direct staff to send a copy of this resolution to the Honourable Doug Ford (Premier of Ontario), the Honourable Michael Parsa (Minister of Children, Community, and Social Services), the Honourable Paul Calandra (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing), the Honourable Sylvia Jones (Minister of Health), the Honourable David Piccini (Minister of Labour, Immigration, Training and Skills Development and MPP for Northumberland-Peterborough South), the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, the Ontario Municipal Social Services Association, the Eastern Ontario Wardens’ Caucus, and all Ontario municipalities.”
"Council Resolution # 2024-03-20-190  Carried

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at matherm@northumberland.ca or by telephone at 905-372-3329 ext. 2238.

Sincerely,
Maddison Mather

[Signature]
Manager of Legislative Services / Clerk
Northumberland County
"That Council adopt all recommendations from the four Standing Committees, as contained within the Committee Minutes (meetings held March 5 and 6), with the exception of the following items (referenced from the Standing Committee Minutes), that will be held for discussion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Name</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Held By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

And Further That the items listed above and held for separate discussion each require a separate resolution."
Social Services Committee Resolution

Committee Meeting Date: March 6, 2024
Agenda Item: 7.a
Resolution Number: 2024-03-06-159
Moved by: O. Honkavsky
Seconded by: B. Ostrander
 Council Meeting Date: March 20, 2024

"That the Social Services Committee, having considered the correspondence from the County of Prince Edward regarding 'Review of Ontario Works and Ontario Disability Support Program Financial Assistance Rates', recommend that County Council support this correspondence and direct staff to send a copy of this resolution to the Honourable Doug Ford (Premier of Ontario), the Honourable Michael Parsa (Minister of Children, Community, and Social Services), the Honorable Paul Calandra (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing), the Honourable Sylvia Jones (Minister of Health), the Honorable David Piccini (Minister of Labour, Immigration, Training and Skills Development and MPP for Northumberland-Peterborough South), the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, the Ontario Municipal Social Services Association, the Eastern Ontario Wardens' Caucus, and all Ontario municipalities."

Carried
Committee Chair’s Signature

Defeated
Committee Chair’s Signature

Deferred
Committee Chair’s Signature
February 16, 2024

Please be advised that during the regular Council meeting of February 13, 2024 the following resolution regarding support for a review of the Ontario Works and Ontario Disability Support Program Financial Assistance Rates was carried.

RESOLUTION NO. 2024-81

DATE: February 13, 2024

MOVED BY: Councillor Roberts

SECONDED BY: Councillor Hirsch

WHEREAS poverty is taking a devastating toll on communities, undermining a healthy and prosperous Ontario, with people in receipt of Ontario Works and Ontario Disability Support Program being disproportionately impacted;

WHEREAS the cost of food, housing, medicine, and other essential items have outpaced the highest inflation rates seen in a generation;

WHEREAS people in need of social assistance have been legislated into poverty, housing insecurity, hunger, poorer health, their motives questioned, and their dignity undermined;

WHEREAS Ontario Works (OW) Financial Assistance rates have been frozen since 2018 ($733 per month);

WHEREAS Ontario Disability Support Program (ODSP) benefit rates have been increased by 6.5 per cent as of July 2023 to keep up with inflation, however even with the increase, ODSP rates still fall below their value in 2018 ($1,376 when adjusted for inflation) and significantly below the disability-adjusted poverty line ($3,091 per month)

WHEREAS OW and ODSP rates do not provide sufficient income for a basic standard of living and, as a result, hundreds of thousands of people across Ontario who rely on these programs live in poverty;

WHEREAS the poverty risk profile for Prince Edward County created by Vital Signs states that 10.1% - 13.5% of County residents are living on low income;
WHEREAS designated Service Managers are doing their part, but do not have the resources, capacity, or tools to provide the necessary income and health related supports to people experiencing poverty; and

WHEREAS leadership and urgent action is needed from the Provincial Government to immediately develop, resource, and implement a comprehensive plan to address the rising levels of poverty in Ontario, in particular for those on Ontario Works and Ontario Disability Support Programs;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of Prince Edward County joins the Town of Orangeville to calls on the Provincial Government to urgently:

a) At least double Ontario Works and ODSP rates and index rates to inflation, answering calls already made by “Raise the Rates” campaign and the “Income Security Advocacy Centre”;

b) Commit to ongoing cost of living increases above and beyond the rate of inflation to make up for the years they were frozen;

c) Commit to jointly working between the Ministry of Children, Community, and Social Services and the Ministry of Health on the best methods of assessing client needs and then matching those in need to the services they require;

AND FURTHER THAT a copy of this resolution be sent to the Minister of Children, Community, and Social Services, the Minister of Health, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, the Ontario Municipal Social Services Association, Prince Edward Lennox and Addington Social Services, the Eastern Ontario Wardens Caucus, and all Ontario Municipalities.

CARRIED

Yours truly,

Catalina Blumenberg, CLERK

cc: Mayor Steve Ferguson, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Hirsch, and Marcia Wallace, CAO
December 21, 2023

Hon. Todd McCarthy
Minister of Public and Business Service Delivery
5th Floor
777 Bay St.
Toronto, ON M7A 2J3

Dear Hon. Todd McCarthy,

Re: Provincial Cemetery Management Support Request – Tay Township

Tay Township Council passed the following resolution during the December 20, 2023 Council Meeting regarding the Provincial Cemetery Management Support Request:

Whereas under the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002 (FBCSA), when a cemetery is declared abandoned by a judge of the Superior Court Justice, the local municipality within whose geographic boundaries the land of the cemetery is located, becomes the owner of the cemetery with all the rights and obligations in respect of the cemetery and the assets, trust funds and trust accounts related to it that the previous owner or operator possessed;

And Whereas over the last decade, there has been an increase in the number of churches and local cemetery boards initiating processes to transfer ownership or abandon their owned and operated cemeteries to the local municipality due to such issues as high maintenance costs, inaccuracy of records, lack of financial and human resources to effectively operate and maintain the cemetery, increased regulatory processes regarding training, selling of interment rights, financial operation of the care and maintenance fund, etc.;

And Whereas municipalities experience the same issues and pressures that churches and local boards experience with the operation and maintenance of cemeteries within its jurisdiction, and additional transfers of cemetery lands only compound the burden on municipal taxpayers;

And Whereas cemeteries are important infrastructure where the reasonable costs for interment rights, burials, monument foundations, corner stones and administration charges do not sufficiently support the general operation of cemeteries;
And Whereas the interest earned from the care and maintenance fund(s) of a cemetery do not provide adequate funding to maintain the cemetery with the rising costs of lawn and turf maintenance contracts and monument restoration;

Now Therefore Be It Resolved that Council of the Township of Tay requests that the Province through the Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery and the Bereavement Authority of Ontario (BAO) consider the following to assist municipalities in this growing concern of cemetery transfers:

- Amending the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002 (FBCSA), to have the Province, through the BAO, identified as the default owner and operator of a cemetery when it is abandoned;

- Provide annual funding (based on the number of cemeteries a municipality owns and operates) to municipalities to assist with the maintenance of inactive and active cemeteries;

- Provide free training opportunities for municipalities regarding cemetery administration; and,

- Investigate and support the design of universal cemetery software for use by municipal cemetery operators that can be offered at an affordable cost;

And that this resolution be circulated to the Hon. Todd McCarthy, Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery, Jim Cassimatis, BAO Interim CEO/Registrar, MPP Jill Dunlop and all Ontario municipalities.

Sent on behalf of Tay Township Council.

Yours truly,

Katelyn Johns, MPPA
Municipal Clerk

Cc: Jim Cassimatis, BAO Interim CEO/Registrar, Hon. Jill Dunlop, Minister of Colleges and Universities/MPP, and all Ontario municipalities.
Council Resolution Form

Date: 21 Mar 2024

Moved By: Councillor Popkie
Seconded by Councillor Thomson

Disposition: CARRIED.

Item No: 12.1

Description: Cemetery Transfer/Abandonment Administration & Management Support

RESOLUTION:

That Council support the resolution passed by the Council of Tay Township during their December 20, 2023 Council Meeting regarding the Provincial Cemetery Management Support Request, including that the Province through the Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery and the Bereavement Authority of Ontario (BAO) consider several points of concern to assist municipalities with the growing concern of cemetery transfers;

And furthermore, that a copy of this resolution and a copy Tay Township's resolution be circulated to the Honourable Todd McCarthy, Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery, Jim Cassimatis, BAO Interim CEO/Registrar, John Yakabuski, MPP for Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke, and all Ontario Municipalities.

Recorded Vote Requested by:

..........................n/a.................................

......................Yea..........................Nay

J. Levesque..............____................____
T. Popkie..................____................____
L. Thomson...............____................____
R. Tripp..................____................____
R. Weir..................____................____

Declaration of Pecuniary Interest:

..........................n/a.................................

Disclosed his/her/their interest(s), vacated he/her/their seat(s), abstained from discussion and did not vote
Be It Resolved that Council receives correspondence from the Township of Clearview dated December 12, 2023 including Staff Report LS-032-2023 regarding cemeteries and that we send a resolution of support for their correspondences to Bereavement Authority of Ontario (BAO), Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery and MPP Graydon Smith.
December 12, 2023

Hon. Todd McCarthy
Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery
777 Bay Street, 5th Floor
Toronto ON M5B 2H7

Sent by Email

RE: Cemetery Transfer/Abandonment Administration & Management Support

Please be advised that Council of the Township of Clearview, at its meeting held on December 11, 2023, passed a resolution regarding Cemetery Transfer/Abandonment Administration & Management Support as follows:

Moved by Councillor Walker, Seconded by Councillor Broderick, Whereas under the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002 (FBCSA), when a cemetery is declared abandoned by a judge of the Superior Court Justice, the local municipality within whose geographic boundaries the land of the cemetery is located, becomes the owner of the cemetery with all the rights and obligations in respect of the cemetery and the assets, trust funds and trust accounts related to it that the previous owner or operator possessed;

And Whereas over the last decade, there has been an increase in the number of churches and local cemetery boards initiating processes to transfer ownership or abandon their owned and operated cemeteries to the local municipality due to such issues as high maintenance costs, inaccuracy of records, lack of financial and human resources to effectively operate and maintain the cemetery, increased regulatory processes regarding training, selling of interment rights, financial operation of the care and maintenance fund, etc.;

And Whereas municipalities experience the same issues and pressures that churches and local boards experience with the operation and maintenance of cemeteries within its jurisdiction, and additional transfers of cemetery lands only compound the burden on municipal taxpayers;
And Whereas cemeteries are important infrastructure where the reasonable costs for interment rights, burials, monument foundations, corner stones and administration charges do not sufficiently support the general operation of cemeteries;

And Whereas the interest earned from the care and maintenance fund(s) of a cemetery do not provide adequate funding to maintain the cemetery with the rising costs of lawn and turf maintenance contracts and monument restoration;

Now Therefore Be It Resolved that Council of the Township of Clearview requests that the Province through the Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery and the Bereavement Authority of Ontario (BAO) consider the following to assist municipalities in this growing concern of cemetery transfers:

- Amend the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002 (FBCSA), to have the Province, through the BAO, identified as the default owner and operator of a cemetery when it is abandoned;
- Provide annual funding (based on the number of cemeteries a municipality owns and operates) to municipalities to assist with the maintenance of inactive and active cemeteries;
- Provide free training opportunities for municipalities regarding cemetery administration; and,
- Investigate and support the design of universal cemetery software for use by municipal cemetery operators that can be offered at an affordable cost.

And that this resolution be circulated to the Hon. Todd McCarthy, Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery, Jim Cassimatis, BAO Interim CEO/Registrar, MPP Brian Saunderson and all Ontario municipalities. Motion Carried.

For reference, please find attached the Staff Report LS-032-2023 that provides background for the above resolution. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Regards,

Sasha Helmkay-Playter, B.A., Dipl. M.A., AOMC
Clerk/Director of Legislative Services

cc: Jim Cassimatis, BAO Interim CEO/Registrar
MPP Simcoe Grey, Brian Saunderson
Ontario Municipalities
To: Mayor and Council

From: Sasha Helmkay, Clerk/Director of Legislative Services

Date: December 11, 2023

Subject: Report # LS-032-2023 – Cemetery Transfer/Abandonment Administration & Management Support

Recommendation

Be It Resolved that Council of the Township of Clearview hereby receives Report LS-032-2023 (Cemetery Transfer/Abandonment Administration & Management Support) dated December 11, 2023; and,

Whereas under the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002 (FBCSA), when a cemetery is declared abandoned by a judge of the Superior Court Justice, the local municipality within whose geographic boundaries the land of the cemetery is located, becomes the owner of the cemetery with all the rights and obligations in respect of the cemetery and the assets, trust funds and trust accounts related to it that the previous owner or operator possessed;

And Whereas over the last decade, there has been an increase in the number of churches and local cemetery boards initiating processes to transfer ownership or abandon their owned and operated cemeteries to the local municipality due to such issues as high maintenance costs, inaccuracy of records, lack of financial and human resources to effectively operate and maintain the cemetery, increased regulatory processes regarding training, selling of interment rights, financial operation of the care and maintenance fund, etc.;

And Whereas municipalities experience the same issues and pressures that churches and local boards experience with the operation and maintenance of cemeteries within its jurisdiction, and additional transfers of cemetery lands only compound the burden on municipal taxpayers;

And Whereas cemeteries are important infrastructure where the reasonable costs for interment rights, burials, monument foundations, corner stones and administration charges do not sufficiently support the general operation of cemeteries;

And Whereas the interest earned from the care and maintenance fund(s) of a cemetery do not provide adequate funding to maintain the cemetery with the rising costs of lawn and turf maintenance contracts and monument restoration;
Now Therefore Be It Resolved that Council of the Township of Clearview requests that the Province through the Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery and the Bereavement Authority of Ontario (BAO) consider the following to assist municipalities in this growing concern of cemetery transfers:

- Amend the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002 (FBCSA), to have the Province, through the BAO, identified as the default owner and operator of a cemetery when it is abandoned;
- Provide annual funding (based on the number of cemeteries a municipality owns and operates) to municipalities to assist with the maintenance of inactive and active cemeteries;
- Provide free training opportunities for municipalities regarding cemetery administration; and,
- Investigate and support the design of universal cemetery software for use by municipal cemetery operators that can be offered at an affordable cost.

And that this resolution be circulated to the Hon. Todd McCarthy, Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery, Jim Cassimatis, BAO Interim CEO/Registrar, MPP Brian Saunderson and all Ontario municipalities.

Background

Under the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002 (FBCSA), when a cemetery is declared abandoned by a judge of the Superior Court Justice, the local municipality within whose geographic boundaries the land of the cemetery is located, becomes the owner of the cemetery with all the rights and obligations in respect of the cemetery and the assets, trust funds and trust accounts related to it that the previous owner or operator possessed.

Over the last decade there appears to be a trend where cemeteries in Ontario are being transferred, whether through abandonment or a mutually agreed upon transfer, to the care and control of municipalities. This is often seen when there is a breakdown in existing cemetery boards and/or when churches cease operations. For many existing private cemetery boards their board members and volunteers are aging and are unable to assist with the operations and maintenance of the cemetery any longer. Finding new members proves to be difficult for these boards to continue. In addition to aging board members, there are other issues that are contributing to the increase in cemetery transfers:

- high maintenance costs
- inaccuracy of records
- lack of financial and human resources to effectively operate and maintain the cemetery
• increased regulatory processes that require ongoing training for selling of interment rights, and the financial operation of the care and maintenance fund, etc.

**Township Owned Cemeteries**

The Township of Clearview currently owns and operates nine (9) cemeteries within its geographic boundaries. Out of these nine cemeteries, four (4) are considered active meaning that there are still interment rights to be sold, or burials to take place. Below is a chart outlining these cemeteries and their status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Batteau Hill Cemetery</td>
<td>2670 County Road 124, Duntroon</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel Union Cemetery</td>
<td>2249 Creemore Avenue, New Lowell</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin Union Cemetery</td>
<td>9 Turkeyroost Lane, Dunedin</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duntroon Pioneer Cemetery</td>
<td>2870 County Road 124, Duntroon</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavender Cemetery</td>
<td>827103 Mulmur/Nottawasaga Townline, Creemore</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Zion Presbyterian Church Cemetery</td>
<td>6130 Highway 26, Sunnidale Corners</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Line Nottawasaga Cemetery</td>
<td>2279 County Road 42, Stayner</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayner Union Cemetery</td>
<td>7661 Highway 26, Stayner</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zion Presbyterian Church Cemetery</td>
<td>12358 County Road 10, Sunnidale Corners</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Dunedin and Stayner Union Cemetery, the Township looks after the maintenance and burials through a third-party contractor. The maintenance and burials for the Lavender Cemetery are conducted through the Board. For the Second Line Nottawasaga Cemetery all the interment rights have been sold, but there remains one burial to be completed. The cost to maintain an active cemetery is expensive. Although burial costs and the installation of markers, etc. are cost recovery through the purchaser, grounds maintenance is not.

Inactive cemeteries still require consistent grounds maintenance, which includes any monument restoration for health and safety, and record searches for the public register.
Comments and Analysis

When analyzing the number of cemeteries that Clearview Township currently owns and operates, maintenance and administration is a large undertaking. To add any additional cemeteries by way of transfer or abandonment will only compound the issues the Township is already facing. In the past year, the Township has been approached by two separate entities regarding possible cemetery transfers. When a board or cemetery transfers ownership to the municipality, the issues are transferred with it. Municipalities are not immune to the same concerns. It becomes a strain on municipal resources, financially, administratively, and operationally.

Administrative Impact

From an administrative perspective the management of four active cemeteries is both time consuming and complex. No interment is the same, and providing good customer service takes time especially for those making arrangements while also dealing with grief. Administrative tasks include but are not limited to: interment right sales and mapping, burial contracts and scheduling, monument placement, historical record searches, plot and monument staking, fees and charges review, family transfers of interment rights and annual reporting to the Bereavement Authority of Ontario (BAO).

- Incomplete records

Often the records accepted by the Township from a dissolved cemetery board or church are incomplete and disorganized. This is no fault of the previous board members, as they are also often operating with limited resources. However, it does make it difficult to manage the cemetery post-transfer when records are sparse. Understanding which plots are occupied and by who is critical to the sound management of a cemetery. Unfortunately, this is not made possible in all cases because of incomplete records. In addition, records received during a transfer usually are maintained under different records management standards and are often organized and named inconsistently. Adaptation to Township records keeping practices takes time.

- Lack of human resources

Cemetery management is a highly regulated professional field, with the responsibility of which is often placed on public sector employees who may have limited knowledge of cemeteries in general. With reduced resources within municipalities especially rural ones, the management of cemeteries often becomes a secondary responsibility to another position. There is also a lack of affordable training available for municipal employees who are required to abide by regulations set out by the FBCSA and the BAO.
• Increased regulatory processes
Annual reporting requirements of the BAO can be extensive and complex. This includes monitoring the number of interments, the transfers to the Care and Maintenance Fund (C&M), and how the C&M fund can be used. There are also regulations pertaining to maintaining a public register, how sales are to be conducted and strict guidelines on Cemetery By-law approvals, and expansions including the erection of columbaria structures.

• Inconsistent cemetery regulations
Cemeteries can have many different regulations related to plot size, number of burials allowed in a given plot, monument size, what types of flowers/shrubs are allowed to be installed near a headstone etc. The transfer of different cemeteries having inconsistent regulations can make it difficult to adapt management practices in order to maintain original cemetery operational standards.

Operational Impact
Similarly, from an operational perspective the grounds maintenance of cemeteries, whether active or inactive, is both time consuming and complex. A key issue when analyzing the maintenance component of cemetery management is the lack of financial resources to support the operation. Cemetery maintenance includes, but is not limited to: grass cutting (whipper snipping around monuments), tree and shrub maintenance, monument and corner stone maintenance, water pipe and washroom monitoring, and general upkeep of cemetery grounds (removal of debris, etc.).

• High maintenance costs
As with many services, there are rising costs to contend with. Municipalities have adopted different models to address the maintenance of such, with third party contractors being commonly used or it becomes the responsibility of an internal department such as Parks & Recreation. Regardless the model, the costs have increased significantly over the last decade with equipment purchases/upgrades, insurance requirements for third-party contractors, and the time it takes to cut the grass and whipper snip around monuments. To put it into perspective, the Stayner Union Cemetery with the expansion is 25 acres with monuments to manoeuvre around during ground care. Other considerations for maintenance includes monument restoration and ensuring that they are not deteriorated to the point where they are unsafe. This is important for older cemeteries where restoration hasn’t been provided in the past and there are many deteriorating monuments.

• Cost of cemetery management software
Cemetery Management Software can help municipalities manage cemetery records, including plot sale contracts, interment rights certificates, and regulatory reporting.
However, these software solutions are often expensive and require a large amount of staff time to implement especially with incomplete data and records. These software solutions range in price from $5,000 to $100,000 with annual maintenance costs. This investment in software can be a large budget request and one that would need to be supported from taxation with the limited funds in cemetery general accounts.

- **Inadequate Care and Maintenance funds**

When the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002 (FBCSA) was enacted, it stipulated that a care and maintenance fund for a cemetery shall be established. A cemetery operator is required to make contributions to the fund from the sale of in-ground graves, crypts, tombs, niches, scattering rights and monument installation. The contribution is prescribed under the FBCSA and differs dependant on the interment type. The idea is that the fund (income earned from the fund - interest) pays for maintenance costs after a cemetery has stopped making sales. In reality, this concept does not produce enough funds to maintain a cemetery. Looking at the Stayner Union Cemetery as an example, for the very basics (grass cutting and whipper snipping) the interest from the care and maintenance fund does not provide enough monies to maintain the cemetery for the 7 months it's required. In addition, the care and maintenance fund is also to be utilized for the stabilization, maintenance and security of markers. Cemeteries are not self funding, and maintenance of such is becoming a larger budget concern.

**Support Request**

Cemetery transfers and abandonments have been an ongoing concern for Clearview Township for many years. When you look at the large geography of the Township there are many cemeteries within the boundaries that have the potential to be transferred. To gauge the concern of other municipalities on this issue, staff addressed it at a Simcoe County Clerks group discussion. Many neighbouring municipalities expressed that they were dealing with the same issues and have also been approached by different external entities on possible transfers.

As result of the discussion, it was agreed that to assist with the real concerns with transfers and abandonments of cemeteries, it's vital that the Province provide assistance to adequately support this infrastructure. Support can be provided in many different forms, with staff making the following recommendations for the Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery and the BAO:

- Amend the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002 (FBCSA), to have the Province, through the BAO, identified as the default owner and operator of a cemetery when it is abandoned;
• Provide annual funding (based on the number of cemeteries a municipality owns and operates) to municipalities to assist with the maintenance of inactive and active cemeteries;
• Provide free training opportunities for municipalities regarding cemetery administration; and,
• Investigate and support the design of universal cemetery software for use by municipal cemetery operators that can be offered at an affordable cost.

There is not one solution to solve all the issues, but at the very least it's important to identify the concerns and have open and real discussions at the provincial level on what support can be provided.

Clearview’s Strategic Plan
The above initiative supports the following strategic pillars:
• Governance

Financial Implications
It is difficult to identify an exact dollar amount that can be attributed to a cemetery transfer/abandonment to the municipality. Every transfer is different and depends on a multitude of factors beginning with the cemetery status (active/inactive), acreage, care and maintenance fund (if any), maintenance of records, etc. What is being recommended by staff by way of support from the province is not meant to erase the costs entirely, but rather, to alleviate the financial burden in some capacity.

Report Appendices
Not applicable.
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RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 24-021-CRS Integrity Commissioner Agreement Renewal be received;

AND THAT the firm of Aird & Berlis LLP be appointed as the Integrity Commissioner for the City of Cambridge, for an additional four-year term;

AND FURTHER THAT the Mayor and Clerk be authorized to enact an agreement with Aird & Berlis LLP, subject to the satisfaction of the City Solicitor.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

To seek Council approval to proceed with renewal of the agreement with Aird & Berlis LLP for Integrity Commissioner services.

Key Findings

- The Municipal Act requires that municipalities establish codes of conduct for members of Council and local boards and appoint an Integrity Commissioner.
- The current agreement for Integrity Commissioner Services with Aird & Berlis LLP expired at the end of 2023.
- Under the terms of the current agreement, the City has the option to renew its contract with Aird & Berlis for an additional four-year term.
- Staff are recommending the agreement with Aird & Berlis LLP be renewed for an additional four-year term.
**Financial Implications**

Services for the Integrity Commissioner are charged on an as needed basis based on requests received by the public, staff or council. The Operating Budget for the Clerks Division includes an annual allocation for Integrity Commissioner Services. For 2024, $60,000 has been earmarked for this service.

**STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:**

☐ Strategic Action

- **Objective(s):** Not Applicable
- **Strategic Action:** Not Applicable

OR

☒ Core Service

- **Program:** Council Services
- **Core Service:** Council Support

Extending the agreement with the Integrity Commissioner makes for good governance and will enable the City to maintain the services of an Integrity Commissioner for an additional four-year period.

**BACKGROUND:**

Bill 68, the Modernizing Ontario’s Municipal Legislation Act, 2017, which received Royal Assent on May 30, 2017, expended the responsibilities of Integrity Commissioners and required that all municipal governments provide for an Integrity Commissioner by either appointing an Integrity Commissioner to perform the functions set out in subsection 223.3(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001, or where Council has not appointed a Commissioner, by making arrangements for the responsibilities set out in subsection 223.3(1) of the Act to be provided by an Integrity Commissioner of another municipality, or through a combination of the two, by March 1, 2019.

Part V.1 of the Act, Accountability and Transparency, subsections 223.2 to 223.12 (Appendix “B”), outline the requirements for Councils “to appoint an Integrity Commissioner who reports to council and who is responsible for performing in an
independent manner the functions assigned by the municipality”. Council has previously expressed its intent to retain its own Integrity Commissioner and to not provide that service through another municipality.

An Integrity Commissioner who reports to Council is responsible for providing the following in relation to members of municipal Council and applicable boards:

- The application of the code of conduct for members;
- The application of any procedures, rules and policies governing the ethical behaviour of members;
- The application of provisions of the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act to members;
- Requests from members for advice respecting a member’s obligations under the code of conduct;
- Requests from members of council and applicable boards for advice respecting their obligations under a procedure, rule or policy governing the ethical behaviour of members;
- Requests from members of council and applicable boards respecting their obligations under the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act;
- Educating members, the municipality and the public about the municipality’s codes of conduct for members of council and members of local boards and about the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act.

The Clerk will work with the Integrity Commissioner to provide annual reports to Council on a go forward basis.

**ANALYSIS:**

Aird & Berlis LLP has acted as the Integrity Commissioner for the City of Cambridge since 2019. This appointment was based on the firm’s broad experience in the municipal sector, their experience with code of conduct investigations, and their exceptional experience related to the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act. Historically the firm has provided timely advice, guidance, and investigation services in accordance with the terms of their contract and has an excellent reputation among Ontario municipalities with the expertise, network of resources and skill set to enable them to perform the responsibilities set out in their contract. The firm currently acts as the Integrity Commissioner for several municipalities throughout Ontario.

The initial appointment of Aird & Berlis LLP was made possible through a procurement process to which the firm was the successful bidder. Under the 2019 agreement, the City has the option to renew the services of Aird & Berlis LLP for an additional four-year period.
The current authority to appoint and remove the Integrity Commissioner rests with Council only and does not provide delegation of authority for a staff recruitment team to select and appoint the Integrity Commissioner.

Under the current agreement with Aird & Berlis LLP, Council has the option to renew the contract for an additional four-year term based on the same terms and conditions, subject to satisfactory performance to date of renewal and price negotiations. Based on a positive response from Aird & Berlis, staff are seeking Council approval to enter into another four-year agreement with the firm.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

The Codes of Conduct for members of Council and Local Boards and Advisory Committees are attached as Appendices A and B, respectively, to this report. Both codes are publicly accessible on the City’s website and demonstrate Council’s commitment to accountability and transparency which increases the public's confidence in its elected officials and volunteers who are appointed to Local Boards and Advisory Committees of Council.

Section 223 of the Municipal Act, 2001, governs the requirement for codes of conduct and the role of the Integrity Commissioner.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Services for the Integrity Commissioner are charged on an as needed basis based on requests received by the public, staff or council. The Operating Budget for the Clerks Division includes $60,000 for Integrity Commissioner services. This amount is a broad estimate of costs to be incurred on an annual basis for the application of the Council Code of Conduct, required education to members of Council and applicable boards, the municipality and the public and with the preparation of an annual report, as required by legislation. Additional costs will depend on each member's (Council and local board) individual situation and the potential for requiring advice from the Integrity Commissioner.

PUBLIC VALUE:

Collaboration:

Collaboration will involve working in partnership with the Integrity Commissioner to forward any matters to their attention and ensuring Council, staff and residents are aware of how to access these services.
Transparency:

To ensure transparency, reports to Council are provided by the Integrity Commissioner regarding their activities. These reports are public reports that enable both Council and residents to understand the matters that the Integrity Commissioner has been involved in and any investigations undertaken.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:

Not Applicable.

PUBLIC INPUT:

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:

The renewal with Aird & Berlis LLP was reviewed with Legal Services and Purchasing staff and there were no objections or concerns with proceeding with the appointment for another four-year term.

CONCLUSION:

Staff are recommending that Aird & Berlis LLP be appointed as the City’s Integrity Commissioner for an additional four-year term.

The firm has broad municipal experience and is well versed in providing advice with respect to matters under the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act.

REPORT IMPACTS:

Agreement: Yes
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. 24-021-CRS Appendix A – Code of Conduct for Members of Council
2. 24-021-CRS Appendix B – Code of Conduct for Local Boards and Advisory Committees
CODE OF CONDUCT FOR MEMBERS OF COUNCIL,
CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

SECTION 1: POLICY STATEMENT

1.1 A written Code of Conduct for Council helps to ensure that the members of Council share a common basis for acceptable conduct.

1.2 This Code is designed as a reference guide and a supplement to the legislative parameters within which all members must operate. These standards should serve to enhance public confidence in the elected officials from the City of Cambridge will operate.

SECTION 2: DEFINITIONS

2.1 For the purposes of this Code:

“Act” means the Municipal Act, 2001 S.O. 2001 c.25

“City” means The Corporation of the City of Cambridge.

“Code” means this Code of Conduct as it applies to members of Council.

“Community groups and organizations” means any group, club, society, or organization and any non-profit or charitable group or organization operated for social welfare, civic improvement, pleasure, recreation or any other purpose except profit.

“Complaint” means an alleged contravention of this Code.

“Confidential Information” means information in the possession of the City that the City is either prohibited from disclosing, or is required to refuse to disclose, under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (MFIPPA) or other legislation.
“Council” means The Corporation of the City of Cambridge.

“Family member” means as defined in the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act.

“Gift and benefits” means any cash or monetary equivalent, fee, object of value, service, travel, accommodation or entertainment.

“Integrity Commissioner” means the Integrity Commissioner appointed by Council pursuant to section 223.3 of the Municipal Act, 2001.

“Meeting” means any legally-constituted meeting of Council or a Committee.

“Member” means a member of Council and Standing Committee of Council.

“Office” means the authority and duties attached to the Member’s position.

“Official duties” means the public duties of a Member and includes functions performed by Members necessary to demonstrate responsible and accountable government with respect to matters within the City or Local Board’s jurisdiction, and which are done for the purpose of providing good government with respect to those matters.

“Pecuniary interest” means an interest as set out in the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act.

“Property” means but is not limited to, all real and personal property, facilities, vehicles, equipment, supplies, services, staff, documents, intellectual property, computer programs or technological innovations belonging to the City.

SECTION 3: APPLICATION OF CODE

3.1 Application

This Code of Conduct applies to all Members.

3.2 Accountable and Good Government

The Act, Part VI, Practices and Procedures, establishes the organization, roles and responsibilities for the Members of Council and administration, including the requirement to pass a Procedural By-Law.

The City’s Procedural By-Law provides rules governing the order and proceedings of the Council and Committees of Council. The Municipal Act and the Procedural By-law ensures that Council is the source of authority for municipal government and its decisions are made and implemented through the appropriate channels of government structure.
Decision-making authority lies with Council as a whole, and not with an individual Member, to approve:

- Budget; Policies; Committee processes; Commit resources; and other municipal matters.

Members shall endeavor to conduct the decision-making process and convey Council business in a transparent, accountable and equitable manner, recognizing that the public has a right to open government, participatory decision-making and reasonable access to information on how decisions are made.

Members of Council must continue to perform their respective duties of office with integrity to avoid conflicts of interest, both apparent and real.

3.3 Role of the Head of Council

In accordance with the Act, this Code of Conduct recognizes the fact that the Mayor, as Head of Council, has additional responsibilities as defined in section 225 of the Act. As a municipality’s Chief Executive Officer, the Head of Council shall:

(a) uphold and promote the purposes of the municipality;
(b) promote public involvement in the municipality’s activities;
(c) act as the representative of the municipality both within and outside the municipality, promote the municipality locally, nationally and internationally; and
(d) participate in and foster activities that enhance the economic, social and environmental well-being of the municipality and its residents.

3.4 Obligation of Members

All Members in the exercise of their duties are expected to follow this Code, the Council Procedural Bylaw in the case of Council Members and other sources of applicable procedural law including:

- Municipal Act, 2001; Municipal Conflict of Interest Act; Municipal Elections Act; Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (MFIPPA) and the Criminal Code of Canada
SECTION 4: CONDUCT OF MEMBERS

4.1 A Member shall at all times conduct themselves with decorum, courtesy, respect, propriety, decency and respect and with the understanding that all members of the public, other Members and staff are to be treated with dignity, courtesy and empathy, recognizing that a member is a representative of the City and of their elected office.

4.2 Such conduct shall also adhere to the provisions of applicable law including the Act and the Procedural By-Law.

4.3 A Member recognizes the importance of co-operation and strives to create an atmosphere during Council and Committee meetings that is conducive to solving the issues before Council, listening to various points of view and using respectful language and behavior in relation to all those in attendance.

4.4 Members shall make every effort to participate in the activities of the agencies, Boards, commissions and Committees to which they are appointed in the same manner as Council activities.

SECTION 5: MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

5.1 Interaction with City staff

The role of City officers and employees is to implement the decisions of Council and to establish administrative procedures to carry out City operations as provided for in the Act.

Under the direction of the City Manager, staff serves Council as a whole, and the combined interests of all Members as evidenced through Council decisions.

The City Manager has overall responsibility for the administration of City affairs in accordance with the decisions adopted by Council. To fulfill this role, the City Manager establishes:

- appropriate administrative policies; systems and structures; processes; and internal controls to implement Council’s goals and objectives.

5.2 No member shall:

a) maliciously, falsely, negligently or recklessly injure the professional, personal or ethical reputation or the prospects or practice of City employees and members shall show respect for the professional capacities of City employees.
b) ask, request or compel City employees to engage in partisan political activities or be subjected to threats or discrimination for refusing to engage in such activities.

c) use, or attempt to use, their authority or influence for the purpose of intimidating, threatening, coercing, commanding, or influencing any City employee with the intent of interfering with that employee’s duties, including the duty to disclose improper activity.

5.3 Accountability and Transparency in Decision Making

Members shall conduct Council business and their duties in an open and transparent manner so that the public and staff can understand the process and rationale which has been used to reach decisions.

Such conduct requires compliance with the Act, MFIPPA, the Procedural By-Law and other applicable legislation regarding open meetings, accountability and transparency.

5.4 Communications with the Public & Media Relations

When a member communicates with the public and/or media, they will accurately communicate the decisions of Council, even if the member did not support the decision. Individual members have the right to express their opinions; however, any discussion must be done in a manner that shows respect for and integrity in the decision making process of Council.

5.5 Confidential Information

Members may receive and shall keep confidential information as part of its decision-making duties. Members have an obligation to keep such information confidential in order to safeguard the corporate interests, corporate image and to uphold disclosure rules to prevent personal gain or advantage to others.

Members respect confidentiality requirements for information received in a closed session of Council under section 239 of the Act.

In accordance with the Procedural By-law, Members shall not publicly disclose the content of any confidential matter or the substance of deliberations or in-camera meetings until the information is open or released to the public as required by law, or approved by Council.
SECTION 6: USE OF RESOURCES AND CITY EXPENDITURES

6.1 Use of Corporate Resources

No Member shall use City property, including land, facilities, equipment, supplies, services, staff or other corporate resources for activities other than the business of the Corporation.

Members shall respect that the powers of the municipality are exercised by Council. Council, as a whole, is responsible for policy making that directs staff in the delivery of services. For tasks or actions that require the commitment of significant staff time and/or City resources, Members must obtain approval through recommendation by decision of Council. By doing so, Council confirms that the corporate interests and business are being advanced in compliance with all applicable rules and policies respecting the use of corporate resources.

6.2 Use of Office Expenditure

Members are entrusted to make decisions based on an impartial and objective assessment of each situation, free from the real or perceived influence of gifts, hospitality or benefits. Regardless of monetary value, the gift, hospitality or benefit could be seen as an instrument of influence, favoritism and bias on the part of the Member.

Council approves an office expenditure for each member through the budget process on an annual basis.

Members agree to respect and uphold the Council Expense Policy that guides their use of their respective office expenditures, budgets and resources.

6.3 Gifts, Hospitality and Benefits

From time to time, gifts, hospitality and benefits are offered and accepted by Members in the course of their duties and attendance at public functions. The acceptance of gifts, hospitality and benefits of a nominal value (up to $300.00) is considered part of the Member’s role and responsibilities and are to be received by the Member only in good faith, as an incident of protocol or social obligation.

In accepting a gift or benefit, Members shall be aware of those that would be of pecuniary interest and subject to the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act.
Members are entrusted to make decisions based on an impartial and objective assessment of each situation, free from the real or perceived influence of gifts, hospitality or benefits. Regardless of monetary value, the gift, hospitality or benefit could be seen as an instrument of influence, favoritism and bias on the part of the Member.

To promote transparency and accountability to the public, Members will continue to set a high standard of conduct and be prepared to openly disclose all gifts and benefits that have been received in carrying out their official duties. No Member shall accept a fee advance, gift or benefit that is connected directly or indirectly with the performance of their duties in office.

SECTION 7: PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY GROUPS AND ORGANIZATIONS

As community leaders, Members are called upon to assist and support various charities, service clubs, and other non-profit and community-based associations.

7.1 Members are entitled to:

a) organize, establish, fundraise, participate in and support community groups and organizations and their associated events;

b) hold positions, including positions on governing boards, within community groups and organizations and be subject to the published rules of each applicable organization;

c) use their discretionary expense budget to support community groups and organizations and their events, subject to the terms of the Councillor Expense Policy.

7.2 Members shall:

a) respect the need for transparency with respect to involvement in community groups, organizations and events and perform their community service in a manner that promotes public confidence;

b) seek Council approval for the use of their position and title in the support of any event where non-corporate fundraising activities occur;

c) seek Council approval for the use of corporate resources in excess of the Council Expense Policy to support any non-corporate event organized by the Member where fundraising activities occur;
d) seek Council approval for the commitment of city resources to any event which is not organized by the City.

SECTION 8: ABUSE OF ROLE

8.1 Improper Use of Influence

No Member shall use the influence of their office for any purpose other than for the exercise of their official duties.

As an elected official, Councillors are expected to perform their duties of office with integrity, accountability and transparency. A Member shall not use the status of their position to influence the decision of another individual to the private advantage of oneself, or one’s parents, children or spouse, staff members, friends, associates, business or otherwise.

In the same manner, and as outlined in the Provincial Offences Act – Conflict of Interest Policy, Members shall not attempt to influence or interfere, either directly or indirectly, financially, politically or otherwise with employees, officers or other persons performing duties under the Provincial Offences Act.

For the purposes of this section "private advantage" does not include a matter that:

a) is of general application;

b) affects a Member, their Family members, City employees friends, or associates, business or otherwise, as one of a broad class of persons;

c) or that concerns the remuneration or benefits of a Member.

8.2 Business Relations

No Member shall act as a paid agent or lobbyist before Council, its Committees, or an agency, board or commission of the City.

No Member shall refer a third party to a person, partnership, or corporation in exchange for financial or other gain.
8.3 **Employment of Family Members**

No Member shall make any decision or participate in the process to hire, transfer, promote, demote, discipline or terminate a Family member.

If a Family member of a Member is an applicant for employment or applicant for a Committee with the City or candidate for promotion or transfer, the Family member will proceed through the usual application/selection process with no special consideration.

No Member shall act as a supervisor of their Family member or be placed in a position where they could have influence over their Family member's employment.

No Member shall attempt to use a family relationship for financial or other gain.

**SECTION 9: HARASSMENT**

9.1 Harassment includes, but is not limited to, any behavior, conduct, form of imagery or comment by any person that is directed at or is offensive to another person on the protected grounds of discrimination: age, ancestry, colour, race, citizenship, ethnic origin, creed, disability, family status, marital status (including single status), gender identity, gender expression, receipt of public assistance (in housing only), record of offences (in employment only), sex (including pregnancy and breastfeeding), sexual orientation and sexual harassment and any other grounds under the provisions of the *Ontario Human Rights Code* and the City’s Respect in the Workplace Policy.

In accordance with the *Ontario Human Rights Code*, the *Occupational Health and Safety Act* and the City’s Respect in the Workplace Policy, all persons will be treated with dignity and respect in an environment free of discrimination and harassment.

Harassment, whether it occurs inside or outside the workplace, but is related to the activities of elected office, is considered to be inappropriate behavior for the purpose of this Code of Conduct.

9.2 Members will abide by the Corporate Values and Behaviours as guiding principles and are attached as Appendix A.
SECTION 10: ROLE OF THE INTEGRITY COMMISSIONER

10.1 Integrity Commissioner appointed under Section 223.3 of the Act is an independent officer who reports directly to Council and is responsible for carrying out his or her functions in accordance with the Act and any other functions assigned by Council, in an independent manner.

10.2 The Commissioner carries out the following core functions.

a) Advisory Role

The Integrity Commissioner provides confidential written and oral advice to the Mayor, City Councillors and Members of Committees and Local Boards appointees about their own situations respecting the applicable Code of Conduct and other by-laws and policies governing ethical behavior.

The Integrity Commissioner also provides opinions and reports to City Council, each as a collective whole, on issues of ethics and integrity.

b) Investigative Role

Complaints about breaches of the Codes of Conduct are made to the Integrity Commissioner. Complaints can be dealt with through a formal or informal process, as defined by the complaint resolution process in Appendix B. When carrying out a formal complaint investigation, the Commissioner can summon evidence and examine under oath.

c) Educational Role

The Integrity Commissioner is responsible for providing educational programs to members of Council and their staff. This is carried out in group settings, one-on-one meetings, annual reporting and through the webpage of the Office of the Integrity Commissioner.

10.3 The responsibility for the interpretation of this policy lies with the Integrity Commissioner. In the case that there is a vacancy or absence of the Integrity Commissioner position, all formal complaints shall be held in abeyance until such time as an Integrity Commissioner has been appointed or an interim measure enacted to enable the complaint to be addressed within a reasonable amount of time.

10.4 Notwithstanding the services above, the Integrity Commissioner shall not provide advice or opinions to any Member with respect to the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act.
SECTION 11: COMPLIANCE AND INTERPRETATION

11.1 **Compliance**

Members are accountable to the public throughout the duration of their term. To provide the public with open, transparent and accountable government, members will respect all legislation, applicable policy and the spirit and intent of this Code of Conduct.

11.2 **Interpretation**

Members of Council seeking clarification of any part of this Code of Conduct should consult directly with the Integrity Commissioner.

11.3 **Nothing contained in this Code shall be interpreted so as to impede vigorous but respectful debate during meetings of Council and its Committees.**

11.4 **Reimbursement of Costs**

The reimbursement of fees for a Member and/or the Complainant may be returned based on the findings of the Integrity Commissioner; this process is outlined in Appendix C.

SECTION 12: REVIEW AND ATTESTATION

12.1 **Review**

Upon adoption of this Code of Conduct and thereafter at the beginning of each term, Members will be expected to sign the Code of Conduct to convey to each other and all stakeholders that they have read, understood and accept it.

To ensure that this Code remains relevant and current, staff will review any significant legislative or internal policy changes for possible impact to the Code and report where necessary.

12.2 **Confirmation**

At the beginning of each Term of Council, this Code will be reviewed with the new term of Council in connection with the development of corporate strategies.

Signature ______________________________________  Date ____________________________
Appendix A

Corporate Core Values and Behaviours

Staff interactions are guided by the Corporate Core Values and Behaviours established in 2014. The City of Cambridge is committed to:

RESPECT
We will…
Have mutual and fair understanding of the wants, needs and expectations of others
Practice open, honest and sincere communication

INTEGRITY
We will…
Conduct ourselves in a professional manner with emphasis on effective communication, accountability for actions, and a strong moral compass
Be committed to maintaining a safe, trusting, and supportive environment
Demonstrate professionalism, good judgement, and personal leadership

SERVICE
We will…
Strive to provide timely, respectful and knowledgeable responses focusing on communication information in a friendly and accessible manner to all
Seek feedback and use it to enhance and continually improve our services
Demonstrate genuine enthusiasm and take pride in our work to achieve common goals
Demonstrate hard work and dedication in an effort to enhance community pride

INCLUSIVENESS
We will…
Commit, to welcome, learn and understand
Foster an environment of respect and a sense of belonging for all
Appendix B
Complaint Resolution Process
of the Integrity Commissioner

A complaint that a Member has contravened the Code may be initiated by any person, employee of the City, any other Member or by Council as follows:

(a) a complaint shall be made in the form attached form and is to be sent directly to the Integrity Commissioner by mail, e-mail, fax or courier (if required, pre-addressed and postage paid envelopes are available from the Clerks Division of the Corporate Services Department;

(b) a complaint shall be made in writing and must be signed and dated by the complainant who shall be an identifiable individual (complaints may not be submitted by any group, organization or corporation);

(c) a complaint shall include:
   (i) an explanation, with specific reference to sections of the Code, as to why the issue raised is alleged to be a contravention of the Code.
   (ii) any evidence in support of the allegations in a sworn affidavit; and
   (iii) any witnesses in support of the allegation must be identified.

Informal Complaint Procedure

Any Member, employee of the City or a member of the public who has reasonable grounds to believe that a behaviour or activity of a Member has contravened the Code may wish to address the behavior or activity with the Member personally. The informal complaint procedure is set out below.

(a) The complainant shall advise the City Clerk that the complainant is willing to attempt to resolve the complaint informally with the Member of Council.

(b) The City Clerk shall contact the Integrity Commissioner.

(c) The Office of the Integrity Commissioner shall co-ordinate the meetings between the Member of Council and the complainant. The Office of the Integrity Commissioner shall act a convener of the meetings between the Member and the complainant and shall note the attendance of those participating in the meetings and shall take no other role in the meetings.

(d) The complainant shall attend at meeting(s) with the Member of Council, alone or with one other person.

(e) The complainant shall advise the Member of the behaviour or activity which may contravene the Code.

(f) The complainant shall provide a written record of the incidents including dates, times, locations, other persons present, and any other relevant information and provide this information to the Member.

(g) The complainant shall discuss with the Member how the behavior or activity may be addressed.
(h) The Complainant shall confirm to the Member the complainant’s satisfaction with the response of the Member, or, alternatively advise the Member of the complainant’s dissatisfaction with the response.

(i) If the complainant is satisfied with the Member’s response, the complainant shall provide a statement in writing to the Integrity Commissioner that the complainant does not wish to pursue a formal inquiry and wishes to withdraw their complaint.

(j) If the complainant is dissatisfied with the Member’s response, the complainant shall provide a statement in writing to the Integrity Commissioner that the complainant will pursue other processes to address their complaint. The complainant shall consider the need to pursue the complaint in accordance with the formal complaint procedure or in accordance with another applicable judicial or quasi-judicial process and shall advise the Integrity Commissioner of the complainant’s decision.

(k) The Integrity Commissioner shall communicate to the City Clerk whether the complainant is satisfied or dissatisfied with the informal complainant procedure.

Everyone is encouraged to initially pursue this informal complaint procedure as a means of stopping and remedying a behaviour or activity that is prohibited by the Code. However, it is not a prerequisite that those complaining must pursue the informal complaint procedure before pursuing the formal complaint procedure.

**Formal Complaint Procedure**

All complaints shall be submitted to the City Clerk and in the form provided and the City Clerk shall forthwith forward them without comment to the Integrity Commissioner.

All complaints must provide:

(a) the name of Member to whom the complaint relates;
(b) the nature of the alleged contravention;
(c) the specific provision(s) of the Code allegedly contravened;
(d) the names of any witnesses to the alleged contravention
(e) provide the specified filing fee of $25;
(f) a signed and sworn statement that sets out the evidence in support of the complaint; and
(g) any written material in support of the alleged contravention.

Upon receipt of a complaint involving a Member other than the Head of Council, the City Clerk shall immediately advise the Head of Council and City Manager. Upon receipt of a complaint involving the Head of Council, the City Clerk shall immediately advise the City Manager and the Acting Mayor.
Confidentiality

The Integrity Commissioner shall carry out all enquiries in a manner which will ensure that the individual to whom the complaint relates is treated fairly and all complaints shall be treated as confidential to the extent possible and in accordance with the Act.

All records of investigations shall be kept confidential and access limited to those in the City with a need to know for the purposes of conducting a full investigation.

Initial Review by Integrity Commissioner

Upon receipt of a complaint, the Integrity Commissioner shall conduct an initial review to determine if the matter is, on its face, a complaint with respect to non-compliance with the Code of Conduct and not covered by other legislation or other municipal policies.

If the complaint, including any supporting documents, is not on its face, a complaint with respect to non-compliance with the Code of Conduct or the complaint is covered by other legislation or a complaint procedure under another Council policy, the Integrity Commissioner shall advise the complainant in writing.

If the Integrity Commissioner is of the opinion that the referral of a matter to him or her is frivolous, vexatious or not made in good faith, or that there are no grounds or insufficient grounds for an investigation, the Integrity Commissioner shall not conduct an investigation, or, where that becomes apparent in the course of an investigation, shall terminate the investigation.

Opportunity for Resolution

If at any time, following receipt of a formal complaint or during the investigation process, the Integrity Commissioner believes that an opportunity to resolve the matter may be successfully pursued without a formal investigation, and both the complainant and the member agree, efforts may be made to achieve an informal resolution.

Investigation & Settlement

If a complaint has been classified as being within the Integrity Commissioner’s jurisdiction, the Integrity Commissioner shall investigate and may attempt to settle the complaint.
The Integrity Commissioner will proceed as follows:

(a) Serve the complaint and supporting affidavit and material upon the Member whose conduct is in question with a request that a written response to the allegation by way of affidavit be filed within ten (10) days or such longer period as the Integrity Commissioner may authorize in writing; and

(b) Serve a copy of the responding affidavit provided by the Member upon the complainant with a request for a written reply by way of affidavit within ten (10) days or such longer period as the Integrity Commissioner may authorize in writing.

(c) Serve a copy of the reply upon the Member with a request that the Member provide a second written response by way of affidavit with ten (10) days or such longer period as the Integrity Commissioner may authorize in writing.

The Integrity Commissioner may speak to anyone relevant to the complaint, access and examine any of the information relevant to the complaint and to enter any municipal work location relevant to the complaint for the purpose of investigation and settlement.

The Integrity Commissioner is to be provided free access to all books, accounts, financial records, electronic data processing records, reports, files and all other papers, things or property belonging to or used by the municipality.

The Integrity Commissioner may make interim reports to Council where necessary and as required to address any instances of interference, obstruction or retaliation encountered during the investigation.

If the Integrity Commissioner determines that there has been no contravention of the Code of Conduct or that a contravention occurred although the member took all reasonable measures to prevent it, or that a contravention occurred that was trivial or committed through inadvertence or error of judgment made in good faith, the Integrity Commissioner shall so state in the report and shall recommend that no penalty be imposed.
Final Report

The Integrity Commissioner shall complete an investigation within 90 days.

In circumstances where the Integrity Commissioner requires more than 90 days completing an investigation, the following shall be notified accordingly:

(a) the complainant;
(b) the Member to whom the complaint relates; and
(c) the City Manager and the Acting Mayor in the case of a complaint concerning the Head of Council.

Reporting the Results of an Investigation

The Integrity Commissioner shall provide a copy of the draft report to the complainant and the Member subject to the investigation within 20 days of the due date.

The report shall remain confidential until the matter has received complete and final disposition by the Integrity Commissioner and has been reported out to the Members of Council in an open meeting.

Should the Integrity Commissioner find a contravention, the Integrity Commissioner may recommend the penalties in accordance with the Municipal Act, 2001, for imposition by Council.

The Integrity Commissioner may also recommend to Council the following actions:

(a) Removal of the Member from membership of a Committee
(b) Removal of the Member as Chair of a Committee
(c) Repayment or reimbursement by the Member of moneys received
(d) Return of property by the member or reimbursement of its value
(e) A request for a written and/or verbal apology by the Member to Council, the complainant or both

Council shall consider and respond to a report from the Integrity Commissioner within 30 days after the day the report is laid before it. Any recommended corrective action shall be designed to ensure that the inappropriate behaviour or activity does not continue and any reprimand will be in accordance with Section 223.4 of the Act.

Reporting to Council

The Integrity Commissioner shall report annually to Council on complaints made that were determined not to be within the jurisdiction of the Integrity Commissioner, but shall not disclose information that could identify a person concerned.
Other than in exceptional circumstances, the Integrity Commissioner shall not report to Council on any complaint described above except as part of an annual or other periodic report. All reports to Council by the Integrity Commissioner on the investigation of complaints are public documents once they have been reported out to the Members of Council.

The Integrity Commissioner shall be responsible for ensuring the above procedures are followed with respect to requests for enquiries and for conducting investigations.

Complaints in Municipal Election Years

Despite any other provision of this process, no complaint received by the City Clerk during the period from Nomination Day to Election Day will be referred to the Integrity Commissioner for investigation until after the election has taken place.

Retroactive complaints

This complaint protocol shall not apply retroactively to any alleged transgressions occurring prior to the date on which the Code of Conduct was formally approved by Council.
Appendix C
Payment of Costs

1. A complainant and a Member who are parties to a Complaint under this Code shall each be reimbursed for actual and reasonable legal and related expenses up to a maximum of:

   (a) $5,000; or

   (b) $20,000, if the Integrity Commissioner has elected to investigate the Complaint by exercise of the powers of a commission under Parts I and II of the Public Inquiries Act.

2. In the case of an application under the Judicial Review Procedure Act for judicial review of actions taken on a Complaint against a Member of Council by the Integrity Commissioner:

   (a) Council may where a Member made the judicial review application, the Member is eligible for reimbursement of legal costs, including additional legal costs in a successful application, that are not covered by the costs awarded by the court, up to a maximum of $20,000.

   (b) A Member may apply for reimbursement of the legal costs of intervention in a judicial review application where the Member’s interests are at stake, up to a maximum of $20,000.

3. Council may consider the reimbursement of costs above the limit in sections 1 and 2 on a case by case basis.

4. Costs may be provided in advance in an investigation, if the Integrity Commissioner is of the opinion that the use of a lawyer by one or more of the parties would facilitate the carrying out of the investigation, and sections 5 and 6 do not apply to the advance costs paid under this section.

5. Costs shall only be reimbursed under this section to the complainant, if the Integrity Commissioner concludes that the Complaint is not frivolous, vexatious or made in bad faith and the Integrity Commissioner’s conclusion is not overturned on judicial review.

6. Costs shall only be reimbursed under this appendix to the Member:

   (a) If the Integrity Commissioner determines that:
      i) there has not been a contravention of the Code of Conduct; or
      ii) a contravention occurred but the Member took all reasonable measures to prevent it; or
iii) a contravention occurred that was trivial or committed through inadvertence or error of judgment made in good faith; And the Integrity Commissioner states such in the report and recommends that no penalty be imposed; And the Integrity Commissioner’s conclusion is not overturned on judicial review; or

(b) where Council receives the Integrity Commissioner’s report on a violation and determines that it should not take any action.

7. Any award of costs under section 6 shall be contingent on a report from the Integrity Commissioner.
CODE OF CONDUCT FOR
LOCAL BOARDS AND ADVISORY COMMITTEES
CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

SECTION 1: POLICY STATEMENT

A written Code of Conduct for Local Boards and Committees helps to ensure that those appointed to represent the City on a board or committee share a common basis for acceptable conduct.

SECTION 2: APPLICATION

This Code of Conduct applies to all public citizen members who are appointed by Cambridge City Council and participate on an advisory and/or local board within the City of Cambridge.

SECTION 3: CONDUCT OF MEMBERS

A member shall at all times conduct themselves with propriety, decency and respect and with the understanding that all members of the public, other members and staff are to be treated with dignity, courtesy and empathy.

Members shall conduct themselves with decorum in accordance with the provisions of applicable law including the Municipal Act and the City’s Procedural By-Law, to show courtesy and respect to fellow members and others.
SECTION 4: DUTIES AND OBLIGATIONS OF PUBLIC MEMBERS

Members of the public appointed to committees are appointed at the pleasure of Council. They do not hold office as elected officials nor do they represent either Council or the committee unless mandated to do so. Members of the public appointed to committees must respect both the word and spirit of this Code as it applies to them and also as it applies to Members of Council.

Members of the public shall, when conducting business of the corporation, act in a manner that:

(a) fulfills the mandate and mission state of the Committee or Board;
(b) respects due process and the authority of the Chair, Vice-Chair or Presiding Officer;
(c) demonstrates respect for all fellow committee members, Council, staff and the public;
(d) respects and gives fair consideration to diverse and opposing viewpoints;
(e) demonstrates due diligence in preparing for meetings, special occasions or other committee-related events;
(f) demonstrates professionalism, transparency, accountability and timeliness in completing any tasks or projects undertaken by the committee;
(g) conforms with all relevant legislation, by-laws, policies and guidelines; and,
(h) contributes in a meaningful manner, offering constructive comments to Council, staff and fellow members.

Furthermore, a member of the public shall not:

(a) come into a position where the member is under obligation to any person who might benefit from special consideration or favour on their part or who might seek in any way preferential treatment;
(b) accord, in the performance of his or her official duties, preferential treatment to relatives or to organizations in which the member, his or her relatives have an interest, financial or otherwise;
(c) deal with an application to the City for a grant, award, contract, permit or other benefit involving the member, his or her immediate relative;
(d) come into a position where the member could derive any direct benefit or interest from any matter about which they can influence decisions; and,
(e) benefit from the use of information acquired during the course of his or her official duties which is not generally available to the public.
Committees of Council are either advisory or quasi-judicial in nature, or have a management function.

(i) An advisory Committee provides Council with information or recommendations on matters related to their mandate for a Council decision.

(ii) Quasi-judicial committees, such as the Appeals Committee and the Committee of Adjustment, make decisions that are not subject to Council approval but may be the subject of an appeal to another body, such as the Ontario Municipal Board.

(iii) A management committee has responsibility for the management of an entity such as a cemetery.

A member who is aware of a known conflict of interest shall immediately disclose to the staff administrator and shall refrain and abide by any decision made with respect to such conflict of interest without recourse.

If a member fails to disclose a conflict of interest, then the matter may be brought forward for consideration by an alternate member. A majority vote would determine if the member is in a conflict position and would be subject to the Code.

SECTION 5: ABUSE OF ROLE

No member of the public shall use the influence of their role as it relates to participating on an advisory committee and/or board for any purpose other than for the exercise of their official duties.

SECTION 6: HARASSMENT

Harassment includes, but is not limited to, any behavior, conduct, form of imagery or comment by any person that is directed at or is offensive to another person on the protected grounds of discrimination: age, ancestry, colour, race, citizenship, ethnic origin, creed, disability, family status, marital status (including single status), gender identity, gender expression, receipt of public assistance (in housing only), record of offences (in employment only), sex (including pregnancy and breastfeeding), sexual orientation and sexual harassment and any other grounds under the provisions of the Ontario Human Rights Code and the Respect in the Workplace Policy.

In accordance with the Ontario Human Rights Code, the Occupational Health and Safety Act and the City’s Respect in the Workplace Policy, all persons will be treated with dignity and respect in an environment free of discrimination and harassment.
Members will abide by the Corporate Values and Behaviours as guiding principles and are attached as Appendix A.

Harassment, whether it occurs inside or outside the workplace, but is related to the activities of elected office, is considered to be inappropriate behavior for the purpose of this Code of Conduct.

SECTION 7: ROLE OF THE INTEGRITY COMMISSIONER

The City shall appoint an Integrity Commissioner under Section 223.3 of the Municipal Act who is an independent officer and is responsible for carrying out his or her functions in accordance with the Municipal Act.

Should a member breach any part of the Code of Conduct, the Integrity Commissioner will be called upon to investigate and review the matter.

SECTION 8: COMPLIANCE AND INTERPRETATION

Compliance

Members will do their utmost to uphold the virtues contained in the Code of Conduct. If a member observes or is credibly informed of a possible contravention of this Code, that member has an obligation to proactively address the contravention.

Interpretation

Members seeking clarification of any part of this Code of Conduct should consult directly with the staff liaison who will receive clarification from the City Clerk or designate.

SECTION 9: REVIEW

Each member appointed to a committee and/or board shall receive a copy of this Code of Conduct.

To ensure that this Code remains relevant and current, staff will review any significant legislative or internal policy changes for possible impact to the Code and report where necessary.
Appendix A
Corporate Core Values and Behaviours

Interactions at the City of Cambridge are guided by the Corporate Core Values and Behaviours established in 2014.

RESPECT
We will...
Have mutual and fair understanding of the wants, needs and expectations of others
Practice open, honest and sincere communication

INTEGRITY
We will...
Conduct ourselves in a professional manner with emphasis on effective communication, accountability for actions, and a strong moral compass
Be committed to maintaining a safe, trusting, and supportive environment
Demonstrate professionalism, good judgement, and personal leadership

SERVICE
We will...
Strive to provide timely, respectful and knowledgeable responses focusing on communication information in a friendly and accessible manner to all
Seek feedback and use it to enhance and continually improve our services
Demonstrate genuine enthusiasm and take pride in our work to achieve common goals
Demonstrate hard work and dedication in an effort to enhance community pride

INCLUSIVENESS
We will...
Commit, to welcome, learn and understand
Foster an environment of respect and a sense of belonging for all
RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 24-053-CD – Addendum – Proposed Official Plan Amendment for Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan be received;

AND THAT Report 23-261-CD – Recommendation Report – Proposed Official Plan Amendment for Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan included as Appendix B be received;

AND THAT Council adopts Official Plan Amendment No. 65, as amended, to establish the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan, and that the adopted Official Plan Amendment be submitted to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo for approval;

AND THAT Council is satisfied that a subsequent public meeting in accordance with subsection 17(15) of the Planning Act is not required;

AND FURTHER THAT the attached By-law is passed.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

The addendum to report 23-261-CD is being provided to Council to address direction received at the Council meeting of Tuesday, October 24, 2023.

Key Findings

- Staff have proposed the addition of a High Density Residential block and an increase in maximum permitted height to 20 storeys for the entire property.
• After the October 24, 2023 meeting, the applicant requested the removal of an existing site specific provision that allowed the property to convert from industrial to mixed use (commercial and residential) with a built form based density target.

• The Region of Waterloo is the final approval authority for the Official Plan Amendment.

Financial Implications

• There are no immediate financial impacts arising from the proposed revision requested by Council.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☒ Strategic Action

Objective(s): PLANNING FOR GROWTH - Provide for a mix of development, uses and amenities in order to meet the needs of a changing and diverse population

Strategic Action: Lay the foundation for future community-building

OR

☐ Core Service

Program: Not Applicable

Core Service: Not Applicable

BACKGROUND:

Location

The requested revision impacts the property located northeast of the intersection of Main Street and Franklin Boulevard (840 and 940 Main Street and 0 Franklin Boulevard). The property is outlined in red in Figure 1.
Surrounding Land Uses

The lands to the north and east of the property generally contain industrial uses. The lands to the south generally contain residential uses and the lands to the west generally contain commercial uses.

ANALYSIS:

Staff met with the owner of 840 and 940 Main Street and 0 Franklin Boulevard and their agents to discuss Council direction and to propose a revision to the site-specific official plan policy proposed for their property. Staff have proposed an increase in the maximum permitted height to 20 storeys as well as to redesignate the future development block at the northwest corner of the property to High Density Residential with a reduction in the minimum required height, from ten storeys to eight storeys, in consideration of their existing development proposal for the property.

The site-specific wording includes a provision requiring a noise study to demonstrate that future development could appropriately mitigate against the existing industrial operations immediately to the north of the subject lands. The applicant is not currently proposing development at 20 storeys in height so any future redevelopment of the lands would require a noise study to support the proposal.

After the Council meeting of October 24, 2023 the applicant made a request to staff to remove the existing site-specific policy (8.10.46) through the Official Plan Amendment (OPA) for the secondary plan rather than through their existing development application (OR12/21). Site specific 8.10.46 was appealed by the property owner and only came into force and effect with the withdrawal of the appeal as acknowledged by the Ontario Land Tribunal. The site-specific policy allowed the property to be converted from industrial to mixed use (commercial and residential) with a built form based density
range. The development proposed for the property is mixed use commercial and residential and the increased permitted height allows for higher density which satisfies the intent and purpose of the existing site specific policies. Staff are satisfied that replacing site specific 8.10.46 with the site specific policies included with the Main Street and Dundas Street S Secondary Plan maintains the intent and purpose of the Official Plan and represents good planning. The removal of site-specific 8.10.46 was identified to Council and the public through the Statutory Public Meeting for OR12/21 and as such, it is the opinion of staff that no further public meeting is required as a result of this change from the last meeting.

Official Plan Amendment No. 65 (OPA No. 65), as amended, has been prepared in accordance with the Planning Act and generally aligns with the policies of the Cambridge Official Plan, the Region of Waterloo Official Plan, the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement and the 2020 Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

Accordingly, staff recommend adoption of OPA No. 65 to facilitate addition of the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan as Chapter 20 to the Cambridge Official Plan along with accompanying schedule and OP policy changes to Chapters 1, 8, 13 and 16.

Planning decisions are subject to appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT), subject to the provisions of the Planning Act, as amended.

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

**Cambridge Official Plan, 2012, as amended.**

The City of Cambridge Official Plan includes policy that states that the City will prepare secondary plans to “ensure development occurs at the densities and form consistent with the Official Plan. More detailed analysis is provided in report 23-261-CD in Appendix B.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

Financial impact is evaluated in detail in report 23-261-CD (Appendix B). There are no anticipated additional impacts resulting from the proposed amendment to OPA No. 65.

**PUBLIC VALUE:**

**Engagement:**

As outlined in report 23-261-CD (Appendix B).

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:**

Not Applicable
PUBLIC INPUT:
In addition to the public input outlined in report 23-261-CD, staff met with the property owner of the impacted property and their consultants.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:
As outlined in report 23-261-CD (Appendix B).

CONCLUSION:
Planning staff is recommending adoption of the Official Plan Amendment, as amended. The amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020; and conforms to the Growth Plan (2020), the Regional Official Plan and Cambridge Official Plan; and represents good planning.

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

APPROVALS:
This report has gone through the appropriate workflow and has been reviewed and or approved by the following as required:

Director
Deputy City Manager
Chief Financial Officer
City Solicitor
City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:
1. 24-053-CD Appendix A – Revised Proposed Official Plan Amendment: Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan Policy and Schedules

2. 24-053-CD Appendix B – Report 23-261-CD Recommendation Report – Proposed OPA for Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
BY-LAW 24-xxx

Being a by-law of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge to adopt Amendment No. 65 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012), as amended with respect to the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan.

WHEREAS sections 17 and 22 of the Planning Act R.S.O. 1990 c. P. 13, as amended empower the City of Cambridge to adopt an Official Plan and make amendments thereto;

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

1. THAT Amendment No. 65 to the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012) applies to lands described as the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan;

2. THAT Amendment No. 65 to the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012) as amended, consisting of the text, and attached maps, is hereby adopted;

3. THAT the Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to make application to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo for approval of the aforementioned Amendment No. 65 to the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012), as amended;

4. AND THAT this By-law shall come into full force and effect upon the final passing thereof.

Enacted and Passed this ______ day of ________ 2024.

______________________________
MAYOR

______________________________
CLERK
PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 65 TO THE
OFFICIAL PLAN OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE:
Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan
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PART A – THE PREAMBLE

1.0 TITLE AND COMPONENTS

This document is entitled ‘Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan’ and will be referred to as ‘Amendment No. 65’. ‘Part A – The Preamble’ provides an explanation of the amendment including the purpose and format of the amendment but does not form part of this amendment.

‘Part B – The Amendment’ forms Amendment No. 65 to the Official Plan of the City of Cambridge and contains a comprehensive expression of the new, deleted and amended text.

2.0 PURPOSE

The purpose of Amendment No. 65 is to amend the Official Plan to include the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan which will introduce a policy framework to guide growth and redevelopment in the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node.

3.0 BACKGROUND

Prior to preparing the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan, extensive public consultation occurred including stakeholder meetings, Public Information Centres and public meetings:
• October 2015 – Stakeholders meeting to allow property owners and interested parties to discuss ideas about the future of the Secondary Plan Area.

• April 2016 – Second stakeholders meeting to present initial draft of Secondary Plan to stakeholders.

• May 10, 2016 – Statutory Public Meeting.

• December 12, 2022 – Public Information Centre.

• May 16, 2023 – Statutory Public Meeting.

At the December 12, 2022, Public Information Centre. A proposed vision for the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan Area was shared with the community, along with proposed key principles to guide future development in the area related to land use and built form, transportation and mobility, parks and open space, and natural heritage. A land use concept was also presented to demonstrate how lands within the Secondary Plan Area could be organized. A question-and-answer period was held following the presentation to allow participants a chance to ask questions and provide comments on the project, presentation, and land use option presented. The Project Team provided responses to all questions received through a subsequent comment-response matrix.

At the May 16, 2023, Statutory Public Meeting the draft Secondary Plan, as revised based on the public and agency comments received, was presented to Council and the public for consideration. Responses to comments received at the Statutory Public Meeting were provided through a comment response matrix appended to the recommendation report.

4.0 LOCATION

Official Plan Amendment No. 65 applies to the lands identified as a Community Node and Future Study Area from Figure 3 of the Cambridge Official Plan and can generally be described as the lands south of McLaren Avenue, north of Franklin Lane, east of Dundas Street South and west of Wesley Boulevard.
5.0 BASIS OF THE AMENDMENT

5.1 Background

The City of Cambridge Official Plan (approved on November 21, 2012, by the Region of Waterloo) imagines Cambridge as a growing, well designed, compact, vibrant, and complete community. The city is planned to feature an appropriate mix of jobs, range of housing options, access to services and community infrastructure, and access to transportation options including public transit and active transportation. One of the keys to achieving this vision is the development and implementation of a robust policy framework that focuses growth and intensification in strategic locations within the existing built-up areas. These locations include the Urban Growth Centre, Community Core Areas, Nodes, Reurbanization Corridors and Major Transit Station Areas. These locations have been selected because they boast services and community infrastructure that support growth, they have land parcels with development and redevelopment potential, and they are located along existing or proposed transit routes including the Region of Waterloo’s rapid transit service (ION).

5.2 Existing Policy Framework

The Secondary Plan has been prepared as an amendment to the City of Cambridge Official Plan. The Secondary Plan Area is currently designated Low/Medium Density Residential, Community Commercial, Industrial and Natural Open Space System in the City’s Official Plan. The City’s Official Plan directs that secondary plans may be prepared for specific areas of the City to provide more detailed planning objectives and policies to direct and guide development (Section 10.2).

5.3 Secondary Plan

The purpose of the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan is to guide the future planning and development of the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node lands. The Secondary Plan supports and builds on the policies of the City of Cambridge Official Plan, and provincial and regional policies and plans, with respect to orderly development of the area.
The Secondary Plan establishes a vision and the principles for the design and development of the area. It also establishes the general land use patterns and conceptual locations of parks and trails, roads and infrastructure. The Secondary Plan includes goals, general policies, and land use policies.

5.4 Proposed Land Use Changes

The Main Street and Dundas Street South lands are currently designated Low/Medium Density Residential, Community Commercial, Industrial and Natural Open Space System in the City’s Official Plan. The proposed new land use designations are shown on Schedule B of the Secondary Plan and are generally described as follows:

- **Mixed Use Mid-Rise High Density** permits a range of medium and high-density residential uses in 5 to 8 storey buildings as well as limited commercial and office uses and is intended to provide a transition from lower density to higher density areas.

- **Mixed Use Medium Density** permits medium density residential uses such as street townhomes, stacked townhomes, and low-rise apartments as well as commercial and office uses.

- **Mixed Use Main Street** permits a range of multiple residential units, commercial uses including retail, service commercial and places of amusement as well as some office uses and are intended to provide a transition in scale, form, massing and height between the Mixed-Use Mid-Rise High Density designation and surrounding lower density residential areas.

- **High Density Residential** permits medium to high density residential uses such as mid-rise and high-rise apartments and other multiple dwellings.

- **Medium Density Residential** permits medium density residential uses such as street townhomes, stacked townhomes, low-rise apartments and other multiple dwellings (excluding semi-detached).

- **Low Density Residential** permits residential uses such as single and semi-detached dwellings as well as additional residential units and existing medium density multi-unit residential uses. The maximum building height is 4 storeys.

- **Prestige Industrial** permits a range of light industrial; office buildings and research uses ranging from hotel and office type uses through to research and development laboratories and permits accessory and complementary uses.

- **Natural Open Space System** is applied to core environmental features, such as wetlands, woodlands and tributaries, and the associated buffers identified in the applicable Subwatershed Study.
5.5 Compliance with Provincial Legislation and Policy

Provincial Policy Statement (2020)

Section 3 of the *Planning Act* requires that decisions affecting planning matters shall be consistent with policy statements issued under the Act. The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) was issued under the authority of Section 3 of the Act. The PPS provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development, including the protection of resources of provincial interest, public health and safety, and the quality of the natural and built environment.

The PPS directs growth to Settlement Areas on full municipal services (Policy 1.1.3) and directs that new development taking place in designated growth areas should occur adjacent to the existing built-up area and is to have a compact form, mix of uses and densities that allow for the efficient use of land, infrastructure, and public service facilities. The Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan lands will provide a mix of residential, commercial, institutional, and open space uses at densities to promote the efficient use of land, infrastructure, and public service facilities.

Policy 1.6.7.1 states that transportation systems should be provided which are safe, energy efficient, facilitate the movement of people and goods, and appropriate to address projected needs. The Secondary Plan proposes complete streets which prioritize active transportation, allow for vehicular movements and plan for future transit infrastructure.

Policy 1.8.1 directs municipalities to support energy conservation and efficiency, improved air quality, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and preparing for the impacts of a changing climate. The Secondary Plan promotes a compact built form and the use of active transportation and transit through transit supportive development. Further, it promotes sustainable design which maximizes energy efficiency and conservation and considers the mitigating effects of vegetation and green infrastructure.

The Secondary Plan is appropriate and consistent with the PPS.

**A Place to Grow – Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Office Consolidation 2020)**

In 2019, the Province of Ontario released an update to the provincial growth plan called “A Place to Grow – Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe” (Growth Plan). An Office Consolidation of the Growth Plan, which includes Amendment 1 (2020) was released in August of 2020. Planning applications are required to conform to Provincial plans.

The Growth Plan focusses on directing new development to existing settlement areas in order to support the development of complete communities that contain a diverse mix of uses and housing options in order to optimize existing infrastructure and public transit. The Growth Plan contains development targets for urban areas (referred to as Built-Up areas). The Main Street and Dundas Street S Secondary Plan area is located within a settlement area and is considered a Built-Up Area in the Growth Plan.

Regional Official Plan

The Secondary Plan area is located in the Built-up Area within the Urban Area Boundary as identified in the Region of Waterloo Official Plan. It is intended that land within the Urban Area is “to accommodate the majority of the Region’s growth within the planning horizon” of the Plan (Section 2.B.2).

The Built-Up Area identifies all lands within the built boundary of the Urban Area. Area municipalities are required to establish policies in their official plans and other supporting documents to ensure that “a minimum of 61 per cent of all new residential development occurring annually within the region as a whole will be constructed within the Built-Up Area” (Section 2.C.2).

Section 2.D.1 requires planning for new development within the Urban Area that:

b) is serviced by a municipal drinking-water supply system and a municipal wastewater system;

c) contributes to the creation of complete communities with development patterns, densities and an appropriate mix of land uses that supports walking, cycling and the use of transit;

d) protects the natural environment, and surface water and groundwater resources;

e) conserves cultural heritage resources and supports the adaptive reuse of historic buildings;

f) respects the scale, physical character, and context of established neighbourhoods in areas where reurbanization is planned to occur; and

h) promotes building designs and orientations that incorporate energy conservation features and the use of alternative and/or renewable energy systems.

The Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan was prepared based on the principles supporting the creation of complete communities, 15-minute neighbourhoods, transit supportive design and uses, and alternative transportation modes. The policy framework was developed to ensure appropriate and efficient growth.

Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 6 has been approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Amongst other changes and modifications, the density for Designated Greenfield Areas has been increased to 59 persons and jobs per hectare which has been reflected in the policies of this amendment.

The proposed Official Plan Amendment conforms to the Regional Official Plan, as amended.

City of Cambridge Official Plan

The Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan area is located in the Built-Up Area according to the City’s Official Plan, and is designated Low/Medium Density Residential, Community Commercial, Industrial and Natural Open Space System.

Uses such as single detached dwellings, townhouses and/or walk-up apartments are permitted on lands designated Low/Medium Density Residential where municipal water supply and wastewater systems are available (8.4.6.9).
The City’s Official Plan directs that secondary plans may be prepared for specific areas of the City to provide more detailed planning objectives and policies to direct and guide development (10.2.1) provided the secondary plan is in conformity with the City and Regional Official Plans (10.2.2), and in consideration of the following Section 10.2.4 criteria:

a) patterns of land use;
b) population and employment projections;
c) mix and range of housing types and densities;
d) phasing of development in an efficient manner;
e) provision for adequate and appropriate areas for commercial, institutional and community-oriented facilities;
f) provision for trails, parks, and open space;
g) natural features;
h) cultural heritage resources;
i) incorporating intensification opportunities;
j) development of a transportation network that facilitates the efficient movement of vehicular and pedestrian traffic including active transportation considerations;
k) municipal services;
l) incorporating opportunities for mixed-use and higher density development in appropriate locations;
m) designation of land; and

n) any other matters as deemed appropriate by the City.

Section 5.2.1 states that the design of the built environment will promote sustainable, healthy, active living through:

a) well-connected and maintained streets, paths and trails that are able to safely accommodate different modes of transportation;
b) safe, accessible, aesthetically pleasing, well-serviced and inclusive developments;
c) resilient natural environments that support wildlife and their habitat and are better connected to residential areas; and

d) walkable neighbourhoods that offer a mix of uses, and range and variety of housing types with convenient access to public transit.
Chapter 5 of the Official Plan establishes urban design policies to achieve a high standard of urban design across the City. The Secondary Plan builds on the policies of the Official Plan to achieve design excellence in the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan Area. It is planned to promote sustainable, healthy, and active living (Section 5.2), support transit usage (Section 5.3), build a high-quality, attractive public realm (Section 5.5) and consider sustainability and energy efficiency in the design of both private and public realms (Section 5.8).

The Secondary Plan conforms to the City of Cambridge Official Plan.

6.0 SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO THE OFFICIAL PLAN

The following is a summary of OPA No. 65:

- Amends Policy 1.2 by adding Chapters for secondary plans.
- Deletes Policy 8.7.2.B
- Deletes the following site specifics:
  - 8.10.9 – 200 Franklin Boulevard;
  - 8.10.38 – Green Gate Boulevard;
  - 8.10.40 – 95 McLaren Avenue;
  - 8.10.46 – Northeast Quadrant of Franklin Boulevard and Main Street;
  - 8.10.69 – 825-875 Main Street and 0 Sparrow Avenue; and
  - 8.10.79 – 400-410 Dundas Street South
- Adds site specifics for the following properties:
  - 8.10.101 – 486 Main Street – Grand Valley Fortifiers;
  - 8.10.102 – 840 and 940 Main Street and 0 Franklin Boulevard;
  - 8.10.103 – 61 – 65 Nottinghill Drive; and
  - 8.10.104 – 115 Dundas Street North and 5 McLaren Avenue
- Deletes definitions for Active Transportation and Major Facilities
- Adds definitions for:
  - 15-minute neighbourhoods;
  - active at-grade uses;
  - active transportation;
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- build-out;
- gross floor area;
- ground floor area;
- intensification target;
- large-format commercial;
- low-rise;
- mid-rise;
- major facilities;
- missing middle housing;
- privately owned public spaces (POPS);
- public service facilities;
- transit supportive; and
- walking, cycling, and rolling.

• Adds Chapter 20: Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan

• Amends Map 1A to align the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node boundaries to match the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan Boundary.

• Amends Map 2 by adding the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan Boundary

• Amends Map 2A by deleting site specific policy figures 10, 13, 42, 44, 77 and 81 and by adding special policy figures 101-104

• Deletes figures 10, 13, 42, 44, 77 and 81 from Chapter 16

• Adds figures 101-104 to Chapter 16

7.0 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Previous drafts of the proposed Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan have been presented to the public during stakeholder meetings in 2015 and 2016. A Statutory Public Meeting was held on May 10, 2016 and a Public Information Centre (PIC) was held on December 12, 2022. The draft secondary plan was posted on the City of Cambridge website for review and comment. A second Statutory Public Meeting was held on May 16, 2023.

All comments received during this process were considered when preparing the Secondary Plan. Posting of related reports to the City’s website was included as part of the public report process.
PART B – THE AMENDMENT

1.0 INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

All of this part of the document entitled ‘Part B - The Amendment’, consisting of the following text, constitutes Amendment No. 65 to the Official Plan of the City of Cambridge.

2.0 FORMAT OF THE AMENDMENT

This section of Amendment No. 65 sets out additions and changes to the text in the Official Plan.

Text that is proposed to be amended is illustrated by various font types (e.g., struck-out text is to be deleted, new text identified in Bold font and defined terms are identified with italics). New sections that are proposed to be added to the Official Plan are shown in standard font type with titles appearing in bold. italicized font within the body of the text indicates defined terms or the name of a provincial act or title of a document.

3.0 IMPLEMENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

The implementation of this amendment shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act. The further implementation and associated interpretation of this amendment shall be in accordance with the relevant text and mapping schedules of the existing Official Plan of the City of Cambridge and applicable legislation. Amendment No. 65 should be read in conjunction with the current Official Plan (2012) as amended, which is available on the City’s website at cambridge.ca or at the Planning Services kiosk located at 50 Dickson Street in the 1st Floor lobby.

4.0 DETAILS OF THE AMENDMENT

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

Chapter 1 is hereby amended by adding Policy “1.2.h) Secondary Plans starting at Chapter 17”

Chapter 8 is hereby amended by deleting Policy “8.7.2.B Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node” and replacing it with “8.7.2.B - The Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan is found in Chapter 20.”

Chapter 8 is hereby further amended by:

A - deleting the following site specific policies from Policy 8.10:

- 8.10.9 – 200 Franklin Boulevard;
- 8.10.38 – Green Gate Boulevard;
- 8.10.40 – 95 McLaren Avenue;
- 8.10.46 – Northeast Quadrant of Franklin Boulevard and Main Street;
- 8.10.69 – 825-875 Main Street and 0 Sparrow Avenue; and,
- 8.10.79 – 400 – 410 Dundas Street South
B – adding the following site specific policies:

8.10.101 - 486 Main Street – Grand Valley Fortifiers

Grand Valley Fortifiers is a livestock feed production company that has existing industrial uses and facilities at 486 Main Street (Figure 101). Notwithstanding the land uses permitted for the Mixed-Use Medium Density designation, the following land uses are permitted on the lands identified in Figure 101:

Light industrial uses in an enclosed building including assembling, fabricating, manufacturing, processing, storage, packaging;

Offices;

Research and development including laboratories;

Retail Commercial; and

Accessory uses to the permitted uses above.

No residential and other sensitive land uses are permitted during the continuance of industrial uses on this site. Should Grand Valley Fortifiers’ industrial operations on this site permanently cease, the industrial land use permissions in Policy 20.3.2.4 will no longer apply, in which case the land use permissions for the Mixed-Use Medium Density designation identified for this site on Schedule B of the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan will apply.

8.10.102 - 840 and 940 Main Street and 0 Franklin Boulevard

The lands subject to this subsection are identified in Figure 102.

A. Notwithstanding the maximum building height permitted in the Mixed-Use Main Street designation in Section 20.3.2.6, a maximum building height of twenty storeys is permitted. In addition, notwithstanding the minimum non-residential gross floor area requirements of Section 20.3.2.2, on lands designated Mixed-Use Main Street, a mid-rise apartment building may be constructed on these lands with the ground floor comprised of non-residential uses, which may include the lobby and residential amenity areas. A minimum non-residential gross floor area of 300 square metres is required. All of the above require the submission and approval of a noise impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Region of Waterloo and City of Cambridge.

B. Notwithstanding the maximum building height permitted in the Medium Density Residential designation in Section 20.3.2.6, a maximum building height of twenty storeys is permitted subject to the submission and approval of a noise impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Region of Waterloo and City of Cambridge.

C. Notwithstanding the minimum required building height and density in the High Density Residential designation in Section 20.3.2.6, a minimum height of eight storeys and a minimum density of 110 Units Per Hectare (UPH) shall be required.
i. The minimum required height may be reduced without amendment to this plan where a noise impact assessment indicates that an eight storey building is not feasible.

The minimum height / storey requirements related to lands designated Medium Density Residential in Section 20.3.2.6 may also be reduced, without further amendment to this plan, due to land use compatibility measures that may be required as a result of the site’s proximity to lands within the Eastern Industrial Park, subject to the approval of the City and the Region.

8.10.103 - 61 – 65 Nottinghill Drive

Notwithstanding the permitted density in this Plan, the land identified in Figure 103 will be permitted a maximum residential density of 2.2 Floor Space Index (FSI).

8.10.104 - 115 Dundas Street North and 5 McLaren Avenue

The lands identified in Figure 104 may only develop in accordance with the policies of the Mixed Use Medium Density designation, where it can be demonstrated that land use compatibility with surrounding existing industrial uses, including Rockwell Automation, can be achieved to the satisfaction of the City. Notwithstanding the permissions for residential uses within the Mixed Use Medium Density designation, where the outcomes of such studies indicate that land use compatibility cannot be achieved, sensitive land uses, including residential, will not be permitted.

Chapter 13 is hereby amended by deleting the definitions for active transportation and major facilities, and adding the following definitions:

**15-minute neighbourhoods** - Compact, well-connected places such as mixed-use neighbourhoods or other areas within the Urban Area. They are places that offer and support and opportunities for people of all ages and abilities and at all times of year to conveniently access the necessities for daily living with a 15-minute trip by walking, cycling, and rolling, and where other needs can be met by taking direct, frequent, and convenient transit, wherever possible. The neighbourhoods should include an appropriate mix of jobs, local stores, and services, a full range of housing, transportation options and public service facilities. They are also age-friendly places and may take different shapes and forms appropriate to their contexts.

**active at-grade uses** – uses at grade with the street that generate activity, in particular pedestrian activity, on the street. Uses may be street-related commercial and/or community uses such as retail stores, restaurants, personal or business services, professional or medical offices, libraries, community centres, and parks/public squares.

**active transportation** - movement of people or goods that is powered by human activity. Active transportation includes walking, cycling, and the use of human-powered or hybrid mobility aids such as wheelchairs, scooters, e-bikes, and rollerblades.
**build-out** - the time in the future when the subject area of land is fully developed in accordance with the vision, objectives, and policies of this Plan.

**gross floor area** – the total of all floor areas of a building or structure, which floor areas are measured between the exterior faces of the exterior walls of the building at each floor level or from the centrelines of partition walls and the exterior faces of the exterior walls, but does not include any underground floor area, unenclosed porch or verandah, mechanical room or penthouse, amenity area and private amenity area, and areas used for parking within the building or structure. The walls of an inner court shall be deemed to be exterior walls.

**ground floor area** – the area of the ground floor of a building or structure measured between the exterior faces of the exterior walls or from the centrelines of partition walls and the exterior faces of the exterior walls.

**intensification target** – the minimum percentage of development each year that are expected to occur within the built-up area.

**large-format commercial** – a commercial use with greater than 2,000 square metres of ground floor area, such as large footprint supermarkets, big box retail stores, warehouse stores, and standalone movie theatres.

**low-rise** - any building that is 2 to 4 storeys in height.

**mid-rise** - any building that is 5 to 8 storeys in height.

**major facilities** - facilities which may require separation from sensitive land uses, including but not limited to airports, manufacturing uses, transportation infrastructure and corridors, rail facilities, marine facilities, sewage treatment facilities, waste management systems, oil and gas pipelines, industries, energy generation facilities and transmission systems, and resource extraction activities. (PPS, 2020)

**missing middle housing** - multi-unit housing types with gentle density that are compatible in scale with single-detached neighbourhoods while providing additional housing options. For example, laneway housing, garden suites, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, rowhouses, townhouses, and low and mid-rise apartments.

**privately owned public spaces (POPS)** – A privately owned and maintained open or landscaped space that is designed to promote public access and use, which may include but is not limited to courtyards, enhanced walkways, and urban greens and squares. The spaces are meant to be open and accessible to the public and may complement, extend or integrate with public parks.

**public service facilities** - lands, buildings, and structures for the provision of programs and services provided or subsidized by a government or other body, such as social assistance, recreation, police and fire protection, health and educational programs, long-term care services, and cultural services. Public service facilities do not include infrastructure. (PPS, 2020).
**transit-supportive** - relating to development that makes transit viable and improves the quality of the experience of using transit. It often refers to compact, mixed-use development that has a high level of employment and residential densities. Transit-supportive development will be consistent with Ontario’s Transit Supportive Guidelines.

**walking, cycling, and rolling** - Methods of active transportation, which means movement of people or goods that is powered by human activity. Active transportation includes walking, cycling, and the use of human-powered or hybrid mobility aids such as wheelchairs, scooters, e-bikes, and rollerblades.

5.0 SCHEDULES

- SCHEDULE 1 – MAP 1A – URBAN STRUCTURE
- SCHEDULE 2 – MAP 2 – GENERAL LAND USE PLAN
- SCHEDULE 3 – MAP 2A – SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES
- SCHEDULE 4 – FIGURE 3
- SCHEDULE 5 – FIGURES 101 - 104
- SCHEDULE 6 – Chapter 20: Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan
SCHEDULE 1 – MAP 1A – URBAN STRUCTURE

Official Plan Map 1A Urban Structure in Chapter 14: Maps is hereby amended by expanding the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node boundary to match the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan Boundary area as depicted in the following mapping.
SCHEDULE 2 – MAP 2 – GENERAL LAND USE PLAN

Official Plan Map 2 General Land Use Plan in Chapter 14: Maps is hereby amended by adding the boundary of the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan area as depicted in the following mapping.
SCHEDULE 3 – MAP 2A – SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES

Official Plan Map 2A Site Specific Policies in Chapter 14: Maps is hereby amended by deleting site specific policy figures 10 13, 42, 44, 77 and 81 and by adding site specific policy figures 101-104 as depicted in the following mapping.
SCHEDULE 4 – FIGURE 3

Official Plan Figure 3 - Community Node Main St and Dundas St S in Chapter 16: Figures is hereby amended by aligning the Community Node boundary with the Secondary Plan Area boundary as depicted in the following mapping.
SCHEDULE 5 – FIGURES 101 - 104

Chapter 16: Figures is hereby amended by deleting Figures 10, 13, 42, 44, 77 and 81 and by adding Figures 101-104 as depicted in the following mapping.
SCHEDULE 6 – CHAPTER 20: Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan

The Cambridge Official Plan is hereby amended by adding the following new Chapter 20: Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan.
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Chapter 20

20.1  INTRODUCTION

The preparation of a Secondary Plan is required by the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012), as amended, for the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node. The Main and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan (“the Secondary Plan”) provides detailed boundaries and land use policies for this community node to achieve a significant density increase and become a medium to high density mixed-use centre.

20.1.1  VISION FOR CHANGE

The Secondary Plan Area is expected to function as one of the City’s main intensification nodes and accommodate up to 1,700 new residential units and 100 additional jobs by 2031 through a combination of new development, infilling, and redevelopment. Over the longer term, the Plan Area has the potential to accommodate up to 6,200 units and 1,400 jobs at build-out, depending on the scale of intensification and the mix of uses proposed.

It is envisioned that the Plan Area will transition into a compact, complete, sustainable, vibrant, and integrated node that supports active transportation and transit service. The Plan Area will integrate a diverse mix of uses to build 15-minute neighbourhoods while continuing to have an important commercial function to support the needs of the broader southeast Cambridge community. This mixed-use and higher density node will be supported by new parks, public spaces, trails, and community amenities that are well connected to the existing public realm network. The transportation network in the Plan Area will provide a full range of mobility options but will prioritize and facilitate active transportation and transit. This vision is to be achieved through a combination of public realm improvements and private sector land development and re-development.

20.1.2  SECONDARY PLAN GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The Plan Area is planned to achieve an overall minimum density of 100 residents and jobs combined per hectare to support growth management, the efficient use of land, and frequent transit service. This is a gross minimum density requirement that is measured within all of the lands delineated by the Plan Area, inclusive of environmental features and constraints. Several of the land use designations set out in this Plan identify minimum net density targets for freestanding residential development within the designation to support achieving the overall minimum density target, along with the other policies of the Plan. As part of any development application, the City will require applications to demonstrate how the application supports the overall gross density target for the Plan Area, and the applicable minimum density requirements of this Plan have been met.
Planning and development within the Plan Area will be guided by the following principles:

a) Intensify and increase the supply of housing, employment, and amenities to accommodate anticipated future growth and contribute to meeting the intensification target;

b) Maintain the node’s important commercial function and transition to become a vibrant and complete community providing a mix of residential, commercial, employment, institutional, and community uses;

c) Build 15-minute neighbourhoods where people can meet their daily needs for goods, services, and employment within a 15-minute trip from home by active transportation, and where other needs can be met by using direct, frequent, and convenient transit;

d) Support transit service and ridership through transit-supportive built-forms, densities, mix of uses, and urban design of the public and private realm;

e) Improve connectivity within the Plan Area and to the Plan Area from surrounding neighbourhoods for active transportation by enhancing safety, permeability, accessibility, and the pedestrian experience;

f) Sensitively integrate with adjacent existing neighbourhoods and ensure compatibility in land use and built form;

g) Provide an appropriate range and mix of housing types, forms, tenures, and affordability that responds to the demography of the community;

h) Support the prosperity of existing businesses and provide opportunities for new economic development and employment;

i) Be well-designed and provide diverse and contextually compatible built form and high quality architectural and urban design in public realm improvements and private realm developments;

j) Create a connected, functional and attractive network of parks, public spaces, natural open spaces, and trails using the process and principles of place-making;

k) Implement sustainable design to minimize environmental impact, conserve energy, manage stormwater, protect natural areas, enhance biodiversity, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and

l) Phase implementation to align with market demand and infrastructure investment.
20.2 PURPOSE

20.2.1 PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

The purpose of the Secondary Plan is to provide a detailed land use plan and policy framework to guide development and redevelopment within the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node (“the Community Node”) to achieve a significant level of intensification.

The policies of this Secondary Plan are intended to result in a complete, vibrant, well-designed, and sustainable community node that meets the objectives and policies of Provincial plans, the Region of Waterloo Official Plan, and the City of Cambridge Official Plan.

The Secondary Plan must be read in conjunction with the applicable policies within the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012), as amended. In addition to the policies of this Secondary Plan, all other parts of the City of Cambridge Official Plan shall apply. The land use designations for the Secondary Plan are intended to complement the broader land use designations provided in the Official Plan. In most cases, the land use policies and permissions described in the Secondary Plan are more detailed than those provided for within the Official Plan. In the event of a policy conflict, the Secondary Plan will prevail unless otherwise specified.

20.2.2 ORGANIZATION

The Secondary Plan document is organized into three main sections:
Section 20.1: Introduction
Section 20.2: Vision and Guiding Principles
Section 20.3: Policies

The contents of Sections 20.2 and 20.3 are considered to be the formal Secondary Plan, including Schedules A through F. Any alterations to the policies in Sections 20.2 and 20.3 or Schedules A through F shall require an Official Plan Amendment (unless otherwise stated in the Plan). Alterations to the contents of Section 20.1 including all text, images, figures, formatting, footnotes, and graphics are not subject to an Official Plan Amendment and are provided for explanatory purposes only.

20.2.3 LOCATION AND BOUNDARY

The limits of the Secondary Plan (the “Plan Area”) are depicted on Schedule A, covers approximately 82 gross hectares (202 acres) of land and is generally centred around the major intersections of Main Street and Dundas Street, Main Street and Franklin Boulevard, and Dundas Street and Franklin Boulevard. The northern boundary of the Plan Area abuts the Eastern Industrial Park. The western boundary generally abuts the Lincoln Oaks and Glenview residential neighbourhoods. The southern boundary
traverses through a small portion of the Branchton Park residential neighbourhood. The eastern boundary traverses through the vacant lands north of Main Street and abuts the residential subdivisions south of Main Street in the Eastview neighbourhood.

Schedule A also identifies the finalized limits of the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node. Unless otherwise stated, the policies of this Secondary Plan apply to the lands located within the Secondary Plan limits as depicted on Schedule A. Changes to the boundary of the Secondary Plan will require an Official Plan Amendment.

20.2.4 COMMUNITY STRUCTURE

The land use designations implement the vision for the Plan Area to transform into a compact and complete community with 15-minute neighbourhoods.

Lands within the Plan Area are designated one of the following land use designations as indicated on Schedule B:

a) Mixed-Use Mid-Rise High Density
b) Mixed-Use Medium Density
c) Mixed-Use Main Street
d) High Density Residential
e) Medium Density Residential
f) Low Density Residential
g) Prestige Industrial
h) Natural Open Space System
20.3 POLICIES

20.3.1 GENERAL POLICIES

20.3.1.1 Uses Permitted in All Designations

With the exception of the Natural Open Space System designation, the Official Plan permits certain land uses within all land use designations in the City, subject to the provision of adequate infrastructure and other criteria. Those land uses are also generally permitted within all land use designations of the Secondary Plan, subject to the policies of the Official Plan and provided that the long-term vision of this Secondary Plan is not precluded.

20.3.1.2 Uses Prohibited in All Designations

The Official Plan prohibits a list of uses in all land use designations of the Official Plan. Those land uses are also prohibited in all designations of this Secondary Plan. In addition, the following uses will be prohibited in all designations of the Secondary Plan:

a) New drive-through facilities subject to Section 20.3.1.4;

b) New auto-related uses subject to Section 20.3.1.4;

c) New large-format commercial uses subject to Section 20.3.1.5; and

d) Noxious uses as defined in the City’s Zoning By-law.

20.3.1.3 Active At-Grade Uses

Portions of certain public streets in the Plan Area are envisioned to transform into vibrant, engaging, and active streetscapes that foster pedestrian-oriented commercial and community activity in the Plan Area.

Developments that front onto streets identified for Active Frontages on Schedule D shall provide active at-grade uses at the street level, where possible taking into consideration existing topographical and engineering constraints. These uses will be street-related, provide visual interest, animate the streetscape, and be designed in accordance with the Urban Design policies in Section 20.3.3.

Residential entrances and lobbies within the ground floor of mixed-use buildings are permitted along Active Frontages but shall consist of a limited portion of a development’s frontage.

Surface parking and structured parking are not permitted along Active Frontages. Driveways and direct vehicular access along Active Frontages shall be in accordance with the policies of this Plan.

20.3.1.4 Drive-Through Facilities and Auto-Related Uses

Auto-related uses include gas bars/stations, motor vehicle service and repair shops
(including body shops), motor vehicle sales and rental, and motor vehicle washing establishments.

Existing drive-through facilities and auto-related uses in the Plan Area that legally existed before the date of adoption of this Secondary Plan are permitted to continue. Over the long term and upon build-out of this Secondary Plan, existing drive-through facilities and auto-related uses should be redeveloped and replaced with pedestrian-oriented and transit-supportive development.

For the purpose of transition and to facilitate redevelopment, existing drive-through facilities may be relocated on the same lot or block on an interim basis subject to the following conditions:

a) Relocated drive-through facilities shall not be situated along Active Frontages;

b) The commercial use to which the drive-through facility is ancillary must be a permitted use on the lands the drive-through facility is being relocated to; and

c) A site plan approval application for relocation must include a Build-out Demonstration Plan.

Existing drive-through facilities are not permitted to increase the number of drive-through lanes existing on the date of adoption of this Secondary Plan.

20.3.1.5 Large-Format Commercial Uses

New large-format commercial uses with more than 2,000 square metres of ground floor area are not permitted within the Plan Area. The purpose of this policy is to limit land-intensive commercial uses to facilitate opportunities for intensification.

Existing large-format commercial uses in the Plan Area that legally existed before the date of adoption of this Secondary Plan are permitted to continue. Over the long term and upon build-out of this Secondary Plan, existing large-format commercial uses should be redeveloped into compact medium to high density mixed-use developments that integrate commercial with residential and other uses. Surface parking should be significantly reduced.

For the purpose of transition and to facilitate redevelopment, existing large-format commercial uses may be relocated on the same lot or block subject to the following conditions:

a) Relocated large-format commercial uses shall not be situated along Active Frontages; and

b) A site plan approval application for relocation must include a Build-out Demonstration Plan.
20.3.1.6 Housing

Housing developments in the Plan Area shall comprise a range and mix of rental and ownership housing types, unit sizes, and tenure, including adequate numbers of dwelling units to accommodate households with children, larger families, seniors and people with special needs.

Affordable housing, including community housing, supportive housing, and other types of subsidized non-market housing units, is encouraged to be provided in the Plan Area. Development that includes residential in the Plan Area will be in accordance with the affordable housing policies of the Official Plan.

The City will collaborate with the Region of Waterloo, non-profit organizations and private developers to promote, encourage and maximize opportunities for affordable housing.

To support the development of affordable housing units, the City, in conjunction with the Region, will explore potential incentives such as reduced or deferred development charges, reduced application fees, grants, and loans.

The development of intrinsically more affordable ownership and rental housing, which may include buildings constructed using innovative and cost-effective techniques, basic in-unit amenities, modest finishes, minimal details, and flexibility within units, is encouraged.

Residential developments and dwelling units designed, constructed, and maintained as purpose-built rental units are encouraged in the Plan Area. Purpose-built rental development should include units for various levels of affordability, including for households with low and moderate income.

To achieve a mix of unit types, and to support the creation of housing suitable for larger households, development containing more than 80 new residential units will include larger units, as follows:

- A minimum of 20 percent of the total number of units as 2-bedroom units; and
- A minimum of 5 percent of the total number of units as 3-bedroom or larger units.

For clarity, one bedroom plus den units will not constitute a 2-bedroom unit, and a two-bedroom plus den unit will not constitute a 3-bedroom unit.

Where appropriate, private, public, and non-profit housing developments designed to provide housing options for seniors, that facilitate “aging-in-place”, are encouraged, including small ownership and rental units as well as retirement and assisted living facilities.

A minimum of 20 percent of new affordable units and new purpose-built rental units shall be constructed accessible with barrier-free, universal or flex design. Housing units geared towards seniors are encouraged to provide accessibility features that
meet the City’s Facility Accessibility Design Manual.

Additional residential units will be permitted in accordance with the policies of this Secondary Plan and the City of Cambridge Official Plan, and the provisions of the Zoning By-law.

20.3.1.7 Employment Areas

Land use decisions regarding lands within or adjacent to employment areas will be consistent with the employment area policy direction in the Region of Waterloo Official Plan until such time the City of Cambridge Official Plan has been updated.

20.3.1.8 Land Use Compatibility

The development of sensitive land uses, major retail uses or major office uses will, in accordance with provincial guidelines, avoid, or where avoidance is not possible, minimize and mitigate adverse impacts on industrial, manufacturing or other uses that are particularly vulnerable to encroachment.

Proposed developments of sensitive land uses, major retail uses or major office uses adjacent to existing or planned employment areas or within the influence area of major facilities will provide a Land Use Compatibility Assessment based on provincial guidelines.

New industrial uses on lands designated Prestige Industrial in the Plan Area may be required to demonstrate that the use(s) will not detrimentally impact adjacent existing sensitive land uses and/or preclude the potential development of sensitive land uses on adjacent lands where envisioned by this Secondary Plan. Supporting studies, including a Land Use Compatibility Assessment, may be required to support approval of the new industrial use.

Where required, methods of abatement and mitigation of potential adverse impacts will be part of site plan agreements, severance agreements, and subdivision/condominium agreements.

20.3.1.9 Source Water Protection

Lands in the Plan Area are identified as being part of the Region’s Wellhead Protection Areas. Refer to the Official Plan for additional guidance regarding development within the Wellhead Protection Areas.

No policies or permissions of this Secondary Plan take precedence over the Wellhead Protection Area policies contained in the Official Plan. In the event of a policy conflict, the parent policies of the Official Plan shall take precedence.

20.3.1.10 Contaminated Sites

Refer to Contaminated Sites policies of the Official Plan for guidance on redevelopment of potentially contaminated sites and need for a Record of Site Condition.
20.3.2 LAND USE POLICIES

20.3.2.1 Relationship with the Official Plan Land Use Categories and Permissions

The land use designations for the Secondary Plan are intended to complement the broader land use designations provided in the Official Plan. In most cases, the land use policies and permissions described in the Secondary Plan are more detailed than those provided for within the Official Plan. Where there are inconsistencies between a particular policy in the Official Plan and the Secondary Plan, the policies of the Secondary Plan will prevail.

20.3.2.2 Mixed-Use Designations

Lands designated with a Mixed-Use designation are intended to be the centre of the Community Node and generally provide the greatest mix of uses and highest densities within the Plan Area. These areas are intended to continue to provide retail and service commercial uses, while integrating residential housing, office, institutional, and community uses through infill and/or redevelopment.

Lands designated with a Mixed-Use designation are intended to intensify and transition to a compact urban form including medium to high density development and a reduction of surface parking. These lands shall be supported by a generous public realm including gateways, vibrant and active streetscapes, active transportation connections, and new parks/public spaces.

The Mixed-Use designations include:

- Mixed-Use Mid-Rise High Density;
- Mixed-Use Medium Density; and
- Mixed-Use Main Street.

The Mixed-Use designations permit a wide range of compatible uses. The following land uses are permitted on lands within the Mixed-Use designations:

b) Multiple unit residential buildings, including apartments and stacked townhouses;

c) Street townhouses;

d) Additional residential units;

e) Live-work units and home occupations;

f) Special needs housing;

g) Commercial uses including retail, service commercial, and places of amusement uses, except any commercial uses prohibited in Section 20.3.1.2;

h) Public service facilities; and
i) Office uses.

The Mixed-Use Medium Density and Mixed-Use Main Street designations are intended to provide transition in scale, form, massing, and height between envisioned high-density developments in the Mixed-Use Mid-Rise High-Density designation and surrounding lower density residential developments. These areas are intended to provide mixed-use developments consisting of *active at-grade uses* that frame the street while ensuring compatibility with abutting *low-rise* residential developments through the implementation of setbacks, landscaping, and mitigation measures as needed. Lot consolidation to support *intensification* and *redevelopment* is encouraged.

The implementing Zoning By-law may further refine the permitted land uses to ensure that new development is appropriate in the context of the adjacent and surrounding community.

To create a *complete community* and support economic activity within the Plan Area, new development within the Mixed-Use designations will provide a minimum of 10 percent of the *gross floor area* of the development as non-residential uses in one or multiple buildings.

### 20.3.2.3 Residential Designations

Lands with predominantly residential land uses are designated Residential. The Residential designations include the High Density, Medium Density Residential and Low Density Residential designations. These neighbourhoods are intended to:

- a) Provide a wide range and mix of housing types, forms, tenures, and affordability that addresses demographic needs of the immediate and broader Cambridge community;
- b) Incorporate *public service facilities*, such as schools and parks, and *compatible* commercial uses, such as convenience commercial establishments, to create 15-minute *neighbourhoods*;
- c) Develop at *transit-supportive* densities and provide *missing middle housing* where appropriate;
- d) Provide *accessible*, pedestrian-oriented, and high-quality public realm with short walking distances to parks, trails, schools, other *public service facilities*, and transit services; and,
- e) Contribute to providing safe and convenient *active transportation* connections to commercial, employment, service, and other community destinations in the Plan Area and surrounding areas.

The following land uses are permitted on lands within the Residential designations:

- a) Additional residential units;
- b) Live-work units and home occupations;
c) Special needs housing;

d) Convenience commercial uses in accordance with Section 8.6.1.5 of the Official Plan; and

e) Public service facilities

In addition to the uses permitted within all Residential designations, the following uses are also permitted on lands within the High Density Residential designation:

a) *Mid and high-rise apartments*; and

b) *Other multiple buildings.*

In addition to the uses permitted within all Residential designations, the following uses are also permitted on lands within the Medium Density Residential designation:

c) *Low and mid-rise apartments*;

d) Stacked townhouses; and

e) Street townhouses.

In addition to the uses permitted within all Residential designations, the following uses are also permitted on lands within the Low Density Residential designation:

a) Stacked townhouses;

b) Street townhouses;

c) Duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes;

d) Semi-detached dwellings; and

e) Single-detached dwellings.

The implementing Zoning By-law may further refine the permitted land uses to ensure that new development is appropriate in the context of the adjacent and surrounding community.

**20.3.2.4 Prestige Industrial**

Lands designated Prestige Industrial are intended to provide transition between the planned mixed-use areas within the Plan Area and the industrial uses north of the Plan Area. The predominant land uses within this designation shall be light industrial, office buildings and research uses. *Intensification* and increased employment densities are encouraged through expansion or redevelopment for existing and new businesses, contributing to employment growth in the Plan Area.

The following land uses are permitted on lands in the Plan Area designated Prestige Industrial provided such uses are *compatible* with residential and other *sensitive land uses*:
a) Light industrial uses in an enclosed building including assembling, fabricating, manufacturing, processing, storage, packaging, and industrial service trades;

b) Offices;

c) Research and development including laboratories;

d) Information technology related uses including data centres and information processing establishments;

e) Hotel, conference centre, and banquet facilities;

f) Accessory uses to the permitted uses above; and

g) Service commercial and ancillary retail uses on a limited basis subject to the conditions set out in the Regional Official Plan and the City’s Official Plan.

Outdoor storage of raw materials and finished products is not permitted. Any storage of raw materials and finished products which is accessory to the primary use shall be contained within a building.

20.3.2.5 Natural Open Space System

Core Environmental Features, watercourses and shorelines, the regulatory one-zone floodplain, the floodway of a two-zone floodplain, additional hazard lands such as steep slopes, approved buffers as determined through the planning process, and publicly owned natural open space have been designated Natural Open Space System on Schedule B of this Secondary Plan. Core Environmental Features and Environmentally Sensitive Policy Areas in and around the Plan Area are identified on Schedule C of this Secondary Plan. The boundaries of Core Environmental Features and Environmentally Sensitive Policy Areas may be refined and expanded without further amendment to this Plan, provided any refinements are minor in nature and supported through an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) in conformity with the policies of this Plan.

The planned function, permitted uses, and policies of the Natural Open Space System designation are as set out in the Cambridge Official Plan. In addition, Chapter 3 of the Official Plan sets out policies regarding natural features and environmental management.

20.3.2.6 Height and Density

The lot area to be used for calculating density shall exclude the following areas:

a) Lands with natural features including any required buffers, provided that development is prohibited on these lands; and

b) Floodplain in a One-Zone Policy Area or the floodway in a Two-Zone Policy Area; and

c) Hazardous lands.
It is the intent of this Secondary Plan that the planned densities will be achieved at *build-out*.

The minimum densities for freestanding residential development, and minimum and maximum heights of new buildings within the Residential and Mixed-Use designations will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Minimum density for free standing units – (UPH-units per hectare)</th>
<th>Minimum Height</th>
<th>Maximum Storeys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Mid-Rise High Density</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Medium Density</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Main Street</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maximum heights of new buildings within the Prestige Industrial designation will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Maximum Height (Storeys)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestige Industrial</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum building heights as identified in this Secondary Plan may be exceeded without an amendment to this Plan, subject to Council approval through a Zoning By-law amendment, in the following circumstances:

a) To achieve the maximum permitted density on a site where land is to be conveyed to the City for a publicly owned park or space; or

   b) Where the maximum permitted density is exceeded as permitted.

The density and scale of development must be contextually appropriate with the planned context and must support the public realm.
20.3.2.7 Ongoing Development Applications

In the event an Official Plan amendment application for lands within the Plan Area has been deemed complete but a decision has not been made by Council prior to the date of adoption of this Secondary Plan, the following shall apply:

a) Applications in the public consultation phase of the Official Plan amendment process shall take into consideration the policies of this Secondary Plan; and

b) The resulting Site-Specific Policy, if any, shall be considered an amendment and Site-Specific Policy of this Secondary Plan.

20.3.2.8 Site Specific Policies

Site specific policies can be found in Chapter 8.10 and are identified on Map 2A.

20.3.3 URBAN DESIGN AND BUILT FORM

20.3.3.1 Intent of Urban Design and Built Form Policies

The following section provides the urban design policies for the Secondary Plan Area. The policies of this section are intended to complement and build upon the urban design policies in Chapter 5 of the Official Plan and be implemented through the site plan process. The purpose of these policies is to provide guidance for enhancing the character of the area, including both the private and public realm. The policies are intended to provide a degree of flexibility, allowing for a range of design styles and expressions which will contribute to creating a unique sense of place. Urban Design and Built Form Vision.

The Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node is a gathering place for shopping, living, and working. Today, the area is dominated by auto-oriented commercial uses, vacant lands, and large surface parking lots. During the Secondary Plan consultation process, stakeholders expressed a desire for an enhanced public realm, more diverse mix of uses and activities, and a comfortable pedestrian environment. The Main Street and Dundas corridors are intended to provide local retail activity and the surrounding blocks offer a diverse range of employment, commercial, and residential uses that enhances the character of the area.

The intent of the Secondary Plan is to encourage an active commercial frontage along Dundas and Main Streets with pedestrian-scaled buildings. Internal blocks provide safe and efficient pedestrian and vehicular access within a vibrant and friendly streetscape. To achieve an enhanced streetscape environment, the urban design policies promote the development that provides a more compact mixed-use built form to fill in the gaps and pockets to create a consistent commercial streetscape. Designed for walking and anchored by a range of mixed-use buildings, the area is both a place to live and a commercial destination. As the heart of the local neighbourhoods, it is a gathering place with unique amenities and supported by a mix of land uses.
20.3.3.2 Public Realm Improvement Strategy

The expectation is that as the Main and Dundas Area intensifies that over time there will be demand for a number of public realm improvements. These improvements are intended to enhance the attractiveness and functionality of the area. The planned Public Realm Improvement Plan is depicted on Schedule D and considers the following:

a) Major Gateway Improvements
b) Minor Gateway Improvements
c) Major Streetscape Improvements;
d) Minor Streetscape Improvements;
e) Potential New Public Spaces; and,
f) Active Transportation Connections.

20.3.3.3 Gateways

Gateways are intended to function as formal entranceways into the Main and Dundas Area and are intended to create a strong sense of place. Presently, the Secondary Plan Area does not feature any prominent public space treatments at Gateway locations and accordingly, the Plan contemplates two levels of improvement:

a) Major Gateway Improvements; and,
b) Minor Gateway Improvements.

20.3.3.4.1 Major Gateway Improvements

Major Gateway Improvements should include signage, flags/banners, enhanced lighting, intensive landscaping (such as seasonal floral displays, tree planting), public art and other types of public realm enhancements. There are two Major Gateway Improvement Areas:

a) Main Street and Dundas Street intersection and surrounding area; and,
b) Franklin Boulevard and Dundas Street.

20.3.3.4.2 Minor Gateway Improvements

Minor Gateway Improvements should include a smaller scale of public realm enhancements, such as landscaping, public art, lighting and appropriately scaled way-finding queues. There are two Minor Gateway Improvement Areas in the Secondary Plan:

a) McLaren Avenue and Dundas Street; and,
b) Main Street and Franklin Boulevard.
20.3.3.4 Streetscape Improvements

Streetscape improvements are intended to provide direction for future enhancements to the non-travel portion of the roads within the Secondary Plan Area. Two levels of improvement area contemplated in this Plan:

a) Major Streetscaping Improvements; and,

b) Minor Streetscaping Improvements.

20.3.3.5.1 Major Streetscape Improvements

Major Streetscape Improvements are proposed for Main Street and Dundas Street. Key improvements should include (but are not limited to) completion of sidewalk networks (on both sides of the street), tree plantings on both sides of the street to provide shade and comfort for pedestrians, improved lighting, bike lanes and occasional street furniture. Where possible, efforts should be made to consolidate access points and improve visibility for pedestrians.

20.3.3.5.2 Minor Streetscape Improvements

Minor Streetscape Improvements are proposed for portions of Main Street and Franklin Boulevard. Key improvements should include (but are not limited to) completion of sidewalk networks (on both sides of the street), tree plantings on both sides of the street to provide shade and comfort for pedestrians and bike lanes.

20.3.3.5 Adjacent Development

Where new development or redevelopment is planned near a Gateway Improvement Area, the proposed development/redevelopment should be designed in a manner which enhances the function of the Gateway, through:

a) Complementary building orientation and massing;

b) Enhanced architectural detailing;

c) Linked private and public pedestrian connectivity;

d) Enhanced private realm landscaping; and,

e) Other elements as appropriate.

20.3.3.6 Potential New Public Spaces

20.3.3.7.1 New Public Spaces

Where new major mixed-use development or redevelopment is planned, new public spaces should be provided. New public spaces should be designed to be barrier free and should be designed to include a mix of design, including but not limited to enhanced landscaping shade trees, ample locations for seating and public art. New public spaces
may include playgrounds, community parks, and other similar spaces that serve a primary function of supporting existing and future needs in the surrounding neighbourhoods. These spaces should be located close to the street and be connected to the pedestrian network. New public spaces should also be connected with existing or planned transit stops. The icons depicted on Schedule D are for illustrative purposes only and the need, location and design of public spaces shall occur through the site plan application process. 20.3.3.7.2 Urban Greens and Squares

Urban Greens and Squares will be established in accordance with the following:

a) Urban Greens and Squares are expected to be small-scale components of the parks system and are intended to provide passive open space areas, both landscaped or hardscaped, and serve as focal points within sub-areas of each neighbourhood by provide stopping points throughout the community.

b) Urban Greens and Squares will be generally greater than 75 square metres but less than 1000 square metres in size.

c) Urban Greens and Squares will be connected to pedestrian movement, accessible, located at grade, provide barrier-free access to people with disabilities, and will have frontage on at least one public street.

d) The adjacent built form will have primary or active frontages facing or flanking the Urban Green or Square, where appropriate.

e) Urban Greens and Squares within the Low/Medium Density Residential designation will reflect the needs of surrounding residents, providing areas to sit and socialize, junior play areas for children, bicycle parking, and a significant tree canopy for shade.

f) Urban Greens and Squares within the Mixed-Use Node will include seating and a full furniture program, including lighting and bicycle parking, opportunities for outdoor cafes and restaurants, and facilities that promote a passive, relaxing urban atmosphere. These facilities will improve mid-block permeability and complement adjacent land uses.

g) Urban Greens and Squares may be publicly owned or considered for a privately owned public space.

h) The City will not accept Urban Greens and Squares as parkland dedication where the City is of the opinion a Neighbourhood Park or Community Park is necessary or desirable.

i) Public access to privately owned public space Urban Greens and Squares will be secured through the development approval process.
20.3.3.7 Potential Active Transportation Connection

Potential Active Transportation Connections are illustrated for the private realm on Schedule D. The network is intended to provide a finer grain network of pedestrian connections and is provided for illustration purposes. The expectation is that improvements to the on-site pedestrian networks be made through the redevelopment process and/or through a Community Improvement Planning exercise.

20.3.3.8 Signage and Wayfinding

The City may consider preparing a signage and wayfinding strategy for the Secondary Plan Area that enhances the public realm and support the land use vision for this corridor. The signage and wayfinding strategy would be implemented through a new signage by-law.

20.3.3.9 Street Tree Guidelines

The combination of both public realm improvements and the design guidelines for the private realm are intended to increase the overall tree canopy in the Secondary Plan Area and support the overall City-wide target for a 30% tree canopy. To support the achievement of the target, the City will:

a) Promote an extensive tree canopy over main pedestrian connections in the Secondary Plan Area;
b) Ensure that sufficient space is provided within the right-of-way to maximize opportunities for trees (in collaboration with the Region);
c) Promote the use of Silva cells and/or raised beds on both public and private lands to allow for healthy soil volumes; and,
d) Promote best practices in arboricultural maintenance.

20.3.3.10 Implementation of Public Realm Improvements

The public realm improvements depicted on Schedule D shall be implemented through a future Community Improvement Plan. The improvements depicted on Schedule D are intended to support growth and intensification within the Secondary Plan Area. Section 20.3.6 of this Plan provides additional details regarding implementation.

20.3.3.11 Private Realm Urban Design Guidelines

The Private Realm Design Guidelines identify the desired future character and function of the built environment, including massing, building articulation, parking and movement, and landscaping. The intent is to ensure that new buildings reinforce a coherent, harmonious and appealing urban environment, are compatible in scale, form, massing and height transition with existing urban forms as well as contribute to the enhancement of the public and private realm.
20.3.3.12.1 Building Frontages and Street Edges

Within the Mixed-Use designations, the design, use and animation of the ground level of buildings define the character and experience of the street. Ensuring that buildings provide an attractive and animated face, especially at the ground level, is a priority.

Buildings and structures should be organized on their sites to have landscaped setbacks adjacent to streets, mid-block open space areas and landscaped pedestrian connections to support and enhance a green and well-treed character.

The siting of buildings, location, and orientation are critical in creating a comfortable and safe pedestrian environment by providing an active and attractive interface conditions that:

a) Orient buildings toward public streets and other public spaces, in order to clearly define the public realm, create a consistent street wall, and to create a safe and attractive street environment for pedestrians. Grading and topographical constraints that may limit orientation to a street are to be taken into consideration.

b) Ensure pedestrian comfort and adequate light penetration.

c) Locate buildings along a build-to-line to provide a consistent edge to the street or public space. Deviation from the general built edge is permitted for building articulations, step-backs/recesses, openings, and other architectural treatments.

d) Buildings in general shall be designed to create mid-block connections and shall be massed and articulated to avoid creating excessively long continuous building facades. Buildings shall generally be not more than 75 metres long. For any building longer than 60 metres in length, articulation and materials of the façade must be varied to break up the massing to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner. Mid-block connections should be pedestrian oriented with appropriate pavement treatment, providing a safe and attractive environment.

e) All buildings oriented toward public streets must have clearly defined primary entry points that open directly on to the public sidewalk.

f) Provides a double frontage for corner buildings to address all streets and provides special design features of with equal architectural expression.

g) Ensures that architectural features and articulation are encouraged at all corner building locations, including residential buildings, to enhance the visual prominence and identity of the area and to enhance the corner.

h) For all commercial buildings, minimum glazing should be 70% and up to 80% glazing is permitted at-grade; second levels and above should be approximately 50% glazing.

i) Discourage blank walls, loading doors and other servicing areas from being located at grade along street frontages, parks, publicly accessible open space, and pedestrian connections.
j) In residential areas, architectural styles that help to foster neighbourhood identity and sense of place, such as front porches and balconies are encouraged.

20.3.3.12.2 Transitional Areas

New development should be designed to ensure that larger developments provide adequate transition to existing and smaller scale built form to reduce negative impacts on adjacent areas. The approach allows for smoother transitions between intensification areas and the adjacent, lower density residential areas. New buildings within the Secondary Plan Area will be located in the following manner to provide appropriate transition between new development and the surrounding stable residential areas:

a) New development must be sympathetic to the existing residential uses and be developed in a way that does not detract, hide from view, or impose negative impacts for light and shadow.

b) Where applicable, taller buildings should transition from the height of adjacent buildings through the use of building step backs, increased setbacks, and terracing building mass.

20.3.3.12.3 Building Entrances, Facades, Corner Sites

Primary building entrances will be located adjacent to the public street, or a publicly accessible courtyard physically and visually connected to the street, unless there are compelling topographical or other engineering related constraints that limit conformity with these policies, as determined by the City and the Region.

Residential building entrances will be located and oriented to have direct access from the street where possible. Porches, stoops, and balconies are encouraged at all entrances to create opportunities for overlook and social interaction along the street.

Entrances to individual grade-related residential units are encouraged to be provided along streets and park edges where possible. A modest grade change will create a threshold between public and semi-private space at the entrance and limit direct views into residential units.

Retail activities and other non-residential or commercial activities within buildings should be oriented towards the street and have direct access from sidewalks through storefront entries to promote overlook and enliven and support the public street.

a) The ground floor of new developments should be transparent to establish a strong visual connection to the street and create a welcoming and comfortable pedestrian environment.

b) Any facade facing a public street shall be considered a primary facade. A minimum of one pedestrian entrance shall be provided for any primary façade, where possible. Buildings on corner lots must be designed to have primary facades on both the front and side streets, where possible.
c) Pedestrian entrances should be architecturally distinct and identifiable as an entry point and designed to be universally accessible from a street or a publicly accessible open space.

d) Entrances to buildings must be clearly defined with maximum visibility to ensure ease of access directly from the street and from open spaces. Architectural treatment, and where appropriate, landscaping, should be used to accentuate entrances.

e) All buildings must be designed to be universally accessible and must provide an unobstructed walkway or pathway between the principal building(s) and the street.

f) Entrances should be designed with attractive weather protection to add to the pedestrian experience and comfort of users.

20.3.3.12.4 Landscaped Setbacks and Other Private Open Spaces

Buildings will have landscaped setbacks along streets and park edges to enhance the attractiveness of the street and to provide a privacy buffer for residential and other at-grade uses. In general, the following should be considered.

a) For any new high-density development, private open space enhancements are required as part of the built form design in order to contribute to the visual aesthetics and quality of the public realm.

b) Landscape treatments should be designed to edge streets, frame, and soften structures, define spaces, and screen undesirable views.

c) Trees and shrubs should be selected having regard to their scale and plating characteristics.

d) Plant materials should be grouped to frame buildings, add visual interest, to blank areas, accentuate entrances, and screen service areas.

e) Larger areas that may have deeper setbacks may take the form of courtyards, forecourts, mid-block connections, or small plazas.

f) On any commercial street, outdoor spill-out activities such as patios are encouraged to further animate the street.

g) Courtyards, forecourts, and other intimate spaces accessible to the public and animated with at-grade uses are encouraged.

h) For mixed-use, commercial, and residential apartment developments, portions of a lot not occupied by a building or structure or used for parking or loading must be landscaped.

i) All mixed-use and multiple residential buildings (e.g., townhouses and condominiums) will provide at-grade open space and outdoor amenity areas.
j) Outdoor amenity areas will include generously scaled areas of soft landscaping capable of supporting shade trees.

k) Landscaped courtyards may be either partially open to streets or parks or surrounded by buildings on all sides. Courtyards will be designed to extend and enhance the public realm of streets, parks and open spaces.

l) The courtyard character will be green and well-treed with outdoor uses that promote pedestrian circulation as well as recreational, gathering and other social uses. Vehicular access and servicing areas will generally be discouraged from being located within a courtyard.

20.3.3.12.5 Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation

The Secondary Plan area should be connected to the broader community, utilizing a network of pedestrian paths, walkways, and cycling. Future redevelopment will provide the opportunity to improve pedestrian and bicycle linkages within the area and the adjacent neighbourhoods. Permeability and connectivity throughout the Secondary Plan area are key aspects of the overall objectives for a more walkable and connected environment. In the future mid-block walkways and active transportation connections are encouraged within the Secondary Plan area. To facilitate enhanced pedestrian connectivity, the following guidelines shall be considered:

a) Sidewalks connections should be provided between all building entrances and the public sidewalk within a comprehensive network.

b) Landscaped mid-block pedestrian walkways and/or bicycle trails should be approximately 6 metres wide to provide room for the path and soft landscaping. Narrower spaces that limit visibility and safety are discouraged.

c) Fencing along neighbourhood connections, pedestrian walkways and/or bicycle trails should be low and allow for views from surrounding buildings and areas to promote safety. A coordinated approach to fencing design, location and height along these routes will be encouraged.

d) Where possible, pedestrian crossings should be designed to be distinct from the street by using paving materials, textures, and colours to enhance the legibility of the crossing.

e) Locate bicycle racks near entrances of buildings with connectivity to the public sidewalk.

f) Align pedestrian paths with transit stops to provide a more direct connection for users.

g) Private outdoor spaces should be designed as barrier free with appropriate lighting to improve route legibility, access, safety, and comfort.

h) Limit planting along edges of pedestrian walkways and cycling trails to low lying vegetation or other that does not restrict visibility and safety.
20.3.3.12.6 Parking, Access and Servicing

This Secondary Plan encourages a future block pattern and street network that supports opportunities for walking, cycling, and connectivity with surrounding areas.

Site specific vehicular access, ramps, servicing and loading should be provided from local streets wherever possible to minimize impacts on vehicular and pedestrian traffic on arterial streets. Ramps, servicing and loading facilities should be integrated into the buildings they serve to minimize impacts on landscaped open space. At-grade parking will be minimized. Where permitted, surface parking areas will be carefully located and screened to minimize impacts on adjoining streets or parks. The following shall be considered in designing parking and servicing facilities:

a) Parking areas are discouraged from being located along street frontages.

b) For structured parking, the facility should be integrated into the built form such that it is relates to the design and façade treatment of the building. Solid blank walls are not permitted.

c) Wherever possible, surface parking and servicing for new developments should be placed at the rear of buildings and accessed by a rear or side yard lane.

d) Where surface parking or service areas are exposed, a generous separation should be provided from the public realm and designed to include additional street trees or landscaping and buffered with hedges or shrub planting or other mitigating design measures.

e) Parking lot lighting, pedestrian pathways and other street furniture should be used to create a comfortable, safe, and connected pedestrian environment.

f) The edges of parking facilities should receive architectural and design treatments to be consistent with the streetscape design and complement adjacent buildings.

20.3.3.12.7 Internal Streets

Redevelopment in the Secondary Plan may include internal streets to support development. The following guidelines shall be considered for proposed new internal streets:

a) Internal streets should be developed with the “look and feel” of local City streets.

b) Streets should be designed at the pedestrian scale with sidewalks, street trees, and street furniture for an enhanced pedestrian environment and for seamless integration with the public realm.

c) Pedestrian scale lighting should be provided along the street edge.
20.3.4 TRANSPORTATION

20.3.4.1 Planned Transportation Network

The existing and planned transportation network is depicted on Schedules E and F and is designed to accommodate a variety of modes, including automobiles, trucks, transit, cycling and pedestrians. As the Community Node evolves over time, the expectation is that major improvements will be made to enhance automobile, transit, cycling and walking networks within and into the area to ensure that an appropriate balance of transportation options is provided.

20.3.4.2 Improvements and Enhancements to Transportation Network

The Secondary Plan contemplates the following potential improvements to the transportation network:

- Road improvements;
- Transit improvements; and,
- Active transportation improvements.

20.3.4.3 Existing and Planned Road Network

The existing and planned road network is depicted on Schedule E and is expected to accommodate the planned growth and intensification potential for the Area up to 2031. Intersections of major arterial roads should consider effective vehicle movements while providing safe pedestrian and cycling crossings.

Appendix A provides illustrations depicting the future planned cross-sections for Main Street, Dundas Street and Franklin Boulevard based on the Region of Waterloo’s Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines. Although the arterial roads are all Regional roads, streetscaping along these roads is a City of Cambridge responsibility. Note that the cross-sections are provided for illustration purposes.

20.3.4.4 Reconstruction of Main Street from Franklin Boulevard to Chalmers Street

This is an excellent opportunity to coordinate active transportation and streetscaping with the Region of Waterloo. Main Street and Franklin Boulevard are Regional roads but streetscaping is a City of Cambridge responsibility. It is important to ensure sufficient setbacks and coordinated implementation of streetscaping as these projects proceed.

Reference Area(s): Main Street, west of Dundas Street
20.3.4.5 Local Road Connections

New local connections are required to facilitate development and/or redevelopment in some locations. The alignment of the proposed new connections are intended to be conceptual (except where the rights-of-way are already established). Detailed alignments and locations of local streets and private laneways shall be determined through further engineering studies and through the development approvals process.

20.3.4.6 Consolidate Entranceways

Development or redevelopment will seek the consolidation of access points and common traffic circulation in accordance with the provisions of this Plan and the Region of Waterloo’s access guidelines.

20.3.4.7 Transit Network

The existing and planned transit network is depicted on Schedule F. Grand River Transit is undergoing a new 5-year Business Plan which will review transit needs. The Land Use Plan (Schedule B) promotes infilling and intensification at a scale which would support increased transit ridership through the Main and Dundas Area.

20.3.4.8 Potential Transit Improvements

The City encourages the Region of the Waterloo to improve the provision of transit pedestrian amenities such as shelters, bike racks seating and lighting at all transit stops.

20.3.4.9 Improving On-site Linkages

Where new or expansions to existing development is proposed, the City will work with private sector applicants to improve on-site linkages and pathways to existing and planned transit stops.

20.3.4.10 Active Transportation Network

The existing and planned Active Transportation Network is depicted on Schedule F. The network is planned to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists.

20.3.4.11 Active Transportation Improvements

Active transportation infrastructure should provide continuous facilities and connectivity to transit stops, multi-use trails, parks, schools, recreational facilities, and on-street cycling network. Proposed active transportation improvements for the area include:

- Streetscape Improvements depicted on Schedule D which are intended to enhance both pedestrian comfort and connectivity;
- Completion of sidewalk network within the Plan Area; and,
- Potential pedestrian crossing/safety improvements along Franklin Boulevard at Green Gate Boulevard, and also at Main Street.
20.3.4.12 Franklin Boulevard and Green Gate Boulevard

The City of Cambridge will work with the Region of Waterloo to implement a pedestrian refuge island to improve pedestrian safety at the intersection of Franklin Boulevard and Green Gate Boulevard. The refuge island will connect pedestrians and cyclists across Franklin Boulevard and provide access to transit stops and the multi-use trail.

20.3.4.13 Sidewalk Improvements

Sidewalk infrastructure is provided throughout the Secondary Plan Area; however there remain parts of the network which are incomplete. Over time, the expectation is that sidewalks will be provided on both sides of the street for all existing and new roads within the Plan Area.

20.3.4.14 Secure Bike Parking Facilities

The implementing Zoning By-law may require the provision of secure bicycle parking facilities in a conspicuous location, long-term bike parking areas within buildings and on-site shower facilities and lockers for employees who bike to work. The City may allow for the reduction in the number of required parking spaces where bicycle parking facilities are provided.

20.3.4.15 Transportation Demand Management

Council may require that development applications include a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan, prepared to the satisfaction of the City. The intent of the TDM Plan shall be to implement and promote measures to reduce the use of low-occupancy automobiles for trips and to increase transit use, cycling and walking.

20.3.4.16 Parking

Through the development approvals process, the City may consider alternative parking requirements for mixed use and high density developments including shared parking standards.

20.3.4.17 Coordination with the City’s Transportation Master Plan

At the time of drafting of this secondary plan, the City was in the process of launching a new city-wide Transportation Master Plan. The expectation is that the growth assumptions, vision and other relevant aspects of this Secondary Plan will be considered in the preparation of the City-wide Transportation Master Plan. Amendments to the Secondary Plan may be required to ensure alignment between the Secondary Plan and the Transportation Master Plan.
20.3.5 INFRASTRUCTURE

20.3.5.1 Water and Sanitary Servicing

As part of the implementation of this Secondary Plan, the City will work with the Region of Waterloo to ensure that there is adequate water and sanitary servicing and capacity to accommodate the long term planned development for the Secondary Plan Area.

20.3.5.2 Municipal Servicing Study

As part of the implementation of this Secondary Plan, and the policies of Chapter 6 of the Official Plan, the City will undertake an analysis of local infrastructure to ensure that adequate servicing is in place to accommodate the planned growth for the area. The City will update its municipal master servicing strategy as required.

20.3.5.3 Development Applications and Servicing Requirements

The City may also require development applications to be supported by site-specific servicing studies.

20.3.5.4 Sustainable Stormwater Management

The municipality encourages innovative measures to help reduce the impacts of urban run-off and maintain base groundwater flow. Such measures may include bioswales, permeable pavers, rain barrels and green roofs.

20.3.5.5 Coordination of Public Works

The City will work with the Region to ensure that planned public works for the area are coordinated to minimize the impacts of construction on the residents and businesses within the Plan Area. Coordination efforts will consider the phasing of streetscape improvements, any future road works, and maintenance, as well as any upgrades to water and sanitary networks.
20.3.6 IMPLEMENTATION

20.3.6.1 General Implementation

20.3.6.1.1 Implementation Tools

The Secondary Plan shall be implemented through a variety of tools, including but not limited to:

a) The planning and development application process, through tools such as site plan approval, plans of subdivision and condominium and consents to sever;

b) The City of Cambridge Zoning by law;

c) Community Improvement Plan; and,

d) Other tools as described in this Chapter.

20.3.6.1.2 Development Proposal Complete Application Requirements

Development applications within the Secondary Plan are subject to any complete application requirements set out in the Official Plan. The City may update these complete application requirements to account for additional supporting studies that may be needed to support growth within the Secondary Plan, including a shadow impact study.

20.3.6.1.3 Municipal Works within the Secondary Plan

All future municipal works undertaken by the City of Cambridge within the Secondary Plan Area shall be consistent with the policies of this Plan.

20.3.6.1.4 Official Plan Amendments

Unless otherwise stated in this Plan or the City’s Official Plan, applications for development which do not align with the Policies or Schedules of this Plan shall require an Official Plan Amendment. Amendments to the Official Plan shall be subject to policies of the Official Plan and shall require a planning justification report, along with any other supporting studies identified through the pre-consultation process.

20.3.6.1.5 Zoning By-Law

The City will update its zoning by-law to ensure that the land use and design policies for this Secondary Plan are reflected in the City’s zoning by-law.

Applications for development within the Plan Area shall be subject to the policies of this Secondary Plan and the City’s Official Plan (where applicable). Amendments to the zoning by-law shall be subject to policies of the Official Plan and shall require a planning justification report, along with any other supporting studies identified through the pre-consultation process.
20.3.6.1.6 Site Plan Approval, Plans of Subdivision, Plans of Condominium and Severances

Applications for site plan approval, plans of subdivision, plans of condominium and consents to sever shall be consistent with the policies of this Secondary Plan and City of Cambridge’s Official Plan.

20.3.6.1.7 Main Street and Dundas Street Area Community Improvement Plan

To assist and accelerate intensification redevelopment and facilitate further public realm improvements within the Secondary Plan Area, the City will consider modifying its Community Improvement Plan (CIP) programs or creating a new CIP for intensification areas. The rationale for completing a CIP as part of the Secondary Plan’s implementation is to ensure that:

- The proposed public realm improvement projects are appropriately planned and accounted for in the City’s capital budget, including any property acquisitions which may be required to complete the proposed streetscaping, public space and gateway improvements; and,
- There is a competitive suite of financial incentives to promote intensification and redevelopment, such as but not limited to incentives for greyfield and brownfield redevelopment, lot consolidation/assembly, residential infilling and/or mixed-use intensification, etc.

20.3.6.1.8 Coordination with the Region of Waterloo

The City will work with the Region of Waterloo, who is the approval authority for this Plan, to ensure that the policies of this Plan are implemented, including any opportunities to implement the urban design and public realm improvements through any future Regional works. The City also encourages the Region of Waterloo to consider opportunities for affordable housing development within the Community Node area.

20.3.6.2 Phasing and Financial Tools

20.3.6.2.1 Municipal Capital Improvements

The City will prepare a phasing strategy as to assist with the implementation of this Secondary Plan. The Phasing Strategy should consider the following:

a) The expecting timing of development, including the expected built-out of vacant lands and redevelopment of existing areas;

b) The timing of any potential transportation, infrastructure, and public realm improvements; and,

c) Any other projects or initiatives which may impact the timing of development.
20.3.6.2.2 Development Charges

The City will include any growth-related infrastructure identified in this plan as part of the next Development Charges By-law update.

20.3.6.2.3 Updating the Plan

The City will comprehensively review the policies of this Secondary Plan at the 10 year review of the City’s Official Plan. Depending on the outcomes of the review, the City may decide to update the Plan.

20.3.6.3 Interpretation

20.3.6.3.1 Conflicts with Official Plan

In the event of a conflict between the Official Plan and this Secondary Plan, the Policies of the Secondary Plan shall prevail.

20.3.6.3.2 Boundaries

The boundaries shown on the Secondary Plan Schedules are approximate, except where they meet with existing roads, river valleys or other clearly defined physical features. Where the general intent of this Secondary Plan is maintained to the satisfaction of the Municipality, minor boundary adjustments will not require an amendment to this Secondary Plan.
Appendix A: Conceptual Street Cross Sections

Figure 20-1: Community Connector, Typical Cross Section

Reference Area(s): Franklin Boulevard; Main Street, between Franklin Boulevard and Dundas Street

Figure 20-2: Neighbourhood Connector, Typical Cross Section

Reference Area(s): Dundas Street; Main Street, between Franklin and Dundas; Franklin Boulevard, south of Dundas Street
To: COUNCIL

Meeting Date: 10/24/2023

Subject: 23-261-CD – Recommendation Report – Proposed Official Plan Amendment for Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan

Submitted By: Joan Jylanne, MCIP, RPP, Manager of Policy Planning
Prepared By: J. Matthew Blevins, MCIP, RPP, Senior Planner Reurbanization

Report No.: 23-261-CD
File No.: D08(2).04.07
Wards Affected: Ward 7

RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 23-261-CD – Recommendation Report – Proposed Official Plan Amendment for Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan be received;

AND THAT Council adopts Official Plan Amendment No. 65 to establish the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan, and that the adopted Official Plan Amendment be submitted to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo for approval;

AND THAT Council is satisfied that a subsequent public meeting in accordance with subsection 17(15) of the Planning Act is not required;

AND FURTHER THAT the attached By-law is passed.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide a recommendation on the proposed Official Plan Amendment for the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan and to provide a summary of, and response to, the comments raised at the statutory public meeting on May 16, 2023.

Key Findings

- The proposed Official Plan Amendment establishes the Main and Dundas Community Node and supports intensified development and redevelopment within the Node, through an updated policy framework provided through a secondary plan.
• Over time, the Main and Dundas Community Node is expected to grow to accommodate a greater density with a range of housing options; as well as commercial, employment, institutional and recreational uses all with access to public transit and active transportation options.

• Region of Waterloo is the final approval authority for the Official Plan Amendment.

**Financial Implications**

• There are no immediate financial impacts with the adoption of the Main Street and Dundas Street Secondary Plan. However, over time, as development occurs within the secondary plan boundaries, there will be impacts on both capital and operating budgets. Further details are in the Financial Impact section.

**STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:**

☑ Strategic Action

**Objective(s):** PLANNING FOR GROWTH - Provide for a mix of development, uses and amenities in order to meet the needs of a changing and diverse population

**Strategic Action:** Lay the foundation for future community-building

**OR**

☐ Core Service

**Program:** Not Applicable

**Core Service:** Not Applicable

**BACKGROUND:**

**Study Area**

The Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan includes the lands identified as a Node and Future Study Area in the Cambridge Official Plan and can generally be described as the lands south of McLaren Avenue, north of Franklin Lane, east of Dundas Street South and west of Wesley Boulevard. The study area is approximately 82 hectares (202 acres) in size as outlined in red in Figure 1.
Figure 1: Study Area

Surrounding Land Uses

The lands to the west, east and south of the Secondary Plan Area generally contain Low/Medium Density Residential with Rockwell Automation and the Eastern Industrial Park to the north.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):


Policy 2.5.5 of the Official Plan states that the City will prepare secondary plans to “ensure development occurs at the densities and form consistent with the Official Plan.”

Policy 8.7.2.7 indicates that there are three defined Community Nodes where the boundaries are approximate. It further indicates that “more detailed land use policies
along with finalization of the Community Node boundaries will be established through a Secondary Plan and implemented through a further amendment to the Official Plan.

Further, Policy 8.7.2.B.6 states that “The final boundaries of this Community Node will be determined through the Secondary Plan process and implemented through a further amendment to the Official Plan.”

**Existing Land Use Designations:** The study area is designated Low/Medium Density Residential, Community Commercial, Industrial and Natural Open Space System on Schedule 2: General Land Use Plan of the Cambridge Official Plan.

**Proposed Land Use Designations:** Mixed Use Mid-Rise High Density, Mixed Use Medium Density, Mixed Use Main Street, High Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Low Density Residential, Prestige Industrial and Natural Open Space System.

A planning analysis report from Dillon Consulting is included in Appendix B.

**ANALYSIS:**

There have been a number of minor changes to the plan based on comments received at the May 16, 2023 Public Meeting. The changes are set out in detail in the comment response table in Appendix D.

- Updated accessibility policies to reflect the City’s Facility Accessibility Design Manual.
- Provided clarity with respect to complete application requirements needed to support growth within the Secondary Plan area, including a shadow impact study.
- Ensured policies provide opportunities for urban squares and green spaces to support future needs in the surrounding neighbourhood.
- Adjusted land designations on the south side of McLaren Avenue to Mixed Use Medium Density (currently Prestige Industrial).
- Modified the land use plan to adjust all lands designated Low Density Residential on the south quadrant between Main St and Dundas Street South (including sites along Morning Calm Drive) to Medium Density Residential, as per the 2016 version of the Plan.
- The proposed site specific policies have been removed from the secondary plan and are being added to Chapter 8 of the Official Plan with the other site specific policies.

The secondary plan is intended to provide a policy framework to help guide growth and redevelopment within the Main and Dundas Community Node and surrounding area. The plan proposes to permit mixed use development in combination with residential,
commercial, and open space uses to work towards a 15-minute neighbourhood. The goal of the 15-minute neighbourhood is to allow opportunities to live, work, shop and play while providing for daily necessities all within a 15-minute travel distance by walking, cycling, or rolling.

The proposed Official Plan Amendment, if adopted by Cambridge Council and approved by the Region, will redesignate the lands within the secondary plan area from Low/Medium Density Residential, Community Commercial and Industrial to a range of land use designations ranging from Low Density Residential through to Mixed Use Mid-Rise High Density and includes designations for Prestige Industrial and Natural Open Space. There is one property at the southeast corner of Main Street and Nottinghill Drive, shown in orange on Figure 2, that is designated High Density Residential with a minimum height of 10 storeys and a maximum height of 20 storeys (See Figure 3).

The highest densities are proposed for the intersections of Dundas and Franklin and Dundas and Main Street (deep purple in Figure 2 above). The Mixed Use Mid-Rise High Density designation allows for the addition of residential development to the existing commercial areas with a minimum height of five storeys and a maximum height of 12 storeys. The lighter purple areas on Figure 2 show the Mixed Use Medium Density designation which permits development with a minimum height of three storeys and a maximum height of eight storeys. The areas in brown are Medium Density Residential which permit straight residential development between three storeys and 8 storeys and the areas identified in pink on Figure 2 above are the proposed Mixed Use Main Street designation which have a minimum height of two storeys up to a maximum height of six storeys.

There is also an active development application at the northeast corner of Main Street and Franklin Boulevard (840 – Main Street - OR12/21) that is relying on the proposed site specific designation through the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan to be able to advance their development application to approval.

Official Plan Amendment No. 65 (OPA No. 65) has been prepared in accordance with the Planning Act and generally aligns with the policies of the Cambridge Official Plan, the Region of Waterloo Official Plan, the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement and the 2020 Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.
Figure 2: Land Use Plan
Figure 3: Proposed Height and Density

Accordingly, staff recommend adoption of OPA No. 65 to facilitate addition of the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan as Chapter 20 to the Cambridge Official Plan along with accompanying schedule and OP policy changes to Chapters 1, 8, 13 and 16.

Planning decisions are subject to appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT), subject to the provisions of the Planning Act, as amended.

Municipal Infrastructure

With the exception of the most eastern lands along Main Street (805 to 1140 Main Street), the lands included within the Secondary Plan boundaries are located along municipal rights-of-way that include municipal servicing.

The servicing strategy for development within the larger South-East Galt area, bounded generally by Dundas Street, Main Street and the municipal boundary, was established through the South-East Galt Community Plan, which was approved in 1999. Capital projects to implement the servicing strategy identified in the Community Plan were created and the majority have been constructed over the last 20 years. There remain two capital projects in the 10-year capital forecast to complete the implementation of the servicing strategy. Further details are in the Financial Impact section.

The City is currently undertaking an update of the Sanitary Sewer Model (A/01194-20) which will include the analysis of growth scenarios to identify future municipal infrastructure upgrades that may be required to support growth. The growth projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Minimum-density-for-freestanding-residential-development (UPH—units per hectare)</th>
<th>Height±</th>
<th>(Storeys)±</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential±</td>
<td>150±</td>
<td>10±</td>
<td>20±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-Density Residential±</td>
<td>80±</td>
<td>3±</td>
<td>8±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Density Residential±</td>
<td>n/a±</td>
<td>n/a±</td>
<td>4±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Mid-Rise High-Density</td>
<td>150±</td>
<td>5±</td>
<td>12±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Medium Density±</td>
<td>60±</td>
<td>3±</td>
<td>8±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Main Street ±</td>
<td>60±</td>
<td>2±</td>
<td>6±</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and recommended densities from this secondary plan, along with recommendations from the ongoing Growth Management Study, will be integrated into the future scenarios in the sanitary sewer model.

Active transportation infrastructure, through a combination of sidewalks and multi-use trails, are included on existing municipal right-of-ways, with the exception of the eastern portion of Main Street, which is currently a rural cross-section. Reconstruction of municipal rights-of-way, by either the City or the Region, will include active transportation. Construction of new local roads would include active transportation as per the standard cross-sections.

It is anticipated that there may be gaps within the active transportation network, either in areas where the cross-section has not been upgraded to an urban section, or in an area that has not yet seen development, where infill sidewalk or multi-use trail may be required. These will need to be reviewed as they are identified and may be included in the sidewalk infill program or may need to be proposed as stand alone capital projects.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

The adoption of the Main Street and Dundas Street Secondary Plan has no immediate financial impacts. Over time, as development occurs within the secondary plan boundaries, there will be impacts on both capital and operating budgets.

**Capital Impacts**

As noted above, there are two capital projects in the 10-year capital forecast to facilitate the servicing of the larger South-East Galt area:

- **A/00480-40 SE Galt Main St Extension of Services** includes approximately $1M of Development Charge funding to extend municipal servicing on Main Street from the current termination location near 805 Main Street towards the urban boundary. The project would cover the cost of oversizing infrastructure as per the Local Services Policy. The project is proposed for 2025 based on expected timing of development but will be reviewed through the preparation of the 2025 capital budget. It is expected the Region will be undertaking reconstruction of Main Street to upgrade the road to an urban cross-section with active transportation facilities and the municipal servicing would be combined with that project if the timing aligned.

- **A/00509-40 SE Galt Infrastructure Upsize** includes approximately $2.4M of Development Charge funding to cover the costs of upsizing municipal infrastructure within subdivision developments if required as per the Local Service Policy. This project is proposed for 2027 based on expected timing of
development and will continue to be reviewed during future capital budget preparation.

Through their Transportation Capital Program, the Region is planning to reconstruct Dundas Street (from Briercrest to Franklin) and Main Street (from Dundas to Chalmers Street) in 2028/2029. As part of the Region’s project, the City will be replacing water and wastewater infrastructure, with capital project A/00714-41 proposed in the capital forecast for 2028. The City project includes $4.25M of funding from the Capital Works, Water and Wastewater Reserve Funds. The Region has not yet begun design of this project, and the growth projections from the Secondary Plan will be taken into consideration when the design for the replacement of City infrastructure is completed.

Should the Sanitary Sewer Model growth scenarios identify upgrades within the secondary plan boundary, capital projects will be proposed for consideration by Council in future budgets. Applicable works would also be included in the next Development Charges Background Study.

It is anticipated that municipal roads and servicing within any draft plans of subdivision within the secondary plan area would be constructed by developers as per the Local Service Policy. If, as per the Local Services Policy, oversizing of infrastructure is required, it could be funded through A/00509-40 described above, or alternatively would be proposed as a future capital project for Council approval.

**Operating Impacts**

The operating impacts of any new infrastructure constructed through the above capital projects has been included in the budget process to ensure resources are provided to operate and maintain new assets at the applicable service level.

For assets constructed by developers that are ultimately transferred to City ownership, growth requests, either for increased budget or resources, will need to be proposed by staff in the appropriate divisions for consideration by Council.

**PUBLIC VALUE:**

**Engagement:**

A Statutory Public Meeting was held on May 16, 2023. Members of the public/residents that have requested to be added to the sign-in registry at the meeting or have requested to be notified of Council’s decision on the proposed development were notified of this Recommendation Report being presented to Council on October 24, 2023.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:**

Not Applicable
PUBLIC INPUT:

Previous drafts of the proposed Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan have been presented to the public during stakeholder meetings in 2015 and 2016. A Statutory Public Meeting was held on May 10, 2016 and a Public Information Centre (PIC) was held on December 12, 2022. The draft secondary plan was posted on the City of Cambridge website for review and comment. A second Statutory Public Meeting was held on May 16, 2023.

The comments received at the public meeting generally fall within the following categories:

- Retention/provision of commercial uses
- Provision of and access to park lands
- Accessible design standards
- Maximum height for low density residential
- Mix of two and three bedroom units

No written submissions have been received since the public meeting on May 16, 2023. Two written submissions were received after the public meeting report was finalized and have been included in Appendix D along with a comment response table that addresses the oral comments and submissions received at the public meeting.

This report has been posted on the City’s website as part of the public report process.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:

A Steering Committee comprised of staff from the: Region of Waterloo, Waterloo District School Board, Waterloo Region Catholic School Board and City staff have reviewed the draft Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan and are generally in agreement with the policy direction proposed.

There have not been any additional comments from members of the Steering Committee on the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan. After adoption by Council the Official Plan Amendment (OPA) will be forwarded to the Region of Waterloo for final approval.

Staff circulated notice of the public meeting and of this recommendation report to representatives from Six Nations of the Grand River, Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation and the Haudenosaunee Resource Centre.
CONCLUSION:
Planning staff is recommending adoption of the Official Plan Amendment. The amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020; and conforms to the Growth Plan (2020), the Regional Official Plan and Cambridge Official Plan; and represents good planning.

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

APPROVALS:
This report has gone through the appropriate workflow and has been reviewed and or approved by the following as required:
Director
Deputy City Manager
Chief Financial Officer
City Solicitor
City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:
1. 23-261-CD Appendix A – Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan Study Area
2. 23-261-CD Appendix B – Planning Analysis Report from Dillon Consulting
3. 23-261-CD Appendix C – Proposed Official Plan Amendment: Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan Policy and Schedules
4. 23-261-CD Appendix D – Public Comments Received and Comment Response Table
5. 23-261-CD Appendix E – May 16, 2023 Public Meeting Minutes
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1.0 OVERVIEW OF POLICY CONTEXT

1.1. BACKGROUND

The City of Cambridge Official Plan (approved on November 21, 2012 by the Region of Waterloo) imagines Cambridge as a growing, well designed, compact, vibrant and complete community, and identified a growth framework to the community, with a planning horizon of 2031. The city will be planned to feature an appropriate mix of jobs, range of housing options, access to services and community infrastructure and access to transportation options including public transit. One of the keys to achieving this vision is the development and implementation of a robust policy framework that focuses growth and intensification in strategic locations within the existing built-up areas. These locations include the Urban Growth Centre, Community Core Areas, Nodes, Regeneration Areas, Reurbanization Corridors and Major Transit Station Areas. These locations have been selected because they boast services and community infrastructure that support growth,
they have land parcels with development and redevelopment potential, and they are located along existing or proposed transit routes including the Region of Waterloo’s rapid transit service (ION).

To support intensification, the City of Cambridge is in the process of preparing six secondary plans for the City’s main intensification areas, including the Main and Dundas Street South Area.

1.2. PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

The purpose of the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan is to provide a planning framework that will guide future development and redevelopment in the Main Street and Dundas Street Community Node to achieve growth planning objectives to the 2031 planning horizon. The plan provides long range policy for the following elements:

- Land use;
- Urban design and public realm improvements;
- Transportation and infrastructure improvements; and
- Implementation tools and monitoring program.

1.3. SECONDARY PLAN PROCESS

The Secondary Plan process has been undertaken in three phases:

- **Phase 1**: The first phase commenced in October 2015 with a stakeholder workshop to identify the key issues and opportunities within the Secondary Plan area. Over 40 stakeholders participated in this workshop and provided feedback, which was used to develop the vision and guiding principles for this Secondary Plan.

- **Phase 2**: The second phase involved establishing the vision, land use and draft policies for the Secondary Plan. Key elements of the draft Secondary Plan were presented to the public in 2016.

- **Phase 3**: The third and final phase involves the development of the implementation program and a draft of the Secondary Plan which was presented at a Statutory Public Meeting under the Planning Act most recently in May 2023. Following the Public Meeting, Staff made several minor revisions to the Plan and will be presenting it to Council for adoption in 2023.
1.4. POLICY PLANNING ANALYSIS

1.4.1. Provincial Policy Statement, 2020

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) 2020 articulates the direction of provincial land use planning in a comprehensive, integrated, and long-term manner. The fundamental mandate of the PPS is ensuring that municipal, provincial, and other governmental land use decisions are consistent with this Statement. Additionally, it encourages the wise management of land use change to meet both current and future needs, while conserving significant resources and avoiding areas with potential health and safety risks.

The PPS establishes wide-ranging land use policies for the province, mandating that all decisions, including those made at the municipal level concerning the development and implementation of Secondary Plans, adhere to its guidelines. Moreover, the PPS indicates that municipalities must “maintain at all times the ability to accommodate residential growth for a minimum of 15 years through residential intensification and redevelopment and, if necessary, lands which are designated and available for residential development” (1.4.1 a). Therefore, municipalities are guided by the PPS to engage in detailed planning processes like secondary planning to make lands available for development.

A key aspect of implementing the policy directions of the PPS is the role of municipalities in the implementation process, including:

- Permitting and facilitating a range of housing choices, including residential intensification, to cater to diverse current and future needs;
- Supporting efficient land use patterns, optimizing resources, infrastructure investments, and housing mix, including affordable options. This approach should promote the long-term financial well-being of municipalities and the Province;
- Working with upper-tier municipalities to allocate population, housing and employment projections; and identify growth areas and set targets for intensification and redevelopment within their jurisdictions;
- Keeping their planning documents, up-to-date with the PPS;
- Updating their zoning and development permit by-laws to align with their planning documents and the PPS; and
- Monitoring the implementation of the PPS policies in their planning documents and report on them as per the Minister’s guidelines.
The Main and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan has been developed to implement the provincial direction as set out in the PPS. The policies of the Secondary Plan, and its implementation, will ensure the area develops to meet the current and future needs of residents in a context-sensitive manner, providing a framework for the efficient use of land and infrastructure, the provision of parkland and opportunities to support alternative modes of transportation, including active transportation, and the provision of an appropriate mix of housing forms, including affordable housing.

1.4.2. Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2020

The Growth Plan sets out a broad, strategic framework for managing growth and development in the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH) region in a sustainable manner. It aims to optimize the use of existing and new infrastructure, protect environmental and agricultural resources, promote development in designated built-up areas, and foster vibrant and complete communities.

Secondary plans, which are more detailed local plans developed within the framework of a municipality's official plan, play a crucial role in implementing the Growth Plan. The Growth Plan's policies, such as minimum density targets and intensification targets, guide the need for secondary plans. Policy 2.2.4 of the Growth Plan encourages the use of secondary plans to facilitate transit-supportive development around planned and existing higher order transit stations and stops, to promote mixed-use development, and to foster the creation of complete communities that contain a diverse mix of uses and housing options in order to optimize existing infrastructure and public transit. In essence, these policies underline the significance of urban intensification and efficient land use in ensuring sustainable development and economic prosperity in the GGH. By concentrating development within delineated areas and setting specific density targets, secondary plans aim to create a future that is both prosperous and sustainable for Ontario.

In the case of the Main and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan, as a designated growth area within the City’s Built-up Area, it is expected that redevelopment and intensification in the area, consistent with the framework set out in the Secondary Plan, will contribute to achieving the City’s intensification target. The proposed Secondary Plan will allow for an appropriate level of intensification for this area, in conformity with the policies of the Growth Plan.
1.5. REGIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK

1.5.1. Region of Waterloo Official Plan, 2010

The Regional Official Plan for Waterloo outlines a vision of liveability, dependent on intertwined cultural, environmental, social, and economic aspects. It emphasizes the importance of a well-designed and accessible infrastructure that promotes a high quality of life, providing options and fostering safety.

For vibrant urban and rural communities, Section 3.0 of the plan calls for diverse housing choices, increased pedestrian, cycling and transit accessibility, reduced reliance on automobiles, improved air quality, and support for alternative energy systems. There's also a strong focus on locally sourced food, human services need, and considerations for an aging and diverse population. These objectives will be achieved through collaboration with Area Municipalities and other agencies, aiming for vibrant urban and rural places.

Regarding infrastructure, Section 5.0 of the Plan views effective planning and management as crucial for achieving a sustainable and liveable Waterloo Region. Infrastructure planning should strive to optimize the use of existing resources, reduce additional demands, and support the community's economic opportunities. Shared responsibilities for infrastructure management lie with various levels of government, the region, municipalities, and other agencies.

Several sections of the Regional Official Plan address infrastructure needs, focusing on transportation, drinking-water systems, wastewater systems, waste management, and utilities. The policies seek to improve transportation modes' connectivity, with special emphasis on the Region's transit system due to the strong land use-transportation planning link. Infrastructure master plans, assisting in planning significant initiatives, will support the Plan's community structure and prioritize infrastructure investments for urban development management.

The Regional Official Plan emphasises that Area Municipalities will establish policies in their official plans to adhere to the plan's overarching goal in infrastructure planning, development, and management that optimizes existing resources, accommodates forecasted growth, and promotes sustainability and a healthy population.
The Secondary Plan has been prepared to conform to the ROP\(^1\); and, City staff have worked with Regional staff to address Regional comments provided throughout the Secondary Planning process to ensure that the final Secondary Plan meets Regional objectives.

### 1.6. INTEGRATION WITH CITY OF CAMBRIDGE OFFICIAL PLAN

Policy 2.5.5 of the City’s Official Plan states that the City will prepare Secondary Plans to “ensure that development occurs at the densities and form consistent with the (Official Plan)”. The Cambridge Official Plan, 2018 designated the Main St and Dundas St S Community Node and Future Study Area for inclusion in node boundary, which are subject to this Secondary Plan. The expectation is the policies of this Secondary Plan will form a new chapter within the Cambridge Official Plan implemented through OPA 65.

---

\(^1\) The Secondary Plan has been prepared to accommodate growth to 2031. The Regional Official Plan Amendment #6 was approved by the Province in April 2023 and includes a number of policies to guide growth and development within the City of Cambridge to 2051. The City of Cambridge Growth Management Strategy currently underway will identify a strategy to implement population and employment growth identified, which may result in additional changes to the City of Cambridge Official Plan and the Main and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan Area, through a subsequent official plan amendment.
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

BY-LAW 23-xxx

Being a by-law of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge to adopt Amendment No. 65 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012), as amended with respect to the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan.

WHEREAS sections 17 and 22 of the Planning Act R.S.O. 1990 c. P. 13, as amended empower the City of Cambridge to adopt an Official Plan and make amendments thereto;

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

1. THAT Amendment No. 65 to the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012) applies to lands described as the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan;

2. THAT Amendment No. 65 to the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012) as amended, consisting of the text, and attached maps, is hereby adopted;

3. THAT the Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to make application to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo for approval of the aforementioned Amendment No. 65 to the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012), as amended;

4. AND THAT this By-law shall come into full force and effect upon the final passing thereof.

Enacted and Passed this ______ day of _________ 2023.

_________________________________
MAYOR

_________________________________
CLERK
AMENDMENT NO. 65
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OFFICIAL PLAN OF THE

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
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PART A – THE PREAMBLE

1.0 TITLE AND COMPONENTS

This document is entitled ‘Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan’ and will be referred to as ‘Amendment No. 65’. ‘Part A – The Preamble’ provides an explanation of the amendment including the purpose and format of the amendment but does not form part of this amendment.

‘Part B – The Amendment’ forms Amendment No. 65 to the Official Plan of the City of Cambridge and contains a comprehensive expression of the new, deleted and amended text.

2.0 PURPOSE

The purpose of Amendment No. 65 is to amend the Official Plan to include the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan which will introduce a policy framework to guide growth and redevelopment in the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node.

3.0 BACKGROUND

Prior to preparing the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan, extensive public consultation occurred including stakeholder meetings, Public Information Centres and public meetings:

- October 2015 – Stakeholders meeting to allow property owners and interested parties to discuss ideas about the future of the Secondary Plan Area.
- April 2016 – Second stakeholders meeting to present initial draft of Secondary Plan to stakeholders.
- December 12, 2022 – Public Information Centre.
- May 16, 2023 – Statutory Public Meeting.

At the December 12, 2022, Public Information Centre. A proposed vision for the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan Area was shared with the community, along with proposed key principles to guide future development in the area related to land use and built form, transportation and mobility, parks and open space, and natural heritage. A land use concept was also presented to demonstrate how lands within the Secondary Plan Area could be organized. A question-and-answer period was held following the presentation to allow participants a chance to ask questions and provide comments on the project, presentation, and land use option presented. The Project Team provided responses to all questions received through a subsequent comment-response matrix.

At the May 16, 2023, Statutory Public Meeting the draft Secondary Plan, as revised based on the public and agency comments received, was presented to Council and the public for consideration. Responses to comments received at the Statutory Public Meeting were provided through a comment response matrix appended to the recommendation report.
4.0 LOCATION

Official Plan Amendment No. 65 applies to the lands identified as a Community Node and Future Study Area from Figure 3 of the Cambridge Official Plan and can generally be described as the lands south of McLaren Avenue, north of Franklin Lane, east of Dundas Street South and west of Wesley Boulevard.

5.0 BASIS OF THE AMENDMENT

5.1 Background

The City of Cambridge Official Plan (approved on November 21, 2012, by the Region of Waterloo) imagines Cambridge as a growing, well designed, compact, vibrant, and complete community. The city is planned to feature an appropriate mix of jobs, range of housing options, access to services and community infrastructure, and access to transportation options including public transit and active transportation. One of the keys to achieving this vision is the development and implementation of a robust policy framework that focuses growth and intensification in strategic locations within the existing built-up areas. These locations include the Urban Growth Centre, Community Core Areas, Nodes, Reurbanization Corridors and Major Transit Station Areas. These locations have been selected because they boast services and community infrastructure that support growth, they have land parcels with development and redevelopment potential, and they are located along existing or proposed transit routes including the Region of Waterloo’s rapid transit service (ION).

5.2 Existing Policy Framework

The Secondary Plan has been prepared as an amendment to the City of Cambridge Official Plan. The Secondary Plan Area is currently designated Low/Medium Density Residential, Community Commercial, Industrial and Natural Open Space System in the City’s Official Plan. The City’s Official Plan directs that secondary plans may be prepared for specific areas of the City to provide more detailed planning objectives and policies to direct and guide development (Section 10.2).
5.3 Secondary Plan

The purpose of the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan is to guide the future planning and development of the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node lands. The Secondary Plan supports and builds on the policies of the City of Cambridge Official Plan, and provincial and regional policies and plans, with respect to orderly development of the area.

The Secondary Plan establishes a vision and the principles for the design and development of the area. It also establishes the general land use patterns and conceptual locations of parks and trails, roads and infrastructure. The Secondary Plan includes goals, general policies, and land use policies.

5.4 Proposed Land Use Changes

The Main Street and Dundas Street South lands are currently designated Low/Medium Density Residential, Community Commercial, Industrial and Natural Open Space System in the City’s Official Plan. The proposed new land use designations are shown on Schedule B of the Secondary Plan and are generally described as follows:

- **Mixed Use Mid-Rise High Density** permits a range of medium and high-density residential uses in 5 to 8 storey buildings as well as limited commercial and office uses and is intended to provide a transition from lower density to higher density areas.

- **Mixed Use Medium Density** permits medium density residential uses such as street townhomes, stacked townhomes, and low-rise apartments as well as commercial and office uses.

- **Mixed Use Main Street** permits a range of multiple residential units, commercial uses including retail, service commercial and places of amusement as well as some office uses and are intended to provide a transition in scale, form, massing and height between the Mixed-Use Mid-Rise High Density designation and surrounding lower density residential areas.

- **High Density Residential** permits medium to high density residential uses such as mid-rise and high-rise apartments and other multiple dwellings.

- **Medium Density Residential** permits medium density residential uses such as street townhomes, stacked townhomes, low-rise apartments and other multiple dwellings (excluding semi-detached).

- **Low Density Residential** permits residential uses such as single and semi-detached dwellings as well as additional residential units and existing medium density multi-unit residential uses. The maximum building height is 4 storeys.

- **Prestige Industrial** permits a range of light industrial, office buildings and research uses ranging from hotel and office type uses through to research and development laboratories and permits accessory and complementary uses.

- **Natural Open Space System** is applied to core environmental features, such as wetlands, woodlands and tributaries, and the associated buffers identified in the applicable Subwatershed Study.
5.5 Compliance with Provincial Legislation and Policy

Provincial Policy Statement (2020)

Section 3 of the Planning Act requires that decisions affecting planning matters shall be consistent with policy statements issued under the Act. The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) was issued under the authority of Section 3 of the Act. The PPS provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development, including the protection of resources of provincial interest, public health and safety, and the quality of the natural and built environment.

The PPS directs growth to Settlement Areas on full municipal services (Policy 1.1.3) and directs that new development taking place in designated growth areas should occur adjacent to the existing built-up area and is to have a compact form, mix of uses and densities that allow for the efficient use of land, infrastructure, and public service facilities. The Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan lands will provide a mix of residential, commercial, institutional, and open space uses at densities to promote the efficient use of land, infrastructure, and public service facilities.

Policy 1.6.7.1 states that transportation systems should be provided which are safe, energy efficient, facilitate the movement of people and goods, and appropriate to address projected needs. The Secondary Plan proposes complete streets which prioritize active transportation, allow for vehicular movements and plan for future transit infrastructure.

Policy 1.8.1 directs municipalities to support energy conservation and efficiency, improved air quality, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and preparing for the impacts of a changing climate. The Secondary Plan promotes a compact built form and the use of active transportation and transit through transit supportive development. Further, it promotes sustainable design which maximizes energy efficiency and conservation and considers the mitigating effects of vegetation and green infrastructure.

The Secondary Plan is appropriate and consistent with the PPS.

A Place to Grow – Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Office Consolidation 2020)

In 2019, the Province of Ontario released an update to the provincial growth plan called “A Place to Grow – Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe” (Growth Plan). An Office Consolidation of the Growth Plan, which includes Amendment 1 (2020) was released in August of 2020. Planning applications are required to conform to Provincial plans.

The Growth Plan focusses on directing new development to existing settlement areas in order to support the development of complete communities that contain a diverse mix of uses and housing options in order to optimize existing infrastructure and public transit. The Growth Plan contains development targets for urban areas (referred to as Built-Up areas). The Main Street and Dundas Street S Secondary Plan area is located within a settlement area and is considered a Built-Up Area in the Growth Plan.


Regional Official Plan

The Secondary Plan area is located in the Built-up Area within the Urban Area Boundary as identified in the Region of Waterloo Official Plan. It is intended that land within the Urban Area is “to accommodate the majority of the Region’s growth within the planning horizon” of the Plan (Section 2.B.2).
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The Built-Up Area identifies all lands within the built boundary of the Urban Area. Area municipalities are required to establish policies in their official plans and other supporting documents to ensure that “a minimum of 61 per cent of all new residential development occurring annually within the region as a whole will be constructed within the Built-Up Area” (Section 2.C.2).

Section 2.D.1 requires planning for new development within the Urban Area that:

b) is serviced by a municipal drinking-water supply system and a municipal wastewater system;

c) contributes to the creation of complete communities with development patterns, densities and an appropriate mix of land uses that supports walking, cycling and the use of transit;

d) protects the natural environment, and surface water and groundwater resources;

e) conserves cultural heritage resources and supports the adaptive reuse of historic buildings;

f) respects the scale, physical character, and context of established neighbourhoods in areas where reurbanization is planned to occur; and

h) promotes building designs and orientations that incorporate energy conservation features and the use of alternative and/or renewable energy systems.

The Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan was prepared based on the principles supporting the creation of complete communities, 15-minute neighbourhoods, transit supportive design and uses, and alternative transportation modes. The policy framework was developed to ensure appropriate and efficient growth.

Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 6 has been approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Amongst other changes and modifications, the density for Designated Greenfield Areas has been increased to 59 persons and jobs per hectare which has been reflected in the policies of this amendment.

The proposed Official Plan Amendment conforms to the Regional Official Plan, as amended.

City of Cambridge Official Plan

The Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan area is located in the Built-Up Area according to the City’s Official Plan, and is designated Low/Medium Density Residential, Community Commercial, Industrial and Natural Open Space System.

Uses such as single detached dwellings, townhouses and/or walk-up apartments are permitted on lands designated Low/Medium Density Residential where municipal water supply and wastewater systems are available (8.4.6.9).

The City’s Official Plan directs that secondary plans may be prepared for specific areas of the City to provide more detailed planning objectives and policies to direct and guide development (10.2.1) provided the secondary plan is in conformity with the City and Regional Official Plans (10.2.2), and in consideration of the following Section 10.2.4 criteria:

a) patterns of land use;

b) population and employment projections;

c) mix and range of housing types and densities;

d) phasing of development in an efficient manner.
e) provision for adequate and appropriate areas for commercial, institutional and community-oriented facilities;

f) provision for trails, parks, and open space;

g) natural features;

h) cultural heritage resources;

i) incorporating intensification opportunities;

j) development of a transportation network that facilitates the efficient movement of vehicular and pedestrian traffic including active transportation considerations;

k) municipal services;

l) incorporating opportunities for mixed-use and higher density development in appropriate locations;

m) designation of land; and

n) any other matters as deemed appropriate by the City.

Section 5.2.1 states that the design of the built environment will promote sustainable, healthy, active living through:

a) well-connected and maintained streets, paths and trails that are able to safely accommodate different modes of transportation;

b) safe, accessible, aesthetically pleasing, well-serviced and inclusive developments;

c) resilient natural environments that support wildlife and their habitat and are better connected to residential areas; and

d) walkable neighbourhoods that offer a mix of uses, and range and variety of housing types with convenient access to public transit.

Chapter 5 of the Official Plan establishes urban design policies to achieve a high standard of urban design across the City. The Secondary Plan builds on the policies of the Official Plan to achieve design excellence in the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan Area. It is planned to promote sustainable, healthy, and active living (Section 5.2), support transit usage (Section 5.3), build a high-quality, attractive public realm (Section 5.5) and consider sustainability and energy efficiency in the design of both private and public realms (Section 5.8).

The Secondary Plan conforms to the City of Cambridge Official Plan.

6.0 SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO THE OFFICIAL PLAN

The following is a summary of OPA No. 65:

• Amends Policy 1.2 by adding Chapters for secondary plans

• Deletes Policy 8.7.2.B

• Deletes the following site specifics:
  o 8.10.9 – 200 Franklin Boulevard
8.10.38 – Green Gate Boulevard;
8.10.40 – 95 McLaren Avenue;
8.10.69 – 825-875 Main Street and 0 Sparrow Avenue; and
8.10.79 – 400-410 Dundas Street South
• Adds site specifics for the following properties:
  8.10.101 – 486 Main Street – Grand Valley Fortifiers;
  8.10.102 – 840 and 940 Main Street and 0 Franklin Boulevard;
  8.10.103 – 61 – 65 Nottinghill Drive; and
  8.10.104 – 115 Dundas Street North and 5 McLaren Avenue
• Deletes definitions for Active Transportation and Major Facilities
• Adds definitions for:
  15-minute neighbourhoods;
  active at-grade uses;
  active transportation;
  build-out;
  gross floor area;
  ground floor area;
  intensification target;
  large-format commercial;
  low-rise;
  mid-rise;
  major facilities;
  missing middle housing;
  privately owned public spaces (POPS);
  public service facilities;
  transit supportive; and
  walking, cycling, and rolling.
• Adds Chapter 20: Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan

• Amends Map 1A to align the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node boundaries to match the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan Boundary.

• Amends Map 2 by adding the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan Boundary

• Amends Map 2A by deleting site specific policy figures 13, 42, 44, 77 and 81 and by adding special policy figures 101-104

• Deletes figures 13, 42, 44, 77 and 81 from Chapter 16

• Adds figures 101-104 to Chapter 16

7.0 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Previous drafts of the proposed Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan have been presented to the public during stakeholder meetings in 2015 and 2016. A Statutory Public Meeting was held on May 10, 2016 and a Public Information Centre (PIC) was held on December 12, 2022. The draft secondary plan was posted on the City of Cambridge website for review and comment. A second Statutory Public Meeting was held on May 16, 2023.

All comments received during this process were considered when preparing the Secondary Plan.

Posting of related reports to the City’s website was included as part of the public report process.
PART B – THE AMENDMENT

1.0 INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

All of this part of the document entitled ‘Part B - The Amendment’, consisting of the following text, constitutes Amendment No. 65 to the Official Plan of the City of Cambridge.

2.0 FORMAT OF THE AMENDMENT

This section of Amendment No. 65 sets out additions and changes to the text in the Official Plan.

Text that is proposed to be amended is illustrated by various font types (e.g., struck-out text is to be deleted, new text identified in Bold font and defined terms are identified with italics). New sections that are proposed to be added to the Official Plan are shown in standard font type with titles appearing in bold. Italicized font within the body of the text indicates defined terms or the name of a provincial act or title of a document.

3.0 IMPLEMENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

The implementation of this amendment shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act. The further implementation and associated interpretation of this amendment shall be in accordance with the relevant text and mapping schedules of the existing Official Plan of the City of Cambridge and applicable legislation. Amendment No. 65 should be read in conjunction with the current Official Plan (2012) as amended, which is available on the City’s website at cambridge.ca or at the Planning Services kiosk located at 50 Dickson Street in the 1st Floor lobby.

4.0 DETAILS OF THE AMENDMENT

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

Chapter 1 is hereby amended by adding Policy “1.2.h) Secondary Plans starting at Chapter 17”

Chapter 8 is hereby amended by deleting Policy “8.7.2.B Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node” and replacing it with “8.7.2.B - The Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan is found in Chapter 20.”

Chapter 8 is hereby further amended by:

A - deleting the following site specific policies from Policy 8.10:

8.10.9 – 200 Franklin Boulevard;
8.10.38 – Green Gate Boulevard;
8.10.40 – 95 McLaren Avenue;
8.10.69 – 825-875 Main Street and 0 Sparrow Avenue; and,
8.10.79 – 400 – 410 Dundas Street South

B – adding the following site specific policies:

8.10.101 - 486 Main Street – Grand Valley Fortifiers
Grand Valley Fortifiers is a livestock feed production company that has existing industrial uses and facilities at 486 Main Street (Figure 101). Notwithstanding the land uses permitted for the Mixed-Use Medium Density designation, the following land uses are permitted on the lands identified in Figure 101:

Light industrial uses in an enclosed building including assembling, fabricating, manufacturing, processing, storage, packaging;

Offices;

Research and development including laboratories;

Retail Commercial; and

Accessory uses to the permitted uses above.

No residential and other sensitive land uses are permitted during the continuance of industrial uses on this site. Should Grand Valley Fortifiers’ industrial operations on this site permanently cease, the industrial land use permissions in Policy 20.3.2.4 will no longer apply, in which case the land use permissions for the Mixed-Use Medium Density designation identified for this site on Schedule B of the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan will apply.

8.10.102 - 840 and 940 Main Street and 0 Franklin Boulevard

The lands subject to this subsection are identified in Figure 102. Notwithstanding the maximum building height permitted in the Mixed-Use Main Street designation that applies to a portion of these lands, a maximum building height of eight storeys is permitted subject to the policies of this Plan. In addition, notwithstanding the minimum non-residential gross floor area requirements of Section 20.3.2.2, on lands designated Mixed-Use Main Street, a mid-rise apartment building may be constructed on these lands with the ground floor comprised of non-residential uses, which may include the lobby and residential amenity areas. A minimum non-residential gross floor area of 300 square metres is required.

The minimum height / storey requirements related to lands designated Medium Density Residential in Section 20.3.2.6 may be reduced due to land use compatibility measures that may be required as a result of the site’s proximity to lands within the Eastern Industrial Park, subject to the approval of the City and the Region.

8.10.103 - 61 – 65 Nottinghill Drive

Notwithstanding the permitted density in this Plan, the land identified in Figure 103 will be permitted a maximum residential density of 2.2 Floor Space Index (FSI).

8.10.104 - 115 Dundas Street North and 5 McLaren Avenue

The lands identified in Figure 104 may only develop in accordance with the policies of the Mixed Use Medium Density designation, where it can be demonstrated that land use compatibility with surrounding existing industrial uses, including Rockwell Automation, can be achieved to the satisfaction of the City. Notwithstanding the permissions for residential uses within the Mixed Use Medium Density designation, where the outcomes of such studies
indicate that land use compatibility cannot be achieved, sensitive land uses, including residential, will not be permitted.

Chapter 13 is hereby amended by deleting the definitions for active transportation and major facilities and adding the following definitions:

15-minute neighbourhoods - Compact, well-connected places such as mixed-use neighbourhoods or other areas within the Urban Area. They are places that offer and support and opportunities for people of all ages and abilities and at all times of year to conveniently access the necessities for daily living with a 15-minute trip by walking, cycling, and rolling, and where other needs can be met by taking direct, frequent, and convenient transit, wherever possible. The neighbourhoods should include an appropriate mix of jobs, local stores, and services, a full range of housing, transportation options and public service facilities. They are also age-friendly places and may take different shapes and forms appropriate to their contexts.

active at-grade uses – uses at grade with the street that generate activity, in particular pedestrian activity, on the street. Uses may be street-related commercial and/or community uses such as retail stores, restaurants, personal or business services, professional or medical offices, libraries, community centres, and parks/public squares.

active transportation - movement of people or goods that is powered by human activity. Active transportation includes walking, cycling, and the use of human-powered or hybrid mobility aids such as wheelchairs, scooters, e-bikes, and rollerblades.

build-out - the time in the future when the subject area of land is fully developed in accordance with the vision, objectives, and policies of this Plan.

gross floor area – the total of all floor areas of a building or structure, which floor areas are measured between the exterior faces of the exterior walls of the building at each floor level or from the centrelines of partition walls and the exterior faces of the exterior walls, but does not include any underground floor area, unenclosed porch or verandah, mechanical room or penthouse, amenity area and private amenity area, and areas used for parking within the building or structure. The walls of an inner court shall be deemed to be exterior walls.

ground floor area – the area of the ground floor of a building or structure measured between the exterior faces of the exterior walls or from the centrelines of partition walls and the exterior faces of the exterior walls.

intensification target – the minimum percentage of development each year that are expected to occur within the built-up area.

large-format commercial – a commercial use with greater than 2,000 square metres of ground floor area, such as large footprint supermarkets, big box retail stores, warehouse stores, and standalone movie theatres.

low-rise - any building that is 2 to 4 storeys in height.

mid-rise - any building that is 5 to 8 storeys in height.
**major facilities** - facilities which may require separation from sensitive land uses, including but not limited to airports, manufacturing uses, transportation infrastructure and corridors, rail facilities, marine facilities, sewage treatment facilities, waste management systems, oil and gas pipelines, industries, energy generation facilities and transmission systems, and resource extraction activities. (PPS, 2020)

**missing middle housing** - multi-unit housing types with gentle density that are compatible in scale with single-detached neighbourhoods while providing additional housing options. For example, laneway housing, garden suites, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, rowhouses, townhouses, and low and mid-rise apartments.

**privately owned public spaces (POPS)** – A privately owned and maintained open or landscaped space that is designed to promote public access and use, which may include but is not limited to courtyards, enhanced walkways, and urban greens and squares. The spaces are meant to be open and accessible to the public and may complement, extend or integrate with public parks.

**public service facilities** - lands, buildings, and structures for the provision of programs and services provided or subsidized by a government or other body, such as social assistance, recreation, police and fire protection, health and educational programs, long-term care services, and cultural services. Public service facilities do not include infrastructure. (PPS, 2020)

**transit-supportive** - relating to development that makes transit viable and improves the quality of the experience of using transit. It often refers to compact, mixed-use development that has a high level of employment and residential densities. Transit-supportive development will be consistent with Ontario’s Transit Supportive Guidelines.

**walking, cycling, and rolling** - Methods of active transportation, which means movement of people or goods that is powered by human activity. Active transportation includes walking, cycling, and the use of human-powered or hybrid mobility aids such as wheelchairs, scooters, e-bikes, and rollerblades.
5.0 SCHEDULES

SCHEDULE 1 – MAP 1A – URBAN STRUCTURE
SCHEDULE 2 – MAP 2 – GENERAL LAND USE PLAN
SCHEDULE 3 – MAP 2A – SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES
SCHEDULE 4 – FIGURE 3
SCHEDULE 5 – FIGURES 101 - 104
SCHEDULE 6 – Chapter 20: Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan
SCHEDULE 1 – MAP 1A – URBAN STRUCTURE

Official Plan Map 1A Urban Structure in Chapter 14: Maps is hereby amended by expanding the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node boundary to match the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan Boundary area as depicted in the following mapping.
SCHEDULE 2 – MAP 2 – GENERAL LAND USE PLAN

Official Plan Map 2 General Land Use Plan in Chapter 14: Maps is hereby amended by adding the boundary of the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan area as depicted in the following mapping.
SCHEDULE 3 – MAP 2A – SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES

Official Plan Map 2A Site Specific Policies in Chapter 14: Maps is hereby amended by deleting site specific policy figures 13, 42, 44, 77 and 81 and by adding site specific policy figures 101-104 as depicted in the following mapping.
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SCHEDULE 4 – FIGURE 3

Official Plan Figure 3 - Community Node Main St and Dundas St S in Chapter 16: Figures is hereby amended by aligning the Community Node boundary with the Secondary Plan Area boundary as depicted in the following mapping.
Chapter 16: Figures is hereby amended by deleting Figures 13, 42, 44, 77 and 81 and by adding Figures 101-104 as depicted in the following mapping.
SCHEDULE 6 – CHAPTER 20: Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan

The Cambridge Official Plan is hereby amended by adding the following new Chapter 20: Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan.
Chapter 20: Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan
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Chapter 20

20.1 INTRODUCTION

The preparation of a Secondary Plan is required by the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012), as amended, for the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node. The Main and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan (“the Secondary Plan”) provides detailed boundaries and land use policies for this community node to achieve a significant density increase and become a medium to high density mixed-use centre.

20.1.1 VISION FOR CHANGE

The Secondary Plan Area is expected to function as one of the City’s main intensification nodes and accommodate up to 1,700 new residential units and 100 additional jobs by 2031 through a combination of new development, infilling, and redevelopment. Over the longer term, the Plan Area has the potential to accommodate up to 6,200 units and 1,400 jobs at build-out, depending on the scale of intensification and the mix of uses proposed.

It is envisioned that the Plan Area will transition into a compact, complete, sustainable, vibrant, and integrated node that supports active transportation and transit service. The Plan Area will integrate a diverse mix of uses to build 15-minute neighbourhoods while continuing to have an important commercial function to support the needs of the broader southeast Cambridge community. This mixed-use and higher density node will be supported by new parks, public spaces, trails, and community amenities that are well connected to the existing public realm network. The transportation network in the Plan Area will provide a full range of mobility options but will prioritize and facilitate active transportation and transit. This vision is to be achieved through a combination of public realm improvements and private sector land development and re-development.

20.1.2 SECONDARY PLAN GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The Plan Area is planned to achieve an overall minimum density of 100 residents and jobs combined per hectare to support growth management, the efficient use of land, and frequent transit service. This is a gross minimum density requirement that is measured within all of the lands delineated by the Plan Area, inclusive of environmental features and constraints. Several of the land use designations set out in this Plan identify minimum net density targets for freestanding residential development within the designation to support achieving the overall minimum density target, along with the other policies of the Plan. As part of any development application, the City will require applications to demonstrate how the application supports the overall gross density target for the Plan Area, and the applicable minimum density requirements of this Plan have been met.

Planning and development within the Plan Area will be guided by the following principles:
a) Intensify and increase the supply of housing, employment, and amenities to accommodate anticipated future growth and contribute to meeting the *intensification target*;

b) Maintain the node's important commercial function and transition to become a vibrant and *complete community* providing a mix of residential, commercial, employment, institutional, and community uses;

c) Build *15-minute neighbourhoods* where people can meet their daily needs for goods, services, and employment within a 15-minute trip from home by *active transportation*, and where other needs can be met by using direct, frequent, and convenient transit;

d) Support transit service and ridership through *transit-supportive* built-forms, densities, mix of uses, and urban design of the public and private realm;

e) Improve connectivity within the Plan Area and to the Plan Area from surrounding neighbourhoods for *active transportation* by enhancing safety, permeability, accessibility, and the pedestrian experience;

f) Sensitively integrate with adjacent existing neighbourhoods and ensure compatibility in land use and built form;

g) Provide an appropriate range and mix of housing types, forms, tenures, and affordability that responds to the demography of the community;

h) Support the prosperity of existing businesses and provide opportunities for new economic development and employment;

i) Be well-designed and provide diverse and contextually compatible built form and high quality architectural and urban design in public realm improvements and private realm developments;

j) Create a connected, functional and attractive network of parks, public spaces, natural open spaces, and trails using the process and principles of place-making;

k) Implement *sustainable design* to minimize environmental impact, conserve energy, manage stormwater, protect natural areas, enhance biodiversity, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and

l) Phase implementation to align with market demand and infrastructure investment.
20.2 PURPOSE

20.2.1 PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

The purpose of the Secondary Plan is to provide a detailed land use plan and policy framework to guide development and redevelopment within the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node (“the Community Node”) to achieve a significant level of intensification.

The policies of this Secondary Plan are intended to result in a complete, vibrant, well-designed, and sustainable community node that meets the objectives and policies of Provincial plans, the Region of Waterloo Official Plan, and the City of Cambridge Official Plan.

The Secondary Plan must be read in conjunction with the applicable policies within the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012), as amended. In addition to the policies of this Secondary Plan, all other parts of the City of Cambridge Official Plan shall apply. The land use designations for the Secondary Plan are intended to complement the broader land use designations provided in the Official Plan. In most cases, the land use policies and permissions described in the Secondary Plan are more detailed than those provided for within the Official Plan. In the event of a policy conflict, the Secondary Plan will prevail unless otherwise specified.

20.2.2 ORGANIZATION

The Secondary Plan document is organized into three main sections:

- Section 20.1: Introduction
- Section 20.2: Vision and Guiding Principles
- Section 20.3: Policies

The contents of Sections 20.2 and 20.3 are considered to be the formal Secondary Plan, including Schedules A through F. Any alterations to the policies in Sections 20.2 and 20.3 or Schedules A through F shall require an Official Plan Amendment (unless otherwise stated in the Plan). Alterations to the contents of Section 20.1 including all text, images, figures, formatting, footnotes, and graphics are not subject to an Official Plan Amendment and are provided for explanatory purposes only.

20.2.3 LOCATION AND BOUNDARY

The limits of the Secondary Plan (the “Plan Area”) are depicted on Schedule A, covers approximately 82 gross hectares (202 acres) of land and is generally centred around the major intersections of Main Street and Dundas Street, Main Street and Franklin Boulevard, and Dundas Street and Franklin Boulevard. The northern boundary of the Plan Area abuts the Eastern Industrial Park. The western boundary generally abuts the Lincoln Oaks and Glenview residential neighbourhoods. The southern boundary traverses through a small portion of the Branchton Park residential neighbourhood. The
eastern boundary traverses through the vacant lands north of Main Street and abuts the residential subdivisions south of Main Street in the Eastview neighbourhood.

Schedule A also identifies the finalized limits of the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node. Unless otherwise stated, the policies of this Secondary Plan apply to the lands located within the Secondary Plan limits as depicted on Schedule A. Changes to the boundary of the Secondary Plan will require an Official Plan Amendment.

20.2.4 COMMUNITY STRUCTURE

The land use designations implement the vision for the Plan Area to transform into a compact and complete community with 15-minute neighbourhoods.

Lands within the Plan Area are designated one of the following land use designations as indicated on Schedule B:

a) Mixed-Use Mid-Rise High Density
b) Mixed-Use Medium Density
c) Mixed-Use Main Street
d) High Density Residential
e) Medium Density Residential
f) Low Density Residential
g) Prestige Industrial
h) Natural Open Space System
20.3 POLICIES

20.3.1 GENERAL POLICIES

20.3.1.1 Uses Permitted in All Designations

With the exception of the Natural Open Space System designation, the Official Plan permits certain land uses within all land use designations in the City, subject to the provision of adequate infrastructure and other criteria. Those land uses are also generally permitted within all land use designations of the Secondary Plan, subject to the policies of the Official Plan and provided that the long-term vision of this Secondary Plan is not precluded.

20.3.1.2 Uses Prohibited in All Designations

The Official Plan prohibits a list of uses in all land use designations of the Official Plan. Those land uses are also prohibited in all designations of this Secondary Plan. In addition, the following uses will be prohibited in all designations of the Secondary Plan:

- a) New drive-through facilities subject to Section 20.3.1.4;
- b) New auto-related uses subject to Section 20.3.1.4;
- c) New large-format commercial uses subject to Section 20.3.1.5; and
- d) Noxious uses as defined in the City’s Zoning By-law.

20.3.1.3 Active At-Grade Uses

Portions of certain public streets in the Plan Area are envisioned to transform into vibrant, engaging, and active streetscapes that foster pedestrian-oriented commercial and community activity in the Plan Area.

Developments that front onto streets identified for Active Frontages on Schedule D shall provide active at-grade uses at the street level, where possible taking into consideration existing topographical and engineering constraints. These uses will be street-related, provide visual interest, animate the streetscape, and be designed in accordance with the Urban Design policies in Section 20.3.3.

Residential entrances and lobbies within the ground floor of mixed-use buildings are permitted along Active Frontages but shall consist of a limited portion of a development’s frontage.

Surface parking and structured parking are not permitted along Active Frontages. Driveways and direct vehicular access along Active Frontages shall be in accordance with the policies of this Plan.

20.3.1.4 Drive-Through Facilities and Auto-Related Uses

Auto-related uses include gas bars/stations, motor vehicle service and repair shops (including body shops), motor vehicle sales and rental, and motor vehicle washing establishments.
Existing drive-through facilities and auto-related uses in the Plan Area that legally existed before the date of adoption of this Secondary Plan are permitted to continue. Over the long term and upon build-out of this Secondary Plan, existing drive-through facilities and auto-related uses should be redeveloped and replaced with pedestrian-oriented and transit-supportive development.

For the purpose of transition and to facilitate redevelopment, existing drive-through facilities may be relocated on the same lot or block on an interim basis subject to the following conditions:

   a) Relocated drive-through facilities shall not be situated along Active Frontages;

   b) The commercial use to which the drive-through facility is ancillary must be a permitted use on the lands the drive-through facility is being relocated to; and

   c) A site plan approval application for relocation must include a Build-out Demonstration Plan.

Existing drive-through facilities are not permitted to increase the number of drive-through lanes existing on the date of adoption of this Secondary Plan.

20.3.1.5 Large-Format Commercial Uses

New large-format commercial uses with more than 2,000 square metres of ground floor area are not permitted within the Plan Area. The purpose of this policy is to limit land-intensive commercial uses to facilitate opportunities for intensification.

Existing large-format commercial uses in the Plan Area that legally existed before the date of adoption of this Secondary Plan are permitted to continue. Over the long term and upon build-out of this Secondary Plan, existing large-format commercial uses should be redeveloped into compact medium to high density mixed-use developments that integrate commercial with residential and other uses. Surface parking should be significantly reduced.

For the purpose of transition and to facilitate redevelopment, existing large-format commercial uses may be relocated on the same lot or block subject to the following conditions:

   a) Relocated large-format commercial uses shall not be situated along Active Frontages; and

   b) A site plan approval application for relocation must include a Build-out Demonstration Plan.

20.3.1.6 Housing

Housing developments in the Plan Area shall comprise a range and mix of rental and ownership housing types, unit sizes, and tenure, including adequate numbers of dwelling units to accommodate households with children, larger families, seniors and people with special needs.

Affordable housing, including community housing, supportive housing, and other types of subsidized non-market housing units, is encouraged to be provided in the Plan Area.
Development that includes residential in the Plan Area will be in accordance with the affordable housing policies of the Official Plan.

The City will collaborate with the Region of Waterloo, non-profit organizations and private developers to promote, encourage and maximize opportunities for affordable housing.

To support the development of affordable housing units, the City, in conjunction with the Region, will explore potential incentives such as reduced or deferred development charges, reduced application fees, grants, and loans.

The development of intrinsically more affordable ownership and rental housing, which may include buildings constructed using innovative and cost-effective techniques, basic in-unit amenities, modest finishes, minimal details, and flexibility within units, is encouraged.

Residential developments and dwelling units designed, constructed, and maintained as purpose-built rental units are encouraged in the Plan Area. Purpose-built rental development should include units for various levels of affordability, including for households with low and moderate income.

To achieve a mix of unit types, and to support the creation of housing suitable for larger households, development containing more than 80 new residential units will include larger units, as follows:

a) A minimum of 20 percent of the total number of units as 2-bedroom units; and

b) A minimum of 5 percent of the total number of units as 3-bedroom or larger units.

For clarity, one bedroom plus den units will not constitute a 2-bedroom unit, and a two-bedroom plus den unit will not constitute a 3-bedroom unit.

Where appropriate, private, public, and non-profit housing developments designed to provide housing options for seniors, that facilitate “aging-in-place”, are encouraged, including small ownership and rental units as well as retirement and assisted living facilities.

A minimum 20 percent of new affordable units and new purpose-built rental units shall be constructed accessible with barrier-free, universal or flex design. Housing units geared towards seniors are encouraged to provide accessibility features that meet the City’s Facility Accessibility Design Manual.

Additional residential units will be permitted in accordance with the policies of this Secondary Plan and the City of Cambridge Official Plan, and the provisions of the Zoning By-law.

20.3.1.7 Employment Areas

Land use decisions regarding lands within or adjacent to employment areas will be consistent with the employment area policy direction in the Region of Waterloo Official Plan until such time the City of Cambridge Official Plan has been updated.
20.3.1.8 Land Use Compatibility

The development of sensitive land uses, major retail uses or major office uses will, in accordance with provincial guidelines, avoid, or where avoidance is not possible, minimize and mitigate adverse impacts on industrial, manufacturing or other uses that are particularly vulnerable to encroachment.

Proposed developments of sensitive land uses, major retail uses or major office uses adjacent to existing or planned employment areas or within the influence area of major facilities will provide a Land Use Compatibility Assessment based on provincial guidelines.

New industrial uses on lands designated Prestige Industrial in the Plan Area may be required to demonstrate that the use(s) will not detrimentally impact adjacent existing sensitive land uses and/or preclude the potential development of sensitive land uses on adjacent lands where envisioned by this Secondary Plan. Supporting studies, including a Land Use Compatibility Assessment, may be required to support approval of the new industrial use.

Where required, methods of abatement and mitigation of potential adverse impacts will be part of site plan agreements, severance agreements, and subdivision/condominium agreements.

20.3.1.9 Source Water Protection

Lands in the Plan Area are identified as being part of the Region’s Wellhead Protection Areas. Refer to the Official Plan for additional guidance regarding development within the Wellhead Protection Areas.

No policies or permissions of this Secondary Plan take precedence over the Wellhead Protection Area policies contained in the Official Plan. In the event of a policy conflict, the parent policies of the Official Plan shall take precedence.

20.3.1.10 Contaminated Sites

Refer to Contaminated Sites policies of the Official Plan for guidance on redevelopment of potentially contaminated sites and need for a Record of Site Condition.

20.3.2 LAND USE POLICIES

20.3.2.1 Relationship with the Official Plan Land Use Categories and Permissions

The land use designations for the Secondary Plan are intended to complement the broader land use designations provided in the Official Plan. In most cases, the land use policies and permissions described in the Secondary Plan are more detailed than those provided for within the Official Plan. Where there are inconsistencies between a particular policy in the Official Plan and the Secondary Plan, the policies of the Secondary Plan will prevail.

20.3.2.2 Mixed-Use Designations

Lands designated with a Mixed-Use designation are intended to be the centre of the Community Node and generally provide the greatest mix of uses and highest densities
within the Plan Area. These areas are intended to continue to provide retail and service commercial uses, while integrating residential housing, office, institutional, and community uses through infill and/or redevelopment.

Lands designated with a Mixed-Use designation are intended to intensify and transition to a compact urban form including medium to high density development and a reduction of surface parking. These lands shall be supported by a generous public realm including gateways, vibrant and active streetscapes, active transportation connections, and new parks/public spaces.

The Mixed-Use designations include:

- Mixed-Use Mid-Rise High Density;
- Mixed-Use Medium Density; and
- Mixed-Use Main Street.

The Mixed-Use designations permit a wide range of compatible uses. The following land uses are permitted on lands within the Mixed-Use designations:

- Multiple unit residential buildings, including apartments and stacked townhouses;
- Street townhouses;
- Additional residential units;
- Live-work units and home occupations;
- Special needs housing;
- Commercial uses including retail, service commercial, and places of amusement uses, except any commercial uses prohibited in Section 20.3.1.2;
- Public service facilities; and
- Office uses.

The Mixed-Use Medium Density and Mixed-Use Main Street designations are intended to provide transition in scale, form, massing, and height between envisioned high-density developments in the Mixed-Use Mid-Rise High Density designation and surrounding lower density residential developments. These areas are intended to provide mixed-use developments consisting of active at-grade uses that frame the street while ensuring compatibility with abutting low-rise residential developments through the implementation of setbacks, landscaping, and mitigation measures as needed. Lot consolidation to support intensification and redevelopment is encouraged.

The implementing Zoning By-law may further refine the permitted land uses to ensure that new development is appropriate in the context of the adjacent and surrounding community.

To create a complete community and support economic activity within the Plan Area, new development within theMixed-Use designations will provide a minimum of 10
percent of the *gross floor area* of the development as non-residential uses in one or multiple buildings.

### 20.3.2.3 Residential Designations

Lands with predominantly residential land uses are designated Residential. The Residential designations include the High Density, Medium Density Residential and Low Density Residential designations. These neighbourhoods are intended to:

a) Provide a wide range and mix of housing types, forms, tenures, and affordability that addresses demographic needs of the immediate and broader Cambridge community;

b) Incorporate *public service facilities*, such as schools and parks, and *compatible* commercial uses, such as convenience commercial establishments, to create *15-minute neighbourhoods*;

c) Develop at *transit-supportive* densities and provide *missing middle housing* where appropriate;

d) Provide *accessible*, pedestrian-oriented, and high-quality public realm with short walking distances to parks, trails, schools, other *public service facilities*, and transit services; and,

e) Contribute to providing safe and convenient *active transportation* connections to commercial, employment, service, and other community destinations in the Plan Area and surrounding areas.

The following land uses are permitted on lands within the Residential designations:

a) Additional residential units;

b) Live-work units and home occupations;

c) Special needs housing;

d) Convenience commercial uses in accordance with Section 8.6.1.5 of the Official Plan; and

e) **Public service facilities.**

In addition to the uses permitted within all Residential designations, the following uses are also permitted on lands within the High Density Residential designation:

a) *Mid and high-rise apartments*; and

b) *Other multiple buildings.*

In addition to the uses permitted within all Residential designations, the following uses are also permitted on lands within the Medium Density Residential designation:

a) *Low and mid-rise apartments*;

d) Stacked townhouses; and

e) Street townhouses.
In addition to the uses permitted within all Residential designations, the following uses are also permitted on lands within the Low Density Residential designation:

a) Stacked townhouses;
b) Street townhouses;
c) Duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes;
d) Semi-detached dwellings; and
e) Single-detached dwellings.

The implementing Zoning By-law may further refine the permitted land uses to ensure that new development is appropriate in the context of the adjacent and surrounding community.

20.3.2.4 Prestige Industrial

Lands designated Prestige Industrial are intended to provide transition between the planned mixed-use areas within the Plan Area and the industrial uses north of the Plan Area. The predominant land uses within this designation shall be light industrial, office buildings and research uses. *Intensification* and increased employment densities are encouraged through expansion or redevelopment for existing and new businesses, contributing to employment growth in the Plan Area.

The following land uses are permitted on lands in the Plan Area designated Prestige Industrial provided such uses are *compatible* with residential and other *sensitive land uses*:

a) Light industrial uses in an enclosed building including assembling, fabricating, manufacturing, processing, storage, packaging, and industrial service trades;
b) Offices;
c) Research and development including laboratories;
d) Information technology related uses including data centres and information processing establishments;
e) Hotel, conference centre, and banquet facilities;
f) Accessory uses to the permitted uses above; and
g) Service commercial and ancillary retail uses on a limited basis subject to the conditions set out in the Regional Official Plan and the City’s Official Plan.

Outdoor storage of raw materials and finished products is not permitted. Any storage of raw materials and finished products which is accessory to the primary use shall be contained within a building.

20.3.2.5 Natural Open Space System

Core Environmental Features, watercourses and shorelines, the regulatory one-zone floodplain, the floodway of a two-zone floodplain, additional hazard lands such as steep
slopes, approved buffers as determined through the planning process, and publicly owned natural open space have been designated Natural Open Space System on Schedule B of this Secondary Plan. Core Environmental Features and Environmentally Sensitive Policy Areas in and around the Plan Area are identified on Schedule C of this Secondary Plan. The boundaries of Core Environmental Features and Environmentally Sensitive Policy Areas may be refined and expanded without further amendment to this Plan, provided any refinements are minor in nature and supported through a Environmental Impact Study (EIS) in conformity with the policies of this Plan.

The planned function, permitted uses, and policies of the Natural Open Space System designation are as set out in the Cambridge Official Plan. In addition, Chapter 3 of the Official Plan sets out policies regarding natural features and environmental management.

20.3.2.6 Height and Density

The lot area to be used for calculating density shall exclude the following areas:

a) Lands with natural features including any required buffers, provided that development is prohibited on these lands; and

b) Floodplain in a One-Zone Policy Area or the floodway in a Two-Zone Policy Area; and

c) Hazardous lands.

It is the intent of this Secondary Plan that the planned densities will be achieved at build-out.

The minimum densities for freestanding residential development, and minimum and maximum heights of new buildings within the Residential and Mixed-Use designations will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Minimum density for freestanding residential development (UPH – units per hectare)</th>
<th>Height (Storeys)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Mid-Rise High Density</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Medium Density</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Main Street</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The maximum heights of new buildings within the Prestige Industrial designation will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Height (Storeys)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestige Industrial</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum building heights as identified in this Secondary Plan may be exceeded without an amendment to this Plan, subject to Council approval through a Zoning By-law amendment, in the following circumstances:

a) To achieve the maximum permitted density on a site where land is to be conveyed to the City for a publicly owned park or space; or

b) Where the maximum permitted density is exceeded as permitted.

The density and scale of development must be contextually appropriate with the planned context and must support the public realm.

**20.3.2.7 Ongoing Development Applications**

In the event an Official Plan amendment application for lands within the Plan Area has been deemed complete but a decision has not been made by Council prior to the date of adoption of this Secondary Plan, the following shall apply:

a) Applications in the public consultation phase of the Official Plan amendment process shall take into consideration the policies of this Secondary Plan; and

b) The resulting Site-Specific Policy, if any, shall be considered an amendment and Site-Specific Policy of this Secondary Plan.

**20.3.2.8 Site Specific Policies**

Site specific policies can be found in Chapter 8.10 and are identified on Map 2A.

**20.3.3 URBAN DESIGN AND BUILT FORM**

**20.3.3.1 Intent of Urban Design and Built Form Policies**

The following section provides the urban design policies for the Secondary Plan Area. The policies of this section are intended to complement and build upon the urban design policies in Chapter 5 of the Official Plan and be implemented through the site plan process. The purpose of these policies is to provide guidance for enhancing the character of the area, including both the private and public realm. The policies are intended to provide a degree of flexibility, allowing for a range of design styles and expressions which will contribute to creating a unique sense of place.
20.3.3.2 Urban Design and Built Form Vision

The Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node is a gathering place for shopping, living, and working. Today, the area is dominated by auto-oriented commercial uses, vacant lands, and large surface parking lots. During the Secondary Plan consultation process, stakeholders expressed a desire for an enhanced public realm, more diverse mix of uses and activities, and a comfortable pedestrian environment. The Main Street and Dundas corridors are intended to provide local retail activity and the surrounding blocks offer a diverse range of employment, commercial, and residential uses that enhances the character of the area.

The intent of the Secondary Plan is to encourage an active commercial frontage along Dundas and Main Streets with pedestrian-scaled buildings. Internal blocks provide safe and efficient pedestrian and vehicular access within a vibrant and friendly streetscape. To achieve an enhanced streetscape environment, the urban design policies promote the development that provides a more compact mixed-use built form to fill in the gaps and pockets to create a consistent commercial streetscape. Designed for walking and anchored by a range of mixed use buildings, the area is both a place to live and a commercial destination. As the heart of the local neighbourhoods, it is a gathering place with unique amenities and supported by a mix of land uses.

20.3.3.3 Public Realm Improvement Strategy

The expectation is that as the Main and Dundas Area intensifies that over time there will be demand for a number of public realm improvements. These improvements are intended to enhance the attractiveness and functionality of the area. The planned Public Realm Improvement Plan is depicted on Schedule D and considers the following:

a) Major Gateway Improvements
b) Minor Gateway Improvements
c) Major Streetscape Improvements;
d) Minor Streetscape Improvements;
e) Potential New Public Spaces; and,
f) Active Transportation Connections.

20.3.3.4 Gateways

Gateways are intended to function as formal entranceways into the Main and Dundas Area and are intended to create a strong sense of place. Presently, the Secondary Plan Area does not feature any prominent public space treatments at Gateway locations and accordingly, the Plan contemplates two levels of improvement:

a) Major Gateway Improvements; and,
b) Minor Gateway Improvements.
20.3.3.4.1 Major Gateway Improvements

Major Gateway Improvements should include signage, flags/banners, enhanced lighting, intensive landscaping (such as seasonal floral displays, tree planting), public art and other types of public realm enhancements. There are two Major Gateway Improvement Areas:

a) Main Street and Dundas Street intersection and surrounding area; and,

b) Franklin Boulevard and Dundas Street.

20.3.3.4.2 Minor Gateway Improvements

Minor Gateway Improvements should include a smaller scale of public realm enhancements, such as landscaping, public art, lighting and appropriately scaled way-finding queues. There are two Minor Gateway Improvement Areas in the Secondary Plan:

a) McLaren Avenue and Dundas Street; and,

b) Main Street and Franklin Boulevard.

20.3.3.5 Streetscape Improvements

Streetscape improvements are intended to provide direction for future enhancements to the non-travel portion of the roads within the Secondary Plan Area. Two levels of improvement area contemplated in this Plan:

a) Major Streetscaping Improvements; and,

b) Minor Streetscaping Improvements.

20.3.3.5.1 Major Streetscape Improvements

Major Streetscape Improvements are proposed for Main Street and Dundas Street. Key improvements should include (but are not limited to) completion of sidewalk networks (on both sides of the street), tree plantings on both sides of the street to provide shade and comfort for pedestrians, improved lighting, bike lanes and occasional street furniture. Where possible, efforts should be made to consolidate access points and improve visibility for pedestrians.

20.3.3.5.2 Minor Streetscape Improvements

Minor Streetscape Improvements are proposed for portions of Main Street and Franklin Boulevard. Key improvements should include (but are not limited to) completion of sidewalk networks (on both sides of the street), tree plantings on both sides of the street to provide shade and comfort for pedestrians and bike lanes.
20.3.3.6  Adjacent Development

Where new development or redevelopment is planned near a Gateway Improvement Area, the proposed development/redevelopment should be designed in a manner which enhances the function of the Gateway, through:

a) Complementary building orientation and massing;

b) Enhanced architectural detailing;

c) Linked private and public pedestrian connectivity;

d) Enhanced private realm landscaping; and,

e) Other elements as appropriate.

20.3.3.7  Potential New Public Spaces

20.3.3.7.1  New Public Spaces

Where new major mixed use development or redevelopment is planned, new public spaces should be provided. New public spaces should be designed to be barrier free and should be designed to include a mix of design, including but not limited to enhanced landscaping shade trees, ample locations for seating and public art. New public spaces may include playgrounds, community parks, and other similar spaces that serve a primary function of supporting existing and future needs in the surrounding neighbourhoods. These spaces should be located close to the street and be connected to the pedestrian network. New public spaces should also be connected with existing or planned transit stops. The icons depicted on Schedule D are for illustrative purposes only and the need, location and design of public spaces shall occur through the site plan application process.
20.3.3.7.2 Urban Greens and Squares

Urban Greens and Squares will be established in accordance with the following:

a) Urban Greens and Squares are expected to be small-scale components of the parks system and are intended to provide passive open space areas, both landscaped or hardscaped, and serve as focal points within sub-areas of each neighbourhood by provide stopping points throughout the community.

b) Urban Greens and Squares will be generally greater than 75 square metres but less than 1000 square metres in size.

c) Urban Greens and Squares will be connected to pedestrian movement, accessible, located at grade, provide barrier-free access to people with disabilities, and will have frontage on at least one public street.

d) The adjacent built form will have primary or active frontages facing or flanking the Urban Green or Square, where appropriate.

e) Urban Greens and Squares within the Low/Medium Density Residential designation will reflect the needs of surrounding residents, providing areas to sit and socialize, junior play areas for children, bicycle parking, and a significant tree canopy for shade.

f) Urban Greens and Squares within the Mixed-Use Node will include seating and a full furniture program, including lighting and bicycle parking, opportunities for outdoor cafes and restaurants, and facilities that promote a passive, relaxing urban atmosphere. These facilities will improve mid-block permeability and complement adjacent land uses.

g) Urban Greens and Squares may be publicly owned or considered for a privately owned public space.

h) The City will not accept Urban Greens and Squares as parkland dedication where the City is of the opinion a Neighbourhood Park or Community Park is necessary or desirable.

i) Public access to privately owned public space Urban Greens and Squares will be secured through the development approval process.

20.3.3.8 Potential Active Transportation Connection

Potential Active Transportation Connections are illustrated for the private realm on Schedule D. The network is intended to provide a finer grain network of pedestrian connections and is provided for illustration purposes. The expectation is that improvements to the on-site pedestrian networks be made through the redevelopment process and/or through a Community Improvement Planning exercise.

20.3.3.9 Signage and Wayfinding

The City may consider preparing a signage and wayfinding strategy for the Secondary Plan Area that enhances the public realm and support the land use vision for this
The signage and wayfinding strategy would be implemented through a new signage by-law.

20.3.3.10 Street Tree Guidelines

The combination of both public realm improvements and the design guidelines for the private realm are intended to increase the overall tree canopy in the Secondary Plan Area and support the overall City-wide target for a 30% tree canopy. To support the achievement of the target, the City will:

a) Promote an extensive tree canopy over main pedestrian connections in the Secondary Plan Area;

b) Ensure that sufficient space is provided within the right-of-way to maximize opportunities for trees (in collaboration with the Region);

c) Promote the use of Silva cells and/or raised beds on both public and private lands to allow for healthy soil volumes; and,

d) Promote best practices in arboricultural maintenance.

20.3.3.11 Implementation of Public Realm Improvements

The public realm improvements depicted on Schedule D shall be implemented through a future Community Improvement Plan. The improvements depicted on Schedule D are intended to support growth and intensification within the Secondary Plan Area. Section 20.3.6 of this Plan provides additional details regarding implementation.

20.3.3.12 Private Realm Urban Design Guidelines

The Private Realm Design Guidelines identify the desired future character and function of the built environment, including massing, building articulation, parking and movement, and landscaping. The intent is to ensure that new buildings reinforce a coherent, harmonious and appealing urban environment, are compatible in scale, form, massing and height transition with existing urban forms as well as contribute to the enhancement of the public and private realm.

20.3.3.12.1 Building Frontages and Street Edges

Within the Mixed-Use designations, the design, use and animation of the ground level of buildings define the character and experience of the street. Ensuring that buildings provide an attractive and animated face, especially at the ground level, is a priority.

Buildings and structures should be organized on their sites to have landscaped setbacks adjacent to streets, mid-block open space areas and landscaped pedestrian connections to support and enhance a green and well-treed character.

The siting of buildings, location, and orientation are critical in creating a comfortable and safe pedestrian environment by providing an active and attractive interface conditions that:

a) Orient buildings toward public streets and other public spaces, in order to clearly define the public realm, create a consistent street wall, and to create a safe and attractive street environment for pedestrians. Grading and topographical constraints that may limit orientation to a street are to be taken into consideration.
b) Ensure pedestrian comfort and adequate light penetration.

c) Locate buildings along a build-to-line to provide a consistent edge to the street or public space. Deviation from the general built edge is permitted for building articulations, step-backs/recesses, openings, and other architectural treatments.

d) Buildings in general shall be designed to create mid-block connections and shall be massed and articulated to avoid creating excessively long continuous building facades. Buildings shall generally be not more than 75 metres long. For any building longer than 60 metres in length, articulation and materials of the façade must be varied to break up the massing to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner. Mid-block connections should be pedestrian oriented with appropriate pavement treatment, providing a safe and attractive environment.

e) All buildings oriented toward public streets must have clearly defined primary entry points that open directly on to the public sidewalk.

f) Provides a double frontage for corner buildings to address all streets and provides special design features of with equal architectural expression.

g) Ensures that architectural features and articulation are encouraged at all corner building locations, including residential buildings, to enhance the visual prominence and identity of the area and to enhance the corner.

h) For all commercial buildings, minimum glazing should be 70% and up to 80% glazing is permitted at-grade; second levels and above should be approximately 50% glazing.

i) Discourage blank walls, loading doors and other servicing areas from being located at grade along street frontages, parks, publicly accessible open space, and pedestrian connections.

j) In residential areas, architectural styles that help to foster neighbourhood identity and sense of place, such as front porches and balconies are encouraged.

**20.3.3.12.2 Transitional Areas**

New development should be designed to ensure that larger developments provide adequate transition to existing and smaller scale built form to reduce negative impacts on adjacent areas. The approach allows for smoother transitions between intensification areas and the adjacent, lower density residential areas. New buildings within the Secondary Plan Area will be located in the following manner to provide appropriate transition between new development and the surrounding stable residential areas:

a) New development must be sympathetic to the existing residential uses and be developed in a way that does not detract, hide from view, or impose negative impacts for light and shadow.

b) Where applicable, taller buildings should transition from the height of adjacent buildings through the use of building step backs, increased setbacks, and terracing building mass.
20.3.3.12.3 Building Entrances, Facades, Corner Sites

Primary building entrances will be located adjacent to the public street, or a publicly accessible courtyard physically and visually connected to the street, unless there are compelling topographical or other engineering related constraints that limit conformity with these policies, as determined by the City and the Region.

Residential building entrances will be located and oriented to have direct access from the street where possible. Porches, stoops, and balconies are encouraged at all entrances to create opportunities for overlook and social interaction along the street.

Entrances to individual grade-related residential units are encouraged to be provided along streets and park edges where possible. A modest grade change will create a threshold between public and semi-private space at the entrance and limit direct views into residential units.

Retail activities and other non-residential or commercial activities within buildings should be oriented towards the street and have direct access from sidewalks through storefront entries to promote overlook and enliven and support the public street.

a) The ground floor of new developments should be transparent to establish a strong visual connection to the street and create a welcoming and comfortable pedestrian environment.

b) Any facade facing a public street shall be considered a primary facade. A minimum of one pedestrian entrance shall be provided for any primary façade, where possible. Buildings on corner lots must be designed to have primary facades on both the front and side streets, where possible.

c) Pedestrian entrances should be architecturally distinct and identifiable as an entry point and designed to be universally accessible from a street or a publicly accessible open space.

d) Entrances to buildings must be clearly defined with maximum visibility to ensure ease of access directly from the street and from open spaces. Architectural treatment, and where appropriate, landscaping, should be used to accentuate entrances.

e) All buildings must be designed to be universally accessible and must provide an unobstructed walkway or pathway between the principal building(s) and the street.

f) Entrances should be designed with attractive weather protection to add to the pedestrian experience and comfort of users.

20.3.3.12.4 Landscaped Setbacks and Other Private Open Spaces

Buildings will have landscaped setbacks along streets and park edges to enhance the attractiveness of the street and to provide a privacy buffer for residential and other at-grade uses. In general, the following should be considered.
a) For any new high-density development, private open space enhancements are required as part of the built form design in order to contribute to the visual aesthetics and quality of the public realm.

b) Landscape treatments should be designed to edge streets, frame, and soften structures, define spaces, and screen undesirable views.

c) Trees and shrubs should be selected having regard to their scale and plating characteristics.

d) Plant materials should be grouped to frame buildings, add visual interest, to blank areas, accentuate entrances, and screen service areas.

e) Larger areas that may have deeper setbacks may take the form of courtyards, forecourts, mid-block connections, or small plazas.

f) On any commercial street, outdoor spill-out activities such as patios are encouraged to further animate the street.

g) Courtyards, forecourts, and other intimate spaces accessible to the public and animated with at-grade uses are encouraged.

h) For mixed-use, commercial, and residential apartment developments, portions of a lot not occupied by a building or structure or used for parking or loading must be landscaped.

i) All mixed-use and multiple residential buildings (e.g., townhouses and condominiums) will provide at-grade open space and outdoor amenity areas.

j) Outdoor amenity areas will include generously scaled areas of soft landscaping capable of supporting shade trees.

k) Landscaped courtyards may be either partially open to streets or parks or surrounded by buildings on all sides. Courtyards will be designed to extend and enhance the public realm of streets, parks and open spaces.

l) The courtyard character will be green and well-treed with outdoor uses that promote pedestrian circulation as well as recreational, gathering and other social uses. Vehicular access and servicing areas will generally be discouraged from being located within a courtyard.

20.3.3.12.5 Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation

The Secondary Plan area should be connected to the broader community, utilizing a network of pedestrian paths, walkways, and cycling. Future redevelopment will provide the opportunity to improve pedestrian and bicycle linkages within the area and the adjacent neighbourhoods. Permeability and connectivity throughout the Secondary Plan area are key aspects of the overall objectives for a more walkable and connected environment. In the future mid-block walkways and active transportation connections are encouraged within the Secondary Plan area. To facilitate enhanced pedestrian connectivity, the following guidelines shall be considered:

a) Sidewalks connections should be provided between all building entrances and the public sidewalk within a comprehensive network.
b) Landscaped mid-block pedestrian walkways and/or bicycle trails should be approximately 6 metres wide to provide room for the path and soft landscaping. Narrower spaces that limit visibility and safety are discouraged.

c) Fencing along neighbourhood connections, pedestrian walkways and/or bicycle trails should be low and allow for views from surrounding buildings and areas to promote safety. A coordinated approach to fencing design, location and height along these routes will be encouraged.

d) Where possible, pedestrian crossings should be designed to be distinct from the street by using paving materials, textures, and colours to enhance the legibility of the crossing.

e) Locate bicycle racks near entrances of buildings with connectivity to the public sidewalk.

f) Align pedestrian paths with transit stops to provide a more direct connection for users.

g) Private outdoor spaces should be designed as barrier free with appropriate lighting to improve route legibility, access, safety, and comfort.

h) Limit planting along edges of pedestrian walkways and cycling trails to low lying vegetation or other that does not restrict visibility and safety.

20.3.3.12.6 Parking, Access and Servicing

This Secondary Plan encourages a future block pattern and street network that supports opportunities for walking, cycling, and connectivity with surrounding areas.

Site specific vehicular access, ramps, servicing and loading should be provided from local streets wherever possible to minimize impacts on vehicular and pedestrian traffic on arterial streets. Ramps, servicing and loading facilities should be integrated into the buildings they serve to minimize impacts on landscaped open space. At-grade parking will be minimized. Where permitted, surface parking areas will be carefully located and screened to minimize impacts on adjoining streets or parks. The following shall be considered in designing parking and servicing facilities:

a) Parking areas are discouraged from being located along street frontages.

b) For structured parking, the facility should be integrated into the built form such that it relates to the design and façade treatment of the building. Solid blank walls are not permitted.

c) Wherever possible, surface parking and servicing for new developments should be placed at the rear of buildings and accessed by a rear or side yard lane.

b) Where surface parking or service areas are exposed, a generous separation should be provided from the public realm and designed to include additional street trees or landscaping and buffered with hedges or shrub planting or other mitigating design measures.

e) Parking lot lighting, pedestrian pathways and other street furniture should be used to create a comfortable, safe, and connected pedestrian environment.
f) The edges of parking facilities should receive architectural and design treatments to be consistent with the streetscape design and complement adjacent buildings.

20.3.3.12.7 Internal Streets

Redevelopment in the Secondary Plan may include internal streets to support development. The following guidelines shall be considered for proposed new internal streets:

a) Internal streets should be developed with the “look and feel” of local City streets.

b) Streets should be designed at the pedestrian scale with sidewalks, street trees, and street furniture for an enhanced pedestrian environment and for seamless integration with the public realm.

c) Pedestrian scale lighting should be provided along the street edge.
20.3.4 TRANSPORTATION

20.3.4.1 Planned Transportation Network

The existing and planned transportation network is depicted on Schedules E and F and is designed to accommodate a variety of modes, including automobiles, trucks, transit, cycling and pedestrians. As the Community Node evolves over time, the expectation is that major improvements will be made to enhance automobile, transit, cycling and walking networks within and into the area to ensure that an appropriate balance of transportation options is provided.

20.3.4.2 Improvements and Enhancements to Transportation Network

The Secondary Plan contemplates the following potential improvements to the transportation network:

- Road improvements;
- Transit improvements; and,
- Active transportation improvements.

20.3.4.3 Existing and Planned Road Network

The existing and planned road network is depicted on Schedule E and is expected to accommodate the planned growth and intensification potential for the Area up to 2031. Intersections of major arterial roads should consider effective vehicle movements while providing safe pedestrian and cycling crossings.

Appendix A provides illustrations depicting the future planned cross-sections for Main Street, Dundas Street and Franklin Boulevard based on the Region of Waterloo’s Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines. Although the arterial roads are all Regional roads, streetscaping along these roads is a City of Cambridge responsibility. Note that the cross-sections are provided for illustration purposes.

20.3.4.4 Reconstruction of Main Street from Franklin Boulevard to Chalmers Street

This is an excellent opportunity to coordinate active transportation and streetscaping with the Region of Waterloo. Main Street and Franklin Boulevard are Regional roads but streetscaping is a City of Cambridge responsibility. It is important to ensure sufficient setbacks and coordinated implementation of streetscaping as these projects proceed.

Reference Area(s): Main Street, west of Dundas Street

20.3.4.5 Local Road Connections

New local connections are required to facilitate development and/or redevelopment in some locations. The alignment of the proposed new connections are intended to be conceptual (except where the rights-of-way are already established). Detailed alignments and locations of local streets and private laneways shall be determined through further engineering studies and through the development approvals process.
20.3.4.6 Consolidate Entranceways

Development or redevelopment will seek the consolidation of access points and common traffic circulation in accordance with the provisions of this Plan and the Region of Waterloo’s access guidelines.

20.3.4.7 Transit Network

The existing and planned transit network is depicted on Schedule F. Grand River Transit is undergoing a new 5-year Business Plan which will review transit needs. The Land Use Plan (Schedule B) promotes infilling and intensification at a scale which would support increased transit ridership through the Main and Dundas Area.

20.3.4.8 Potential Transit Improvements

The City encourages the Region of the Waterloo to improve the provision of transit pedestrian amenities such as shelters, bike racks seating and lighting at all transit stops.

20.3.4.9 Improving On-site Linkages

Where new or expansions to existing development is proposed, the City will work with private sector applicants to improve on-site linkages and pathways to existing and planned transit stops.

20.3.4.10 Active Transportation Network

The existing and planned Active Transportation Network is depicted on Schedule F. The network is planned to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists.

20.3.4.11 Active Transportation Improvements

Active transportation infrastructure should provide continuous facilities and connectivity to transit stops, multi-use trails, parks, schools, recreational facilities, and on-street cycling network. Proposed active transportation improvements for the area include:

- Streetscape Improvements depicted on Schedule D which are intended to enhance both pedestrian comfort and connectivity;
- Completion of sidewalk network within the Plan Area; and,
- Potential pedestrian crossing/safety improvements along Franklin Boulevard at Green Gate Boulevard, and also at Main Street.

20.3.4.12 Franklin Boulevard and Green Gate Boulevard

The City of Cambridge will work with the Region of Waterloo to implement a pedestrian refuge island to improve pedestrian safety at the intersection of Franklin Boulevard and Green Gate Boulevard. The refuge island will connect pedestrians and cyclists across Franklin Boulevard and providing access to transit stops and the multi-use trail.

20.3.4.13 Sidewalk Improvements

Sidewalk infrastructure is provided throughout the Secondary Plan Area; however there remain parts of the network which are incomplete. Over time, the expectation is that
sidewalks will be provided on both sides of the street for all existing and new roads within the Plan Area.

20.3.4.14 Secure Bike Parking Facilities

The implementing Zoning By-law may require the provision of secure bicycle parking facilities in a conspicuous location, long-term bike parking areas within buildings and on-site shower facilities and lockers for employees who bike to work. The City may allow for the reduction in the number of required parking spaces where bicycle parking facilities are provided.

20.3.4.15 Transportation Demand Management

Council may require that development applications include a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan, prepared to the satisfaction of the City. The intent of the TDM Plan shall be to implement and promote measures to reduce the use of low-occupancy automobiles for trips and to increase transit use, cycling and walking.

20.3.4.16 Parking

Through the development approvals process, the City may consider alternative parking requirements for mixed use and high density developments including shared parking standards.

20.3.4.17 Coordination with the City’s Transportation Master Plan

At the time of drafting of this secondary plan, the City was in the process of launching a new city-wide Transportation Master Plan. The expectation is that the growth assumptions, vision and other relevant aspects of this Secondary Plan will be considered in the preparation of the City-wide Transportation Master Plan. Amendments to the Secondary Plan may be required to ensure alignment between the Secondary Plan and the Transportation Master Plan.
20.3.5 INFRASTRUCTURE

20.3.5.1 Water and Sanitary Servicing
As part of the implementation of this Secondary Plan, the City will work with the Region of Waterloo to ensure that there is adequate water and sanitary servicing and capacity to accommodate the long term planned development for the Secondary Plan Area.

20.3.5.2 Municipal Servicing Study
As part of the implementation of this Secondary Plan, and the policies of Chapter 6 of the Official Plan, the City will undertake an analysis of local infrastructure to ensure that adequate servicing is in place to accommodate the planned growth for the area. The City will update its municipal master servicing strategy as required.

20.3.5.3 Development Applications and Servicing Requirements
The City may also require development applications to be supported by site-specific servicing studies.

20.3.5.4 Sustainable Stormwater Management
The municipality encourages innovative measures to help reduce the impacts of urban run-off and maintain base groundwater flow. Such measures may include bioswales, permeable pavers, rain barrels and green roofs.

20.3.5.5 Coordination of Public Works
The City will work with the Region to ensure that planned public works for the area are coordinated to minimize the impacts of construction on the residents and businesses within the Plan Area. Coordination efforts will consider the phasing of streetscape improvements, any future road works, and maintenance, as well as any upgrades to water and sanitary networks.
20.3.6 IMPLEMENTATION

20.3.6.1 General Implementation

20.3.6.1.1 Implementation Tools

The Secondary Plan shall be implemented through a variety of tools, including but not limited to:

a) The planning and development application process, through tools such as site plan approval, plans of subdivision and condominium and consents to sever;

b) The City of Cambridge Zoning by law;

c) Community Improvement Plan; and,

d) Other tools as described in this Chapter.

20.3.6.1.2 Development Proposal Complete Application Requirements

Development applications within the Secondary Plan are subject to any complete application requirements set out in the Official Plan. The City may update these complete application requirements to account for additional supporting studies that may be needed to support growth within the Secondary Plan, including a shadow impact study.

20.3.6.1.3 Municipal Works within the Secondary Plan

All future municipal works undertaken by the City of Cambridge within the Secondary Plan Area shall be consistent with the policies of this Plan.

20.3.6.1.4 Official Plan Amendments

Unless otherwise stated in this Plan or the City’s Official Plan, applications for development which do not align with the Policies or Schedules of this Plan shall require an Official Plan Amendment. Amendments to the Official Plan shall be subject to policies of the Official Plan and shall require a planning justification report, along with any other supporting studies identified through the pre-consultation process.

20.3.6.1.5 Zoning By-Law

The City will update its zoning by-law to ensure that the land use and design policies for this Secondary Plan are reflected in the City’s zoning by-law.

Applications for development within the Plan Area shall be subject to the policies of this Secondary Plan and the City’s Official Plan (where applicable). Amendments to the zoning by-law shall be subject to policies of the Official Plan and shall require a planning justification report, along with any other supporting studies identified through the pre-consultation process.
20.3.6.1.6 Site Plan Approval, Plans of Subdivision, Plans of Condominium and Severances

Applications for site plan approval, plans of subdivision, plans of condominium and consents to sever shall be consistent with the policies of this Secondary Plan and City of Cambridge’s Official Plan.

20.3.6.1.7 Main Street and Dundas Street Area Community Improvement Plan

To assist and accelerate intensification redevelopment and facilitate further public realm improvements within the Secondary Plan Area, the City will consider modifying its Community Improvement Plan (CIP) programs or creating a new CIP for intensification areas. The rationale for completing a CIP as part of the Secondary Plan's implementation is to ensure that:

- The proposed public realm improvement projects are appropriately planned and accounted for in the City’s capital budget, including any property acquisitions which may be required to complete the proposed streetscaping, public space and gateway improvements; and,

- There is a competitive suite of financial incentives to promote intensification and redevelopment, such as but not limited to incentives for greyfield and brownfield redevelopment, lot consolidation/assembly, residential infilling and/or mixed-use intensification, etc.

20.3.6.1.8 Coordination with the Region of Waterloo

The City will work with the Region of Waterloo, who is the approval authority for this Plan, to ensure that the policies of this Plan are implemented, including any opportunities to implement the urban design and public realm improvements through any future Regional works. The City also encourages the Region of Waterloo to consider opportunities for affordable housing development within the Community Node area.

20.3.6.2 Phasing and Financial Tools

20.3.6.2.1 Municipal Capital Improvements

The City will prepare a phasing strategy as to assist with the implementation of this Secondary Plan. The Phasing Strategy should consider the following:

a) The expecting timing of development, including the expected built-out of vacant lands and redevelopment of existing areas;

b) The timing of any potential transportation, infrastructure, and public realm improvements; and,

c) Any other projects or initiatives which may impact the timing of development.

20.3.6.2.2 Development Charges

The City will include any growth-related infrastructure identified in this plan as part of the next Development Charges By-law update.
20.3.6.2.3 Updating the Plan
The City will comprehensively review the policies of this Secondary Plan at the 10 year review of the City’s Official Plan. Depending on the outcomes of the review, the City may decide to update the Plan.

20.3.6.3 Interpretation

20.3.6.3.1 Conflicts with Official Plan
In the event of a conflict between the Official Plan and this Secondary Plan, the Policies of the Secondary Plan shall prevail.

20.3.6.3.2 Boundaries
The boundaries shown on the Secondary Plan Schedules are approximate, except where they meet with existing roads, river valleys or other clearly defined physical features. Where the general intent of this Secondary Plan is maintained to the satisfaction of the Municipality, minor boundary adjustments will not require an amendment to this Secondary Plan.
Schedules
Appendix A: Conceptual Street Cross Sections

Figure 20-1: Community Connector, Typical Cross Section

Reference Area(s): Franklin Boulevard; Main Street, between Franklin Boulevard and Dundas Street

Figure 20-2: Neighbourhood Connector, Typical Cross Section

Reference Area(s): Dundas Street; Main Street, between Franklin and Dundas; Franklin Boulevard, south of Dundas Street
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Policy Reference</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Prestige industrial plaza (115 Dundas St N and 5 McLaren Avenue) | Chapter 8.10.104 – Site Specific Policy recommended to be added to the Secondary Plan. | • request to redesignate property from Prestige Industrial to Mixed Use Medium Density Residential  
• Letter from Victor Labreche on behalf of Canadian Commercial (South Cambridge) Inc. and Tawse Realco Inc. (attached below) | • Property rezoned commercial in March of 2009 to permit commercial plaza.  
• (H) Holding removed in 2010  
• Site Specific Policy added to Chapter 8.10 to permit mixed use medium density residential provided introduction of sensitive use does not prohibit continuation of existing surrounding industrial uses |
| Parks (Urban Greens and Squares) | 20.2.1 vision – "mixed use higher density node will be supported by new parks, public spaces, trails"  
20.2.2.j) – “Create a connected, functional and attractive network of parks, public spaces, natural open spaces, and trails using the process and principles of place-making"  
20.3.2.3.d) Provide accessible, pedestrian-oriented, and high-quality | • Ensure policies provide opportunities for public space and parks to support future needs in the surrounding neighbourhood | • The Potential New Public Spaces policy (20.3.3.7) has been updated to reflect opportunity for playgrounds and community parks to support existing and future needs in the surrounding neighbourhood.  
• Urban Greens and Squares policy added in line with wording from upcoming Parks Master Plan (20.3.3.7)  
• A definition for POPS (Privately Owned Public Spaces) has been added to the Official Plan to support their inclusion in future development. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Policy Reference</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>public realm with short walking distances to parks, trails, schools, other public service facilities, and transit services 20.3.3.7 – new public spaces should be designed to be barrier free and be designed to include a mix of enhanced landscaping, shade trees, ample places for seating and public art. 20.3.3.12.4 – landscaped setbacks and other private open spaces 20.3.4.11 – “Active transportation infrastructure should provide continuous facilities and connectivity to transit stops, multi-use trails, parks, schools, recreational facilities and on-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Policy Reference</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flex design (FADS)</td>
<td>20.3.1.6 – Housing – “shall be constructed accessible with barrier-free, universal or flex design.”</td>
<td>• The secondary plan should specifically reference the City of Cambridge Facility Accessibility Design Standards (FADS) rather than ‘flex design’</td>
<td>• Policy 20.3.1.6 has been updated to reflect this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 storey low density residential</td>
<td>20.3.2.6 – Maximum height of Low Density Residential set at 4 Storeys</td>
<td>• Four storeys is not an appropriate height limit for Low Density Residential, it should be lowered to three storeys</td>
<td>• A four storey maximum height for Low Density Residential is an appropriate limit which reflects best practices. There is no minimum height requirement and nothing to compel property owners to build to four storeys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of commercial uses</td>
<td>OP Section 8.4.6.14: “Lands in a residential designation may be used for … convenience commercial uses as specified in Section 8.6.1.5 of this Plan; and d) a compatible community facility or commercial use as specified in Section 8.4.7 of this Plan.”</td>
<td>• A concern was raised that the existing grocery stores and convenience commercial uses will leave as properties redevelop.</td>
<td>The City cannot compel property owners to introduce specific commercial uses/stores however there are several commercial-supportive provisions in the Official Plan, as amended, and proposed secondary plan. • OP statements encouraging, incentivising, and/or identifying the City’s objective for BALANCED, MIXED, and COMPLETE land development and uses (thereby including commercial uses – see OP sections 2.2.F, 2.6.1.7, 2.6.4.3, 2.7.1.1-2.7.1.2, and 8.6) • OP mechanisms that encourage commercial development compatible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Policy Reference</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP Section 8.4.7: “The City may permit the inclusion of a range of compatible, non-residential community facilities and commercial uses in residential neighbourhoods.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>with existing community characteristics (OP s.8.4.2.1). The Main and Dundas Community Node is characterized in the OP by having “existing low rise commercial plazas surrounded by established residential neighbourhoods” (OP s. 8.7.2.B.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP Section 8.6.1.5.1: Lands designated for residential, or employment uses … may be zoned to permit convenience commercial uses … that serve the day-to-day shopping needs of residents living in the surrounding neighbourhood or employees in the area.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• OP provisions supporting the transformation of residential and industrial lands in areas like Main and Dundas to commercial mixed uses (sections 8.4.6.14, 8.4.7, 8.6.1.5.1, 8.6.2.3, 8.6.2.5, 8.7.2.B.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP Section 8.6.2.3: “… Consideration may be given to permitting medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additionally, where there is an increase in population there is an increase in demand for commercial uses such as grocery stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key draft secondary plan supports includes principle statements which support mixed residential-commercial land use in the Main and Dundas area and protection of existing commercial functions. This is demonstrated in the draft secondary plan sections 20.2.1, 20.2.1.B, and 20.3.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 20.2.1: the area will “integrate a diverse mix of uses … while continuing to have an important commercial function to support [community] needs”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Policy Reference</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or high-density residential development as appropriate … [if it is] demonstrated that the proposed residential use(s) will not compromise the planned function of the lands or result in a reduction in the existing gross leasable area of commercial uses on the lands.”</td>
<td>OP Section 8.6.2.5: Identifies that new or expanded retail commercial centres exceeding 42,000m² are permitted in Main and Dundas area as it is a Community Node</td>
<td>• 20.2.1.B: “Maintain the node’s important commercial function”  • 20.3.1.5: Existing large-format commercial uses are permitted to continue… [and] should be redeveloped into compact medium to high density mixed-use developments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Policy Reference</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Boulevard and Main Street from employment lands to other purposes has been justified in keeping with the provisions of the Provincial Growth Plan, based on the Council approved Hemson Growth Management Study." | Boulevard and Main Street from employment lands to other purposes has been justified in keeping with the provisions of the Provincial Growth Plan, based on the Council approved Hemson Growth Management Study." | A comment was raised at the public meeting asking why the mix of unit types was different than that proposed in the Hespeler Road Corridor Secondary Plan. | - The Hespeler Road Corridor Secondary Plan Area consists of Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs) which are intended to accommodate a majority of growth within the City. The Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan Area does not have direct access to rapid transit and the area generally contains lower density, ground oriented development. The Hespeler Road Corridor Secondary Plan proposes a higher percentage of multiple bedroom units to provide a better mix of residential options than currently exist.  
- Regulations cannot be put in place to require a mix of 2 and 3 bedroom units but a Community Improvement |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Policy Reference</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| percent of the total number of units as 3-bedroom or larger units." | | Plan (CIP) may be able to further incentivize dwellings with higher bedroom counts. Recent changes to the Development Charge Act prorate DCs for rental units based on the number of bedrooms.  
- No change recommended to policy 20.3.1.6. | |
| 840 and 940 Main St. E and 945 Franklin Blvd. | 20.3.2.2 – (excerpt) To create a complete community and support economic activity within the Plan Area, new development within the Mixed-Use designations will provide a minimum of 10 percent of the gross floor area of the development as non-residential uses in one or multiple buildings.  
20.3.3.12.1e) – All buildings oriented toward public streets, must have clearly defined primary entry points that open directly on public streets. | A comment letter was submitted requesting a site specific provision for reduction in minimum required percentage of non-residential floor area as well as site specific provisions for relief from a requirement for doors to address the street where grading or other challenges exist. | Noted. Discussions regarding the development proposal are ongoing with the applicant. Site specific provisions have been added in Chapter 8.10.102 as requested. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Policy Reference</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|       | to the public sidewalk.  
20.3.3.12.3 -  
Primary building entrances will be located adjacent to the public street, or a publicly-accessible courtyard physically and visually connected to the street, unless there are compelling topographical or other engineering related constraints that limit conformity with these policies, as determined by the City and the Region. |         |          |
Dear Mr. Blevins,

We are providing you this letter on behalf of our clients, Canadian Commercial (South Cambridge) Inc. and Tawse Reaslo Inc., who collectively own the properties addressed as 115-125 Dundas Street North and 5 McLaren Avenue in the City of Cambridge. The subject properties are located at the northwest limit of the proposed Secondary Plan. The property was developed as a service commercial plaza in approximately 2011 and its main tenants include Shoppers Drug Mart, Bulk Barn, Anytime Fitness, Meridian Financial along with smaller service commercial tenant space/units as well as a health care office. The subject lands are located within the 'Main St. and Dundas St. S. Community Node' as illustrated on Figure 3 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan.

Within the current draft Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan the proposed Secondary Plan designation is 'Prestige Industrial'. Given that the properties are entirely developed with service commercial retail uses the properties should be designated 'Mixed-Use Medium Density'. Further, it is relevant to note that the subject lands are currently zoned 'CS5 – Local Shopping Centre zone' and are proposed to be zoned 'CC1 – Community Commercial 1 Zone' in the final draft proposed new city-wide Zoning By-Law.

With regard to the policies within the Main St. and Dundas St. S. Community Node noted in Section 8.7.2.5 of the Official Plan, it notes in sub-policy #6 the following:

6. The preparation of a Secondary Plan for this node will be required, which will take into consideration the results of available City-wide studies, such as the Comprehensive Commercial Review and Sanitary Servicing Master Plan. The Secondary Plan will be based on achieving a significant level of intensification, which was the basis for conversion of employment lands in keeping with the Provincial Growth Plan. The final boundaries of this Community Node will be determined through the Secondary Plan process, and implemented through a further amendment to the Official Plan. In addition a Tertiary Plan may also be needed for those lands being converted from an employment designation as a component of the overall Secondary Plan for this Community Node.

This policy recognizes that some properties within this community node have converted over recent years from employment/industrial land uses to more intensified commercial and or residential uses.
Mr. Matthew Blevins, MCIP, RPP  
City of Cambridge  
May 11, 2023  

Based on the forgoing and as previously noted above, we request that the subject lands be designated ‘Mixed-Use Medium Density’ as the correct designation in the proposed Secondary Plan given the properties are entirely developed as a Commercial Retail Plaza recognized as primary permitted use in the Mixed-Use Medium Density designation.

Thank you for your consideration to the above comments and our request. We are available at your convenience to discuss this matter in further detail if you wish.

Sincerely,

ARCADIS PROFESSIONAL SERVICES (CANADA) INC.

Victor Labreche, MCIP, RPP  
Associate Director – Practice Lead, Planning

Email: victor.labreche@arcadis.com  
Direct Line: 519-585-2255 ext.63252
May 15, 2023

Matthew Blevins
Senior Planner Reurbanization
City of Cambridge
30 Dickson Street, 3rd floor,
Cambridge ON N1R 8S1

Dear Matthew:

RE: Draft Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan
840 & 940 Main Street East and 945 Franklin Boulevard, Cambridge
OUR FILE ‘Y509AD’

On behalf of our clients, South Cambridge CP Inc., we are pleased to submit comments regarding the Draft Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan, April 2023 (the “draft Secondary Plan”).

As you are aware, our clients submitted Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision applications for the lands municipally known as 840 & 940 Main Street East and 945 Franklin Boulevard (the “subject lands”) in December 2021. The applications proposed the development of the subject lands with a residential plan of subdivision containing a range of unit types. Based on feedback received at the public meeting and in the circulation comments, a revised submission has now been filed with the City. This resubmission addresses circulation comments and is currently under review by the City, Region and agencies.

We have reviewed the revised draft Secondary Plan and are supportive of the proposed land use designations for the subject lands as well as the policy framework proposed. We appreciate that the comments on the previous draft of the Secondary Plan, as outlined in our January 15, 2023 correspondence and subsequent meetings, have been substantially addressed through revisions to the proposed land use designations that apply to the subject lands, the inclusion of Site Specific Policy 2, and other policy modifications.

Please accept these further, minor comments for consideration in the final draft of the Secondary Plan.

Mixed Use Main Street

The Mixed Use Main Street designation applies to the southwest portion of the subject lands. These lands are proposed to be developed with a mixed-use building including retail uses at grade and residential uses above.
Section 20.3.2.2 of the Draft Official Plan requires that new development within the Mixed-Use designations will provide a minimum of 10 percent of the gross floor area of the development as non-residential uses in one or multiple buildings.

The site-specific policy that applies to the subject lands allows for a mid-rise apartment to be constructed on these lands with a ground floor comprised of non-residential uses. We suggest a minor revision to this policy to explicitly indicate that the non-residential requirements of Section 20.3.2.2 do not apply. Our suggested language is underlined below:

In addition, notwithstanding the minimum non-residential gross floor area requirements of Section 20.3.2.2, on lands designated Mixed-Use Main Street, a mid-rise apartment building shall be constructed with the ground floor comprised of non-residential uses.

Active Frontages

Through our previous correspondence and discussions, we requested that the draft Secondary Plan be revised to allow for flexibility to respond to site conditions that would make it difficult to have a front entrance facing the street. We appreciate that the following language, underlined below, has been included to address our comments:

Primary building entrances will be located adjacent to the public street, or a publicly accessible courtyard physically and visually connected to the street, unless there are compelling topographical or other engineering-related constraints that limit conformity with these policies as determined by the City and the Region. (Section 20.3.3.12.3)

However, there are still a few references in the draft Secondary Plan which require front doors facing the street (Section 20.3.3.12.1e, Section 20.3.3.12.3). We respectfully request that policies 20.3.3.12.1e and 20.3.3.12.3 be revised similarly to allow for flexibility in design in cases where front doors facing the street cannot be provided or where it is not practical, based on site conditions.

Thank you for consideration of these minor comments. We look forward to continuing to work with you.

Yours truly,

MHBC

Emily Elliott, MCIP, RPP
Associate

cc: Jeff Robinson, Kevin Fergin
MINUTES
Corporation of the City of Cambridge
Planning - Statutory Public Meeting

Date: May 16, 2023, 6:30 p.m.
Location: Council Chambers


Regrets: Councillor Devine - Ward 2

Staff Members in Attendance: Hardy Bromberg, Deputy City Manager - Community Development, Bryan Boodhoo – City Solicitor, Lisa Prime – Chief Planner, Michael Oliveri - Council Committee Services Coordinator, Maria Barrantes Barreto - Council Committee Services Coordinator

Others in Attendance: Michael Campos - Planner, Matthew Blevins - Senior Planner, Reurbanization

1. Meeting Called to Order
2. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest
3. Public Meeting Notice
4. Presentations


5. Public Meetings


Motion: 23-183

Moved by Councillor Reid
Seconded by Councillor Cooper

THAT Report 23-218-CD Public Meeting Report – 240-276 Limerick Road – Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision submitted by 2582427 Ontario Inc. be received;

AND THAT application R04/23 for 240-276 Limerick Road be referred back to staff for a subsequent report and staff recommendation.

In Favour (8): Councillor Reid, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Mayor Liggett, and Councillor Ermeta

Absent (1): Councillor Devine

Carried (8 to 0)


Motion: 23-184

Moved by Councillor Kimpson
Seconded by Councillor Earnshaw

AND FURTHER THAT the proposed Official Plan Amendment for the Hespeler Road Corridor Secondary Plan be referred back to staff for a subsequent report and staff recommendation.

In Favour (7): Councillor Reid, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Hamilton, Mayor Liggett, and Councillor Ermeta

Absent (2): Councillor Devine, and Councillor Cooper

Carried (7 to 0)

5.3 23-203-CD Public Meeting Report – Proposed Official Plan Amendment for the Main and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan

Motion: 23-185

Moved by Councillor Hamilton
Seconded by Councillor Cooper

THAT Report 23-203-CD Public Meeting Report – Proposed Official Plan Amendment for the Main and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan be received;

AND FURTHER THAT the proposed Official Plan Amendment for the Main and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan be referred back to staff for a subsequent report and staff recommendation.

In Favour (8): Councillor Reid, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Mayor Liggett, and Councillor Ermeta

Absent (1): Councillor Devine

Carried (8 to 0)

6. Delegations


6.5 Victor Labreche, Arcadis Professional Services re: 23-203-CD Public Meeting Report – Proposed Official Plan Amendment for the Main and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan

6.6 Bahnam Sabah re: 23-203-CD Public Meeting Report – Proposed Official Plan Amendment for the Main and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan

6.7 Frank Jungton re: 23-203-CD Public Meeting Report – Proposed Official Plan Amendment for the Main and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan

7. Correspondence

7.1 Canadian Commercial Inc re: 23-203-CD Public Meeting Report – Proposed Official Plan Amendment for the Main and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan


8. Motion to Receive Correspondence and Presentations

Motion: 23-186

Moved by Councillor Cooper
Seconded by Councillor Roberts

THAT all presentations and correspondence from the May 16, 2023 Planning – Statutory Public Meeting Committee be received.

In Favour (8): Councillor Reid, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Mayor Liggett, and Councillor Ermeta
Absent (1): Councillor Devine

Carried (8 to 0)

9. **Adjournment**

Motion: 23-187

Moved by Councillor Roberts
Seconded by Councillor Hamilton

THAT the Planning – Statutory Public Meeting Committee does now adjourn at 9:53 p.m.

In Favour (8): Councillor Reid, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Mayor Liggett, and Councillor Ermeta

Absent (1): Councillor Devine

Carried (8 to 0)

________________________________________
Mayor

________________________________________
Clerk
To: COUNCIL
Meeting Date: 4/23/2024
Subject: 2024 Speed Management Program Action Plan
Submitted By: Leah Walter, Director of Engineering
Prepared By: Shannon Noonan, Manager of Transportation
Report No.: 24-042-CD
File No.: N/A
Wards Affected: All Wards

RECOMMENDATION(S):

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose
To provide an overview of the 2024 Speed Management Program Action Plan and update Council on other speed management and road safety initiatives.

Key Findings

- The City’s Speed Management Program, approved by Council in 2019 provides a framework to ensure staff resources and available budget are being allocated where they are most needed across the City.

- Twenty-eight (28) locations where speeding was raised as a concern in 2023 were reviewed and prioritized for the proposed 2024 action plan.

- Additionally, there are four (4) locations being carried over into 2024 that were delayed due to road reconstruction, required studies, or additional monitoring and review requirements.

- In 2024 the City will continue with the installation of seasonal traffic calming locations from previous years, and the Radar Message Board (RMB) and Tommy & Friends programs will begin in May or earlier.
- Recognizing that speeding on residential streets is the most common concern that Transportation Engineering receives, staff are continually considering new programs and initiatives as outlined within this report.

**Financial Implications**

- The estimated cost to implement the measures of the 2024 Speed Management Action Plan is approximately $50,000.
- These speed management initiatives will be funded from the approved 2024 Transportation Operating Budget.

**STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:**

☐ Strategic Action

**Objective(s):** Not Applicable

**Strategic Action:** Not Applicable

OR

☒ Core Service

**Program: Transportation Management**

**Core Service:** Traffic Operations

The development of an annual Speed Management Program Action Plan provides a consistent and committed approach to addressing residential speeding concerns.

**BACKGROUND:**

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

In 2019, Council approved a Speed Management Program which provides a consistent methodology and framework for assessing these locations. This is aimed at ensuring resources are being allocated where they are most needed, and that appropriate tools and solutions are being utilized when addressing speeding complaints.

Each speeding concern received is assigned to a staff member who will perform a Traffic Investigation. Traffic investigations require a substantial effort to collect data,
analyze it, and suggest solutions. Depending on the available information and the unique complexities or challenges of the location being reviewed, this effort may take anywhere from one week to several months to complete. Often, the data collected at the site of concern shows that speeding is not evident, based on the 85th percentile of vehicles travelling at or below the posted speed limit, which is used as an industry standard and best practice. This information can be challenging for a resident to accept since their perception is that speeding is occurring by most drivers.

Residents will also often ask for solutions that might not be effective in controlling speed, such as traffic signals, all-way stops, or reduced speed limits in isolated areas. However, using inappropriate tools to address traffic issues can lead to additional safety concerns such as increased response times for emergency services and worsening of local driving behaviours. It is important to choose the right solution to solve the problems effectively and safely. With the introduction of the Speed Management Program in 2019 and annual Action Plans from 2020 to 2023, this year marks the fifth year of an annual Action Plan.

ANALYSIS:

2024 Speed Management Program Action Plan:

In 2023, the City reviewed twenty-eight (28) locations where speeding was raised as a concern.

As per the Speed Management Program, all twenty-eight (28) locations were categorized according to the degree of speeding that may be occurring based on the 85th percentile speed (the speed at which 85% of drivers are travelling at or below). The locations were grouped into three (3) categories:

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

Of the twenty-eight (28) locations, twenty-one (21) fell into Category 1, with two (2) in Category 2 and five (5) in Category 3.

For locations within Category 1, data related to speeding is not considered to be significant enough to warrant further action and residents are notified of the outcome. For a complete list of all Category 1 locations, see Appendix A – Speed Management Category 1 Summary.

The locations within Categories 2 and 3 have been assessed further to determine potential remedial measures and to identify which program or tool would be most
appropriate for the specific situation. These locations have been included in the 2024 Speed Management Program Action Plan and are noted in Table 1 below along with the proposed actions:

Table 1: 2024 Speed Management Program Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Scheduled for Radar Message Board &amp; Tommy program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spruce Street to Oak Street)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Street East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Scheduled for Radar Message Board &amp; Tommy program and request Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cooper Street to Melran Drive)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Police Service enforcement through the Selective Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Automated Speed Enforcement program installed in Fall of 2023. Continue to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Munch Avenue to Sekura Street)</td>
<td></td>
<td>monitor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Location will be reviewed for the implementation of *Level 2 – Physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kerwood Drive to Cooper Street)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention Traffic Calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher Mills Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Installation of seasonal traffic calming and request Waterloo Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Scott Road to Guelph Avenue)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Police Service enforcement through Selective Traffic Enforcement Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ridge Drive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Installation of seasonal traffic calming and request Waterloo Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(St. Andrews Street to West River</td>
<td></td>
<td>Police Service enforcement through Selective Traffic Enforcement Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowther Street South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Installation of seasonal traffic calming and request Waterloo Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hamilton Street to Rose Street)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Police Service enforcement through Selective Traffic Enforcement Program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Level 2 – Physical Intervention: Level 2 treatments physically alter the roadway creating vertical and horizontal obstacles which can include speed humps/cushions, raised intersections, median islands, bump outs and roundabouts.

In addition to the twenty-eight (28) locations where speeding concerns were reviewed the following streets are still being reviewed as additional studies are required in the Spring of 2024.

- Elgin Street North (Franklin Boulevard to Northview Heights Drive)
- Elgin Street North (Glamis Road to Munch Avenue)
- Ridge Road
- Thorman Drive
Supplementary Speed Management Initiatives:

In 2023, seasonal traffic calming signs were installed at three (3) new locations and twenty-six (26) locations were reinstalled for a total of twenty-nine (29) locations. For the 2024 season one (1) new location will have seasonal traffic calming signs installed. For a full list of the seasonal traffic calming sign locations see Appendix B – Seasonal Traffic Calming Locations.

Recognizing that speeding on residential streets is the most common concern that Transportation Engineering receives, staff are continually considering new programs and initiatives to add to our suite of options to address speeding and road safety on residential streets and in school zones. In 2024 staff will continue to work on various programs/initiatives that are highlighted below.

Seasonal Rubber Speed Cushion Pilot

In addition to seasonal traffic calming signs, new for the 2024 season, rubber speed cushions will be piloted at two (2) locations, namely Ellis Road and Fisher Mills Road. Rubber speed cushions are a series of small speed humps installed across the width of the road and are designed to be wide enough to slow vehicles with minimum impact on emergency vehicles. They will be installed seasonally for the same period seasonal traffic calming signs (May to October). See Figure 1.0 below for an image of rubber speed cushions.
Radar Message Board and Tommy and Friends Program

The Radar Message Board and Tommy & Friends programs will be in full operation for 2024 with eight (8) radar message boards and six (6) Tommy & Friends silhouettes being rotated around the City on 2-week rotations.

This program will be streamlined for 2024 to focus on three (3) types of locations including proactive, reactive (complaint-based), and construction areas. Proactive locations will include streets where speeding has consistently been identified as a concern, but speeding has not been confirmed through speed studies and/or the location does not qualify for speed management measures (i.e. Category 1 Locations). Placeholders will also be held in the program schedules for reactive (complaint-based) and construction areas so that these locations can be addressed more immediately as issues arise.

Automated Speed Enforcement Program

The Region of Waterloo in collaboration with area municipalities has been implementing Automated Speed Enforcement (ASE) since 2021 in School Zones. The primary objective of ASE is to lower vehicle operating speeds near schools to be more in line
with posted speed limits and reduce the risk (and severity) of collisions with the most vulnerable road users. The use of ASE in school zones is also intended to provide a more comfortable walking, rolling, and cycling environment at and near schools.

Currently, two (2) School Zones within the City of Cambridge are equipped with ASE, namely Guelph Avenue and Elgin Street North. In May 2023, Regional Council endorsed a plan to further expand the existing ASE program to 32 School Zones and subsequently approved the rapid expansion of ASE to all School Zones by 2028.

As part of the initial expansion of the ASE program to 32 School Zones, the following four (4) additional locations will be implemented in Cambridge in 2024:

- Myers Road (between Holy Spirit Catholic Elementary School and Moffat Creek Public Elementary School)
- Holiday Inn Drive (at Jacob Hespeler Public Highschool)
- Saginaw Parkway (at Clemens Mills Public School)
- Avenue Road (at St. Peters Catholic Elementary School)

**Neighbourhood Area 40km/h Speed Limit Implementation**

In 2021 a pilot project to evaluate the effectiveness of neighbourhood wide 40km/h speed limits was implemented in four (4) Cambridge neighbourhoods across the City, described as: Central Cambridge, Lower Preston, North Hespeler and Southwest Galt. All streets within the pilot areas had a speed limit of 40km/h marked with 40km/h gateway signage at each boundary entry point.

Through Report 23-165-CD, Neighbourhood Area Speed Limit Pilot Evaluation, Council approved the expansion of the program to implement reduced Neighbourhood Area 40km/h speed limits across all City neighbourhoods along with reducing School Zone speed limits to 30km/h. Implementation of the new speed limits will begin this spring.

Reduced speed limit neighbourhoods are intended to encourage more conscious driving in residential neighbourhoods, reduce the severity of collisions and create a more welcoming environment for pedestrians and active modes of transportation.

**Selective Traffic Enforcement Program**

The Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) is a collaborative enforcement initiative that is designed to systematically identify and target high-risk areas based on traffic data including speed, volume, and collision history. Compared to previous approaches which relied primarily on traffic complaints, the data-driven approach of STEP helps to ensure that enforcement efforts are applied where they will have the most significant impact.
To improve collaboration and data sharing, quarterly meetings with the Waterloo Region Police Service and area municipalities have been established to discuss the program’s progress and identify new areas of concern for targeted enforcement. STEP members are working towards more data-driven decision-making for enforcement locations by leveraging traffic data and network screening analysis.

Other programs/initiatives

Staff continue to explore other speed management and road safety initiatives for the future to deliver a comprehensive road safety program that includes evaluation, engineering, enforcement, education, and engagement.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

The Council approved Speed Management Program was used for developing the 2024 Speed Management Program Action Plan.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The estimated cost to implement the measures of the 2024 Speed Management Program Action Plan is approximately $50,000 to be funded from the approved 2024 Transportation Operating Budget.

PUBLIC VALUE:

Sustainability:

Development of the annual Speed Management Program Action Plan in addition to other road safety initiatives demonstrates innovative leadership while allocating resources responsibly and in a sustainable manner.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:

Not Applicable

PUBLIC INPUT:

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:

There was no internal/external consultation undertaken.

CONCLUSION:

The 2024 Speed Management Program Action Plan has been developed in accordance with the 2019 Council approved Speed Management Program methodology and will be
implemented as noted in this report. The annual Speed Management Program Action Plan is one of the City initiatives that delivers a consistent and proactive approach to road safety while also ensuring responsible financial and resource management.

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. 24-042-CD Appendix A – Speed Management Category 1 Summary
2. 24-042-CD Appendix B – Seasonal Traffic Calming Locations
### Appendix A

#### Speed Management Category 1 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bakersfield Drive</td>
<td>Champlain Boulevard to Goldsboro Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Beechwood Drive</td>
<td>Southwood Drive to Southwood Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Broadoaks Drive</td>
<td>Chester Drive to Fitzgerald Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Burnett Avenue</td>
<td>Essex Point Drive to Falcon Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cambridge Street</td>
<td>Dundas Street to Roseview Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Christopher Drive</td>
<td>Elliott Street to Ballantyne Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Clemens Avenue</td>
<td>Scott Road to Sheffield Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cooper Street</td>
<td>between Ellis Road to Jamieson Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Elgin Street South</td>
<td>Main Street to Elliott Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Green Gate Boulevard</td>
<td>Franklin Boulevard to Wesley Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Gunn Avenue</td>
<td>Ramsay Avenue and Kribs Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Kerwood Drive</td>
<td>Ellis Road to Townline Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. McCormick Drive</td>
<td>McMeeken Drive to Melran Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Oak Street</td>
<td>Main Street to McNaughton Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Osgoode Street</td>
<td>Dalton Drive to Apple Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Scott Road</td>
<td>Fisher Mills Road to Poplar Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Weaver Street</td>
<td>Woodsdale Boulevard to Heather Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Wellington Street</td>
<td>Dundas Street to Roseview Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Wheatland Drive</td>
<td>Christopher Drive to Langlaw Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Winston Boulevard</td>
<td>Franklin Boulevard to Queen Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Winston Boulevard</td>
<td>Franklin Boulevard to Cooper Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B
### Seasonal Traffic Calming Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Locations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Arthur Fach Drive</td>
<td>Garth Massey Drive to Coulthard Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Avenue Road</td>
<td>Franklin Boulevard to Townline Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Avenue Road</td>
<td>Hespeler Road to Elgin Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Beaverdale Road</td>
<td>Mohawk Road to Fisher Mills Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Berkley Road</td>
<td>Cedar Street to Churchill Drive (#91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bismark Drive</td>
<td>Devils Creek Drive to Farmstead Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Bismark Drive</td>
<td>Blair Road to Sunset Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Black Bridge Road</td>
<td>Guelph Avenue to Michigan Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Blenheim Road</td>
<td>Parkwood Drive to Devil's Creek Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Burnett Avenue</td>
<td>Can-Amera Parkway to Saginaw Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Champlain Boulevard</td>
<td>Christopher Drive to Chalmers Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Cheese Factory Road</td>
<td>Myers Road to south City limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Cooper Street</td>
<td>Hammet Street to Cooper Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Dunbar Road</td>
<td>Concession Road to Industrial Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Elgin Street</td>
<td>Alison Avenue to Hilltop Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Essex Point Drive</td>
<td>Burnett Avenue to Saginaw Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Gail Street</td>
<td>at Avenue Road Public School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Glenvalley Drive</td>
<td>Saginaw Parkway to Essex Point Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Guelph Avenue</td>
<td>Shaw Avenue and Fisher Mills Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Hardcastle Drive</td>
<td>Freure Drive to Salisbury Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Kent Street</td>
<td>Cedar Street to Salisbury Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. McCormick Drive</td>
<td>at Sault Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Melran Drive</td>
<td>at Red Wilfong Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Queen Street West</td>
<td>Winston Boulevard to Schofield Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. River Road</td>
<td>Melran Drive to Townline Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Saginaw Parkway</td>
<td>Green Vista Drive to Longhurst Crescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Salisbury Avenue</td>
<td>Pacific Court to Southgate Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Samuelson Street</td>
<td>Haddington Street to Dundas Street Overpass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Speedsville Road</td>
<td>Mill Run Trail Crossing (south of Rogers Dr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2024 New Locations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowther Street South</td>
<td>Hamilton Street to Rose Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: COUNCIL
Meeting Date: 4/23/2024
Subject: Black Bridge Road and CN Railway Crossing Agreements
Submitted By: Leah Walter, Director of Engineering
Prepared By: Scott MacDonald, Project Engineer
Report No.: 24-049-CD
File No.: A/00492-40
Wards Affected: Ward 1

RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 24-049-CD Black Bridge Road and Canadian National Railway (CNR) Crossing Agreements be received;

AND THAT Mayor and Clerk be authorized to execute the required Construction and Maintenance agreements with Canadian National Railway for the Black Bridge Road railway crossing, to the satisfaction of the City Solicitor.

AND FURTHER THAT Council proceed with Option 2 (defer/cancel whistle cessation) for the at-grade railway crossing on Black Bridge Road and reallocate the budgeted funds of $570,000 toward project contingencies.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

- As part of the Black Bridge Road improvements including a new multi-use trail, Staff are seeking Council approval to execute construction and maintenance agreements with Canadian National Railway (CNR).
- Additional information is being provided to Council on train volume and costs associated with whistle cessation.

Key Findings

- Council directed Staff to pursue whistle cessation as part of Report 22-084-CD (see Appendix A) at an estimated cost of $570,000.
- The crossing safety assessment has determined that an active crossing warning system, equipped with lights, bells and automated gates will be required to implement whistle cessation.
The updated cost associated with these whistle cessation improvements are estimated to be $850,000 and will be subject to further cost estimation and refinement by CN rail, who would be required to implement the upgrades in tandem with the City’s planned roadway improvements in 2025.

Considering new information related to low train volumes, costs, risks and recent Cambridge to Union GO passenger rail discussions staff is recommending to cancel/defer work related to whistle cessation (Option 2) prior to entering into CNR crossing agreements.

Financial Implications

- The updated estimated cost to implement Option 1 (active crossing warning system including bells, lights, automated gates to support whistle cessation) is $850,000 which is $280,000 more than budgeted.
- Option 2 is to cancel/defer whistle cessation and the associated active crossing warning system improvements for the Black Bridge CNR crossing. This would be maintaining the existing stop control and whistle order for the crossing. Option 2 would provide an estimated savings of $850,000 over Option 1. It is recommended to reallocate the budgeted funds of $570,000 toward project contingencies.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action
   - Objective(s): Not Applicable
   - Strategic Action: Not Applicable

OR

☒ Core Service

Program: Transportation Management

Core Service: Transportation Planning

The recommendations of this report represent continued support for initiatives to improve the livability of our City while also creating a safe and efficient transportation network for all users.

BACKGROUND:

General:
An update on the Black Bridge Road and Townline Road Project was provided to Council in Report 22-084-CD (see Appendix A) in August 2022 following the completion of public consultation, and prior to proceeding to 100% design. Black Bridge Road and Bridge Reconstruction (Capital Project A/00492-40) has been approved as part of the 2024 budget process. The project will be tendered following approvals being granted by all required regulatory authorities. Staff and the City’s consultant WSP have been working with the regulatory bodies throughout the design project.

At the time of authoring the report, approvals have been received by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) and Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP). Final permit approvals remain outstanding from the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA), Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), and Transport Canada Navigation Protection Program (TCNPP). These permit processes were initiated in 2023 and are anticipated to be complete by the end of Q2 2024.

If all regulatory approvals are received by the end of Q2 2024, the following schedule is anticipated to be as follows:

- Q3-Q4 2024 – Tendering and begin construction on new bridge and bridge approaches
- 2025 - Completion of new bridge, Black Bridge Road Reconstruction and Improvements (Baldwin Drive to Townline Road) and rail crossing improvements

Townline Road Improvements and Reconstruction – Black Bridge Road to Wellington County Road 34 (A/00720-40) are planned for the year 2026, as part of the current approved Capital budget forecast.

**Current Rail Crossing Site Conditions:**

The CNR crossing on Black Bridge Road is a single track at-grade crossing with a four-way stop. There are poor sightlines at the crossing because of existing high rock outcrops on either side of the tracks. Train volume at the crossing consists of one (1) freight train per day. Both trains and vehicles are required to stop and proceed when the road is clear.

To improve sightlines and safety at the crossing, the design proposes removal of the rock outcrop which will provide additional visibility of oncoming trains for pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Improvements to the crossing surface, signage, and pavement markings are also proposed and will be implemented during Stage 2 construction.

**Whistle Cessation:**

The existing Black Bridge Road at-grade railway crossing is unprotected and under Rule 14(1) of the Canadian Rail Operating Rules, train operators are required to
operate the train’s whistle where a whistle cessation order is not in place. CNR has confirmed that part of their safety procedures at this crossing includes operation of the train whistle a quarter mile in advance of the crossing to alert pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Over the past several years, the City has received concerns from residents regarding train whistling at this crossing and due to these concerns staff were directed to review the implementation of whistle cessation at this crossing. Report 22-084-CD included the following recommendations regarding whistle cessation:

- That Council direct staff to issue a public notice of the City’s intention to pass a resolution to stop train whistling on the CN Rail line at-grade crossing with Black Bridge Road,
- That funding in the amount of $30,000 be added to existing design project A/00091-30 to pursue the design of at-grade crossing improvements for whistle cessation,
- That the additional construction cost of $570,000 to implement whistle cessation at the CN Rail line at-grade crossing with Black Bridge Road be incorporated into the Black Bridge Road and Bridge construction project A/00492-40 as part of the 2023-2032 Capital Budget forecast.

The implementation of whistle cessation at a public at-grade railway crossing must follow the process established by Transport Canada. The process for applying to stop train whistling at a public grade crossing requires the following to be completed:

- Consult with the railway company about whether the request is feasible
- Notify the public and others that it intends to stop the whistling
- Pass a municipal council resolution
- Implement the required safety measures

An outline of the detailed procedure and steps still to be completed are included in the Analysis section of this report.

ANALYSIS:

As part of the Black Bridge Road and Townline Road design project, WSP was retained by the City to conduct a Crossing Safety Assessment for the Black Bridge Road at-grade railway crossing controlled by CNR.

The purpose of the Crossing Safety Assessment was to:

- Review the existing conditions of a crossing,
- Make recommendations for safety improvements to support the City’s future application for train whistle cessation pursuant to the Railway Safety Act, and
- Verify the conformance of the crossing with Transport Canada’s Grade Crossing Regulations and Standards.
For the assessment WSP gathered existing relevant crossing information from various sources and made the following observations and recommendations:

- Crossing surface and road approaches are in poor condition and should be renewed and repaved.
- Road approach grades should be improved to reduce the gradient in the vicinity of the crossing.
- Stopping sight distance (sightlines) should be improved to meet minimum regulatory requirements.
- Signs and pavement markings should be restored, or new ones implemented to meet minimum regulatory requirements.
- Improve stormwater drainage in the vicinity of the crossing area.
- Widen the road shoulder width and/or install guiderails.
- If whistle cessation is pursued an active crossing warning system is recommended.

**Rail Crossing Safety Improvements:**

The recommendations listed above, other than the active crossing warning system, will be implemented as part of the Black Bridge Road improvements during Stage 2 of construction. With these improvements the crossing would meet current standards and would continue to operate as a stop and proceed crossing, with trains continuing to whistle.

CNR commented that the addition of the MUT will not trigger the need for an active warning system. The existing stop condition would be sufficient and additional stop signs will be needed for the MUT.

**Whistle Cessation:**

A review of the requirements for Whistle cessation was included in the Crossing Safety Assessment. Consultation with CNR has been ongoing throughout the design project. Staff and the City’s consultant have been continuing to work with CNR on the possibility of implementing whistle cessation as part of the Black Bridge Road improvements. CNR is still conducting their detailed review of the safety assessment report (submitted to CNR August, 2023), and the City is still awaiting final comments and CN’s agreement on the recommendations of the report.

A current overview of the requirements needed for whistle cessation, resulting in an updated $850,000 estimate include:

- Supply and installation of all ducts, communication cables, control panels to support warning system (lights/bells/gates)
- Automated warning lights, bells and gates
- Track work and restoration
- Ballast/Sub-Ballast restorations
- Signal control hut/panels
- Electrical work including power supply/power transformer
- Flagging ($2000/day)
- Estimating and construction contingency

The preliminary cost estimate of $570,000 for whistle cessation, provided to Council in 2022 and currently budgeted, was based on expected costs before the safety assessment was completed. The safety assessment has indicated a need for automated gates which has therefore increased the costs and scope of work significantly.

In light of Council’s direction from 2022, considering the length of time elapsed, and the additional considerations based on the new information provided below, staff are presenting two options for Council to consider before proceeding with the required CNR crossing agreements for the Black Bridge Road project.

**Option 1: Continue to pursue whistle cessation for the Black Bridge Crossing**

Whistle cessation was originally proposed in response to complaints being received from residents living in the Mill Pond subdivision. Staff would like to confirm Council’s desire to continue to pursue this option considering the following new information:

- The rail volume for this crossing is one (1) freight train per day.
- The cost of this option if implemented is approximately $850,000 and will be subject to further review and cost estimation by CNR. This is $280,000 higher than the cost originally estimated in 2022 which is currently budgeted and is still considered a high-level estimate (typically +/- 30%) with ongoing review by CNR.
- The Cambridge to Union GO passenger connection initial business case and concept design is underway. If this Region led project were to proceed in the future, crossing upgrades would likely be required and funded as part of that project.
- There is some risk that after whistle cessation is implemented that the cessation order is overturned in response to an incident at the crossing by Transport Canada or otherwise. For example, this could be a safety incident in relation to the crossing which would require the railway to revert to whistle orders.

If whistle cessation is to be implemented, the following next steps are required:

- CNR to finalize their review of the safety assessment and confirm their
agreement that a whistle cessation order can be implemented for this crossing in accordance with that assessment.

- CNR to finalize their design and costs for the protected crossing.
- The City to issue a public notice, outlining intent to pass a resolution to stop train whistling at a railway crossing.
- Railway Construction and Maintenance Agreement for active crossing warning system is initiated and work is implemented.
- The City passes a resolution on Whistle Cessation for this location.
- Railway company confirms whistling has stopped at the crossings (30 days following Council resolution).

**Option 2: Defer/Cancel whistle cessation**

Under this option, City staff will pursue construction and maintenance agreements to the satisfaction of the City Solicitor required under the base scope of the project described above, which will not include upgrades to support whistle cessation. This includes the minor track work for widening the crossing to support the addition of multi-use trail, road improvements and drainage improvements including the storm sewer crossing. Sightline improvements will also be undertaken to improve the safety of the crossing. The four way stop control, and whistle order will remain in place.

Under this option, it does not mean that the City could not proceed with whistle cessation in the future. This option could also include deferment of this process until a later time as the work would largely be undertaken by CNR and not the City’s contractor as part of the road works. Some work efficiency, such as track restoration, could be gained by doing both at the same time as included under Option 1.

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

Railway Authorities and Municipalities are governed by Transport Canada regulations for railway corridors and public crossings. Staff require Council’s approval to enter railway agreements as there is no delegated authority under City’s Delegated Authority By-Law 19-186.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

- If the City proceeds with Option 1 (whistle cessation) the estimated cost is $850,000 for the active crossing warning system (bells, lights and automated gates). This estimated cost is $280,000 greater than the current approved budgeted value of $570,000 and is subject to further review and refinement by CNR who must complete the majority of the work. This incremental budget cost is recommended to be funded via debenture issuance following suit with the approved funding source for this project.
Option 2 (defer/cancel whistle cessation) results in estimated savings to the project of $850,000 over Option 1 and the existing stop control and whistle control will be maintained. It is recommended to reallocate the budgeted funds of $570,000 toward project contingencies.

**PUBLIC VALUE:**

**Collaboration:**

Canadian National Railway (CNR) has worked in partnership with the City and the Black Bridge Road design consultant to complete the crossing safety assessment for the at-grade railway crossing operated by CNR. CNR and the City continue to work together to implement safety improvements at this crossing.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:**

Not applicable.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

Extensive Public Consultation has been completed during the Black Bridge Road and Townline Road Class Environmental Assessment, preliminary design and has continued through the detailed design.

**INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:**

Consultation with Transport Canada and Canadian National Railway (CN) has been ongoing throughout the project regarding railway crossing safety and potential improvements at the Black Bridge Road at-grade crossing.

**CONCLUSION:**

City Staff and the City’s consultant WSP are moving towards the tendering stage of Black Bridge Road and Bridge Reconstruction (Capital Project A/00492-40). As part of Report 22-084-CD Staff were directed to pursue whistle cessation at the Black Bridge CNR crossing. Considering the time elapsed, and the new information presented as part of this report, staff are recommending Option 2 to cancel/defer whistle cessation at this time. Staff are also seeking Council authorization to enter into construction and maintenance crossing agreements with CNR, to the satisfaction of the City Solicitor as noted.

**REPORT IMPACTS:**
Agreement: Yes
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. 24-049-CD Appendix A – Council Report 22-084-CD
RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 22-084-CD Black Bridge Road and Townline Road Project Update be received;

AND THAT Council direct staff to issue a public notice of the City’s intention to pass a resolution to stop train whistling on the CN Rail line at-grade crossing with Black Bridge Road;

AND THAT funding in the amount of $90,000 be added to existing design project A/00091-30; $60,000 for the additional design tasks not included in the original scope of work and $30,000 to pursue the design of at-grade crossing improvements for whistle cessation;

AND THAT funding be provided from the Capital Works Reserve Fund in the amount of $30,000 and from Development Charges of $60,000;

AND FURTHER THAT the additional construction cost of $570,000 to implement whistle cessation at the CN Rail line at-grade crossing with Black Bridge Road be incorporated into the Black Bridge Road and Bridge construction project A/00492-40 as part of the 2023-2032 Capital Budget forecast.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

- This Report provides an overview of the detailed design for the new Black Bridge Road bridge structure and the proposed improvements to both Black Bridge...
Road and Townline Road in advance of finalizing the design and preparing the tender documents for construction.

- Information on whistle cessation at the CN Rail line at-grade crossing with Black Bridge Road is also provided. This Report seeks Council direction to pursue implementing whistle cessation for this crossing.

Key Findings

- The detailed design is progressing towards the 90% design milestone. Appendix A provides some renderings of the detailed design.

- A Public Information Centre was held from May 9 to May 23, 2022 using the engageCambridge platform to present the detailed design to the public. Appendix B contains a summary of the comments received.

- Marginal increases to flood elevations above 0.14m during the Regional Storm Event require further consultation with the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) and sign off from impacted property owners.

- Issuing a Public Notice would be required to pursue implementing whistle cessation of the CN Rail line at-grade crossing with Black Bridge Road. In addition, an updated safety assessment, railway crossing agreement, and construction of the necessary safety measures would be required.

- Based on Transport Canada standards, a flashing light and bell warning system would be required at the CN Rail line at-grade crossing in order to pursue whistle cessation on Black Bridge Road.

Financial Implications

- The budget of existing project A/00091-30 for detailed design of Black Bridge Road, Bridge, and Townline Road is $1,470,000. $1,062,000 has been expended, leaving approximately $408,000 to finalize the detailed design and prepare the tender documents.

- As part of the 90% milestone, additional design tasks are required by the consultant totalling $60,000 in added cost not originally included in the design terms of reference.

- Additional design costs in the amount of $30,000 would be needed to pursue the design of the at-grade crossing improvements required for whistle cessation.

- The estimated additional cost to implement the crossing improvements for whistle cessation on Black Bridge Road is $570,000 and would be added to the Black Bridge Road and Bridge construction project (A/00492-40) should Council direction be provided to pursue whistle cessation at this location.
• The updated cost estimate, including whistle cessation, for the Black Bridge Road and Bridge construction (A/00492-40 and A/01068-41) and for the Townline Road construction (A/00720-40) is $18,400,000 and $11,200,000 respectively. The cost estimates have increased from previous year budget forecasts due to substantial inflationary conditions, which have also been factored in to future year cost estimation and escalation. The 2022-2031 Capital Budget forecast had project estimates of $11,580,000 and $6,370,000 for these projects respectively. The updated values will be included as part of the 2023-2032 Capital Budget forecast for consideration, which include the City’s inflationary projections as part of these costs.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action; or
☒ Core Service

Objective(s): Not Applicable

Strategic Action: Not Applicable

Program: Design & Approvals

Core Service: Design & Approvals

The design and construction of a new bridge over the Speed River and the improvements to Black Bridge Road and Townline Road would support growth and address the structural deterioration of the existing Black Bridge Heritage Bridge.

BACKGROUND:

General:

In June 2016 the City completed a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) study that recommended a preferred infrastructure management plan for Black Bridge Road and Townline Road. The Class EA also recommended a preferred bridge management plan for the heritage Black Bridge truss bridge over the Speed River and improvements to the Irish Creek Culvert on Townline Road.

Following the mandatory review period for the Class EA, two Part II Order requests were received by the Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks. In October 2017, the Minister issued their decision, which was to deny the Part II Order requests, with several conditions for implementation.
Report 17-139(CD), received by General Committee on November 3, 2017, provided an update on the project and outlined the next steps required for implementation, including proceeding with design in two stages (preliminary design, followed by detailed design).

In June 2018, BT Engineering Inc. (BTE) was retained to complete the preliminary design assignment for the project. The preliminary design assignment was completed in 2020 and included a number of the key components of the design. Report 20-168(CD), presented the preliminary design to Council on August 11, 2020.

After the completion of the preliminary design a Detailed Design Assignment was prepared and Wood Environment and Infrastructure Solutions was retained through a Request for Proposal process to complete the assignment.

The project team is working towards completing the detailed design drawings and obtaining the necessary approvals and permits to tender the project and begin construction.

**Whistle Cessation:**

The existing CN Rail line at-grade railway crossing is an unprotected crossing. Under Rule 14(1) of the Canadian Rail Operating Rules train operators are required to operate the train’s whistle when approaching Black Bridge Road. Over the past several years the City has received numerous concerns regarding the train’s whistling at this railway crossing, requesting that the train whistling stop. The design consultant has completed an initial assessment of this rail crossing to determine if the location meets the Transport Canada requirements for whistle cessation and has identified the required safety measures and associated costs in order to pursue whistle cessation for this location.

The Transport Canada procedure for applying to stop train whistling at a public grade crossing requires the following to be completed:

- Consult with the railway company about whether the request is feasible
- Notify the public and others that it intends to stop the whistling
- Pass a municipal council resolution
- Implement the required safety measures

An outline of the detailed procedure and steps completed is noted in the Analysis section of this report.

**ANALYSIS:**

**Key Project Elements:**

- Conversion of the existing Black Bridge Road heritage bridge to a multi-use path
• Realignment of Black Bridge Road and construction of a new bridge north of the existing bridge
• Construction of a new multi-use path on the south side of Black Bridge Road and on the west side of Townline Road
• Addition of on-road bicycle lanes (both directions)
• Irish Creek Culvert Replacement
• Wetland restoration

Conversion of Black Bridge Heritage Bridge:

• The existing steel truss bridge was constructed in 1916 and is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act
• The existing bridge is proposed to be converted from a single-lane vehicular bridge to an active transportation crossing of the Speed River
• Several repairs and modifications will be required to convert the bridge
• A Strategic Conservation Plan (SCP) was completed to ensure the cultural significance and heritage aspects of Black Bridge are conserved over the short, medium, and long term
• The SCP was received and accepted by the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee at their April 21, 2022 meeting
• A key modification to the existing bridge would be the installation of a new railing as a safety measure for cyclists and pedestrians

Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL) Considerations:

• Maintain access, parking, and the existing storyboard at the canoe launch area
• Materials sympathetic to the CHL are proposed to be used (weathering steel girders and railings, low-level lighting, coloured concrete)
• The installation of a vegetated retaining wall is also proposed to minimize the visual impacts within the CHL

New Bridge Construction:

• The new bridge consists of the following elements:
  o 77m long structure consisting of two 38.5m spans supported on a central pier and abutments at each end
  o Two 3.5m wide traffic lanes
  o Two 2.0m wide buffered bike lanes (1.5m bike lane and 0.5m buffer)
  o One 2.0m wide sidewalk on the south side, with a pedestrian lookout at the central pier
• Girders consisting of weathering steel will create a rust patina that will visually tie the new bridge to the existing heritage bridge
• Bridge approach side slopes will be constructed with a reinforced vegetated retaining wall

New Bridge Hydraulics:
• The hydraulic models completed during the preliminary design have been updated where required as detailed design advances
• The updated model estimates a water surface elevation rise of approximately 0.2m on the upstream side of the proposed bridge during the Regional Storm Event
• GRCA has confirmed that an increase of up to 0.14m is acceptable and that only property owners impacted by an increase of 0.14m or greater would need to be consulted and agree to the increase of flood lines on their specific property.
• Engineering and Realty staff are identifying the properties and obtaining contact information and then the required property owners will be consulted.

Irish Creek Structure Replacement:
• The existing structure over Irish Creek will be fully removed and replaced
• The new structure will consist of the following elements:
  o Slabs on prestressed precast concrete planks with caisson abutments, wingwalls and a span of 7.35m
  o Two 3.3m wide traffic lanes
  o Two 1.7m wide buffered bike lanes
  o Dedicated structure for the multi-use path
• The proposed structure configuration does not require excavating below the existing box culvert and will avoid the need for dewatering during construction and minimizes the risk of undermining the stability of the adjacent dam at Coles Pond

Traffic Calming:
• Currently Black Bridge Road and Townline Road have a posted speed limit of 50 km/h
• To ensure operating speeds are minimized, several traffic calming measures are being considered:
  o Reduced lane widths
  o Radar speed display boards
  o Speed cushions
Raised intersections

Environmental Protection:

- The design and future construction aim to minimize impacts to the existing wetlands and compensate for unavoidable impacts by creating a new wetland area on the east side of the Speed River that is of greater size than the impacted wetland area.
- Impacts will also be mitigated by:
  - Limiting temporary construction work to areas which are currently not wetlands.
  - Designing the roadways and bridge approaches with retaining walls to minimize grading impacts on the existing wetlands.

Canoe Launch and Parking Plan:

- After completion of the works, on-street parking will not be permitted along Townline Road or Black Bridge Road.
- In order to maintain community access to the Speed River and surrounding trails, the following is proposed to be completed as part of the construction project:
  - Improvements to the existing canoe launch on the west side of the Speed River, including the provision for large trailer turnaround and room for 25 vehicles to park.
  - The creation of a new parking area at the intersection of Black Bridge Road and Townline Road with 24 additional parking spaces and a small parkette that would incorporate any heritage structural components discovered during the controlled demolition of the house structure.

Whistle Cessation:

- Implementation of whistle cessation at a public at-grade railway crossing is required to follow the process established by Transport Canada which includes:
  - Municipality consults with railway company
    - Municipality reviews and consults with the Railway company if whistle cessation is feasible at a railway crossing location.
  - Municipality and railway company assess the crossing
    - A railway crossing safety assessment is completed meeting the requirements of section 104 of the Grade Crossings Regulations and Appendix D of the Grade Crossings Standards.
  - Municipality notifies the public
    - Municipality issues a public notice, which says it intends to pass a resolution to stop train whistling at a railway crossing.
Municipality and railway company agree the crossing meets all requirements
  ▪ Railway Maintenance and Crossing Agreement is initiated
Municipality passes a resolution
  ▪ Municipality passes a resolution agreeing to the implementation of Whistle Cessation
Railway company confirms whistling has stopped at the crossings (30 days following Council resolution.

Throughout the design assignment the City and consultant has been in discussions with the CN Rail regarding their requirements for design and construction as well as the potential for whistle cessation.

A preliminary safety assessment was completed by the design consultant for the CN Rail line at-grade crossing with Black Bridge Road to determine the feasibility of implementing whistle cessation at this crossing.

The initial review has identified that an active warning system (flashing lights and bells) would need to be installed in order to eliminate the need for routine train whistling at this crossing.

Next Steps:

- Issue public notice of City’s intent to stop train whistling at the CN Rail line at-grade crossing with Black Bridge Road
- Finalize detailed design and prepare the tender documents for construction
- Council resolution for whistle cessation and execute agreement with CN Rail
- Complete utility relocations
- Issue multi-year tender for Black Bridge Road and Bridge construction year 1 and Townline Road construction year 2.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

The study of alternatives and selection of the preferred alternative for the improvements to Black Bridge Road and Townline Road was carried out in accordance with the Municipal Class EA process and the Environmental Assessment Act. The implementation of the preferred alternative follows the recommendations and commitments from the Class EA Study and the conditions for implementation as outlined in the Ministers decision letter from October 2017.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

- A budget of $1,470,000 has been approved for the design of the project in capital account A/00091-30. $1,062,000 has been expended, leaving $408,000 to complete the detailed design and prepare the tender documents.
• Additional design costs in the amount of $60,000 are required for additional design tasks by the consultant including species at risk assessments (butternut tree health), heritage review, property acquisition support, and hydraulic modelling analysis that were not included in the original design terms of reference. These additional design tasks will be funded by $40,000 from Development Charges Roadways and $20,000 from Capital Works Reserve Fund.

• Additional design costs in the amount of $30,000 would be needed to pursue the design of the at-grade crossing improvements required for whistle cessation. This additional design would be funded by $20,000 Development Charges Roadways and $10,000 from Capital Works Reserve Fund.

• The estimated additional cost to implement the at-grade crossing improvements for whistle cessation on Black Bridge Road is $570,000. This additional construction cost would be funded by $380,000 from Development Charges - Roadways and $190,000 from Capital Works Reserve Fund and would be added to Black Bridge Road and Bridge construction capital project A/00492-40 as part of the 2023-2032 Capital Budget forecast, should Council direction be provided to pursue whistle cessation at this location.

• The updated cost estimate, including whistle cessation, for the Black Bridge Road and Bridge construction (A/00492-40 and A/01068-41) and for the Townline Road construction (A/00720-40) is $18,400,000 and $11,200,000 respectively. The cost estimates have increased from previous year budget forecasts due to substantial inflationary conditions, which have also been factored into future year cost estimation and escalation. The 2022-2031 Capital Budget forecast had project estimates of $11,580,000 and $6,370,000 for these projects respectively. The updated values will be included as part of the 2023-2032 Capital Budget forecast for consideration, which include the City’s inflationary projections as part of these costs.

PUBLIC VALUE:

Sustainability:

This project supports sustainability by providing new active transportation infrastructure within this area of the City. The design and construction of this project also aims to minimize impacts to existing wetlands with suitable compensation for unavoidable impacts through the creation of a new wetland area on the east side of the Speed River.
Engagement:

Throughout this project, public involvement has been a high priority with comments and feedback received influencing the overall shape of the project’s design. During the Class Environmental Assessment several Public Information Centres (PIC) and Workshops were held and the information received at these engagements had a direct impact on the preferred alternative that was selected. During the preliminary design phase another PIC was held and meetings took place with key stakeholders. The comments received from these engagements were used in preparing the preliminary design. The latest virtual PIC has helped to confirm aspects of the detailed design and inform where some revisions are needed.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:

Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC):

The Black Bridge Road Strategic Conservation Plan (SCP) for the heritage bridge was presented to the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) on April 21, 2022. MHAC accepted the SCP as prepared by Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions, dated December 15, 2021.

PUBLIC INPUT:

Public Information Centre

Through the use of information boards, drawings, and renderings a virtual Public Information Centre (PIC) presented the key components of the design to the public and stakeholders using the engageCambridge platform from May 9 to May 23, 2022. A total of 329 visits and 15 visitors provided comments or questions. Some of the key comments received include:

- Looking forward to the trail system that will be part of the project
- Concerns about traffic volumes and speeds and support for the traffic calming measures that are being proposed
- Request to review if tunnels/culverts can be installed for turtle crossings
- Good to see that the design has considered previous public input and is sensitive to the Culture Heritage Landscape
- Support for the canoe/kayak launching area
- Concerns about impacts to private property
INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:
Consultation with internal divisions, external agencies, and utilities has continued during the detailed design process.

Internal:

- Policy Planning (Environmental and Heritage) was consulted on the environmental and heritage aspects of the project.
- Parks Operations were consulted regarding the canoe launch and parking areas.
- Realty Services has been involved throughout the design for property acquisitions and related items.

Agencies:

- Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) was consulted and provided input in regards to their permitting process and flood elevation impacts.
- Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry (MNDMNRF) was consulted and provided input into the Public Lands Act requirements and Work Permit.
- Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) was consulted in regards to the Endangered Species Act and Permit to Take Water, if required.
- Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) consulting regarding the Fisheries Act Authorization.
- Consultation with the Township of Puslinch has continued regarding the transfer of Townline Road to the City.

Utilities

- Meetings with the utilities are ongoing regarding their relocation designs. These utilities include Energy+ Inc (now Grandbridge), Bell Canada, Rogers Communications, Enbridge (Union Gas), and Hydro One.
- Consultation with CN Rail are ongoing regarding their requirements for design and construction as well as discussions regarding potential improvements for whistle cessation of the at-grade crossing with Black Bridge Road.
CONCLUSION:
The design for the new Black Bridge Road bridge structure and the proposed improvements to both Black Bridge Road and Townline Road is advancing to the 90% design milestone. Whistle cessation at the CN Rail line at-grade crossing with Blackbridge Road requires additional improvements to the crossing. Staff are seeking Council direction to begin the process of notifying the public of the City’s intention to seek whistle cessation at this crossing.

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

APPROVALS:
This report has gone through the appropriate workflow and has been reviewed and or approved by the following as required:
Director
Deputy City Manager
Chief Financial Officer
City Solicitor
City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:
1. 22-084-CD Appendix A – Renderings and Roll Plans
2. 22-084-CD Appendix B – PIC Comments and Responses
To: COUNCIL  
Meeting Date: 4/23/2024  
Subject: 24-052-CD City Owned Sites – Affordable Housing Concepts  
Submitted By: Lisa Prime, Chief Planner  
Prepared By: J. Matthew Blevins, Senior Planner Reurbanization  
Report No.: 24-052-CD  
File No.: D04.01.01  
Wards Affected: Ward 2  
Ward 3  
Ward 4  
Ward 5  
Ward 6  
Ward 8

RECOMMENDATIONS:
THAT Report 24-052-CD City Owned Sites – Affordable Housing Concepts be received;  
AND THAT Council direct staff to not advance any further work on the 0 Dando Avenue site due to the land acquisition requirements needed for a feasible development option;  
AND THAT Council direct staff to not advance any further work on the 0 Bishop Street site due to the lack of developable land on the property;  
AND THAT Council direct staff to initiate Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications for 10 Ethel Street for an increase in maximum permitted density from 40 Units Per Hectare (UPH) to 76 UPH and a reduction in parking to facilitate up to 14 stacked townhouse units to advance the Moderate Density Development Concept;  
AND THAT Council direct staff to initiate Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications for 1580 Queenston Road for an increase in maximum permitted density from 40 Units Per Hectare (UPH) to 89 UPH and a reduction in parking to facilitate a three storey apartment building with up to 24 units to advance the Walk-up Apartments Development Concept;  
AND THAT Council direct staff to initiate Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications for 25 Chalmers Street S to redesignate the property to High Density Development
Residential with a permitted maximum density of 315 Units Per Hectare and a reduction in parking to facilitate three apartment buildings with a total of up to 360 units to advance the Mid-Rise Apartment with future phase and municipal facility Development Concept;

AND FURTHER THAT Council direct staff to initiate Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications for 0 Grandridge Drive to redesignate the property to High Density Residential with a permitted maximum density of 116 Units Per Hectare (UPH) and a reduction in parking to facilitate a four storey apartment building with a maximum of 50 units.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to report back to Council to address the direction received regarding Report 21-018(CD) and for direction to initiate Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments on four of the six identified properties.

Key Findings

- Staff recommend initiating Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications for the preferred development concepts for four of the six sites
- Staff recommend no further action for 0 Dando Ave. and 0 Bishop St.

Financial Implications

There are no immediate financial implications to the City arising from this report. Any financial impacts associated with future steps in the proposed process will be set out in future staff report(s). This project work will include support from the Housing Accelerator Funding (HAF) received by the City.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☒ Strategic Action

Objective(s): PLANNING FOR GROWTH - Provide for a mix of development, uses and amenities in order to meet the needs of a changing and diverse population

Strategic Action: Increase housing options

OR
BACKGROUND:
At its meeting of August 25, 2020, after receiving report 20-197(CD) – Alternative Housing Proposal for Churchill Park, Council directed staff to review other opportunities for City owned land to be used for affordable housing projects.

Accordingly, staff brought forward report 21-018(CD) in April of 2021 with a short list of City owned properties that could potentially accommodate affordable developments. Council passed a resolution related to this report (See Appendix A) that “Option #3, as outlined in Report 21-018(CD) be included in the 2022 Planning Services Workplan.”

Option 3 from Report 21-018(CD) “Public Consultation with Guidelines” recommends that staff prepare potential renderings for public consultation and then report back to Council with a consultation strategy.

Staff recommend that Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments be initiated to advance public consultation on a preferred development concept for four of the six sites. Staff have recommended parameters based on the visualizations prepared by our consultant.

This future work supports housing project commitments as outlined in the agreement with CMHC as part of the City for Housing Accelerator Funding (HAF).

Location
Four properties were short listed by Council for consideration for affordable rental housing: 10 Ethel Street, 1580 Queenston Road, 0 Dando Avenue and the former St. Ambrose School site at 25 Chalmers Street S.

In addition to shortlisting the above properties, Council endorsed the property at 0 Grand Ridge Drive to submit to the Region for consideration under the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) Rapid Housing Initiative (RHI). CMHC did not select the property for the RHI and as a result, Council has requested that it be added to the short list of properties considered in this report. Council has also requested the inclusion of the property at 0 Bishop Street North for consideration.

10 Ethel Street
10 Ethel Street is the location of a former regional water tower and is located on the north side of Ethel Street, west of Johnson Avenue and is generally surrounded by single and semi-detached residential dwellings. The property is approximately 0.18 hectares (0.4 acres) in size with frontage on Ethel Street and Harvey Lane.

The property is outlined in red in Figure 1.

![Figure 1: Location Map – 10 Ethel Street](image)

**1580 Queenston Road**

1580 Queenston Road is the former Preston Scout House which is a designated heritage structure and is being leased to two community groups for a term of two years. The proposed concepts have been designed as additions to the structure to demonstrate possible options to provide additional density through sympathetic additions to a heritage structure. The property is located on the south side of Queenston Road at the intersection of Queenston Road and Brown Street and is generally surrounded by townhouses, three-storey walk-up apartments with single detached dwellings to the north and east and the Preston Auditorium Complex to the west. The property is approximately 0.3 hectares (0.7 acres) in size with frontage on Queenston Road. Development on the site is unlikely to occur before the term of the leases is complete and the option to retain community space within the development could be pursued through the surplusing and procurement processes.
The property is outlined in red in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Location Map – 1580 Queenston Road

25 Chalmers Street S (St. Ambrose school property)

The former St. Ambrose school property is located on the east side of Chalmers Street South at the intersection of Chalmers St S and Elliott St. The site also contains existing community facilities. The property is generally surrounded by single detached residential with two places of worship to the south and a light industrial property to the southeast. The property is approximately 1.14 hectares (2.8 acres) in size with frontage on Chalmers Street S and Elliot Street.
The property is outlined in red in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Location Map – 25 Chalmers Street S

0 Grand Ridge Drive (Southwest corner of Cedar Street and Grand Ridge Drive)

The subject property is a vacant parcel located at the western boundary of the City at the corner of Cedar Street and Grand Ridge Drive. The property is generally surrounded by single detached residential with Open Space land to the north and east and Southwood Secondary School further to the east. The property is approximately 0.43 hectares (1.07 acres) in size with frontage on Grand Ridge Drive and Cedar Street.

The property is outlined in red in Figure 4.

Figure 4: Location Map – 0 Grand Ridge Drive
**0 Bishop Street**

0 Bishop Street is a vacant parcel located on the south side of Bishop Street with frontage on the east side of Conestoga Boulevard and the north side of Can-Amera Parkway. The property contains a Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) and a Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry identified woodlot. The property also abuts a Hydro One transmission corridor and would need permission from Hydro One, Grandbridge Energy and a Condominium Corporation on Lena Crescent who all have easements over the lands separating the developable portion of 0 Bishop Street and the available access from Conestoga Boulevard. In addition, any proposed development abutting the Hydro One corridor requires an application for review and approval from Hydro One.

Figure 5 below shows the available, developable, portion of the site as the green portion fronting Conestoga Boulevard. The approximately 0.15 hectares (0.37 acres) could potentially accommodate a duplex or triplex. The complete map is attached as Appendix D.

![Figure 5: Location Map – 0 Bishop Street North with potential developable area in green.](image)

**0 Dando Avenue**
0 Dando Avenue is a vacant parcel located on the north side of Dando Avenue and most of the property falls within the floodplain of the Grand River. The property is generally surrounded by single detached residential to the north, the Grand River to the west and Galt Collegiate Institute (GCI) to the south and a sports field for GCI to the east. The property is approximately 0.4 hectares (0.98 acres) in size with frontage on Dando Avenue.

The property is outlined in red in Figure 6.

![Figure 6: Location Map – 0 Dando Avenue](image)

**ANALYSIS:**

The City’s consultant has prepared visualizations that demonstrate potential development concepts for each of the four sites at a low, moderate and high density based on general urban design principles for minimum viable unit sizes and consideration of the minimum parking requirements of the zoning by-law. (Appendix C). The development concepts also take into consideration missing middle building typologies such as stacked townhouse and walk-up apartment buildings.

The addition of gentle density in existing neighbourhoods allows for more residents to age in place as it presents opportunities to downsize without having to move out of their neighbourhood. The proposed infill developments would also work towards fulfilling the recent housing pledge made to the Province.

The concepts do not show detailed designs but general massing to allow Council and the area residents to understand what infill intensification at the three levels could look like. The design concepts were created to form a basis for municipally initiated
amendments on the properties and to facilitate public engagement through the development application process. The intent of the amendments would be to set a maximum building envelope for each property and then declare the properties as surplus to sell through a procurement process to the private sector for the construction of affordable rental housing.

Appendix C provides a site by site analysis of the proposed concepts for four of the six properties. Staff has reviewed the concepts and provided recommendations to Council below for the preferred option for each property.

**10 Ethel Street**

The options range from seven townhouses to 24 walk-up apartment units. Staff recommend the moderate density concept which proposes a four storey building containing 14 stacked townhouse units with one parking space per unit accessed from Harvey Lane. Stacked townhouse units have a density of 76 Units Per Hectare (UPH) which would necessitate an Official Plan Amendment for an increase in maximum permitted density. A reduction in parking would be required from the 18 required spaces to the 14 proposed. This concept would allow for a moderate increase in density through an infill project while maintaining amenity space for the future residents and maximizing the separation distances between the existing dwellings on the two abutting properties and the proposed future units.

**1580 Queenston Road**

1580 Queenston Road contains the former Preston Scout House which is a designated heritage structure. The options provided for this property have been designed using the concept of respectful additions to a heritage structure. The detailed design of the project would be left to the future developer and would be subject to the site plan process so consideration could be given for the style of the addition and determine if it is preferable to have a more traditional addition that blends in with the existing structure or a sympathetic but more modern addition to complement the heritage structure. The overall impacts of the addition would need to be evaluated through a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). More specific direction on the style of the addition can be provided through review of the HIA by staff and the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC).

The three options provided for this site include two designs for 16, four storey stacked townhouse units or a 24 unit, three storey, walk-up apartment building. All three concepts propose parking at a rate of one space per unit and would require an Official Plan Amendment for an increase in density and Zoning By-law Amendment for, at minimum, a reduction in parking. Care and consideration will need to be given at the detailed design stage to ensure a development that protects and enhances the heritage
structure. Staff recommend the three storey, 24 unit, apartment building at a density of 89 UPH as it will provide the most affordable units with less visual impact than the four storey designs. Further reductions in required parking would allow for outdoor amenity space but the property is in close proximity to a public park and the Preston Auditorium Complex which provide opportunities for outdoor and indoor recreation.

**25 Chalmers Street S (former St. Ambrose School)**

The former St. Ambrose school site at 25 Chalmers Street S presents an infill opportunity to provide more density on an underutilized site in an area with a wide range of unit types from single detached dwellings through to apartment buildings with several commercial, institutional, and light industrial buildings in the surrounding area.

The options proposed for this site are broken out to two or three building options with the third building listed as a future phase. The unit count for the future phase currently includes community related facilities within the new building. If the facilities are relocated to a different site, there could potentially be additional units or the inclusion of community space in the third building.

Concepts with Community Facilities Remaining in Existing Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation</th>
<th>Moderate Density</th>
<th>High Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height (in storeys)</td>
<td>5 with step back at 5th floor</td>
<td>7 and 9 with step backs at 5, 7 and 9th floors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit count</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (surface and one underground level)</td>
<td>192 (1.01 space per unit)</td>
<td>320 (1.16 space per unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (Units Per Hectare)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concepts with Community Facilities Included in Third Building (future phase).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation</th>
<th>Moderate Density</th>
<th>High Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height (in storeys)</td>
<td>5 with step back at 5th floor</td>
<td>7 and 9 with step backs at 5, 7 and 9th floors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit count</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (surface and one underground level)</td>
<td>253 (1 space per unit)</td>
<td>410 (1.14 space per unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (Units Per Hectare)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is the opinion of staff that the high density option represents the best opportunity for this site. With appropriate building design, the visual impact on surrounding residents will be similar to the existing school building and it will provide the opportunity for up to an additional 360 affordable rental units. The property is in close proximity to bus routes and commercial areas at the intersection of Main St and Dundas St. S which include, amongst other stores, a pharmacy, grocery stores, a bank and Canadian Tire.

**0 Grand Ridge Drive**

The property at 0 Grand Ridge Drive represents an infill opportunity to provide more density on an underutilized gateway site in close proximity to parks, schools and approximately one kilometer from a commercial plaza that contains a grocery store, pharmacy, and convenience commercial uses. The property also has a GRT bus stop immediately abutting the site.

The options proposed for this site are 16, three storey, townhouses for the low density (37.2 UPH) and a 50 unit, four storey, apartment building (116 UPH). With strong urban design this gateway site can support a higher density development. Further to the east there are several higher density developments including an eight storey apartment building abutting the commercial plaza.

It is the opinion of staff that the high density option represents the best opportunity for this site. With appropriate building design, the visual impact on surrounding residents can be minimalized. The property is in close proximity to bus routes, schools, parks and a commercial area.

**0 Dando Avenue**

0 Dando Avenue was included on the short list of properties but its location in the Grand River floodplain and the overall site topography means that the property on its own is not developable. The consultants provided potential development concepts that involve acquisition of some of the abutting lands owned by the Waterloo District School Board. Accordingly, staff recommends that no further action be taken on 0 Dando Avenue and...
that the provision of this report satisfy the prior Council direction from Report 21-018(CD).

0 Bishop Street North

0 Bishop Street North was included on the short list of properties but the Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) and MNRF Woodlot and their associated buffers mean that the majority of the property is not developable. The additional constraint of a Hydro One transmission corridor and three easements over the road allowance that abuts the only developable portion of the property represents additional cost and process to access the lands. Conceptually, with a 0 m front yard setback, a lot could be created for a duplex or triplex with frontage on Conestoga Boulevard. There could be additional constraints on available parking and there is an increased chance of contamination of the natural features through establishing new development. It remains the opinion of staff that this property should be preserved and that no further action be taken on 0 Bishop Street North.

Planning Process and Future Steps

Report 21-018(CD), in Option 3, set out that public consultation with some parameters needed to be undertaken to assess the potential to facilitate construction of affordable rental housing on the short listed properties. The high level development concepts in Appendix C have been prepared to provide the requested parameters and staff’s recommendations are based on these concepts. Accordingly, staff has requested direction to initiate Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications on four of the six sites based on the recommended development concepts. The public will have an opportunity to provide feedback through the public participation components of the OPA and ZBA application processes.

Staff are recommending the following through this report to Council.

10 Ethel Street:

Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments for an increase in maximum permitted density from 40 Units Per Hectare (UPH) to 76 UPH and a reduction in parking to facilitate up to 14 stacked townhouse units.

1580 Queenston Road:

Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments for an increase in maximum permitted density from 40 UPH to 89 UPH and a reduction in parking to facilitate a three storey walk-up apartment building with up to 24 units.

0 Dando Avenue:
No further action be taken by staff.

25 Chalmers Street S

Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments to redesignate the property to High Density Residential with a permitted maximum density of 315 UPH and a reduction in parking to facilitate three apartment buildings with a total of up to 360 units.

0 Bishop Street N

No further action to be taken by staff.

0 Grand Ridge Drive

Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments to redesignate the property to High Density Residential with a permitted maximum density of 116 UPH and a reduction in parking to facilitate a four storey apartment building with up to 50 units.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S)

City of Cambridge Official Plan, 2012, as amended

Five of the six properties are designated "Low/Medium Density Residential" in the City of Cambridge Official Plan which permits a range of residential dwelling types from single detached residential to walk-up style apartment buildings to a maximum density of 40 Units Per Hectare (UPH). A portion of 0 Dando Avenue and all of 0 Bishop Street North are designated as Natural Open Space which does not permit residential development.

Policy 2.6.1 provides guidance for intensification and infill development within the built-up area. In particular, 2.6.1.6 b) indicates that intensification within the built-up area will be planned and designed to provide for a range and mix of housing that takes into account affordable housing needs. Additionally, 2.6.1.6 indicates that infill development will be planned and designed to support the cultural heritage of the area (2.6.1.6 e) and generally achieve higher densities than surrounding areas (2.6.1.6 f).

City of Cambridge Zoning By-law 150-85, as amended

10 Ethel and 0 Dando are zoned R4 (Single Residential), 1580 Queenston is zoned N1 (Institutional) and 25 Chalmers is zoned N1R4 (Institutional) (Single Detached Residential). 0 Grand Ridge Drive is zoned R5 (Single Residential) and a portion with residual OS1 (Open Space). 0 Bishop Street is zoned OS1 (Open Space) and M3(Heavy Industrial). The R4 and R5 zoning permits single detached residential (with up to two Additional Residential Units (ARUs) to a total of three units per property and the N1 zoning permits a range of institutional uses including publicly funded schools,
public hospitals and a municipal home for the aged or municipal rest home. Neither OS1 nor M3 zoning permits stand alone residential uses.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

There are no immediate financial implications to the City arising from this report. Any financial impacts associated with future steps in the proposed process will be set out in future staff report(s). This project work will include support from the Housing Accelerator Funding (HAF) received by the City.

If Council directs staff to initiate Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications on the four properties, the applications will need to be added to the Planning Services workplan to account for the staff resources needed to process the applications. There is no incremental change anticipated at this time to the existing staff complement or approved budgeted cost.

**PUBLIC VALUE:**

The purpose of this report is to fulfill Council direction to staff provided in Report 21-018(CD) and to propose a strategy to engage the public to facilitate construction of affordable rental property on vacant or underutilised lands currently owned by the City.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:**

Not Applicable

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

This report is not part of a public process. It recommends municipally initiated planning applications for City owned lands which include public notice and participation for four of the six properties. Staff recommend no further action on 0 Dando Avenue and 0 Bishop Street N.

**INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:**

The proposed development concepts have not been circulated or released to the public prior to their inclusion in this report. Staff have recommended municipally initiated planning applications. Planning applications include a public consultation process and the applications will be circulated for comment to internal departments and external agencies.

**CONCLUSION:**
Staff recommend that the proposed densities, outlined above, be supported by Council and that staff be directed to initiate Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment applications for 10 Ethel Street, 1580 Queenston Road, 25 Chalmers Street S, and 0 Grand Ridge Drive and to take no further action with regards to 0 Dando Avenue and 0 Bishop Street N.

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. 24-052-CD Appendix A – Excerpt from Council Minutes – April 27, 2021
2. 24-052-CD Appendix B – Report 21-018(CD) Affordable Rental Housing – City Owned Land
3. 24-052-CD Appendix C – City Surplus Sites Visualizations
4. 24-052-CD Appendix D – Map of 0 Bishop Street N showing development constraints
AND THAT Cambridge Council approves the Zoning By-law Amendment to change the site specific zoning on the property from C1RM1 4.1.178 to (H)C1RM1 4.1.395 to permit the intensification of the site with additional height and density, and reduction in parking and amenity area with a Holding provision in place until the agreement for parking and transportation demand measures is registered on title;

AND THAT Cambridge Council authorize the Chief Planner to execute an agreement with the owner for cash in lieu of parking for 19 parking spaces, and Transportation Demand Measures to be implemented, subject to the satisfaction of the City Solicitor;

AND THAT the By-law attached to Recommendation Report 21-028(CD) be passed;

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

Opposed (8): Councillor Reid, Councillor Devine, Councillor Mann, Councillor Liggett, Councillor Wolf, Councillor Adshade, Councillor Hamilton, and Councillor Ermeta

Absent (1): Mayor McGarry

Defeated (0 to 8)

10.3.3 21-018(CD) Affordable Rental Housing – City-Owned Land

Motion: 21-125
Moved by Councillor Wolf
Seconded by Councillor Adshade

THAT Report 21-018(CD): Affordable Rental Housing – City-Owned Land be received;

AND THAT Report 21-018(CD) satisfies the Council direction from August 2020 regarding Report 20-197 (CD) and no further action is required at this time pending further information from the Region
and Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation about whether future funding will be available for an affordable housing development in Cambridge;

AND FURTHER THAT AND FURTHER THAT Option #3, as outlined in report 21-018(CD) be included in the 2022 Planning Services Workplan.

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

Absent (1): Mayor McGarry

Carried (8 to 0)

10.3.4 21-068(CD) Affordable Housing: City of Cambridge and the Region of Waterloo Working Together

Motion: 21-126
Moved by Councillor Adshade
Seconded by Councillor Wolf

THAT Report 21-068(CD): Affordable Housing: City of Cambridge and the Region of Waterloo Working Together – be received as information.

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

Absent (1): Mayor McGarry

Carried (8 to 0)

10.3.5 21-026(CD) Holding Removal – 2420 & 2780 Townline Road – Mataj Architects Inc. (c/o Eva Mataj)

Motion: 21-127
Moved by Councillor Ermeta
Seconded by Councillor Devine

THAT report 21-026(CD) – Holding Removal – 2420 & 2780 Townline Road – Mataj Architects Inc. (c/o Eva Mataj) be received;
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Meeting Date:       04/27/21
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Submitted By:       Elaine Brunn Shaw, Chief Planner, MCIP, RPP
Prepared By:        Elaine Brunn Shaw, Chief Planner and Hardy Bromberg, Deputy City Manager
Report No.:         21-018(CD)
File No.:           D04.01.01

Recommendations

THAT Report 21-018(CD): Affordable Rental Housing – City-Owned Land be received;

AND THAT Report 21-018(CD) satisfies the Council direction from August 2020 regarding Report 20-197 (CD) and no further action is required at this time pending further information from the Region and Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation about whether future funding will be available for an affordable housing development in Cambridge.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- This report is provided as follow-up to Report 20-197(CD) from August 25, 2020 – Alternative Housing Proposal at Churchill Park in which Council directed staff to review other opportunities for City-owned land to be made available for an affordable housing project.

- Subsequent to this direction, Council directed staff after its Closed Council meeting on November 18, 2020, to offer a vacant City-owned property at the corner of Cedar Creek Road and Grand Ridge Drive as part of the Rapid Housing Initiative to support the creation of affordable housing and in accordance with the City’s disposition of land by-law 74-95.

- The Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) has recently advised that the Cedar Creek Road and Grand Ridge Drive site has not been selected
for an affordable housing project as part of the Rapid Housing Initiative at this time.

- CMHC has advised that they will be seeking additional funding for affordable housing and will keep the Region’s applications on file pending a decision on additional funding for the initiative.

- The purpose of this report is to seek direction from Council as to whether further work from City staff is required.

**Key Findings**

- Staff has provided an additional short list of City-owned sites for potential consideration and future public consultation. With this list of properties, Council can:
  
  - Direct staff to carry out this public consultation without detailed information about potential site development details;
  - Provide parameters on the sites such as the maximum density and height, which would enable City staff to have potential renderings prepared for public consultation; or
  - Direct staff to carry out further discussions with the Region about potential site development opportunities to have better information to share with the public.

To date there has not been any further public consultation about any of the City-owned properties included in this report.

**Financial Implications**

- The financial implications of providing future affordable rental housing on City-owned sites can be better assessed once more information is available about the potential number and type of units for additional sites, if any.

- One next step option in this report includes Council putting parameters on the City-owned sites such as the maximum density and height, which would enable City staff to have potential renderings prepared for public consultation. Renderings could cost approximately $4,000 per site to provide images from different vantage points. It is proposed that if Council wants to proceed with this work, this project be funded from the operating budget if the overall cost of the renderings is less than $50,000.

- Although the City has an Affordable Housing Reserve Fund, the implementation policy for the fund specifies that it cannot be used for studies:
4. Ineligible Costs

Funding from the Reserve Fund will not be used for any costs associated with the operation, maintenance or repairs of existing or new proposed affordable rental units. Funding will not be used to finance any studies or consultant’s fees.

Background

On August 25, 2020 Council considered the merits of using a portion of Churchill Park for an affordable housing project by considering Report 20-197(CD) Alternative Housing Proposal at Churchill Park – Citizens for Cambridge, and passed the following resolution:

    THAT Council authorizes staff to complete community consultation and provide a feasibility report on other city owned locations except for parkland, which support the Region’s mission to provide affordable housing for our community.

Subsequent to this direction, Council further directed staff to submit for consideration under the Rapid Housing Initiative the vacant City-owned property at the corner of Cedar Creek Road and Grand Ridge Drive, to support the creation of affordable housing.

Aerial photo of City-owned land at Cedar Creek Road and Grand Ridge Dr

The purpose of this report is to seek direction from Council as to whether further work from City staff is required on additional city-owned lands for use as an affordable housing project. If so, it is suggested that determination on potential maximum density and height options and visualizations/renderings be prepared for future public consultation in 2021 to help provide context for the public. This timing would impact the Planning Services work plan and processing development applications since this is not a current work plan item.
Rapid Housing Initiative

The Region of Waterloo has been allocated almost $8.2 million as part of the $1B Rapid Housing Initiative under the National Housing Strategy announced in the Fall of 2020. City staff has worked with Regional staff discussing how the City could support any Regional submissions as part of the funding opportunity. On November 18, 2020, City Council endorsed providing two vacant City-owned parcels (a lot at Cedar Creek and Grand Ridge, and the other at 2 Manhattan Circle) for affordable housing (modular units) subject to entering into a 49 year lease agreement with the Region. Public consultation about this affordable housing opportunity did not occur due to the short timeline for the Region to submit a proposal to Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) for this initiative by November 27, 2020.

Following further review, City staff became aware that 2 Manhattan Circle is landlocked and is not available for residential development. This information has been shared with the Region.

The Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) has recently advised that the Cedar Creek Road and Grand Ridge Drive site has not been selected for an affordable housing project as part of the Rapid Housing Initiative at this time. CMHC has advised that they will be seeking additional funding for affordable housing and will keep the Region’s applications on file pending a decision on additional funding for the initiative. Unless Council chooses to advise the Region that this site should no longer be considered, the site can remain in the list of potential sites being considered by the Region and CMHC if additional funding is found.

Strategic Alignment

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

Goal #1 - Community Wellbeing

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

Council has recently endorsed providing land for a long-term lease to the Region for an affordable housing project as part of the Rapid Housing Initiative which aligns with the Strategic Plan objective of participating in the development of affordable, welcoming and vibrant neighbourhoods.
Comments

If Council decides to proceed with public consultation on additional City-owned lands for affordable housing, it is recommended based on need that Cambridge focus on affordable rental housing for this initiative, with the Region taking the lead. If Council wants to include other forms of housing on the housing continuum (e.g. emergency shelters, transitional housing, and/or social housing) for this initiative, assistance will be needed from Regional staff on the approach to public consultation since they are the subject matter experts.

Site Evaluation Criteria

The Region of Waterloo uses the following criteria for site selection they use for affordable housing projects that would need to be applied to consideration of any sites for affordable housing, and is the basis for our feasibility of these sites:

1) **Area**: The sites the Region identified as having the highest potential range from 0.43 acres to 2.7 acres.

2) **Location**: Proximity to transit routes and amenities such as parks, stores, and schools.

3) **Timing and Yield**: Zoning and density. It is noted that the City’s Official Plan and Zoning By-law permit a use by the Region of Waterloo and/or City of Cambridge in any designation or zone, with a few exceptions for environmental lands.

4) **Use**: Compatibility to surrounding uses.

**Attachment 1** includes a summary of all the lands (excluding the properties with Open Space, park and City-owned facilities) assessed relative to the above criteria.

Excluded City Lands

In addition to the criteria above, as follow up to Council’s August 2020 direction after consideration of Report 20-197(CD) Alternative Housing Proposal at Churchill Park – Citizens for Cambridge; Council excluded City-owned parks. It is proposed that city-owned properties with facilities and parking lots should also be excluded from consideration for affordable housing projects.

Short List of Potential City-owned Lands for Future Affordable Housing

**Attachment 2** includes a short list of potentially suitable City-owned properties along with maps of the sites and a brief summary of how they meet the criteria above.
Attachment 3 includes the remaining list of unsuitable City-owned properties along with maps of the sites and a brief summary of whether they meet the criteria above and any potential issues.

Options

1) No further Action from Staff:

No further action be taken at this time as Council has met the objective of offering City-owned land for affordable housing other than Churchill Park and other similar park space; namely Cedar Creek/Grand Ridge Dr. as part of the Rapid Housing Initiative. Unless Council choses to advise the Region that this site should no longer be considered, the site can remain in the list of potential sites being considered by the Region and CMHC if additional funding is found.

2) Public Consultation without Guidelines as to What Could be Built:

Council has the option of City staff proceeding with public consultation without detailed information about potential maximum density and height options. It is anticipated that that approach would not be well received by the public and lead to numerous questions.

Additional meetings or engagement may be needed after more specific details about development potential is determined.

The benefit to not having parameters would be that public consultation could get underway in a shorter timeframe. The current Planning Services work plan does not include this project for public consultation.

3) Public Consultation with Guidelines:

If any upcoming public consultation is going to take place about the opportunity for affordable housing on additional City-owned sites, it is beneficial for the public to have clear, understandable information about the potential number and type of units for each site that would be considered. Currently, details about the potential number of and type of units has not yet been determined.

Council direction on parameters on the sites such as the maximum density and height would enable City staff to have potential renderings prepared for public consultation. Compatibility of a potential development with surrounding existing uses would need to be considered. More information is needed in consultation with Regional staff to undertake further work on potential maximum density and height options and visualizations/renderings prepared for future public consultation.

City staff would provide a subsequent report to Council about the results of those discussions and recommend a public consultation strategy.
The current Planning Services work plan does not include further work advancing City-owned land for affordable housing. Public consultation, coordinating, preparing presentation materials and holding public consultation meetings in 2021 would impact the processing of planning applications.

Council direction on parameters on the sites such as the maximum density and height would enable City staff to have potential renderings prepared for public consultation.

Feasibility of Providing Affordable Housing

Based upon direction from City Council in August 2020, which was to also consider a feasibility report on City-owned land for affordable housing, staff would focus only on affordable rental housing, not transitional or emergency housing.

Staff would recommend using the site evaluation criteria that the Region has provided as the basis for determining the feasibility of each city owned property.

Existing Policy/By-Law

Official Plan

The City’s Official Plan includes the following policies regarding Affordable Housing:

8.4.1 Affordable Housing

1. The City recognizes the importance of affordable housing and will encourage the development of affordable housing and provide opportunities for the development of affordable housing through:

   a) permitting mixed-use development in the Urban Growth Centre, Community Core Areas, Nodes, Regeneration Areas, Reurbanization Corridors and Major Transit Station Areas; Chapter 8 Land Use Policies and Designations 108 September 2018 Consolidation

   b) promoting the inclusion of a residential component in commercial development; and

   c) encouraging the development of community housing and affordable private sector housing that is aimed at meeting the needs of lower income residents.

2. Where a development application proposing residential uses is submitted for a site containing two hectares or more of developable land, the City will require, wherever appropriate, a minimum of 30% of new residential units to be planned in forms other than single-detached and semi-detached units, such as town homes and multi-unit residential buildings.
3. New residential development will include a minimum number of affordable housing units based on the targets established in the Region’s Community Action Plan for Housing.

In addition, through the uses permitted in all designations and all zones in the City’s Official Plan and Zoning By-law, a use by the Region of Waterloo and/or City of Cambridge is permitted in any designation or zone, with a few exceptions for environmental lands.

**Real Property By-Law 74-95**

In accordance with the Municipal Act, Section 4(c)(iv) of By-law 74-95 sets out that leases of twenty-one years or longer are to be dealt with under the same processes as a property sale whereby the steps include (1) the subject lands be declared surplus by by-law or resolution, (2) obtain at least one appraisal of the fair market of the land value, and (3) give public notice. Arrangements about the use of any City-owned land for affordable housing would be subject to a future report. The future report will set out any requirements under this legislation, if applicable.

**Additional Policies**

The City has other existing policies and programs relating to affordable housing, including the Affordable Housing Community Improvement Plan and the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund, although they are not specifically or exclusively related to housing on city-owned lands. As of December 31, 2020, the balance in the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund is $17,389.

**Financial Impact**

The financial implications of providing future affordable rental housing on city-owned sites will be able to be better assessed once more information is available about the potential number and type of units.

If the Region were to buy land from the City, that would significantly impact the remaining monies to construct affordable rental housing. Alternatives in this process are for the City to consider donating land and/or entering into a land lease arrangement. Any land lease with the Region beyond 49 years (which includes any renewal options), will trigger Land Transfer Tax for the Fair Market Value of the property. To eliminate this need, and its related costs, a lease of 49 years or less at a nominal rate would be needed.

A lease arrangement would provide the following opportunities:

- The value of the land remains with the City;
• It allows the City to have more control over the type and form of development, any redevelopment and the operation on the site as conditions of the lease agreement; and,

• The increased value of the site over time accrues to the City and in 50+ years redevelopment options may be significant, so the City retains control of future use of the site.

One next step option in this report includes Council putting parameters on the city-owned sites such as the maximum density and height, which would enable City staff to have potential renderings prepared for public consultation. Renderings could cost approximately $4,000 per site to provide images from different vantage points. It is proposed that if Council wants to proceed with this work, this project be funded from the operating budget if the overall cost of the renderings is less than $50,000.

Although the City has an Affordable Housing Reserve Fund, the implementation policy for the fund specifies:

4. Ineligible Costs

Funding from the Reserve Fund will not be used for any costs associated with the operation, maintenance or repairs of existing or new propose affordable rental units. Funding will not be used to finance any studies or consultant’s fees.

Public Input

This report sets out that additional information is needed about the potential number and type of affordable rental units on certain City-owned sites and that information will be shared with Council through a future report before public consultation is carried out.

No public consultation has taken place to date as follow up to the August 2020 report.

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

Internal/External Consultation

The list of City-owned sites and associated information was prepared by Realty Services staff.

Conclusion

As a result of a request to add affordable housing within the city-owned Churchill Park property, Council directed staff to look at other city-owned lands to provide a location for an affordable housing initiative. Since that time, Council deliberated what parcels could be used for the Rapid Housing Initiative. Based on that discussion, two properties were
put forward to the Region, with one being submitted as a candidate for affordable housing.

Staff are of the opinion that this decision satisfies the Council direction from August and no further action is required. Should Council wish to explore additional lands for affordable housing initiatives, further sites are included in this report and shortlisted in the comments section above.
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Attachments

- Assessment of City of Cambridge Properties for Rapid Housing Initiative - excluding the properties with park and City-owned facilities

- Short List of Potentially Suitable City-owned Properties for Low Density Affordable Housing from Table in Attachment 1

- List of Unsuitable City-Owned Properties for Low Density Affordable Housing from Table in Attachment 1
## Attachment 1 – Assessment of City of Cambridge Properties for Rapid Housing Initiative - excluding the properties with park and City-owned facilities

### Affordable Housing - City Owned Lands within City and Region Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property #</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Address or General Location</th>
<th>Main Intersection</th>
<th>Current Usage</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Area SF</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Parks</th>
<th>Stores</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>037740046</td>
<td>Beside 3 Dayton St</td>
<td>Dundas St N / Water St N</td>
<td>Wooded Lot</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>38,192.66</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Trail on parcel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>037740352</td>
<td>Beside 1246 Rose St</td>
<td>Montrose St S / Queenston Rd</td>
<td>Vacant Lot</td>
<td>OS1 R4</td>
<td>33,543.42</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Next to Ontario Wastewater Treatment Facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>037740428</td>
<td>1580 Queenston Rd</td>
<td>Queenston Rd / Bishop St S</td>
<td>Vacant Lot/Building</td>
<td>N1</td>
<td>29,434.97</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Former Preston Scout House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>037820505</td>
<td>753 Queenston Rd</td>
<td>Queenston Rd / Church St S</td>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>C1RM2</td>
<td>31,008.61</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Smaller parking lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>038080158</td>
<td>Laneway behind Norfolk Ave home</td>
<td>Norfok Ave / Samuelson St</td>
<td>Vacant Lot</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>43,935.70</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Probably too narrow parcel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>038150368</td>
<td>Beside City Hall</td>
<td>Dickson St / Ainslie St N</td>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>C1RM1</td>
<td>19,619.20</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Not suitable - parking lot next to City Hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>038160048</td>
<td>Imperial Ln Parking Lot</td>
<td>Water S S / Main St</td>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>C1RM1</td>
<td>52,678.66</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Not suitable - parking lot too small..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>038160798</td>
<td>35 Ainslie</td>
<td>Wellington S / Lutz St</td>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>C1RM1</td>
<td>91,598.36</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Bigger parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>038170021</td>
<td>21 Wellington</td>
<td>Wellington S / Dickson St</td>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>C1RM1</td>
<td>32,726.71</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Part of bigger parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>038170100</td>
<td>17 Beverly</td>
<td>Beverly St / Kerr St</td>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>70,202.62</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Part of bigger parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>038270001</td>
<td>Cedar Creek Rd Lot</td>
<td>Cedar Creek Rd / Grand Ridge Rd</td>
<td>Vacant Lot</td>
<td>OS1 R5</td>
<td>46,594.53</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Vacant Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>038330155</td>
<td>St Andrews Public School</td>
<td>Victoria Ave / Glenmorrins St</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>N1R4</td>
<td>30,518.41</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Vacant lot being used as part of playground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>226350044</td>
<td>former watertower site</td>
<td>Ethel St / Johnston Ave</td>
<td>Vacant Lot</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>19,782.84</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Vacant lot was former water tower site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>226401068</td>
<td>Beside 434 River Rd</td>
<td>River Rd / Townline Rd</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>19,137.21</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Not suitable - currently part of laneway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>038360138</td>
<td>St Ambrose Public School</td>
<td>Elliot St / Elgin St</td>
<td>Vacant Building</td>
<td>N1R4</td>
<td>122,881.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Swimming pool still in use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>037970433</td>
<td>Conestoga Blvd / Can Amera Pkwy</td>
<td>Conestoga Blvd / Can Amera Pkwy</td>
<td>Wooded Lot</td>
<td>OS1 M3</td>
<td>1,922,067.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Portions of land may be developable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>037581115</td>
<td>2 Manhattan Cir</td>
<td>Guelph Ave / Manhattan Cir</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>23,218.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
1) City criteria: City owned lands excluding OS, Parks, Roads, Cemeteries, Lands with Infrastructure.
2) Region criteria: City owned lands between .42 acres and 2.7 acres, and within 1 km of transit, schools, parks, and stores.
3) All properties within the criteria are listed even though some may not be suitable.
**Attachment 2 - Short List of Potentially Suitable City-owned Properties for Low Density Affordable Rental Housing from Table in Attachment 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property #1</th>
<th>Dando Avenue and Water St N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PIN:</strong></td>
<td>037740046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area Size:</strong></td>
<td>.88 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Intersection:</strong></td>
<td>Dundas St N / Water St N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong></td>
<td>Wooded Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Zoning:</strong></td>
<td>R4 – permits single detached houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within 1 km of:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Transit:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Schools:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Stores:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Park:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td>Site may not be suitable as there is a trail on site. Land partially within the floodplain/regulated area of the Grand River Conservation Authority. Ministry of Natural Resources Woodland on part of property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property # 3</th>
<th>1580 Queenston Rd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PIN:</strong></td>
<td>037740428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area Size:</strong></td>
<td>.68 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Intersection:</strong></td>
<td>Queenston Rd. / King St. E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong></td>
<td>Vacant Building and Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Zoning:</strong></td>
<td>N1 - institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within 1 km of:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Transit:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Schools:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Stores:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Park:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td>Former site of Preston Scout House. Building has some heritage impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property #13 Ethel St / Johnston Ave</td>
<td>Property #15 St. Ambrose School Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PIN:</strong> 226350044</td>
<td><strong>PIN:</strong> 038360138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area Size:</strong> .45 acres</td>
<td><strong>Area Size:</strong> 2.82 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Intersection:</strong> Ethel St / Johnston Ave</td>
<td><strong>Main Intersection:</strong> Elliot St / Elgin St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong> Vacant Lot</td>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong> Vacant Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Zoning:</strong> R4 permits single detached houses</td>
<td><strong>Current Zoning:</strong> N1R4 institutional and residential zoning permits single detached houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within 1 km of:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Within 1 km of:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Transit: Yes</td>
<td>a) Transit: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Schools: Yes</td>
<td>b) Schools: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Stores: Yes</td>
<td>c) Stores: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Park: Yes</td>
<td>d) Park: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong> Former water tower site.</td>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong> This site has been included even though the swimming pool is currently in use. As part of the business case for acquiring the property was to demolish the building for future use. As part of a future assessment of this property, consideration could be given to retaining the portion of the building with the pool and demolishing the remainder of the building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Property #16 Conestoga Blvd / Can-Amera Pkwy | PIN: 037940332  
| | Area Size: 44.1 acres  
| | Main Intersection: Conestoga Blvd / Bishop St N  
| | Current Use: Wooded Lot  
| | Current Zoning: OS1 M3 open space and industrial  
| | Within 1 km of:  
| | a) Transit: Yes  
| | b) Schools: Yes  
| | c) Stores: Yes  
| | d) Park: Yes  
| | Comments: A small portion along Can-Amera Pkwy may be developable. Rest of land is Provincially Significant Wetland. |
## Attachment 3 - List of Unsuitable City-Owned Properties for Low Density Affordable Housing from Table in Attachment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property #2</th>
<th>Montrose St. S / Hamilton St.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PIN:</strong> 037740352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area Size:</strong> .77 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Intersection:</strong> Montrose St S / Hamilton St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong> Vacant Lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Zoning:</strong> OS1 / R4 , Open Space and permits single detached houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within 1 km of:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Transit: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Schools: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Stores: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Park: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong> Site is next to Ontario Waste Water Treatment Facility which may not conform with Provincial guidelines for setbacks from Treatment facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property #4</th>
<th>753 Queenston Rd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PIN:</strong> 037820058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area Size:</strong> .71 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Intersection:</strong> Queenston Rd. / Church St S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong> Parking Lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Zoning:</strong> C1RM2 – commercial and multi-residential, permits higher density development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within 1 km of:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Transit: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Schools: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Stores: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Park: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong> Probably not suitable as it cannot support both a parking lot and a development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property #5   Norfolk Laneway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PIN:</strong> 038080158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area Size:</strong> 1 acre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Intersection:</strong> Norfolk Ave. / Samuelson St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong> Open space - laneway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Zoning:</strong> R5 - permits single detached houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within 1 km of:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Transit: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Schools: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Stores: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Park: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong> Not suitable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property #6   Dickson St Parking Lot</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PIN:</strong> 038150368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area Size:</strong> .45 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Intersection:</strong> Dickson St / Ainslie St S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong> Parking Lot beside City Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Zoning:</strong> C1RM1 - commercial and multi-residential, permits higher density development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within 1 km of:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Transit: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Schools: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Stores: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Park: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong> Not suitable as it cannot support both a parking lot and a development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property #7</td>
<td>Imperial Lane Parking Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN: 038160048</td>
<td>Area Size: 1.21 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Intersection: Water St / Main St</td>
<td>Current Use: Imperial Lane Parking Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Zoning: C1RM1 - commercial and multi-residential, permits higher density development</td>
<td>Within 1 km of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Transit: Yes</td>
<td>b) Schools: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Stores: Yes</td>
<td>d) Park: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: Not suitable. Parking lot too small to support both parking lot and development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property #8</th>
<th>Ainslie St Parking Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIN: 038160789</td>
<td>Area Size: 2.1 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Intersection: Wellington S / Main St</td>
<td>Current Use: Ainslie St Parking Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Zoning: C1RM1 - commercial and multi-residential, permits higher density development</td>
<td>Within 1 km of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Transit: Yes</td>
<td>b) Schools: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Stores: Yes</td>
<td>d) Park: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: Parking lot can support both parking lot and development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property #9 Wellington St Parking Lot</td>
<td>Property #10 Beverly St Parking Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PIN:</strong> 038170021</td>
<td><strong>PIN:</strong> 038170100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area Size:</strong> .75 acres</td>
<td><strong>Area Size:</strong> 1.6 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Intersection:</strong> Wellington S / Dickson St</td>
<td><strong>Main Intersection:</strong> Wellington S / Beverly St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong> Wellington – Beverly St Parking Lot</td>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong> Wellington - Beverly St Parking Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Zoning:</strong> C1RM1 - commercial and multi-residential, permits higher density development</td>
<td><strong>Current Zoning:</strong> R5 – permits single detached houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within 1 km of:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Within 1 km of:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Transit: Yes</td>
<td>a) Transit: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Schools: Yes</td>
<td>b) Schools: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Stores: Yes</td>
<td>c) Stores: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Park: Yes</td>
<td>d) Park: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong> Parking lot together with Beverly parking lot can support both parking lot and development.</td>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong> Parking lot together with Wellington parking lot can support both parking lot and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property #12  St Andrews Public School Lot</td>
<td>Property #14  River Rd. Laneway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PIN:</strong> 038330155</td>
<td><strong>PIN:</strong> 226410168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area Size:</strong> .7 acres</td>
<td><strong>Area Size:</strong> .44 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Intersection:</strong> Victoria Ave / Glenmorris St</td>
<td><strong>Main Intersection:</strong> River Rd / Townline Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong> Open Space</td>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong> Vacant Lot / Laneway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Zoning:</strong> N1 R4 – institutional and residential zoning permits single detached houses</td>
<td><strong>Current Zoning:</strong> R2 – permits single detached houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within 1 km of:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Within 1 km of:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Transit: Yes</td>
<td>a) Transit: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Schools: Yes</td>
<td>b) Schools: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Stores: Yes</td>
<td>c) Stores: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Park: Yes</td>
<td>d) Park: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong> Probably not suitable. Currently being used as part of playground at St Andrews Public School</td>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong> Not Suitable as it currently being used for a laneway. Potential sale to abutting property owners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SUBJECT SITE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area:</th>
<th>1,837 sq m</th>
<th>(0.45 acres, 0.18 ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone:</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>(permits single detached houses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Vacant Lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OFFICIAL PLAN: Low/Medium Density Residential Designation**

- Lands in a Low/Medium Density Residential designation where a municipal water supply and municipal wastewater systems are currently available may be developed and used for uses such as single detached dwellings, townhouses and/or walk up apartments.
- A maximum of 40 units per gross hectare for the Low/Medium Density Residential designation.

- Higher densities are considered in this study as per the current best practices and parking requirement. The site can comfortably accommodate a higher density.
- Harvey Lane is proposed to be widened to provide a comfortable and safe access.
## DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Low Density Single Detached

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO. OF UNITS</td>
<td>3 SINGLE DETACHED UNITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING HEIGHT</td>
<td>2 STOREYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFA</td>
<td>1,326 m² (14,271 ft²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE UNIT SIZE</td>
<td>442 m² (4,757 ft²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING SPACES</td>
<td>12 (2 spaces within garage and 2 on driveway for each lot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSITY</td>
<td>16.7 UNITS PER HECTARE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development concept is for low-density single detached units.
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Low Density Single Detached
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Low Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF UNITS</th>
<th>7 TOWNHOUSE UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING HEIGHT</td>
<td>3 STOREYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFA</td>
<td>1,948 m² (20,976 ft²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE UNIT SIZE</td>
<td>278 m² (2,996 ft²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING SPACES</td>
<td>7 (1 space per unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSITY</td>
<td>38 UNITS PER HECTARE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Low Density
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Moderate Density

NO. OF UNITS 14 STACKED TOWNHOUSE UNITS

BUILDING HEIGHT 4 STOREYS

GFA 2,598 m² (27,968 ft²)

AVERAGE UNIT SIZE 185 m² (1,998 ft²)

PARKING SPACES 14 (1 space per unit)

DENSITY 76 UNITS PER HECTARE
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - High Density

NO. OF UNITS 24 WALK-UP APARTMENT UNITS
8 UNITS PER FLOOR

BUILDING HEIGHT 3 STOREYS

GFA 1,968 m² (21,183 ft²)

AVERAGE UNIT SIZE 82 m² (882 ft²)

PARKING SPACES 24 (1 space per unit)

DENSITY 130 UNITS PER HECTARE
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - High Density
**SUBJECT SITE**

| Area:      | 2,687 sq m (0.66 acres, 0.27 ha) |
| Zone:      | N1 (Institutional)               |
| Current Use: | Former Preston Scout House  
Designated Heritage Property |

ZBL:
Adjacent sites are zoned RM3.
- Maximum Density for Cluster Development of Multiple Unit Residential Buildings other than Apartment House in RM-Class Zones
  
= 40 DU per ha
- Maximum Density for Apartment Houses Containing Four or More Dwelling Units in RM-Class Zones
  
= 75 DU per ha

OFFICIAL PLAN:

- Higher densities are considered in this study as per the current best practices and parking requirement. The site can comfortably accommodate a higher density.
  

DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Stacked Town Houses (Op-1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF UNITS</th>
<th>16 STACKED TOWNHOUSE UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING HEIGHT</td>
<td>4 STOREYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFA</td>
<td>1,824 m² (19,626 ft²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE UNIT SIZE</td>
<td>114 m² (1,226 ft²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING SPACES</td>
<td>16 (1 space per unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSITY</td>
<td>59 UNITS PER HECTARE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Stacked Town Houses (Op-2)

NO. OF UNITS  
16 STACKED TOWNHOUSE UNITS

BUILDING HEIGHT  
4 STOREYS

GFA  
2,368 m² (25,480 ft²)

AVERAGE UNIT SIZE  
148 m² (1,592 ft²)

PARKING SPACES  
16 (1 space per unit)

DENSITY  
59 UNITS PER HECTARE
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Stacked Town Houses (Op-2)
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Walk-up Apartments

- **NO. OF UNITS**: 24 APARTMENT UNITS
- **BUILDING HEIGHT**: 3 STOREYS
- **GFA**: 2,208 m² (23,758 ft²)
- **AVERAGE UNIT SIZE**: 92 m² (990 ft²)
- **PARKING SPACES**: 24 (1 space per unit)
- **DENSITY**: 89 UNITS PER HECTARE
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Walk-up Apartments
SUBJECT SITE

Official Plan: Low / Medium Density Residential
Zoning By-Law: RM3 (Maisonette / Stacked Townhouse)
Area: 4,329 sq m (1.07 acres / 0.43 ha)
Current Use: Vacant Lot

The Official Plan (OP) describes the designation as:

- Lands in a Low/Medium Density Residential designation where a municipal water supply and municipal wastewater systems are currently available may be developed and used for uses such as single detached dwellings, townhouses and/or walk up apartments.
- A maximum of 40 units per gross hectare for the Low/Medium Density Residential designation.

The concepts, that follow, are generated with the following assumptions:

- Higher densities beyond the OP and ZBL are considered in this demonstration as per current best practices;
- The higher densities only considered where they can comfortably be deployed on the lot and parking requirements could be met; and,
- A secondary emergency access is provided along the western edge of the property and will be accessed from Cedar Street by emergency vehicles (hatched in site plan).
- Driveway / lane width is 6.5m in width and is accessed from Grand Ridge Drive while all paths indicated are 1.5m in width.
- Both Low and High Density concepts assume landscaped edges along Cedar Street and Grand Ridge Drive front yard setbacks and privacy fencing with buffer planting along the south and west property lines.
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Low Density

The Low Density concept is based on providing the number of units permitted by the Official Plan. It envisions two 8-Unit townhouse blocks with 6.0m wide 3-storey units, and integral rear garages accessed from the driveway / lane. The proposed concept fronts onto Cedar Street and flanks Grand Ridge Drive. It includes setbacks to allow for a shared 1.5m walkway in between the blocks and a 1.5m planted buffer and privacy fence along the south and western edges. The 6.0m setbacks to the streets are in compliance with the ZBL requirements except at the corner. This concept also provides for 8 visitor parking spaces and includes a parkette at the southeast corner.

SUMMARY STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF UNITS</th>
<th>16 TOWNHOUSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING HEIGHT</td>
<td>3 STOREYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA COVERAGE</td>
<td>37% (~1600 m²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE UNIT SIZE</td>
<td>210-240m² (~2,300 - 2,580 ft²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING SPACES</td>
<td>32 (2 spaces per unit) + 8 Visitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSITY</td>
<td>37.2 UNITS / HECTARE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Low Density

View from Northeast
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - High Density

The High Density concept is based on a low-rise apartment building typology. The proposed massing addresses the corner, the two flanking streets, as well as the Southwood Pond natural heritage feature. The total number of units and height is based on what can fit on the site comfortably while still providing 1 parking space per unit at-grade plus 1 visitor space for every 4 units). Given the parking constraints, approximately 48 to 50 units can be accommodated in a 4-storey walk-up configuration. This concept relies on internal amenity space(s) in addition to the 48 to 50 residential units. The number of units proposed would require further amendment to the maximum density permitted and require an OPA to permit this higher density use. The front, rear, and side yard setbacks are all in compliance with the ZBL.

SUMMARY STATISTICS

NO. OF UNITS 48 to 50
BUILDING HEIGHT 4 STOREYS
AREA COVERAGE 24% (~1,050 m²)
TOTAL ~3,940 m² (~42,400 ft²)
AVERAGE UNIT SIZE ~ 80 m² (~860 ft²) + indoor amenity
PARKING SPACES 64 (1 per unit + 14-16 visitor spaces)
DENSITY 112 - 116 UNITS PER HECTARE
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - High Density

View from Southwest
**SUBJECT SITE**

Area: 11,402 sq m (2.81 acres, 1.14 ha)
Zone: N1R4
Current Use: John Dolson Centre (swimming pool)
Former St. Ambrose Catholic School

**OFFICIAL PLAN DESIGNATION:**
Low/medium density residential

**Zoning By-law:**
Adjacent sites are zoned R4.

Zone provisions for the N1 zone and R4 zone are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N1</th>
<th>R4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitted residential uses</td>
<td>municipal home for the aged or a municipal rest home within the meaning of the Homes for Aged and Rest Homes Act</td>
<td>Single detached dwelling; residential care facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. front yard</td>
<td>6.0 m</td>
<td>6.0 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. interior side yard</td>
<td>3.0 m</td>
<td>1.2 m*note section 3.1.1.5 of Cambridge ZBL as it pertains to reduced side yard subject to windowless building wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. exterior side yard</td>
<td>6.0 m</td>
<td>6.0 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. rear yard</td>
<td>7.5 m *abutting any R or RS zone</td>
<td>7.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. gross floor area</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. lot coverage</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. landscaped open space</td>
<td>30% *see section 2.4 for landscaping requirements</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Higher densities are considered in this study as per the current best practices and parking requirement. The site can comfortably accommodate a higher density.
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Moderate Density Apartments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO. OF UNITS</td>
<td>190 UNITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING HEIGHT</td>
<td>5 STOREYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFA</td>
<td>16,390 m² (176,422 ft²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE UNIT SIZE</td>
<td>85.94 m² (925 ft²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING SPACES</td>
<td>192 (1.01 space per unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One level underground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSITY</td>
<td>166 UNITS PER HECTARE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Moderate Density Apartments
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Moderate Density Apartments
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Moderate Density Apartments (FUTURE PHASE)

- **NO. OF UNITS**: 253 UNITS
- **BUILDING HEIGHT**: 5 STOREYS
- **GFA**: 21,780 m² (234,437 ft²)
- **AVERAGE UNIT SIZE**: 85.94 m² (925 ft²)
- **PARKING SPACES**: 253 (1 space per unit)
  One level underground
- **DENSITY**: 220 UNITS PER HECTARE

Note:
- The existing public swimming pool will be accommodated in the ground level of the future phase.
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Moderate Density Apartments (FUTURE PHASE)
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Moderate Density Apartments (FUTURE PHASE)
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - High Density Apartments

NO. OF UNITS 276 UNITS

BUILDING HEIGHT 9 STOREYS & 7 STOREYS

GFA 23,760 m² (255,750 ft²)

AVERAGE UNIT SIZE 85.94 m² (925 ft²)

PARKING SPACES 320 (1.16 space per unit)
Two levels underground

DENSITY 242 UNITS PER HECTARE

Note:
• The proposed building adjacent to residences to the east will have a stepped form for a better visual transition.
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - High Density Apartments
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - High Density Apartments
### DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - High Density Apartments (FUTURE PHASE)

| NO. OF UNITS | 360 UNITS |
| BUILDING HEIGHT | 9 STOREYS & 7 STOREYS |
| GFA | 30,870 m² (332,282 ft²) |
| AVERAGE UNIT SIZE | 85.94 m² (925 ft²) |
| PARKING SPACES | 410 (1.14 space per unit)  
Two levels underground |
| DENSITY | 315 UNITS PER HECTARE |

Note:
- The existing public swimming pool will be accommodated in the ground level of the future phase.
- The proposed buildings adjacent to residences to the east will have a stepped form for a better visual transition.
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - High Density Apartments (FUTURE PHASE)
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - High Density Apartments (FUTURE PHASE)
OFFICIAL PLAN: Low/Medium Density Residential Designation

- Lands in a Low/Medium Density Residential designation where a municipal water supply and municipal wastewater systems are currently available may be developed and used for uses such as single detached dwellings, townhouses and/or walk up apartments.
- A maximum of 40 units per gross hectare for the Low/Medium Density Residential designation.

- Land assembly will be required in order to develop this site because of the 15m buffer space requirement from the flood plain line.
- Higher densities are considered in this study as per the current best practices and parking requirement. The site can comfortably accommodate a higher density.
**DEVELOPABLE LAND** (with land assembly)

- **SITE BOUNDARY = 3,562 sq m**
- **FLOOD PLAIN LINE**
- **15m OFFSET FROM FLOOD PLAIN**
- **DEVELOPABLE AREA = 576 sq m**
- **LAND ASSEMBLY = 2,992 sq m**
- **TOTAL DEVELOPABLE AREA (WITH LAND ASSEMBLY) = 576+2,992 = 3,568 sq m**
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Stacked Town Houses

NO. OF UNITS 24 STACKED TOWNHOUSE UNITS

BUILDING HEIGHT 4 STOREYS

GFA 4,608 m² (49,600 ft²)

AVERAGE UNIT SIZE 192 m² (2,066 ft²)

PARKING SPACES 24 (1 space per unit)

DENSITY 67 UNITS PER HECTARE
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Stacked Town Houses
## DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Walk-up Apartments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO. OF UNITS</td>
<td>48 APARTMENT UNITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING HEIGHT</td>
<td>4 STOREYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFA</td>
<td>3,648 m² (39,267 ft²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE UNIT SIZE</td>
<td>82 m² (882 ft²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING SPACES</td>
<td>50 (1.04 space per unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSITY</td>
<td>135 UNITS PER HECTARE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![map of Dando Avenue Property]
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT - Walk-up Apartments
Wards Affected: Ward 4

RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 24-028-CD Mill Race Park Pedestrian Bridge Replacement and Decommissioning be received;

AND FURTHER THAT Council approves Option 3, to rebuild bridge 3, and permanently close and decommission bridge 2

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

Two pedestrian bridges located in Mill Race Park (see Appendix A) were closed in 2022 due to structural concerns identified as part of regular inspections. Staff are seeking Council direction prior to moving ahead to detailed design of the preferred option.

Key Findings

Four options were identified for consideration:

- Option 1 is to permanently close and remove both bridges;
- Option 2 is to rebuild both bridges;
- Option 3 is to rebuild bridge 3, and permanently close and remove bridge 2; and
- Option 4 is to maintain the existing bridge closures and defer permanent replacement/decommissioning decisions until a future park revitalization project takes place.
Mill Race Park is an important recreational destination, bringing together the City’s past and present. As such, public engagement and advisory committee consultation has been undertaken to help support Council in making this decision. Staff’s recommendation is in alignment with the feedback received.

Financial Implications

Cost estimates for Options 1 to 3 are noted below, with Option 4 being a deferral of the costs and options below:

1: Permanently close and remove both bridges $50,000
2: Rebuild both bridges $400,000
3: Rebuild bridge 3 and close and remove bridge 2 $200,000

Note the above costs are preliminary design costs and have a +/- 30% level of accuracy. As there is no capital project for the construction of the preferred alternative in the capital forecast, the work will be identified and prioritized amongst all capital needs through the 2025 budget process.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☒ Core Service

Program: Parks Operations

Core Service: Placemaking

Mill Race Park is an important downtown destination, including the amphitheater river/heritage ruin vistas, and a highly photographed location especially for wedding photos. The existing bridges form part of the walkway network within the park, that allow users to view the historic mill race and enjoy the park.

BACKGROUND:

Mill Race Pedestrian Bridges 2 and 3 (refer to Appendix A - Site Map and Bridge Pictures.) have been closed since 2022 following structural inspections that identified structural concerns with the bridges and recommended their closure to protect public safety. The bridges have been deemed to be at the end of their service life considering rotting timber beam members that would require full replacement.

The bridges provide recreational access over the existing historic mill race, within Mill Race Park. There are other access and entry point options available within close proximity to the closed bridges which remain open. This includes access from Park Hill
Road West sidewalk and Bridge 1 which was replaced in 2019 within Mill Race Park. These two open access points are approximately 50m apart.

**ANALYSIS:**

**Option 1 - Permanently close both bridges**

The preliminary design estimate (+/- 30% accuracy) to remove both bridges is $50,000. This would include dismantling and disposal of the existing bridge structures, installing new guard/handrails, and restoration work related to the bridge removal.

The benefit of this option includes reduced capital cost and future maintenance and replacement costs. The disadvantages of this option include reducing existing recreational access over the historic mill race area of the park.

**Option 2 - Rebuild both bridges**

The preliminary design estimate (+/- 30% accuracy) to rebuild both bridges is $400,000. Work would include dismantling and disposal of the existing bridge structures, new foundations/piles, abutments, fabrication and installation of two (2) new galvanized steel bridges and restoration works related to the installation.

The benefit of this option is maintaining the existing recreational service level to the park including recreational access over the historic mill race. The disadvantage of this option is increased capital and future maintenance/replacement costs. It should be noted that bridge 2 has grade limitations which would prevent a new bridge in this location meeting the integrated accessibility standards under O.Reg. 191/11.

**Option 3 - Permanently close bridge 2 and replace bridge 3**

Preliminary design estimate (+/- 30% accuracy) to remove bridge 2 and to replace bridge 3 is $200,000. Work would include dismantling and disposal of the existing bridge structures, new foundations/piles, abutments, fabrication & installation of one (1) new galvanized steel bridge and intermediary restoration works related to the install.

The benefit of this option is maintaining similar service levels to existing based on the very close proximity of the two bridges. Bridge 3 has surrounding grades that would allow for the slope of the replaced bridge to be approximately 5% which would be in accordance with the integrated accessibility standards under O.Reg. 191/11. The reduced scope of one bridge allows for less capital and maintenance costs compared to both bridges being replaced. Bridge 2 has steeper surrounding grades, and could not be installed within accessible slope tolerances, which is why it is not the preferred bridge replacement under this option.
It should be noted that any replacement option will need to carefully protect the existing stone mill race structure. There is some level of risk of damage to the structure, which would need to be repaired if this were to occur. The existing stone arch adjacent to bridge 2, would remain in place, and would still be visible for viewing from the adjacent pathways and bridge under this option.

**Option 4 – Deferral of replacement/decommissioning options above**

An option was initially considered for the deferral of the replacement/decommissioning of these bridges until future revitalization plans for the park are undertaken. The existing bridges are barricaded and closed to the public. Considering the historic mill race is a heritage asset, which is expected to remain part of the park, re-configuration of pedestrian access is not anticipated in the future. Therefore, a deferral of the decision on the options above has not been considered further. The costs for the options listed above would still apply, and they would be subject to inflation. The only advantage of Option 4 over Options 1-3 presented above would be short-term cost savings.

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

There is no existing policy/by-law(s).

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

Cost estimates for Options 1 to 3 are noted below, with Option 4 being a deferral of the costs and options below:

1: Permanently close and remove both bridges $50,000  
2: Rebuild both bridges $400,000  
3: Rebuild bridge 3 and close and remove bridge 2 $200,000

Note the above costs are preliminary design costs and have a +/- 30% level of accuracy. As there is no capital project for the construction of the preferred alternative in the capital forecast, the work will be identified and prioritized amongst all capital needs through the 2025 budget process.

**PUBLIC VALUE:**

**Sustainability:**
Option 3 would provide a balance between maintaining the City’s existing recreational access to a valued park and space, while recognizing the financial sustainability advantages of decommissioning one bridge permanently.

**Leadership:**
This project is contributing to residents’ pride in the place the work, live and visit. The historic nature of the property in addition to when the mill property was transformed into a park in 1977. It is an early example of a constructed landscape (place making).
centered around adaptive reuse and makes this an important recreational and historic asset to the City.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:**

**Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee**

A presentation was provided by Lashia Jones, Cultural Heritage Specialist, Stantec on June 15, 2023 reviewing the modified Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), see Appending C – Modified Heritage Impact Assessment). A Brief history of the Park, heritage attributes and reasons for its cultural heritage status were presented. The different options considered at that time were noted along with any mitigation measures for each option. There were no questions of the Committee, and there were no objections of staff’s preliminary Option 3 recommendation (refer to Appendix D – MHAC June 2023 Meeting Minutes).

**Cambridge Cycling and Trails Advisory Committee (CCTAC)**

A presentation overview of the options was provided by City staff including the outcome of the Public Engagement and the feedback received. It was noted that the staff recommendation aligns with public engagement survey results preferred option (Option 3). Comments received from the committee included questions on timing of the construction project, the expected lifespan of a new galvanized steel bridge, winter maintenance, and if the stone wall adjacent to bridge 2 was part of the original Mill. It was noted by the committee that Option 3 is a fair compromise in removing one bridge but maintaining one bridge which can meet accessible slope requirements. Refer to Appendix E - CCTAC January 2023 Meeting Minutes.

**Cambridge Accessibility Advisory Committee (CAAC)**

An overview presentation of the options and the outcome of the public engagement results was provided by City Staff. It was noted that the staff recommendation will align with public engagement survey results preferred option (Option 3). Comments received included questions on cost, potential design materials including decking, footings and abutments, and if the approach or immediate access onto/off of the bridge(s) was within accessible grade tolerances. The approach areas are generally flat, but the project is limited to just the bridge approaches in the immediate vicinity of the bridge. It was noted that once Staff receive a decision by City Council on the preferred option, additional consultation will be undertaken with the committee during detailed design.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

*Engage Cambridge*
Public engagement was undertaken through Engage Cambridge in December 2023. An overview map and context of the options was presented, along with the preliminary design cost estimates. Information was also provided on the Heritage Impact assessment completed to consider the various options. As part of the engagement a survey the public was asked to rank their preferred option. Option 3 which aligns with Staff’s recommendation was the preferred alternative as part of the public survey.

The Engage Cambridge project page received 1546 page views, 460 survey responses and 242 detailed comments provided by engaged survey takers. In general, the public feedback was mostly related to costs, maintaining heritage features, weddings/photography, homelessness concerns, and accessibility. Refer to Appendix B – Engage Cambridge Results for the detailed analysis of the engagement, comments received, and a summary table of the comments.

The Engage Cambridge page was updated with the survey results following the closure of the survey.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:

Internal consultation was undertaken by Engineering staff with Heritage Planning, Inclusion and Accessibility, Transportation Engineering and Operations City staff in addition to the public and committee consultation as described above.

CONCLUSION:

Mill Race Park is an important recreational destination, bringing together the City’s past and present. Two pedestrian bridges within the park have been closed due to structural concerns and staff are seeking Council direction on the preferred option for replacement/decommissioning of these two bridges. Staff’s recommendation is to proceed with Option 3, which involves the permanent decommissioning of bridge 2, and the replacement of bridge 3. Public engagement and advisory committee consultation has been undertaken to help support Council in making this decision. Staff’s recommendation is in alignment with the feedback received.

REPORT IMPACTS:

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

APPROVALS:
This report has gone through the appropriate workflow and has been reviewed and or approved by the following as required:

Director

Deputy City Manager

Chief Financial Officer

City Solicitor

City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

1. 24-028-CD Appendix A – Site Map and Bridge Pictures

2. 24-028-CD Appendix B – Public Engagement Results

3. 24-028-CD Appendix C – Modified Heritage Impact Assessment

4. 24-028-CD Appendix D – MHAC June 2023 Meeting Minutes

5. 24-028-CD Appendix E – CCTAC January 2024 Meeting Minutes
Pedestrian Bridge 1 – Replaced in 2019
Pedestrian Bridge 2 – Closed in 2022
Recommended for Removal and Permanent Closure (cannot meet accessibility standard)
Pedestrian Bridge 3 – Closed in 2022
Recommended for Replacement
Summary of Survey Responses

Question 1 (mandatory) – Please rank your preferred option for the closed bridges in Mill Race Park from 1 (most preferred) to 3 (least preferred).

- Permanently close and remove both bridges
- Replace Bridge 3 and permanently close and remove Bridge 2
- Replace both bridges

A total of 460 responses were received and the average ranked responses are noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Average Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replace Bridge 3 and permanently close and remove Bridge 2</td>
<td>1.55/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace both bridges</td>
<td>2.02/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently close and remove both bridges</td>
<td>2.44/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2 (optional) – Please provide any comments you wish to share regarding the Mill Race Park pedestrian bridges.

A total of 242 responses were received and 218 survey takers skipped this question. 5 main themes in the responses were provided as noted below:

- Heritage – 13 respondents noted heritage being important. See a few examples below
  - “Heritage protocols should be so at not to damage the stone structure, in addition, the reconstruction of bridge 3 should be a designed to capture the historic nature of the surrounding structure.”
  - “For a resurfing downtown is important there are areas that are walkable/inviting while preserving the heritage. Closing things down is going backwards, and that is not the right direction. The rating method is odd — Replacing both is only optiony”
  - “I feel that these two bridges are important part of the heritage part of Downtown Galt.”

- Cost – 29 respondents noted cost being a concern and that the estimates are inaccurate. See a few examples below:
  - “The proposed cost to rebuild is exorbitant and severely overpriced. Removal of those 2 bridges means that there will also not be any ongoing
maintenance or repairs"

- "Cost $50,000 to remove both, therefore to replace the one for the additional $150,000 well spent to replace and keep as it is an asset to the park!"

- "The distance between the bridges doesn’t justify the cost + a better view of the old mill/creek without the bridges is preferred.

Weddings/Photos – 12 respondents noted bridges are a good place for wedding photos. See a few examples below:

- "As a wedding photographer who has done many weddings at the Mill Race in the past 40 yrs, the bridges provide a large part of the scenic backdrop used for photos and as such should be maintained as much as possible. Not only for access!"

- "It’s a well used place for weddings, graduations and other city events. Keeping at least two walk-ways accessible would be wise.”

- "It is a beautiful park and best hangout place/ photo place in Cambridge downtown. Bridges make it more beautiful and waters underneath are very soothing"

Homelessness – 13 respondents brought up concerns around homelessness. See a few examples below:

- "Money better spent giving the homeless somewhere to go and get them out of the park. People don’t use the park anymore because it’s unsafe. Don’t waste city coney on that.”

- "These bridges are unnecessary, usage is minimal, I walk through this area every day. Use the cost savings for our homelessness and affordable housing challenges.”

- "The homeless are just going to use it to sit and people will not want to walk through. The one bridge is enough that was redone in 2019. .”

Accessibility – 9 respondents voiced the need for accessibility. See a few examples below:

- "Three bridges were a lot for such a small park, so keeping 2 – one at each end of the the park – makes sense and they can be accessible. In the initial plan for the park, the bridges were to provide unique access AND viewing of the old mill race, so keep two.”
Summary Report
11 November 2023 - 10 December 2023

EngageWR

PROJECTS SELECTED: 1
Mill Race Park Pedestrian Bridges
FULL LIST AT THE END OF THE REPORT

Visitors Summary

Highlights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAX VISITORS PER DAY</td>
<td>1.6 k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW REGISTRATIONS</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGISTRATIONS</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH VISITORS</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMED VISITORS</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWARE VISITORS</td>
<td>1.5 k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pageviews vs Visitors graph:
- Green line: Pageviews
- Yellow line: Visitors

Page 395 of 577
## PARTICIPANT SUMMARY

### ENGAGED PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>Unverified</th>
<th>Anonymous</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributed on Forums</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Surveys</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to Newsfeeds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Quick Polls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted on Guestbooks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to Stories</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked Questions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placed Pins on Places</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to Ideas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A single engaged participant can perform multiple actions

### INFORMED PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viewed a video</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewed a photo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downloaded a document</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited the Key Dates page</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited an FAQ list Page</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited Instagram Page</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited Multiple Project Pages</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to a tool (engaged)</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A single informed participant can perform multiple actions

### AWARE PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visited at least one Page</td>
<td>1,546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Aware user could have also performed an Informed or Engaged Action

* Total list of unique visitors to the project
ENGAGEMENT TOOLS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORUM TOPICS</th>
<th>SURVEYS</th>
<th>NEWS FEEDS</th>
<th>QUICK POLLS</th>
<th>GUESTBOOKS</th>
<th>STORIES</th>
<th>Q&amp;A'S</th>
<th>PLACES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SURVEYS SUMMARY

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributors</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissions</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOP 3 SURVEYS BASED ON CONTRIBUTORS

460 Contributors to
Bridge Survey
INFORMATION WIDGET SUMMARY

0 DOCUMENTS
0 PHOTOS
0 VIDEOS
0 FAQS
0 KEY DATES
### TRAFFIC SOURCES OVERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERRER URL</th>
<th>Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m.facebook.com</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>im.facebook.com</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.facebook.com</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.cambridgetimes.ca">www.cambridgetimes.ca</a></td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.cambridgetoday.ca">www.cambridgetoday.ca</a></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>android-app</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t.co</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.therecord.com">www.therecord.com</a></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.google.com">www.google.com</a></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linktr.ee</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.cambridge.ca">www.cambridge.ca</a></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.google.ca">www.google.ca</a></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>webmail.bell.net</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.facebook.com">www.facebook.com</a></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SELECTED PROJECTS - FULL LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>AWARE</th>
<th>INFORMED</th>
<th>ENGAGED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mill Race Park Pedestrian Bridges</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bridge Survey

SURVEY RESPONSE REPORT
11 November 2023 - 10 December 2023

PROJECT NAME:
Mill Race Park Pedestrian Bridges
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTIONS</th>
<th>AVG. RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replace Bridge 3 and permanently close and remove Bridge 2</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace both bridges</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently close and remove both bridges</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q1** Please rank your preferred option for the closed bridges in Mill Race park from 1 (most preferred) to 3 (least preferred).

Mandatory Question (460 response(s))
Question type: Ranking Question

**Q2** Please provide any comments you wish to share regarding the Mill Race Park pedestrian bridges.
Bridge Survey: Survey Report for 11 November 2023 to 10 December 2023

Often drunks loitering at that Park, makes it hard to enjoy as a family.

Tourism in an important part of our City and needs to be maintained

Get rid of the drunk crowd that hangs out there all day, trashing the area. Perhaps additional garbage cans.

These bridges are unnecessary, usage is minimal, I walk through this area every day. Use the cost savings for our homelessness and affordable housing challenges.

The brick on bridge 2 needs to be maintained.

The replace option is best aligned with the original design of the park

Bridge 3 will improve access for larger events and will respect the original design

The bridges provide a unique look at the heritage components of the old mill race and are important parts of the community.

Why in hell does it cost $400K? That is insane How be we put it out for tender to “REAL” business with real cost estimates!!!!!!!!!!!!

There is no need to have 3 bridges, especially when there are walking trails on both sides.

I don't see the need for both bridges especially with everything being so pricy.

If you further limit pedestrian access and for traffic here it will just worsen drug use and vagrancy in the area and make it less appealing for locals
Minimal cost...should replace all.

I recommend replacing both. I am hoping by replacing Bridge 2 as well, there can still be access to the walkway even though the Ampitheatre is reserved for a wedding. Blocking both bridges on serves the Cambridge Mill to make money on weddings.

I think keeping either bridge is an unnecessary waste of money. If someone is walking along the pathway, they can just cross over to the other one along Park Hill. It’s time to close down the two bridges that aren’t missed now.

I think public space is very valuable and we need to preserve it as much as possible for a reasonable cost. At least 1 bridge needs to stay in this valuable riverside spot.

The area is well used and should continue to have 2 access bridges.

the City needs to budget and spend money on all season public washroom facilities on trails and in parks.

Please provide police patrol in this area. It’s a meeting place for drug users, and unless you cross the street, you have no choice but to walk through this. My grandsons big memory of this area is that he found a needle.

Footbridges are part of the charm of Galt.

If we are going replace pedestrian bridges, please do not let it be in vain and be overrun by drug addicts.

Great to see the park bridges being considered for restoration and use by all members of the community. We do not visit as often as we would like due to the homeless often congregating in the area though recognize it is a public space open for all to use.

One bridge is all that is required. Having two seems redundant.
Bridge 2, while nice to have is close enough to 3 to allow us to retain access but still not overburden taxpayers.

I frequently walk in this area with my dog and have missed having the option to use the bridges. They are an attractive addition to the area in addition to providing alternatives should there be something I want to avoid on the main route.

I sincerely hope that the stone wall for bridge 2 is kept even if the bridge is removed.

I believe leaving the existing bridge that was rebuilt in 2019 provides good access to Mill Race Park on its own. In the past the two bridges up for debate had blind spots particularly in the evening. The two existing paths on either side are accessible.

I built the last round of bridges around 1998. I know the detail that went into their design and am aware of the historical significance. However rebuilding both is not necessary. We must keep at least one intact. I also redid the Mill Race down in the wa

Not everyone can walk the whole of the long path. I would rather do a circle than the same path twice. Ideally I would like all the bridges being fixed but at least fix one of them. Save money by not painting bike lanes no one uses for a year or two.

Why is this not an obvious choice? you're quite happy to spend countless dollars on footbridges that look awful and not give it a seconds thought, but when it comes to keeping part of our heritage there is a question!

We are taxed much to high as it is...it's time to pull back on none essential spending, especially since the greater number of tax payers don't even utilize these bridges.

I frequently walk downtown along the Grand. At least one bridge there would be far better than none in that area.
They’ve been closed since 2022 with little to no impact on my enjoyment of the area. I don’t see the need to spend the money to replace them both at this time.

Replacing all three bridges would be very irresponsible fiscal decision.

I always wondered why there were two bridges in the first place...

I assume you wanted to rank the options in question 1? also just a bit confused about what questions 3-4 and 5 have to do with this. What a terribly worded survey!

For a resurging downtown is important there are areas that are walkable/inviting while preserving the heritage. Closing things down is going backwards, and that is not the right direction. The rating method is odd — Replacing both is only optiony

Put the work to tender with non-union contractors to reduce the cost.

Galt has done nothing to enhance this property. Used to go down on weekends and listen to live entertainment years ago. Even when that accident took down the wall and archway entrance the city din a minimal work to rebuild the wall but not the archway.

If they could be left with the stone it would be nice to have one more but if they have to be modernized I don’t see the need to have them

I have attended every folk festival there and many other events, and have eaten at Frank’s a hundred times, and NEVER needed to cross either bridge. Not once!

What’s the point in having three bridges?

I feel that removing both bridges 2 and 3 makes more sense if the entrance off of Park Hill Rd. was enlarged to encompass both
Cambridge is thriving. Keep it that way.

Please maintain the integrity of the park by keeping two of the three bridges open.

Nice to have 2 bridges to cross over. Children especially like to cross and look at the creek below.

If there are wedding photos happening, there needs to be an option, this is why both should be replaced.

Two pedestrian bridges are unnecessary in such a small space. No further comments.

Such a beautiful area when it is clean and in working order. Unfortunately the area is no longer clean and tidy due to people down on their luck.

Removing both bridges would be a shame. Removing one and replacing the other is a reasonable compromise.

There's often a group of people congregating on the Water St side of the bridges, so initially I was leaning towards closing both, but for the many folks crossing to and from the Cambridge Mill, this is a much more intuitive and welcoming path.

It would be great to keep both bridges, but I understand the price tag. Maybe keeping one bridge would be a good compromise.

I feel it is important for people to actually see the original mill channel that carried the water to power the equipment for the factory that used to be on this land.

The bridges improve accessibility and walkability in the park.
Both bridges will be redundant and too expensive. One bridge will maintain the quality of the park

Bridge 2 is not necessary. As stated the incline is too steep for accessibility requirements and is very close to Bridge 3. Having both Bridge One and Bridge 3 in operation would offer two means of access, one at each end of the park.

Even 50000.00 is too much for removal

cost estimates seem awfully high...

It would be wonderful to have both bridges but as the bridges are in close vicinity to each other I feel it would be cost saving to only have one bridge not two.

The proposed cost to rebuild is exorbitant and severely overpriced. Removal of those 2 bridges means that there will also not be any ongoing maintenance or repair costs.

They are very close to bridge 1, so it doesn’t seem reasonable to replace both and have 3 bridges within such close proximity. Bridge 3 replacement would be nice if historical components can be kept.

I hope that some of the natural historical look can be preserved

As a wedding photographer who has done many weddings at Mill Race in the past 40 yrs, the bridges provide a large part of the scenic backdrop used for photos and as such should be maintained as much as possible. Not only for access!

Reach out to a popper contractor to replace both bridges at a quarter of the cost.

Lets maintain the beauty of Mill Race
Nice to have an alternative route to cross incase some sort of danger presents itself on the only open bridge.

Events will need at least two exits/entrances to be less congested. And for safety reasons

Prices to replace are ridiculous

Park is not that big. 3 bridges was too much and spending to repair bridges is a waste for this little area. People can walk the extra few hundred feet.

having all 3 bridges makes it great for the walking trails and picture taking

Keep at least one bridge is nice for the ease of access to the area

Utilize the bridge abutments and engage volunteer conservation groups to naturalize Mill Creek through the park & provide habitat for existing fauna, ie.: Brown Trout.

I believe meeting half way, that is replace bridge 3 and permanently close and remove bridge 2. That will leave 2 accesses a walking bridge. I feel it will encourage more walkers and improve downtown Galt area.

I think the bridges add character to the park

It is too costly to replace. There is still access provided.

We are struggling with tax increases and this is a "nice to have" project so by default we should take the least expensive option.
Having 3 bridges open allows for improved flow for larger event and better wheelchair access.

Having the 3 bridges in place is a large part of the appeal of this heritage site. They provide a lovely area to walk especially during a crowded summer when the beauty and river are highlighted. Weddings and photo ops are magical on these bridges.

tax payers are very heavedy taxed as it is.

We should keep at least one bridge for the pedestrians to cross the river.

The third bridge is needed to properly see the old mill gear systems in the Mill Race

It’s a great experience to walk across these bridges and look down into the cavities and see the remnants from the past, it all adds to the story of the Mill Race Park

Fixing the bridge will allow the other bridge to last longer by having less foot traffic… at the very least one of the bridges must be fixed. With weddings and many functions being held in the summer months, the bridges should be repaired.

If Bridge 2 is removed, will the stone wall be removed, as well, or remain? I hate to see more stones removed..

It’s a well used place for weddings, graduations and other city events. Keeping at least two walk-ways accessible would be wise.

It is a beautiful park and best hangout place/ photo place in Cambridge downtown. Bridges make it more beautiful and waters underneath very soothing

It was much easier to navigate through that area when the bridges were open. We need them back in working order please.
### Bridge Survey: Survey Report for 11 November 2023 to 10 December 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/21/2023 04:26 AM</td>
<td>Cost $50,000 to remove both, therefore to replace the one for the additional $150,000 well spent to replace and keep as it is an asset to the park!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21/2023 07:59 AM</td>
<td>My fear with opening up the Bridges is more access for the unhoused to walk across from Food Basics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Since the bridges are pretty close to one another, I feel it is better to save money. It is a walking trail, having no bridge changes the vibe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Replace Bridge 3 and permanently close and remove Bridge 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>I have no additional comments. Have a nice day :)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>2 bridge access and egress points would be desirable in this location for the park. Potentially even a safety concern, allowing an additional point of exit if someone is in danger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>That's the poorest wording on a questionnaire ever. Do better Cambridge. Fiscally bridge 2 can be removed and repair/keep bridge 1 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Beautiful park unique to our city with beautiful stone walls nice to keep both bridges to encourage access and traffic for all to enjoy the space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>I think it's ridiculous to even consider rebuilding these bridges. There are walkable crossings at either end the area within a 1 minute walk. Convenience is one thing but publicly funding laziness is quite the other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>I think this area only needs one of the 2 bridges. However, the bridge should be wide enough to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians traveling in opposite directions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anonymous 11/21/2023 02:46 PM
This area is high traffic for drug users and not very safe for pedestrian use. My children are not allowed near this location for safety reasons. Investing any money into this location at this moment is not worth it.

Anonymous 11/21/2023 03:40 PM
Nooo need for 3 bridges in the same place. Add more AT bridges elsewhere.

Anonymous 11/21/2023 03:59 PM
These bridges are very pretty!

Anonymous 11/21/2023 04:11 PM
I have often walked in that area and I rarely use these bridges. I am more likely to walk to bridge one which is not part of this survey.

Anonymous 11/21/2023 04:46 PM
Too bad we cannot preserve the historic character of the originals but it would still be good to have an entrance/exit at both ends of the area.

Anonymous 11/21/2023 08:12 PM
Too high a cost. More important issues to deal with.

Anonymous 11/21/2023 08:57 PM
One bridge is needed to appreciate the mill race from above and to provide a midway crossing point.

Anonymous 11/21/2023 09:00 PM
Seems easy enough to access via the sidewalks and bridge 1.

Anonymous 11/21/2023 10:28 PM
I think it's better to have 2 bridges than just 1, but that we can get by without 3.

Anonymous 11/21/2023 10:48 PM
Keeping one of the two closed bridges still let's people cross and access amphitheatre easily. Having Bridge 1 and bridge 3 open and usable also creates a nice little walking loop.

Anonymous 11/22/2023 06:32 AM
The cost compromise of removing bridge 2, rebuilding bridge 3 seems a reasonable one.
Anonymous  
11/22/2023 07:51 AM  
Why would you put a park in place if you’re not willing to maintain it?

Anonymous  
11/22/2023 07:59 AM  
Bridges 2 and 3 are very close together so I don’t think replacing both is needed.

Anonymous  
11/22/2023 08:05 AM  
Having at least one bridge at this location makes the area much more interesting for people.

Anonymous  
11/22/2023 08:34 AM  
Walking bridges are essential to walking trails. Neither closing the bridges or only replacing one are options. I only selected them as you gave me no choice but to rank them, suggesting a flawed decision-justifying process vs actual community consultation.

Anonymous  
11/22/2023 09:17 AM  
The bridges add additional interest to the park and are fun viewing placed.

Anonymous  
11/22/2023 10:01 AM  
It would be a shame to lose those bridges. I hope at least one is rebuilt if not both of them.

Anonymous  
11/22/2023 01:17 PM  
I believe that this is a beautiful tourist attraction that should be preserved and maintained in the best way possible. Its these small public spaces that continue to make Cambridge a beautiful place to live and visit.

Anonymous  
11/22/2023 01:25 PM  
The bridges are an integral part of the intended user experience of Mill Race Park. Retaining both bridges would be preferable if cost were not a factor. Given the cost associated with replacing bridges, replacing the accessible bridge appropriat balance.

Anonymous  
11/22/2023 05:46 PM  
I was a past chair of river bank committee in the 80s the culture of that park has change dramatically my advice is not to spend a nickel take that money and give to mental health in communities organizations that the word on the stree.

Anonymous  
11/22/2023 07:17 PM  
With the bridges so close together there’s no good reason for both.

Anonymous  
11/22/2023 07:29 PM  
With the amphitheatre located there, I think it is important to have a
Anonymous  
11/22/2023 08:23 PM  
No need to spend $400,000. The current wooden bridges have lasted 45 years... rebuild similar wood ones at 1/2 cost and be more compatable with park..should last another 40 years. No painted railings like walkay along river which is a peeling mess

Anonymous  
11/22/2023 08:23 PM  
To protect the history and beauty of downtown Galt, the bridges and the waterway should be preserved. Downtown Galt is becoming a popular tourist location (thanks to Narcity and blogTO) and the bridges add to the character and charm of our downtown core.

Anonymous  
11/22/2023 08:25 PM  
Just replace what is there with similar wooden bridges. No need to spend so much.

Anonymous  
11/22/2023 09:05 PM  
Save our historic downtown Galt. These are small but important parts of history in the Mill Race area.

Anonymous  
11/22/2023 10:40 PM  
I don't want the first suggestion as my third option but you made me choose it.

Anonymous  
11/22/2023 11:32 PM  
This is an incredibly confusing survey. How are you going to get credible responses? Are we being asked to rate the options in order of preference? If so, that's not the question. The question is asking for our preferred option: replace 3, remove 2

Anonymous  
11/23/2023 12:04 AM  
There was an event planned at the Mill Race that was moved indoors. In anticipation of more events at this space, replacing bridge 3 makes sense. If no future events are anticipated this location, remove both bridges.

Anonymous  
11/23/2023 07:27 AM  
Not necessary to have three bridges in such a small area

Anonymous  
11/23/2023 07:35 AM  
The distance to navigate to either side of this little ravine is minimal. These bridges are not needed.

Anonymous  
11/23/2023 08:02 AM  
Heritage is extremely important
Anonymous 11/23/2023 08:27 AM

I love the rock wall on bridge 2 it would be sad to get rid of it

Anonymous 11/23/2023 08:45 AM

BOTH bridge help create the amazing ambience in the area.

Anonymous 11/23/2023 09:08 AM

The compromise is a better option while maintaining access for trail users thanks for the opportunity to comment

Anonymous 11/23/2023 09:11 AM

This is a highly used trail area and 2 bridges are needed here

Anonymous 11/23/2023 09:57 AM

The Bridges are part of the concept of exploring and understanding the works of the Mills which are a direct link to the Heritage of Galt. It also offers a link and enhances the flow of the paths. The property was salvaged for a reason. Let's enjoy the pr

Anonymous 11/23/2023 11:18 AM

The bridges have been closed for some time and are often closed in the winter anyway. It does not impact movement and is a massive expense. Put that towards social programs for the unhoused who use Mill Race Park and make it difficult to bring families th

Anonymous 11/23/2023 11:51 AM

The lowest cost alternative is preferred. Both bridges should be removed.

Anonymous 11/23/2023 12:08 PM

Own home on Park Hill Road East, Cambridge

Anonymous 11/23/2023 12:59 PM

Rebuild the bridges

Anonymous 11/23/2023 01:13 PM

Rebuild both bridges

Anonymous 11/23/2023 02:09 PM

It’s a great area, but I think the city needs to be fiscally responsible. The cheapest option is to remove both bridges, so I say choose that. Times are uncertain and homeowners cannot afford property tax increases and our social services need more suppor
Anonymous
11/23/2023 02:44 PM

Great park!

Anonymous
11/23/2023 03:18 PM

It would be nice if I knew what options 123 mean?

Anonymous
11/23/2023 03:48 PM

Makes sense to keep one bridge to allow people access without having to go around.

Anonymous
11/23/2023 05:40 PM

Your survey doesn't make sense with the numbers 1 2 and 3 as answers. Perhaps they were supposed to be form symbols and the form is corrupt. Only repair one bridge. The one that meets accessible requirements.

Anonymous
11/23/2023 06:46 PM

Please do not forget about texture on the ground for sight impaired visitors (The app is not working well on my iPhone) very confusing.

Anonymous
11/23/2023 07:30 PM

Both bridges should be replaced.

Anonymous
11/23/2023 07:43 PM

Fix both as people come downtown to our riverside and walk.

Anonymous
11/23/2023 07:45 PM

Such a wonderful place and has such potential and history. Already took a hit when arch wasn't repaired. Try to keep the existing as much as possible. Additionally get better quotes for work! Outrageous numbers.

Anonymous
11/23/2023 09:13 PM

The city should get some more quotes. These prices are very high. Remember - these are our tax dollars.

Anonymous
11/23/2023 09:58 PM

With the planning and development of many apartment buildings in the Galt area over the next many years it will be necessary to have as much green space as possible to offset the concrete jungle that will become Cambridge.

Anonymous
11/23/2023 10:32 PM

It seems like removing both bridges would inhibit traffic flow through the park too much, especially when busy/during events; replacing both with current-standard bridges would keep things more accessible for everyone.
Anonymous 11/24/2023 04:37 AM
Keep bridges. Create an all glass enclosure for public to visit year round. Nice green space in the winter. Just an idea.

Anonymous 11/24/2023 05:48 AM
removing would lessor the homeless. repairing would have more weddings as it is great for photos there.

Anonymous 11/24/2023 07:04 AM
Our taxes are high enough and reckless spending is not helping that. Someone needs to say enough is enough.

Anonymous 11/24/2023 09:23 AM
The bridges have been in many many wedding photographs and should continue to do so. People love bridges they do. Hey I know it’s sorry that’

Anonymous 11/24/2023 02:35 PM
Bridge 3 would suffice.

cjsman 11/24/2023 08:14 PM
Permanently close and remove both bridges. I think that's the best thing if you replace people will wreck them.

Anonymous 11/24/2023 09:00 PM
I would suggest to close bridge 3 and rebuild bridge 2. A far better looking bridge.

Anonymous 11/25/2023 06:04 PM
It is worth while saving both bridges. We should have pride in our downtown core and repairs are vital.

Anonymous 11/25/2023 11:47 PM
The Mill Race is one of the best places in downtown that is accessible (free), unique and with character. You don't have to buy anything to be there. We should save it for the future. We are just stewards and should preserve it.

Anonymous 11/26/2023 07:09 AM
Listen you cannot afford to spend anymore money on these bridges. Just disable both bridges, don't spend the money to remove. Send the minimum to keep them closed safely.

Anonymous 11/26/2023 07:58 PM
---
|Anonymous | Closing bridge two, but not removing any old stone works/heritage buildings pieces. |
|Anonymous | Building one stronger bridge is preferable to having 2 weaker structures. As long as people can exit the park in an emergency, I am good with one bridge rebuilt. |
|Anonymous | I think those bridges add to the park and it would be a shame to not have them there. |
|Anonymous | To avoid sketchy strangers and for safety, at least 2 bridges can give someone feeling in danger more than one option to cross and get away. Mental health issues of some people that hang out there can be extremely intimidating. |
|Anonymous | Please move bridges shelter so residents of cambridge can once again enjoy mill race park |
|Anonymous | Bridge 2 is in the middle. Why not replace it and remove 3? |
|Anonymous | 1 bridge is enough. |
|Anonymous | Replacing bridge 3 seems like a reasonable action. |
|Anonymous | Bridges should be re-opened unless more info on why they failed is made public. Bringing bridges up to code should be option #1. Idiots. |
|Anonymous | There needs to be a bridge to the amphitheater and make it accessible. I would also suggest the nearby archway should be fixed too that was broken due to crash years ago |
|Anonymous | Great area to walk the kids around. Both bridges allow the kids to run back and forth and around easily while not impeding other pedestrian traffic and being a nuisance. |
|Anonymous | Fix or replace all bridges. Needed for increased Cambridge |
population to downtown area. Excellent site to encourage people to get put and support downtown Cambridge. No point trying to increase downtown shopping if no lovely places to visit.

Anonymous 11/29/2023 04:07 PM

Heritage is important. Saving both bridges is unrealistic and expensive. Saving one bridge seems best of both worlds.

Anonymous 11/29/2023 04:30 PM

Na

Anonymous 11/29/2023 04:40 PM

Why does it cost so much to replace. I’d love both to be replaced but understand there are more pressing matters in the city that need money

Anonymous 11/29/2023 04:44 PM

Brides need a bridge closer to Parkhill.

Anonymous 11/29/2023 04:53 PM

One bridge is sufficient. It is not a large area

Anonymous 11/29/2023 05:30 PM

If both bridges can be rebuilt, this would be the best option, but the $400k price tag seems excessive.

Anonymous 11/29/2023 06:17 PM

Like every thing else the city operates, they run it into the ground with no plans to repair or replace! ie Arenas, pools etc! How bout some new roads to handle all the new homes you’re approving!

Anonymous 11/29/2023 06:33 PM

We don’t need all 3 when one of them doesn’t even meet standards

Anonymous 11/29/2023 06:49 PM

Mill Race Park is a beautiful place to visit and enjoy. It is located right in the middle of our town where many people get to experience the beauty of our city and the Grand River. Enhancing the park is a priority.

Anonymous 11/29/2023 06:59 PM

It’s a popular wedding spot and is worth the investment in the downtown core.

Anonymous 11/29/2023 07:02 PM

So long as there is one, we don’t need more.
Anonymous
11/29/2023 07:00 PM
An explanation to the taxpayers would be nice as to why it needs to cost 200k per bridge.

Anonymous
11/29/2023 07:45 PM
Publish a complete breakdown of costs, 400K sounds steep. People shouldn’t be forced to make three choices. There is only one correct choice.

Anonymous
11/29/2023 07:45 PM
There should be more control of the homeless people that gather here. Such a beautiful space ruined.

Anonymous
11/29/2023 08:47 PM
Both bridges should be removed and open the view to the spillway.

Anonymous
11/29/2023 08:55 PM
We love these walking paths and the lack of bridges is cumbersome.

Anonymous
11/29/2023 08:57 PM
Build them with the stone. Price out other trades people. I know many masons that would be skilled for this task and charge less

Anonymous
11/29/2023 09:12 PM
Beautiful part of the downtown that should be preserved

Anonymous
11/29/2023 09:56 PM
Permanently closing & removing both bridges shouldn’t even be an option.

Anonymous
11/29/2023 09:57 PM
As much as I love and use these bridges, I’d rather see these funds support affordable housing, homelessness & food banks. Now is not the time to spend tax dollars on preservation when so many are in need.

Anonymous
11/29/2023 09:58 PM
Why the hello is that expensive

Anonymous
11/29/2023 10:24 PM
I’d rather we fix both bridges please.

Anonymous
11/29/2023 10:42 PM
I think bridge 2 should be removed only because the two so close seems useless. But the stone work should be preserved some how.
Anonymous 11/30/2023 02:26 AM

Money better spent giving the homeless somewhere to go and get them out of the park. People don’t use the park anymore because it’s unsafe. Don’t waste city money on that.

Anonymous 11/30/2023 02:30 AM

Keep the heritage of Cambridge

Anonymous 11/30/2023 05:24 AM

It’s such a lovely space and so popular for its concerts it be a shame to lose the accessible nature for when we host those events.

Anonymous 11/30/2023 07:29 AM

Keep them all

Anonymous 11/30/2023 07:41 AM

Wooden bridges have a limited time span. Look at the boardwalk in the Sudden Tract. GONE. Don’t throw away taxpayers money. That area lately is just a hangout for the homeless and who wants to enjoy that.

Anonymous 11/30/2023 07:41 AM

The price tag seems rather ridiculous for this project. Maybe keep bridge two standing but repurpose it for non pedestrian use?

Anonymous 11/30/2023 08:46 AM

Money should be saved and used towards other parks and improvement projects

Anonymous 11/30/2023 08:54 AM

Given the amount the space is used including for weddings and filming, it seems to me that complete restoration is worthwhile

Anonymous 11/30/2023 09:04 AM

We shpuld look after our parks for future generations!

Anonymous 11/30/2023 09:06 AM

These bridges are a large part of the areas aesthetics and usability, we should continue to invest to make things better and more functional rather than going backwards.

Anonymous 11/30/2023 09:07 AM

The security and safety of the public are at risk each and every time they enter the park, the homeless take up occupying the area drinking and drug use, it is not patrolled to eliminate this issue
Anonymous  11/30/2023 09:38 AM

I've lived in Cambridge for 35 years and the maintenance needed to preserve its integrity is important!

Anonymous  11/30/2023 10:04 AM

Why does it cost SO much to build small bridges. I could build this myself for $1000.

Anonymous  11/30/2023 10:27 AM

These costs are astronomical for such small bridges

Anonymous  11/30/2023 10:28 AM

Taking away from the park makes no sense

Anonymous  11/30/2023 11:44 AM

Take them both down, they have been closed since 2022 and the money could be spent on more pressing issues.

Anonymous  11/30/2023 11:58 AM

The distance between the bridges doesn't justify the cost + a better view of the old mill/creek without the bridges is preferred.

Anonymous  11/30/2023 01:43 PM

Pedestrian bridges are essential to any portion of the river - and now that there is more development on the West end, it's essential to ensure we have an additional safe route if possible.

Anonymous  11/30/2023 02:39 PM

I think you should move/rotate bridge 3 slightly so it's entering the wedding area better it builds up ice in the winter in its current state before it was closed and made it harder for people with mobility problems.

Anonymous  11/30/2023 02:45 PM

Please save the bridges!!

Anonymous  11/30/2023 03:22 PM

You need to revist your contractor rates, seriously!! 400,000 is insane for this small job. Stop letting our city get ripped off!

Anonymous  11/30/2023 04:00 PM

We need to invest more in public spaces

Anonymous  11/30/2023 04:14 PM

Heritage protocols should be followed so at not to damage the stone structure. In addition, the reconstruction of bridge 3 should be a
When it gets busy with visitors one bridge will not be enough. We need to protect heritage.

The more accessible pedestrian walkways, the better.

I use these bridges all the time before they closed.

Replace both bridges. One of the nicest areas in the city and many people visit. It is a tourist destination that should be used for more music events.

Cost needs to be a consideration. If excessive, both bridge 2 & 3 need to be removed.

As the region grows in population, access to multiple bridges will help to alleviate congestion during peak times of use. With the loss of the entrance arch a couple of years ago, I would prefer to see the stonework on bridge number 2 preserved.

I love the stone of bridge 2 and hope we can keep the structure of it.

Three bridges were a lot for such a small park, so keeping 2 - one at each end of the park - makes sense and they can be accessible. In the initial plan for that park, the bridges were to provide unique access AND viewing of the old mill race, so keep two.

Close them and stop wasting tax payers money. Only the homeless are down there so what family wants to go down there now!

I walk here everyday and really don’t think it would benefit anyone to replace the bridges. I think the money could be much better spent.

In an effort to increase traffic downtown and alleviate traffic concerns, the only option is to replace both.
Anonymous 12/05/2023 02:10 PM
Fix the bridges back to original - it's part of our heritage

Anonymous 12/05/2023 04:23 PM
To many groups have taken over very uncomfortable using the bridge

Anonymous 12/05/2023 06:46 PM
I feel that these two bridges are important part of the heritage part of Downtown Galt.

Anonymous 12/05/2023 09:37 PM
The homeless are just going to use it to sit and people will not want to walk through. The one bridge is enough that was redone in 2019.

Andrew 12/06/2023 06:47 AM
Maintaining a city's infrastructure costs money; the City (and/or developers) can't just keep razing buildings and removing inconvenient features in the landscape. This does not create a sense of place. It creates a bland, generic urban environment.

Anonymous 12/06/2023 10:24 AM
Please do not waste money on these totally unnecessary bridges. They were ok at the time, but truly do not need to be there for the park to be accessed or enjoyed. In the past, these two bridges had been used for camping underneath and that was unsafe!

Anonymous 12/06/2023 01:59 PM
Maintain the original character of Mill Race Park if you do close them. Ensure little damage to existing structures and try to work into closing architecture.

Anonymous 12/08/2023 10:26 PM
The cost seems quite high on all options proposed

Anonymous 12/09/2023 02:55 AM
How is it possible that this project can cost this much? Even the removal is $50,000. Who is providing these estimates? It is only a wooden bridge, how can it cost as much as a house?

Anonymous 12/09/2023 10:32 AM
Who gave these estimates? They are wooden bridges. It should not cost more than $40,000 per bridge. I would take the contract for $40,000 each bridge. The city is being taken advantage of, get better and more companies to bid on these projects.
Optional question (242 response(s), 218 skipped)

**Question type:** Single Line Question
Q3  What is your age group?

- 110 (25.3%) Over 65
- 89 (20.5%) 26-35 years
- 84 (19.4%) 36-45 years
- 64 (14.7%) 56-65 years
- 58 (13.2%) 46-55 years
- 76 (17.5%) 36-45 years
- 8 (1.8%) 26-35 years
- 1 (0.2%) Under 18
- 1 (0.2%) Prefer not to answer

Optional question (434 responses, 26 skipped)
Question type: Dropdown Question
Q4 | What is your gender?

Question options
- Male
- Female
- Gender fluid
- Non-binary
- Two-spirit
- Prefer not to answer
- Other/prefer to self-describe

Optional question (427 response(s), 33 skipped)
Question type: Dropdown Question
Q5  Do you identify with any of the following groups? Please choose all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question options</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person living on low income</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racialized, Black or Person of Colour</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person living with a disability</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SLGBTQIA+</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional question (415 response(s), 45 skipped)
Question type: Checkbox Question
LETTER: City should replace bridges in Mill Race Park

Letter to the Editor
Jul 12, 2023 9:47 AM

One of the timber bridges spanning the mill race in Mill Race Park on Water Street in Galt as seen in this file photo | City of Cambridge

Listen to this article
00:01:17

CambridgeToday received the following letter to the editor from reader Thomas Smith on the future of Mill Race Park.
Mill Race Park is an important and significant part of the city’s open space system and historically important as one of the first projects to incorporate flood protection into its design.

In the day, the Riverbank Advisory Committee and City Council thought it was worthwhile to invest significant funding to start integrating public open space in conjunction with flood protection being implemented by the GRCA. Not to mention keeping a significant portion of the industrial buildings to teach us about the past uses on the site.

Council took on the responsibility of maintaining what they built when they approved its construction. Do what is necessary to replace those bridges as close to the original design as can be. Doing anything less would be a shame.

As a city staff person, I oversaw the construction of Mill Race Park and worked with the Riverbank Development Advisory Committee to Create the “Living Levee” Riverbank master plan. Many of the concepts in that plan have been implemented. Look what that work has done for the Galt core.

Not maintaining what you have built is the wrong thing to do.

*Thomas Smith*
Hi [Name],

Hope you are doing OK!

Not sure who to send this suggestion to, can you please forward it to the appropriate person for me?

Millrace Park has too many bridges, these two are closed.

This bridge is not needed and should be removed:

![Bridge with a warning sign](image1)

This bridge has a nice stone wall beside it and should be repaired:

![Bridge with a stone wall](image2)

My two cents.

Thanks,

[Name]

Citizens for Cambridge


*Improving the future of Cambridge as a community*
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Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec) was retained by the City of Cambridge (the City) to prepare a modified Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the Mill Race Park located at 104 Water Street North in the City of Cambridge, Ontario. The property is a listed resource on the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register. The property contains a municipal park with an amphitheatre built within the stone ruins of a former textile mill and a mill race which formerly powered the mill. The City has identified that two timber bridges within the park, built circa 1990, are due for replacement. As the Mill Race Park is a listed heritage resource, the City has requested preparation of a modified HIA to review the four proposed alternatives and their potential impacts on Mill Race Park.

Following an evaluation of the Study Area according to Ontario Regulation 9/06 (O. Reg. 9/06) as amended by O. Reg. 569/22 and the City of Cambridge Cultural Heritage Evaluation Criteria, the property was found to contain cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI). The property meets criteria 1, 4, 7, and 8 of O. Reg. 9/06. The property also meets criteria 1, 3, 5, 9, and 12 of the City of Cambridge Cultural Heritage Evaluation Criteria.

An assessment of impacts resulting from the proposed undertaking indicates direct impacts through destruction if Alternatives 2 and 4 are selected. These impacts are related to the removal or replacement of the existing bridges. In addition, indirect impacts are possible if Alternatives 2, 3, or 4 are selected. These impacts are related to land disturbance from the construction activity related to bridge removal or replacement. Alternative 1 would not result in direct or indirect impacts. Based on the impacts identified, the following mitigation measures are recommended:

**Alternatives 2 and 4:** Documentation of the bridges and their contextual relationship with the circulation network is an appropriate mitigation measure. This additional documentation can be a supplementary report or amendment to the HIA to record the locations of the bridge and their surrounding context more fully. This can include a key plan and photography log to visually illustrate Mill Race Park and its identified heritage attributes, including the locations of the bridges as part of the circulation network. The additional information provided can be used to inform future design considerations for Mill Race Park and should be deposited at the City of Cambridge Archives and Records Centre.
Alternatives 2, 3, and 4: A qualified person(s) such as an engineer or stone mason with experience in heritage structures should be retained to complete a pre-construction assessment for the stone ruins to determine acceptable levels of vibration given the site-specific conditions (including soil conditions, equipment proposed to be used, and stone characteristics and mortar). Should the stone ruins be determined to be within the zone of influence, additional steps should be taken to secure the ruins from experiencing negative vibration effects (i.e., adjustment of machinery or establishment of buffer zones).

The Executive Summary highlights key points from the report only; for complete information and findings, the reader should examine the complete report.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Study Purpose

Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec) was retained by the City of Cambridge (the City) to prepare a modified Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the Mill Race Park located at 104 Water Street North in the City of Cambridge, Ontario (Figure 1 and Figure 2). The property is a listed resource on the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register. The property contains a municipal park with an amphitheatre built within ruins of a former textile mill and a mill race which formerly powered the mill.

The City has identified that two timber bridges within the park, built circa 1990, are due for replacement given their unsafe condition. As the Mill Race Park is a listed heritage resource, the City has requested preparation of a modified HIA to review the four proposed alternatives and their potential impacts on Mill Race Park. The purpose of the modified HIA is to respond to policy requirements regarding the conservation of cultural heritage resources in the land use planning process.

The City has provided a Terms of Reference (ToR) for a modified HIA that includes the following components:

- A map of the subject area to identify the location of the property and properties within 150 m of the subject site. Municipal street address, legal description and current owner’s address are also required. An evaluation of the property from a cultural heritage perspective will be conducted. The property will be assessed in accordance with the Heritage Evaluation Criteria in Policy 4.4 of the Official Plan and the Parks Canada Standards and Guidelines.

- The proposal will be described and its impact on the heritage resource assessed. Changes to the heritage resource such as additions, alterations or demolition will be described. Changes to the landscape and/or streetscape will also be described. New construction shall be evaluated in such terms as orientation, massing, scale, building materials/colour and fenestration.

- The priority is to preserve and be compatible with the heritage resource and surrounding lands into the proposed project in a manner that respects the cultural heritage attributes of the subject property. Describe why the demolition is necessary and how the proposed demolition/rebuild will respect the existing built heritage resources into the proposal.

- Describe what measures are being taken to ensure the integration of the new materials with the existing structures surrounding it. Mitigation may include, but is not limited to, landscaping, lighting, and signage.
Mill Race Pedestrian Bridges—Modified Heritage Impact Assessment, Cambridge, Ontario

1 Introduction June 9, 2023

- The scale and design of the project should complement the heritage resource in terms of its orientation, massing, materials and scale. Signage, if proposed in the overall project, will meet the requirements of the City of Cambridge Sign By-law for Heritage Conservation Districts and Heritage Buildings. The Senior Planner - Heritage will be consulted for additional information concerning any sign application that may be required as part of the overall project.

(City of Cambridge No Date [n.d.])

To meet these objectives, this HIA contains the following content:

- Summary of project methodology
- Review of background history of the Study Area and historical context
- Evaluation of CHVI
- Description of the proposed site alteration
- Assessment of impacts of the proposed site alterations on cultural heritage resources
- Review of design alternatives or mitigation measures where impacts are anticipated
- Recommendations for mitigation measures for design alternatives
2 Methodology

2.1 Policy Framework

2.1.1 Planning Act

The Planning Act provides a framework for land use planning in Ontario, integrating matters of provincial interest in municipal and planning decisions. Part I of the Planning Act identifies that the Minister, municipal councils, local boards, planning boards, and the Municipal Board shall have regard for provincial interests, including:

(d) The conservation of features of significant architectural, cultural, historical or scientific interest

(Government of Ontario 1990)

2.1.2 Provincial Policy Statement

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) is intended to provide policy direction for land use planning and development regarding matters of provincial interest. Cultural heritage is one of many interests contained within the PPS. Section 2.6.1 of the PPS states that “significant built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.”

(Government of Ontario 2020)

Under the PPS definition, conserved means:

The identification, protection, management and use of built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources in a manner that ensures their cultural heritage value or interest is retained. This may be achieved by the implementation of recommendations set out in a conservation plan, archaeological assessment, and/or heritage impact assessment that has been approved, accepted, or adopted by the relevant planning authority and/or decision maker. Mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches can be included in these plans and assessments.

Under the PPS definition, significant means:

In regard to cultural heritage and archaeology, resources that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest. Processes and criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest are established by the Province under the authority of the Ontario Heritage Act.
Under the PPS, “protected heritage property” is defined as follows:

- property designated under Parts IV, V or VI of the Ontario Heritage Act;
- property subject to a heritage conservation easement under Parts II or IV of the Ontario Heritage Act; property identified by the Province and prescribed public bodies as a provincial heritage property under the Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties; property protected under federal legislation, and UNESCO World Heritage Sites.

(Government of Ontario 2020)

2.1.3 Ontario Heritage Act and Ontario Regulation 9/06

The Ontario Heritage Act (OHA) provides the primary statutory framework for the conservation of cultural heritage resources in Ontario. Conservation of cultural heritage resources is a matter of provincial interest, as reflected in the OHA policies. Under Part IV and V of the OHA, a municipal council may designate individual properties containing CHVI (Part IV) or properties within a heritage conservation district (Part V) as containing CHVI. In accordance with Section 27(1) of the OHA, a municipality maintains a register of properties that are of cultural heritage value or interest CHVI. A municipality may also include a list of properties that have not been designated but may contain CHVI, these are often referred to as “listed properties.”

The criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI) are defined by Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 9/06 as amended by O. Reg. 569/22. In order to establish CHVI, at least two of the following criteria must be met:

1. The property has design value or physical value because it is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method.
2. The property has design value or physical value because it displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.
3. The property has design value or physical value because it demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
4. The property has historical value or associative value because it has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community.
5. The property has historical value or associative value because it yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.
6. The property has historical value or associative value because it demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.
7. The property has contextual value because it is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area.

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

9. The property has contextual value because it is a landmark

(Government of Ontario 2023)

2.1.4 Region of Waterloo Official Plan

The Region of Waterloo’s Official Plan contains the following policy regarding cultural heritage resources:

3.G.1 The Region and Area municipalities will ensure that cultural heritage resources are conserved using the provisions of the Heritage Act, the Planning Act, the Environmental Assessment Act, the Cemeteries Act, and the Municipal Act

The Region of Waterloo’s Official Plan also contains the following general objective regarding cultural heritage resources:

3.G Cultural Heritage Resources are the inheritance of natural assets that give people a sense of place, community and personal identity. Continuity with the past promotes creativity and cultural diversity. The region has a rich and diverse heritage, including distinctive cultures, traditions, festivals, artisans and craftspersons, landmarks, landscapes, properties, structures, burial sites, cemeteries, natural features and archaeological resources. These resources provide an important means of defining and confirming a regional identity, enhancing the quality of life of the community, supporting social development and promoting economic prosperity. The Region is committed to the conservation of its cultural heritage. This responsibility is shared with the Federal and Provincial governments, Area Municipalities, other government agencies, the private sector, property owners and the community.

(Region of Waterloo 2015)
2.1.5 City of Cambridge Official Plan

The City of Cambridge Official Plan contains the following general statement regarding cultural heritage resources:

The City recognizes and benefits from a variety of cultural heritage resources which are focal to community identity and economic prosperity and inherited from past generations. Cultural heritage resources throughout the municipality are used for such activities as industry, tourism and other commercial uses and residences.

(City of Cambridge 2018)

The City of Cambridge Official Plan contains the following objectives regarding cultural heritage resources:

1. Support the conservation, restoration and prominence of the city’s built heritage as a key identifying feature of the community;
2. co-ordinate the City’s heritage interests with property owners, local business improvement areas and other special interests;
3. promote built heritage as a key component of the city’s local tourism and quality of life for existing and new residents;
4. support the designation of cultural heritage resources under the Ontario Heritage Act and the conservation of cultural heritage resources through the Planning Act, the Environmental Assessment Act, the Cemeteries Act and the Municipal Act;
5. maintain and support the rehabilitation of the Heritage Conservation Districts, located in the Galt City Centre, Blair Village and the City-owned lands in West Galt and to consider the establishment of additional districts;
6. actively make available or pursue funding opportunities to assist property owners in heritage conservation and restoration;
7. support and require where feasible the identification, cataloguing, adaptive reuse, analysis and relocation of cultural heritage resources, and in some cases the preservation of sites containing these resources; and
8. promote the Grand River and its major tributaries, including the Speed River through Cambridge, as a nationally designated Canadian Heritage River

(City of Cambridge 2018)

City of Cambridge Cultural Heritage Evaluation Criteria

The City Official Plan uses the following criteria to determine the significance of cultural heritage resources included or proposed to be included in the City Heritage Register:
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A property will be considered to have CHVI if the property has been designated by the Province to be of architectural or historical significance pursuant to the OHA or, in the opinion of the City, satisfies at least two of the following criteria:

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

ii) It is a representative example of the work of an outstanding local, national, or international architect, engineer, builder, designer, landscape architect, interior designer, sculptor, or other artisan and is well preserved or may be rehabilitated;

iii) It is associated with a person who is recognized as having made an important contribution to the city’s social, cultural, political, economic, technological or physical development or as having materially influenced the course of local, regional, provincial, national or international history;

iv) It is directly associated with an historic event which is recognized as having local, regional, provincial, national or international importance;

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

vi) It is a representative example of a method of construction now rarely used;

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

viii) It is a representative example of architectural design;

ix) It terminates a view or otherwise makes an important contribution to the urban composition or streetscape of which it forms a part;

x) It is generally recognized as an important landmark;

xi) It is a representative example of outstanding interior design; or

xii) It is a representative example of a rare or otherwise important feature of good urban design or streetscaping.

(City of Cambridge 2018)

2.2 Field Program

A property assessment was undertaken on April 20, 2023, by Frank Smith, Cultural Heritage Specialist, with Stantec. Photographs were taken on Nikon D5300 at a resolution of 300 dots per inch and 6000 by 4000 pixels. The weather conditions were seasonably cool and partly cloudy.
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2.3 Background Research

Historical research was undertaken to put the Study Area into historical context. Primary sources, secondary sources, and historical mapping were reviewed, including using digital databases and conducting research at the City of Cambridge Archives and Records Centre.

2.4 Assessment of Impacts

The assessment of impacts is based on the impacts defined in the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) Infosheet #5 Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans (Infosheet #5). Impacts to heritage resources may be direct or indirect.

Direct impacts include:

- Destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features
- Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance

Indirect impacts do not result in the direct destruction or alteration of the feature or its heritage attributes, but may indirectly affect the CHVI of a property by creating:

- Shadows that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden
- Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship
- Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features
- A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces
- Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soil, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource

(Government of Ontario 2006)

In addition to direct impacts related to destruction, this HIA also evaluated the potential for indirect impacts due to vibrations resulting from construction and the transportation of project components and personnel. This was categorized together with land disturbance. Although the effect of traffic and construction vibrations on historic period structures is not fully understood, vibrations may be perceptible in buildings with a setback of less than 40 metres from the curbside (Crispino and D'Apuzzo 2001; Ellis...
1987; Rainer 1982; Wiss 1981; National Park Service 2001). For this study, a 50-metre buffer is used to represent a conservative approach to delineate potential effects related to vibration. The proximity of the proposed alternatives to heritage attributes was considered in this assessment.

2.5 Mitigation Options

In addition to providing a framework to assess the impacts of a proposed undertaking, the MCM Infosheet #5 also provide methods to minimize or avoid impacts on cultural heritage resources. These include, but are not limited to:

- **Alternative development approaches**
- **Isolating development and site alteration from significant built and natural features and vistas**
- **Design guidelines that harmonize mass, setback, setting, and materials**
- **Limiting height and density**
- **Allowing only compatible infill and additions**
- **Reversible alterations**
- **Buffer zones, site plan control, and other planning mechanisms**

(Government of Ontario 2006)
3 Historical Summary

3.1 Introduction

The Study Area is located at 104 Water Street North in the City of Cambridge. Historically, this parcel of land is part of Lot 1, East of the Grand River, Concession 11, in the former Township of Dumfries, later the City of Galt. The Study Area was previously a mill that was built by the C. Turnbull Company Limited, which operated a knitting factory.

The City of Cambridge is located on land traditionally used by the Haudenosaunee, Anishinaabe, and Neutral Indigenous peoples (City of Cambridge 2023a). The City of Cambridge is situated on lands covered under Treaty 3, known as the Between the Lakes Purchase. This treaty was signed in December 1792 between representatives of the Crown and certain Mississauga peoples (Ministry of Indigenous Affairs 2023). Part of this land was used to create the Haldimand Tract, a tract of land six miles deep on each side of the Grand River granted to the Haudenosaunee. In 1796, the Haudenosaunee began to sell land within the Haldimand Tract. The present-day City of Cambridge is historically located in a tract of land known as Block 1 of the Haldimand Tract that was sold in 1798 (Filice 2016).

3.2 Site History

The early settlement of present-day Galt is linked to William Dickson, a prominent landowner and Scottish immigrant. In 1837, his son Robert Dickson retained John Cain of Montreal to construct a dam across the Grand River and a mill race along the east bank. Dickson planned to build mills at the site and invited businesses to establish themselves along the Mill Race. The waterpower provided by the dam and mill race would later be used by the C. Turnbull Company (Quantrell 2015: 7; Heritage Cambridge 1988). By 1846, Galt was known for its abundant and valuable waterpower and many industries were noted as operating within the community (Smith 1846: 62).

The C. Turnbull Knitting Company traces its origins to 1854 when Robert Turnbull and John Deans immigrated to Galt from Scotland. In Scotland, Turnbull had worked in the tweed industry and Deans had worked in the knitting industry (Toronto Globe 1909). In 1859, Deans and Turnbull founded a knitting company that operated from a roughcast building on West Main Street in Galt, located outside of the Study Area (Toronto Globe 1905). During this time the business had about six employees, including Turnbull and Deans, and all knitting was done by hand (Toronto Globe 1909). In 1861, the company purchased hand knitting frames which allowed for the manufacture of full-fashioned underwear. This type of underwear was regarded as more comfortable and better shaped. However, it was also more time consuming to manufacture and more expensive. Turnbull was the only manufacturer in North America of full-fashioned...
underwear, and it was marketed under the brand name “CEETEE”. (Quantrell 2015: 84). While Turnbull and Deans operated their business outside the Study Area, historical mapping from 1867 indicates the Study Area already contained a mill race and was lined with businesses (Figure 3).

In 1872, Robert Turnbull purchased Dean’s share of the business. Robert continued to operate the business until his death in 1878 (Toronto Globe 1905). Following his death, the business was taken over by his sons Charles Turnbull and John Turnbull (Toronto Globe 1905; Toronto Globe 1909) (Plate 1 and Plate 2). Charles Turnbull served as Secretary-Treasurer of the company and was a prominent citizen of Galt. He variously served on the City Council, the Public Library Board, the Gore Mutual Fire Insurance Company, and was a noted bowler and curler (Toronto Globe 1924). John Turnbull served as Director of Sales and Marketing and was also a prominent citizen of Galt who served as an Alderman, Reeve, Chairman of the Suburban Roads Commission, and member of the Board of Trade. He was also known as a keen golfer and curler (Toronto Globe 1921).

Under the leadership of the Turnbull brothers, the company achieved national recognition. The company was noted for its manufacture of underwear for men, women, and children and its products were sold across Canada. Charles Turnbull received awards for his garments at the Centennial Exhibition of 1876 and the Industrial Fair at Toronto in 1880 (Industries of Canada 1886). Garments manufactured by the company were used to supply clothing for the Royal Northwest Mounted Police (the present-day RCMP) for 25 years (Toronto Globe 1909).

Plate 1: Charles Turnbull, circa 1909 (Toronto Globe 1909)  Plate 2: John Turnbull, circa 1909 (Toronto Globe 1909)
In 1890, the company moved into the Study Area when it took over the former Wardlaw Mill, which had previously operated within the Study Area since at least 1880 (Mills 2017; Quantrell 2015: 84; GRCA n.d.). That same year, the company was reorganized as a joint stock company named the C. Turnbull Company (Toronto Globe 1905). The move to the Study Area included the purchase of twenty hand machines and the doubling of the staff of the factory. However, the company did not dismiss or retrain their staff who were solely hand laborers. Instead, they were allowed to continue working as before (Toronto Globe 1909). By the end of the 19th century, Galt had developed into a significant manufacturing centre and its mills and factories were powered by the Grand River, including the C. Turnbull mill (Francis 2009). Between 1871 and 1891 the population of Galt increased from 3,827 to 7,535 (Dominion Bureau of Statistics 1953).

In 1897, the former Wardlaw Mill was destroyed by fire and was replaced by a three-storey stone structure, of which some ruins remain in present-day Mill Race Park (Toronto Globe 1905; Heritage Cambridge 1988). Between 1898 and 1909 the factory was once again expanded (Toronto Globe 1909). By 1905, the factory was noted as “one of the best mills in Canada” and employed about 200 workers (Toronto Globe 1905). An article from the Toronto Globe illustrated the expansion of the mill over the years (Plate 3). The company reached its peak in the early 1920s when it employed about 450 workers and manufactured lines of full-fashioned, knit and cut, and rayon underwear (Quantrell 2015: 84). Fire insurance mapping from 1929 shows the location of the mill race and the extent of the C. Turnbull Company and its buildings (Figure 4). After the death of Charles Turnbull, the new company president was Robert Forbes (City of Cambridge Archives and Records Centre 1977).

Plate 3: Expansion of the C. Turnbull Company between 1859 and 1909 (Toronto Globe 1909)
In 1946, the C. Turnbull Company was sold to Newlands and Company. This company was then sold to Stauffer-Dobbie, another textile company (Mills 2017). In the early 1950s, Stauffer-Dobbie discontinued the use of waterpower derived from the millrace. By that point, waterpower was a secondary power source and the mill had also used steam power and electricity (Quantrell 2015: 84).

Stauffer-Dobbie continued to operate the former Turnbull mill until its closure in 1972 (GRCA n.d.). In 1973, the City of Cambridge and the Citizens Advisory Committee on Riverbank Development began plans to develop the shoreline of the Grand River into a greenbelt. In November 1973, the committee received a proposal from the landscape architect Andres Kalm for the project (Cambridge Archives and Records Centre No Date [n.d.]). Kalm was an Estonian-Canadian landscape architect who also completed work for the Estonian Home and Ehatare Rest Home in Toronto (Estonians in Canada 1984). In May 1974, the Grand River experienced extensive flooding when two-and-one-half inches of rain fell (63 millimetres). The rainfall caused the waters of the Grand River in Galt to rise 17 feet above normal (Globe and Mail 1974). As a result, much of the mill was destroyed (GRCA n.d.; Heritage Cambridge 1988). Following the flood, much of the mill was demolished, except for some wall sections, which Kalm intended to integrate into the greenbelt (Plate 4) (Cambridge Archives and Records Centre No Date [n.d.]).
Plate 4: Partial demolition of the mill, 1974 (Cambridge Archives and Records Centre 1974)

Redeveloping the Turnbull Mill into a park was the first major project of the riverbank redevelopment program. The Riverbank Redevelopment Committee worked with the City of Cambridge and the Grand River Conservation Authority to realize the project. Work on the site began in the fall of 1976 and included the construction of paths, the partial demolition of walls to a “desirable height”, and the clearing of the mill race. The contractor for the project was McLean-Peister. In the spring of 1977 the boardwalk, bridges, and seating area were installed. The landscaping program included planting native plants and shrubs (City of Cambridge Archives and Record Centre n.d.).

The park was opened to the public on July 31, 1977, and was attended by dignitaries including the Mayor of Cambridge (City of Cambridge Archives and Record Centre n.d.). Photographs from the 1980s shows the park shortly after its completion (Plate 5 and Plate 6). Today, Mill Race Park and its ruins are used for concerts, weddings, and recreation (Heritage Cambridge 1988; City of Cambridge 2023b). The southernmost bridge over the mill race was replaced by the City of Cambridge in 2019.
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Plate 5: Mill Race Park, *circa* 1980 (Cambridge City Archives and Record Centre 1980a)

Plate 6: Mill Race Park, *circa* 1980 (Cambridge City Archives and Record Centre 1980b)
Historical Mapping, 1867
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4 Site Description

4.1 Introduction

A visual review of the Study Area was undertaken on April 20, 2023, by Frank Smith, Cultural Heritage Specialist. The weather conditions were seasonably cool and partly cloudy. Photographs were taken on a Nikon D5300 at a resolution of 300 dots per inch and 6000 by 4000 pixels. The Study Area contains the Mill Race and ruins of the Turnbull Knitting Mill, which has been adaptively reused into a public park.

4.2 Contextual Setting

The Study Area is located at the southwest corner of Park Hill Road and Water Street North. Park Hill Road is a four-lane asphalt paved roadway with turning lanes. The roadway contains concrete curbs and concrete sidewalks. The north side of the roadway is lined with timber utility poles with municipal LED streetlighting (Photo 1). To the west of the Study Area, the Park Hill Road Bridge spans the Grand River (Photo 2). Water Street North is a two-lane asphalt paved road with on-street parking lanes, concrete curbs and a concrete sidewalk on the entire east side of the road and part of the west side. The road is lined with freestanding municipal streetlighting (Photo 3 and Photo 4).

To the west of the Study Area is the Grand River. The river is set in a valley surrounded by riparian vegetation. Much of the river valley is lined with a concrete dike (Photo 5). To the north of the Park Hill Road Bridge is the Mill Dam, Mill Race, and the former Cambridge Mill, which has been converted into a restaurant (Photo 6 and Photo 7). To the south of the Study Area along the shoreline of the Grand River and above the dike is a multi-use pathway which leads south to the Galt Carnegie Library. To the east of the multi-use pathway is parking lot for the Mill Race Park (Photo 8). This is part of a larger greenbelt located along the Grand River in Cambridge.

The general character of the area is mixed and is heavily influenced by the Grand River and its associated flood control and recreational components, including the Study Area. The structures along Park Hill Road and Water Street North consist of a mix of low-rise and mid-rise structures dating from the mid-19th century to the late 20th century (Photo 9 and Photo 10). Aside from the ruins of Mill Race Park, there are other examples of stone ruins along Water Street North and Park Hill Road. The ruins of the Albion Hotel are located just north of the Study Area at the southeast corner of Water Street North and Park Hill Road and stone ruins associated with the Cambridge Mill are located just west of the northwest corner of Water Street North and Park Hill Road (Photo 11 and Photo 12).
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Photo 1: Park Hill Road, looking west

Photo 2: Park Hill Road Bridge, looking west

Photo 3: Water Street North, looking north

Photo 4: Water Street North, looking south

Photo 5: Grand River, looking south

Photo 6: Dam across Grand River, looking north
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Photo 7: Cambridge Mill, looking north

Photo 8: Parking lot and waterfront trail, looking south

Photo 9: Mixed streetscape along Water Street North, looking north

Photo 10: Mixed streetscape along Park Hill Road, looking east

Photo 11: Albion Hotel ruins, looking north

Photo 12: Mill area ruins, looking north
5 Mill Race Park

Mill Race Park is a multi-tiered passive use park built around the ruins of the Turnbull Knitting Company factory and the Mill Race (Photo 13). The park is connected to a larger greenbelt that runs along the east side of the Grand River between the Galt Carnegie Library and Augusta Street. The park is accessible from entrance along Park Hill Road, Water Street North, and the multi-use trail (Photo 14 to Photo 16).

Along Park Hill Road, the stone ruins directly abut the municipal sidewalk (Photo 17). The stone ruins have been capped with a modern layer of mortar and a plaque, affixed to the ruins, briefly interprets the history of the site (Photo 18 and Photo 19). Along Water Street North, the stone ruins have been partially built into a small earth embankment landscaped with intermediate deciduous trees, shrubs, lawn, and garden beds (Photo 20). To the south of this area on Water Street North is a one-storey stone building which according to fire insurance plans was a storage building for the Turnbull Mill. The building is presently an eatery named “L.A. Frank’s” (Photo 21).

The easterly part of the park is located to the east of the Mill Race. This part of the park consists of the stone ruins of the Turnbull Mill, interlocking brick paver pathways, benches and garden beds (Photo 22 and Photo 23). The Mill Race is located approximately 13 metres west of Water Street North and divides the park. The Mill Race contains stone walls and is built into an earth embankment lined with intermediate deciduous and coniferous trees, shrubs, perennials, and lawn. The Mill Race under Park Hill Road has been partially infilled with concrete and a rusted set of gears is located just south of the infilled concrete. This set of gears likely controlled a sluice gate. Spanning the Mill Race are several stone and concrete beams, which likely supported sections of the Turnbull Knitting Mill that were located above the Mill Race (Photo 24 and Photo 25). Three pedestrian bridges span the Mill Race. The northerly two bridges are timber structures with timber railing and decking and are closed to pedestrian access (Photo 26 and Photo 28). The southerly bridge is a steel girder bridge with timber decking and a metal railing (Photo 30 and Photo 31).

The westerly part of the park is divided into three sections that descend toward the Grand River. The uppermost section contains stone ruins, the cornerstone for the Turnbull Mill, benches, intermediate deciduous trees, and an interlocking brick paver walkway. The dedication plaque for the Grand River’s designation as a Canadian Heritage River is also included in this section (Photo 32 and Photo 33). To the west of this area are sets of timber stairs that lead to an amphitheatre with seating built into the slope of the area and timber retaining walls. The stairs lead to an open area paved with stone and set against stone ruins along the Grand River (Photo 34 and Photo 35). To the south of the amphitheatre is a stone pathway along the Grand River and a set of stairs that descend to the river itself (Photo 36). Along the river is a concrete pathway (Photo 37).
Mill Race Pedestrian Bridges—Modified Heritage Impact Assessment, Cambridge, Ontario
5 Mill Race Park
June 9, 2023

Photo 13: General view of Mill Race Park, looking east

Photo 14: Park entrances along Park Hill Road, looking west

Photo 15: Park entrance at corner of Park Hill Road and Water Street North, looking west
Photo 16:  Park entrances from trail and Water Street North, looking north

Photo 17:  Ruins along Park Hill Road, looking south

Photo 18:  Mortar comparison, looking south

Photo 19:  Plaque along Park Hill Road, looking south

Photo 20:  Park along Water Street North, looking south

Photo 21:  L.A. Frank’s, looking west
Photo 22: Easterly part of park, looking south

Photo 23: Easterly part of park, looking north

Photo 24: Mill Race, looking north

Photo 25: Mill Race, looking north
Photo 26: Northernmost pedestrian bridge closed to public, looking west

Photo 27: Northern pedestrian bridge closed to public, showing decking and railing, looking north
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Photo 28: Southern pedestrian bridge closed to public, general view, looking west

Photo 29: Southern pedestrian bridge closed to public, showing decking and railing, looking south
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Photo 30: Southerly bridge, looking south

Photo 31: Southerly bridge, looking west

Photo 32: Upper area west of Mill Race, looking north

Photo 33: Turnbull Company cornerstone, looking west

Photo 34: Amphitheatre, looking north

Photo 35: Stone floor and stone ruins, looking west
Photo 36: Stone walkway and stairs to river, looking south

Photo 37: Path along river, looking north
6  Evaluation

6.1  Introduction

The criteria for determining CHVI are defined by Ontario Regulation 9/06 (O. Reg. 9/06) as amended by O. Reg 569/22. If a property meets two or more of the criteria it is determined to contain, or represent, a cultural heritage resource. A summary statement of cultural heritage value will be prepared and a list of heritage attributes which define the CHVI identified. In addition, the Study Area was evaluated against the City of Cambridge’s Cultural Heritage Evaluation Criteria. The evaluation of Mill Race Park according to O. Reg. 9/06 and the City’s Cultural Heritage Evaluation Criteria are provided below.

6.2  Design or Physical Value

The Study Area contains the ruins of a mill race and the former Turnbull Knitting Company factory, stone structures that have been adaptively reused into a public park. The factory was partially demolished in the mid-1970s following its closure and partial destruction from flood damage. The City of Cambridge contains many examples of stone architecture that retain a higher degree of heritage integrity. In 1988, Heritage Cambridge noted that “The stone architecture in Cambridge forms one of the most vital elements contributing to the charm and character of our community” (Heritage Cambridge 1988). Stone structures dating to the mid-19th to early 20th century remain widespread in downtown Galt into the present-day. The downtown Galt area also contains an example of an intact exterior of a textile mill, specifically the property at 35 Water Street North, which was formerly occupied by the Galt Knitting Company (Quantrell 2015: 8). While the mill race remains visible in the park, it is a ruin that was modified when the area was adaptively reused. Modifications include the partial closure of the mill race at its north and south ends and the exposing of sections of the mill race formerly obscured by the Turnbull Factory. Therefore, the stone ruins at Mill Race Park cannot be considered to illustrate a particular style, type, expression, material, or construction method in the City of Cambridge. Stone architecture is not rare in the community and partial demolition of the factory precludes it from having many of the shared characteristic typical to factories or stone architecture.

Plans for the adaptive reuse of the Turnbull Factory and mill race began as early as 1973 and the park was opened in 1977. In general, modern adaptive reuse began in the 1970s and became increasingly popular after 1975 when Sherban Cantacuzino authored “New Uses For Old Buildings.” Mills were one of the examples provided by Cantacuzino when discussing adaptive reuse (Van Cleempoel and Plevoets 2013). Therefore, the park would be an early example of a constructed landscape centred around adaptive reuse.
Neither Mill Race Park as a constructed landscape or the stone ruins show a high degree of craftsmanship, artistic merit, technical achievement, or scientific achievement. The layout of the park itself and the materials used for the park are typical. The stone ruins themselves consist of rubble stone, a common and utilitarian building method for Waterloo County.

### 6.3 Historical or Associative Value

The property is historically associated with Robert Dickson and the Turnbull Knitting Company. Robert Dickson was the son of William Dickson and was instrumental in developing Galt into a centre of manufacturing in the area. Dickson was responsible for the construction of the mill race within the Study Area and invited businesses to establish operations along the mill race. Therefore, Robert Dickson made a significant contribution to the development of Galt through the construction of infrastructure which acted as a catalyst to Galt’s industrial development. One of the companies that took advantage of the waterpower made available by the mill race was the Turnbull Knitting Company. The company produced wool underwear that was sold throughout Canada and the factory employed hundreds of workers. During much of the late 19th and early 20th century, the Turnbull Company was operated by brothers Charles and John Turnbull. Both Charles and John were prominent citizens of Cambridge who served on various civic committees and as elected officials. Therefore, the Turnbull Company made a significant contribution to the textile industry in Galt, which was an important industry in Galt, and the Turnbull brothers both made significant contributions to the development of Galt through their management of the mill and involvement in public life.

Mill Race Park does not offer new knowledge or a greater understanding of a particular aspect of the community’s history. The original factory has been partially demolished and adaptively reused as a passive use park.

Mill Race Park was designed by the landscape architect Andres Kalm. While Kalm was evidently an early adopter of the adaptive reuse movement, historical research does not indicate that Kalm made a strong or notable contribution to the development of Cambridge or the overall field of landscape architecture.

### 6.4 Contextual Value

The area surrounding Mill Race Park is mixed in character and contains a mix of low-rise and mid-rise structures dating to the mid-19th century to late 20th century. A major contributor to the character of the area around Mill Race Park is stone architecture, particularly the stone ruins at the intersection of Park Hill Drive and Water Street North. The Study Area is located adjacent to the stone ruins of the Albion Hotel and stone ruins adjacent to the Cambridge Mill. As a result, this gives the area a character influenced by the use of stone and stone ruins. Mill Race Park and its stone ruins contribute to this distinct character. Mill Race Park is physically, functionally, visually,
and historically linked to its surroundings. This includes a physical, functional, visual, and historical link with the dam located to the north of the park, a physical, functional, visual, and historical link with the Grand River, which provided a source of waterpower to be dammed.

Much of Mill Race Park is located within the river valley or partially obscured by remaining stone walls. In addition, the most visually prominent example of stone architecture in the vicinity is the Cambridge Mill, which is readily visible when traveling eastbound on Park Hill Road and northbound on Water Street North. Therefore, Mill Race Park is not particularly prominent within the area compared to other nearby properties.

### 6.5 O. Reg. 9/06 Evaluation

**Table 1: Evaluation According to O. Reg. 9/06**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria of O. Reg. 9/06 (amended by O. Reg. 569/22)</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The property has design value or physical value because it is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The park was opened in 1977 and is an early example of a constructed landscape centred around adaptive reuse. In general, modern adaptive reuse began in the 1970s. The stone ruins at Mill Race Park cannot be considered to illustrate a particular style, type, expression, material, or construction method in the City of Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The property has design value or physical value because it displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The quality of execution and assembly of materials are typical. The materials and layout of the park reflect late 20th century design and the stone ruins are typical rubble stone construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The property has design value or physical value because it demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The park and stone ruins do not demonstrate any breakthroughs in construction techniques or adaptation of materials, forms, and arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria of O. Reg. 9/06 (amended by O. Reg. 569/22)</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The property has historical value or associative value because it has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The property is historically associated with Robert Dickson and the Turnbull Knitting Company. Robert Dickson made a significant contribution to the development of Galt through the construction of infrastructure which acted as a catalyst to Galt’s industrial development. The Turnbull Company made a significant contribution to the textile industry in Galt, which was an important industry in Galt, and the Turnbull brothers both made significant contributions to the development of Galt through their management of the mill and involvement in public life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The property has historical value or associative value because it yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mill Race Park does not offer new knowledge or a greater understanding of a particular aspect of the community’s history. The original factory has been partially demolished and adaptively reused as a passive use park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The property has historical value or associative value because it demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mill Race Park was designed by the landscape architect Andres Kalm. While Kalm was evidently an early adopter of the adaptive reuse movement, historical research does not indicate that Kalm made a strong or notable contribution to the development of Cambridge or the overall field of landscape architecture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. The property has contextual value because it is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria of O. Reg. 9/06 (amended by O. Reg. 569/22)</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. The property has contextual value because it is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mill Race Park is located adjacent to the stone ruins of the Albion Hotel and stone ruins adjacent to the Cambridge Mill. As a result, this gives the area a character influenced by the use of stone and stone ruins. Mill Race Park and its stone ruins contribute to this distinct character.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria of O. Reg. 9/06 (amended by O. Reg. 569/22)</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. The property has contextual value because it is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mill Race Park is physically, functionally, visually, and historically linked to its surroundings. This includes a physical, functional, visual, and historical link with the dam located to the north of the park, a physical, functional, visual, and historical link with the Grand River, which provided a source of waterpower to be dammed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The property has contextual value because it is a landmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria of O. Reg. 9/06 (amended by O. Reg. 569/22)</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. The property has contextual value because it is a landmark</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Much of Mill Race Park is located within the river valley or partially obscured by remaining stone walls. In addition, the most visually prominent example of stone architecture in the vicinity is the Cambridge Mill, which is readily visible when traveling eastbound on Park Hill Road and northbound on Water Street North.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.6 Cambridge Cultural Heritage Evaluation Criteria Summary

Table 2: Evaluation According to Cambridge Cultural Heritage Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It dates from an early period in the development of the city’s communities;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Mill Race was built in 1837 and is an early structure that served as a catalyst for Galt’s industrial development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is a representative example of the work of an outstanding local,</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mill Race Park was designed by the landscape architect Andres Kalm. Historical research does not indicate he was particularly significant to the field of landscape architecture in Cambridge or the wider provincial or national realm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national, or international architect, engineer, builder, designer,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landscape architect, interior designer, sculptor, or other artisan and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is well preserved or may be rehabilitated;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is associated with a person who is recognized as having made an</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The property is associated with Robert Dickson, Charles Turnbull, and John Turnbull.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important contribution to the city’s social, cultural, political,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Dickson made a significant contribution to the development of Galt through the construction of infrastructure which acted as a catalyst to Galt’s industrial development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic, technological or physical development or as having materially</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Turnbull and John Turnbull both made significant contributions to the development of Galt through their management of the mill and involvement in public life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influenced the course of local, regional, provincial, national or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international history;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is directly associated with an historic event which is recognized</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The Study Area is not associated with a particular event that has local, regional, provincial, national, or international importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as having local, regional, provincial, national or international</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>importance;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is a representative example and illustration of the city’s social,</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The remains of the mill race and foundation walls are representative examples of Galt’s industrial heritage and the cultural redevelopment of the Grand River waterfront in the mid to late 20th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural, political, economic or technological development history;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It is a representative example of a method of construction now rarely used;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>While stone is a building material now rarely used, the City of Cambridge and downtown Galt contains many examples of intact stone buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is a representative example of its architectural style or period of building;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The stone ruins are not representative of a particular architectural style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It is a representative example of architectural design;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The stone ruins are not representative of a particular architectural design. While the park is an example of adaptive reuse, its unique design is not representative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It terminates a view or otherwise makes an important contribution to the urban composition or streetscape of which it forms a part;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>As one of several stone ruins in the area, Mill Race Park makes an important contribution to the composition of the streetscape at the intersection of Water Street North and Park Hill Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It is generally recognized as an important landmark;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>There is no indication the community considers this a landmark. The adjacent Cambridge Mill is a more prominent stone structure in the vicinity of the Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. It is a representative example of outstanding interior design; or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No interior elements remain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It is a representative example of a rare or otherwise important feature of good urban design or streetscaping.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mill Race Park contributes to the urban design of the Grand River waterfront in Galt as an example of an adaptively reused industrial space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.7 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

Description of Property

The property at 104 Water Street North, named Mill Race Park, is located in the City of Cambridge, Region of Waterloo, Ontario. The property contains the ruins of a mill race and knitting factory. The mill race was built in 1837 and the knitting factory was built in 1897. Between 1890 and 1946, the property was occupied by the C. Turnbull Knitting Company, which manufactured wool underwear using waterpower provided by the mill race.

Cultural Heritage Value

Mill Race Park contains design/physical value as an early example of a constructed landscape centred around adaptive reuse. Plans for the adaptive reuse of the knitting factory began in 1973, shortly after the closure of the mill. The adaptive reuse movement began in the 1970s. Mill Race Park was opened in 1977 and is an early example in Cambridge of adaptive reuse.

Mill Race Park contains historical/associative value through its direct associations with Robert Dickson, the Turnbull Knitting Company, Charles Turnbull, and John Turnbull. Robert Dickson was instrumental in developing Galt into a centre of manufacturing in the area. Dickson was responsible for the construction of the mill race within the Study Area and invited businesses to establish operations along the mill race. One of the companies which took advantage of the waterpower made available by the mill race was the Turnbull Knitting Company. The company produced wool underwear which was sold throughout Canada and the factory employed hundreds of workers. During much of the late 19th and early 20th century, the Turnbull Company was operated by brothers Charles and John Turnbull. Both Charles and John were prominent citizens of Cambridge who served on various civic committees and as elected officials. Therefore, the Turnbull Company made a significant contribution to the textile industry in Galt, which was an important industry in Galt, and the Turnbull brothers both made significant contributions to the development of Galt through their management of the mill and involvement in public life.

Mill Race Park contains contextual value as it contributes to the character of the surrounding area through its stone ruins, which are a major contributor to the character of the area around Mill Race Park. Mill Race Park is located adjacent to the stone ruins of the Albion Hotel and stone ruins adjacent to the Cambridge Mill. As a result, this gives the area a character influenced by the stone and stone ruins. Mill Race Park is physically, functionally, visually, and historically linked to its surroundings. This includes a physical, functional, visual, and historical link with the dam located to the north of the park, a physical, functional, visual, and historical link with the Grand River, which provided a source of waterpower to be dammed.
Heritage Attributes

Early example of a constructed landscaped centred around adaptive reuse, including:

- Stone ruins part of the former Turnbull Knitting Factory
- Mill Race consisting of stone walls and sluice gate machinery
- Network of circulation routes including paths, bridge crossings over the mill race, and staircases
- Amphitheatre area consisting of seating built into terrain on timber retaining walls.
- Physical, functional, visual, and historical link with the Grand River and Mill Dam
- Landscaped grounds with garden beds
7  Impact Assessment

7.1  Description of Proposed Undertaking

The City has identified that two timber bridges within the park, built *circa* 1990, are due for replacement given their unsafe condition. The City has identified four alternatives, including:

1. Do nothing, keep bridges closed and defer decision on bridges until long term Mill Race planning is complete;
2. Permanently decommission/demolish both bridges, do not rebuild;
3. Decommission/demolish both bridges and rebuild both bridges;
4. Permanently decommission/demolish Bridge 2; rebuild Bridge 3 (due to accessibility restraints [bridge deck slope] only Bridge 3 is to be rebuilt if both are not rebuilt to meet accessibility requirements).

Should replacement be determined to be the preferred option, the proposed replacement bridges are based on a similar bridge replacement undertaken in 2019. This replacement bridge contains timber decking and a general appearance which is sympathetic to the design of the existing bridges. The bridges are not anticipated to be installed directly on or attached to the existing mill race stones. Drawings of the 2019 bridge replacement are contained in Appendix A.

7.2  Assessment of Impacts

The Mill Race Park has CHVI since it meets four criteria for determining CHVI in O. Reg. 9/06 and meets five criteria of the City of Cambridge Cultural Heritage Evaluation Criteria. Therefore, an assessment of potential impacts to the heritage attributes identified for Mill Race Park based on the four alternatives is provided in Table 3 and . Impacts are defined by InfoSheet #5 (Section 2.4).
Table 3: Evaluation of Potential Direct Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Impact</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features.</td>
<td>This proposed alternative will retain the bridges <em>in situ</em> and not result in the destruction of heritage attributes. <strong>Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
<td>This proposed alternative will result in the removal of both bridges. The location of these bridges are part of the network of circulation routes identified as a heritage attribute. <strong>Therefore, mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
<td>This proposed alternative will result in the replacement of the existing bridges. While the bridges will be replaced, the CHVI identified is not related to the bridges themselves but their placement within the network of circulation routes. <strong>Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
<td>This proposed alternative will result in the removal of one bridge and replacement of one bridge. The location of these bridges are part of the network of circulation routes identified as a heritage attribute. <strong>Therefore, mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.</td>
<td>This proposed alternative will not result in the alteration of heritage attributes as the existing bridges will be retained <em>in situ</em>. <strong>Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
<td>This proposed alternative will result in the removal of both bridges. <strong>Therefore, this direct impact is not applicable.</strong></td>
<td>This proposed alternative will result in the replacement of the existing bridges. While the bridges will be replaced, the CHVI identified is not related to the bridges themselves but their placement within the park as part of the network of circulation routes identified as a heritage attribute.</td>
<td>This proposed alternative will result in the removal of one bridge and replacement of one bridge. The proposed replacement bridge is based on a similar bridge replacement undertaken in 2019. This replacement bridge contains timber decking and a general...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Impact</td>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>heritage attribute. In addition, the proposed replacement bridges are based on a similar bridge replacement undertaken in 2019. This replacement bridge contains timber decking and a general appearance which is sympathetic to the design of the existing bridges. The bridges are not anticipated to be installed directly on or attached to the existing mill race stones. Drawings of the 2019 bridge replacement are contained in Appendix A. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</td>
<td>appearance which is sympathetic to the design of the existing bridges. The bridges is not anticipated to be installed directly on or attached to the existing mill race stones. Drawings of the 2019 bridge replacement are contained in Appendix A. <strong>Therefore, this direct impact is not applicable.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 4: Evaluation of Potential Indirect Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Impact</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shadows</td>
<td>This proposed alternative will result in the retention of the existing bridges in situ. This will not create new shadows. <strong>Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
<td>This proposed alternative will result in the removal of both bridges. <strong>Therefore, this indirect impact is not applicable.</strong></td>
<td>This proposed alternative will result in the replacement of both existing bridges. This will not introduce new shadows. <strong>Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
<td>This proposed alternative will result in the replacement of one bridge and removal of one bridge. This will not introduce new shadows. <strong>Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>This proposed alternative will result in the retention of the existing bridges in situ. <strong>Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
<td>This proposed alternative will result in the removal of both bridges. <strong>Therefore, this indirect impact is not applicable.</strong></td>
<td>This proposed alternative will result in the replacement of both bridges. This will not result in isolation. <strong>Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
<td>This proposed alternative will result in the removal of one bridge. While only one crossing will remain in this area, the relationship between these bridges is not significant from a heritage perspective. <strong>Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Indirect Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Description</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features</strong></td>
<td>No significant views or vistas were identified as heritage attributes. <strong>Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
<td>This proposed alternative will result in the removal of both bridges. <strong>Therefore, this indirect impact is not applicable.</strong></td>
<td>No significant views or vistas were identified as heritage attributes. <strong>Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
<td>No significant views or vistas were identified as heritage attributes. <strong>Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces</strong></td>
<td>This proposed alternative will not result in a change of land use. The area will remain a passive use park. <strong>Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
<td>This proposed alternative will not result in a change of land use. The area will remain a passive use park. <strong>Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
<td>This proposed alternative will not result in a change of land use. The area will remain a passive use park. <strong>Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
<td>This proposed alternative will not result in a change of land use. The area will remain a passive use park. <strong>Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Indirect Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land disturbances</strong></td>
<td>This proposed alternative will result in the retention of the existing bridges in situ. <strong>Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
<td>This proposed alternative will result in the removal of both bridges. Land disturbance from the demolition of the bridges may also have the potential to impact the stone ruins through temporary vibrations during the construction period that may cause shifts or damage. <strong>Therefore, mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
<td>This proposed alternative will result in the removal of both bridges and the construction of new bridges. Land disturbance from the demolition and replacement of bridges may also have the potential to impact the stone ruins through temporary vibrations during the construction period that may cause shifts or damage. <strong>Therefore, mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
<td>This proposed alternative will result in the removal of one bridge and replacement of one bridge. Land disturbance from the bridge demolition and replacement may also have the potential to impact the stone ruins through temporary vibrations during the construction period that may cause shifts or damage. <strong>Therefore, mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Typically, indirect impacts resulting from land disturbances apply to archaeological resources, which are beyond the scope of this report. However, this report also considers land disturbance impacts resulting from construction activities.
7.3 Summary of Impacts

The results of the impact assessment for each alternative are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5: Summary of Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Direct Impacts Summary</th>
<th>Indirect Impacts Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>Both bridges will be retained in situ and no direct impacts are anticipated. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</td>
<td>Both bridges will be retained in situ and no direct impacts are anticipated. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>Both bridges will be removed and not replaced. Therefore, direct impacts are anticipated through destruction as defined in InfoSheet #5. Therefore, mitigation measures are required.</td>
<td>Indirect impacts related to land disturbance from the removal of both bridges may have the potential to impact the stone ruins through temporary vibrations during the construction period that may cause shifts or damage. Therefore, mitigation measures are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>The existing bridges will be removed and replaced. While the bridges will be replaced, the CHVI identified is not related to the bridges themselves but their placement within the park as part of the network of circulation routes. In addition, the proposed bridge replacements are sympathetic to the existing bridges. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.</td>
<td>Indirect impacts related to land disturbance from the removal of both bridges may have the potential to impact the stone ruins through temporary vibrations during the construction period that may cause shifts or damage. Therefore, mitigation measures are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Direct Impacts Summary</td>
<td>Indirect Impacts Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>One bridge will be removed, and one bridge will be replaced. Therefore, direct impacts are anticipated through destruction as defined in InfoSheet #5. <strong>Therefore, mitigation measures are required</strong></td>
<td>Indirect impacts related to land disturbance from bridge removal and replacement may have the potential to impact the stone ruins through temporary vibrations during the construction period that may cause shifts or damage. <strong>Therefore, mitigation measures are required.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 Mitigation

8.1 Introduction

Mill Race Park was determined to contain CHVI at it meets four criteria for determining CHVI in O. Reg. 9/06 and meets five criteria of the City of Cambridge Cultural Heritage Evaluation Criteria. As identified in Table 3 and Table 4, Alternatives 2 and 4 have the potential to result in direct impacts from the removal and replacement of bridges and Alternatives 1 through 4 have the potential for indirect impacts from land disturbance. Accordingly, the following mitigation options for each alternative is discussed below.

8.2 Direct Impacts

8.2.1 Alternative 1

Alternative 1 would result in no impacts to the heritage attributes of Mill Race Park. Therefore, if Alternative 1 is chosen no mitigation measures are required. It is understood that Alternative 1 is an interim option until long term Mill Race Park planning is completed.

If this option is selected, the long-term Mill Race Park planning should consider the heritage attributes of Mill Race Park identified in this HIA. This should include retaining the existing network of paths and bridge crossings over the mill race located in Mill Race Park.

8.2.2 Alternative 2 and 4

Alternatives 2 and 4 would result in direct impacts to the heritage attributes of Mill Race Park as one or both bridges will be removed as part of the proposed undertaking. Given that the CHVI of the bridges is limited to their role as part of the circulation network of Mill Race Park, additional documentation of the bridges and their contextual relationship with the circulation network is an appropriate mitigation measure.

This additional documentation can be a supplementary report or amendment to the HIA to record the locations of the bridge and their surrounding context more fully. This can include a key plan and photography log to visually illustrate Mill Race Park and its identified heritage attributes, including the locations of the bridges as part of the circulation network. The additional information provided can be used to inform future design considerations for Mill Race Park. Documentation also creates a public record of Mill Race Park and its surrounding context which provides researchers and the general public with construction details and a photographic record of the resource. This documentation should be undertaken prior to any changes made to the property.
8.2.3 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would not result in any direct impacts to the heritage attributes of Mill Race Park. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required. The identified CHVI of the bridges is limited to their role as part of the circulation network of Mill Race Park. It is also understood that both bridges are not original and according to discussions with the City of Cambridge were rebuilt based on the original bridges circa 1990.

8.3 Indirect Impacts

8.3.1 Alternative 1

Alternative 1 does not result in any indirect impacts as both bridges are retained in situ.

8.3.2 Alternatives 2, 3, and 4

The proposed demolition and/or reconstruction of bridges adjacent to the stone ruins has the potential to cause indirect impacts through land disturbance which could damage the stone ruins and/or their mortar. Site Plan Controls are an appropriate mitigation measure to address this concern.

A qualified person(s) such as a qualified engineer stone mason with experience in heritage structures should be retained to complete a pre-construction assessment to determine acceptable levels of vibration given the site-specific conditions (including soil conditions, equipment proposed to be used, and stone characteristics and mortar). Should the stone ruins be determined to be within the zone of influence, additional steps should be taken to secure the ruins from experiencing negative vibration effects (i.e., adjustment of machinery or establishment of buffer zones).
9 Recommendations

9.1 Supplementary Documentation (Alternatives 2, and 4)

Given that the CHVI of the bridges is limited to their role as part of the circulation network of Mill Race Park, additional documentation of the bridges and their contextual relationship with the circulation network is an appropriate mitigation measure to address the impacts identified in Alternatives 2 and 4.

This additional documentation can be a supplementary report or amendment to the HIA to record the locations of the bridge and their surrounding context more fully. This can include a key plan and photographic log to visually illustrate Mill Race Park and its identified heritage attributes, including the locations of the bridges as part of the circulation network. The additional information provided can be used to inform future design considerations for Mill Race Park and should be deposited at the City of Cambridge Archives and Records Centre.

Documentation also creates a public record of Mill Race Park and its surrounding context that provides researchers and the general public with construction details and a photographic record of the resource. This documentation should be undertaken prior to any changes made to the property.

9.2 Site Plan Controls (Alternatives 2, 3, and 4)

A qualified person(s) such as a qualified engineer or stone mason with experience in heritage structures should be retained to complete a pre-construction assessment to determine acceptable levels of vibration given the site-specific conditions (including soil conditions, equipment proposed to be used, and stone characteristics and mortar). Should the stone ruins be determined to be within the zone of influence, additional steps should be taken to secure the ruins from experiencing negative vibration effects (i.e., adjustment of machinery or establishment of buffer zones).
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Committee Members in Attendance: Nelson Cecilia, Michelle Goodridge, Jack O’Donnell, Megan Oldfield (7:06 p.m.) Councillor Corey Kimpson (7:02 p.m.) Nancy Woodman and Kimberly Livingstone in the role of Chair.

Regrets: Natasha Beaton, Susan Brown

Staff in Attendance: Laura Waldie, Senior Planner Heritage, Karin Stieg-Drobig, Recording Secretary and Maria Barrantes Barreto, Council Committee Services Coordinator

Meeting Called to Order

The meeting of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee was held virtually via Microsoft Zoom and live streamed to the City of Cambridge YouTube channel. Kimberly Livingstone, MHAC Chairperson, welcomed everyone present, and she advised those present that in its advisory role, MHAC makes recommendations that then go to Council for a decision. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. and the meeting adjourned at 8:11 p.m.

Declarations of Interest – NIL

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Moved by: Nancy Woodman
Seconded by: Nelson Cecilia

It was noted that on page 6 of the agenda, in the last paragraph, the words “photolight metrics” should be “photo metrics” and was corrected in the minutes.

THAT the minutes of the March 16, 2023 meeting of the Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee be considered for errors and omissions and be adopted.

CARRIED
Presentation:

Paul Willms, Sustainability Planner, gave a comprehensive presentation explaining the draft Parks Master Plan. Mr. Willms explained that the 30 year plan, with shorter, 10 year term increments will include public engagement at various stages. He noted that public and stakeholder input will be gathered through surveys, visits to the advisory committees and public meetings. This information will then be utilized in the report to Council to seek direction moving forward with the Plan.

The number and types of parks was explained in detail, including community and neighbourhood parks, urban squares and parkettes, trailheads and outdoor recreation facilities that are part of the approximately 500 hectares of public space within Cambridge. It was noted that the expected 50% increase of population within the City of Cambridge will require 64 hectares of developable parkland to meet the current service standard and will include privately owned public spaces (POPS) and Strata Parks. These parks on top of low rise parking and buildings are relatively new but it is expected that the City will see more of these through intensification. Lastly, levels and types of services were also explained to the Committee.

It was noted there are numerous heritage resources that are within parks in the City currently and it is expected that this will increase with the addition of various resources such as the Stone Tower that will be removed from the Guelph Avenue Forbes Estate to Jacob’s Landing. Mr. Willms noted that he is seeking input from the Committee on how and when they wish to be consulted moving forward and what areas of interest the Committee feels should be addressed within the Parks Master Plan.

The Committee thanked Mr. Willms for his presentation. The question of designating specific resources within a park versus the entire park was discussed. Further, it was noted that designating any attribute must address operational needs in ensuring the attribute is maintained. The Chair noted that further discussions will take place, with the Committee providing comments once completed.

Reports:

1. Request to Alter a Part V Designated Property: Sign Permit Application for 47 Main Street

Laura Waldie, Senior Planner Heritage provided a brief overview of the applicant’s plans noting the sign fascia will be painted with the letters being pin screwed into the existing fascia. The sign will be illuminated via the existing gooseneck lighting above the
The Committee asked if the fascia trim would also be painted in the same colour. Laura Waldie confirmed that it would.

Moved by: Nancy Woodman
Seconded by: Michelle Goodridge

THAT Report 23-015 (MHAC)- Request to Alter Part V Designated Property Sign Permit Application for 47 Main Street, be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) approve the application for a sign permit for the property municipally known as 47 Main Street.

CARRIED

2. Request to Alter a Part V Designated Property: Sign Permit and Variance Application for 43 Main Street.

Laura Waldie, Senior Planner Heritage, provided a brief overview of the application for a sign. She advised the applicant has contacted her to indicate that they have revised their plan for the size of the sign down to 2.59 square metres.

The Committee confirmed that a variance would still be required as it is bigger than the 1.25 square metres permitted under the Sign Bylaw. Additionally, it was confirmed that the sign will fit within the sign fascia and that it will be illuminated through gooseneck lighting and not internally.

Moved by: Nelson Cecilias
Seconded by: Michelle Goodridge

THAT Report 23-016 (MHAC) Request to Alter a Part V Designated Property: Sign Permit and Variance Application for 43 Main Street, be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) not approve the application for a sign permit for the property municipally known as 43 Main Street due to the size being 4.29 square metres

AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC approves a variance to the Sign Bylaw to permit a fascia sign measuring three square metres or less for the Suave Social Boutique at 43 Main Street

CARRIED
3. Memo – Mill Race Park HIA

The Chair advised this item is for information purposes and will not require a vote on recommendations. A short Power Point presentation was provided by Lashia Jones, Cultural Heritage Specialist, Stantec. Ms. Jones advised that the wooden bridges within the listed heritage Mill Race Park are due to be replaced as they are unsafe. She provided a brief history of the Park, heritage attributes and reasons for its cultural heritage status.

She further gave the options available and any mitigation required based upon the options. There were no questions of the Committee.

Information Items: NIL

Other Business - NIL

Chair’s Comments:

Chair, Kimberly Livingstone, advised she did not have any comments this month.

Council Report/ Comments:

Councillor Kimpson noted that should any committee members have any items of interest they wish to discuss, that she is available.

Staff/Senior Planner- Heritage comments:

Laura Waldie noted that there would be a designation report and grant request among other things coming to MHAC next month. She also advised that work on the Heritage Register is continuing. She further noted that the plan is to have a break in August unless a time sensitive application is received.

Next Meeting

Date & Time: July 20, 2023, 7:00 p.m.
Location: Virtually via Zoom

Close of Meeting

Moved by: Nancy Woodman
Seconded by: Jack O’Donnell
THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee meeting does now adjourn at 8:11 p.m.

CARRIED

Approved by the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee at the July 20, 2023 meeting

Kimberly Livingstone  Karin Stieg-Drobig
MHAC Chairperson    Recording Secretary
Committee Members in Attendance: Andrew Cann, Julie Graham, Matt Rogers, Mike Jeans, Renee Billiau, Sarah Purdy, Selwyn Langlois, and Stephanie Bangarth

Staff Members in Attendance: Abbey Poser, Events Assistant, Claire McLoughlin, Landscape Architect, Jason Leach, Active Transportation Coordinator, Mohamed Juuda, Sustainable Transportation Coordinator, Shannon Smith, Administrative Service Representative, and Steven Huckabone, Senior Civil Engineering Technologist II

Others in Attendance: Councillor R. Earnshaw, Mark Longo, Alternate Committee Member; and Patrick Connor, Executive Director - Ontario Trails Council

Meeting Called to Order

The regular meeting of the Cambridge Trails Advisory Committee of the City of Cambridge was held in a hybrid format in person at Cambridge City Hall, 50 Dickson St, Cambridge, ON N1R 8S1, Secord Room, 2nd floor; and virtually via Zoom. S. Bangarth, Chair, welcomed everyone present and called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

Roll Call

Indigenous Territory Acknowledgment

Disclosure of Interest

No disclosures of interest

Approval of November 2023 Advisory Committee Minutes

Moved by: M. Jeans

Seconded by: S. Purdy

THAT the minutes listed under the heading of Approval of Minutes be approved.

1. Cambridge Cycling and Trails Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes – November 9, 2023, be approved.

In Favour (8): A. Cann, J. Graham, M. Rogers, M. Jeans, R. Billiau S. Purdy, S. Langlois, and S. Bangarth
CARRIED (8-0)

Agenda Items

a) 2024 Bike Month – Events Discussion with City Staff

A round table discussion was facilitated by the Recreation and Cultures Special Events Assistant. The discussion provided the Bike Month committee with information on how to run a City event and the requirements needed to get started.

A. Poser left the meeting: 7:20 p.m.

b) Transportation Project Updates

J. Leach, Active Transportation Coordinator, Transportation Services provided the committee with a presentation with the following project updates:

1. **Dunbar Rd. Phase 2 Multi-Use Trail** – Will be completing the end phase from Industrial road connecting to Hespeler Rd. Construction is expected to commence early spring 2024.

2. **Bismark Drive Multi-Use Trail** – To replace the existing 1.2 meter concrete sidewalk with a 3 meter asphalt trail.

3. **Christopher Drive Multi-Use Trail** – To replace the existing 1.2 meter concrete sidewalk with a 3 meter asphalt trail that will connect the Moffat Creek Trail. Pavement markings will be placed on the trail to indicate that it is a multi-use trail. Feedback of pavement arrow markings will be taken into consideration regarding wayfinding.

4. **Riverside Drive to Linear Trail Connection** – There are currently trail connections at Westminster Drive South and Rose Street. A recommendation is being made to add an additional connection from the trail to Riverside Drive. Option B is being considered which would include a 102 meter long connection.

J. Leach let the meeting: 7:38 p.m.

c) Mill Race Park Bridges Presentation

S. Huckabone, Civil Engineering Technologist, Infrastructure Engineering, gave a presentation on the Mill Race Park Bridges.

In 2022, Bridges 2 and 3 located nearest to Park Hill Road were closed due to the structures being deemed unsafe. The bridges were originally constructed in approximately 1990.
A survey was conducted through the Engage Cambridge website to receive feedback on preferred options of the bridges. The feedback from the survey indicated that option 3 was preferred. This option included to replace bridge number 3 and to permanently close and remove bridge number 2. The construction of bridge 3 will be the same design as the bridge that was replaced in 2019. The existing stone retaining wall part of bridge 2 will be preserved. It is anticipated that the proposed galvanized steel will have a long life span of up to 50 years. A report along with recommendations and considerations will be provided to Council.

S. Huckabone left the meeting at: 7:55 p.m.

d) Bike Storage Solutions

The Cycle Sitter is a weatherproofed storage locker that is 42 inches wide, 76 inches in length, and 50 inches tall. The bike locker is designed to store two bicycles per unit with the opportunity to park 6 bicycles total at start across three locations at City Hall, Mill Street and Water Street. The bike storage units can accommodate standard bikes and some e-bikes. The ability to accommodate cargo bikes is not present at this time. There would be no costs associated with the use of a locker with the exception of the requirement of cyclists to bring their own lock to secure the unit.

e) Ontario Trails Council – Guest Speaker

Guest Speaker P. Conner, Executive Director at the Ontario Trails Council gave a presentation on what the Ontario Trails Council does and provided information on the Ontario Trails Act and recent changes.

Committee members are encouraged to utilize the Ontario Trails Council website as a resource. The Ontario Trails Council can also aid in getting information out to the public and recognize other committee efforts.

P. Conner left the meeting at: 8:57 p.m.

f) Expression of Interest – 50th Anniversary of ’74 Flood

The Firehall Museum Board of Directors were seeking interest and participation from the committee for the 50th Anniversary of ’74 flood event on Saturday, May 4th, 2024. The committee will have a kiosk located at City Hall or Market Square where they can promote bike month and discuss the development of the City’s trails system. An expression of the committees interest in participating in the event will be communicated to the Firehall Museum.
Councillor’s Report

- Active Transportation trail connection projects including Dunbar Road Phase 2, Bismark Drive, Churchill Park, and the Linear Trail, are projects going forward this year as part of the 2024 Capital Budget, subject to review and approval by Council, that would be of interest to the committee.

- Upon review of the 2024 Capital Budget, questions were raised regarding the scope of a few projects and if they included trail systems. Claire McLoughlin will plan to follow up with more information on Blenheim Road, Southpoint/Bosdale, and 2024 Trail Bridges.

- Blair Pedestrian Bridge and Trail – Council received a presentation advising that the project is recommended to be paused and voted in favour. The committee discussed whether there were other considerations that could be investigated for the safety of cyclists along Fountain Street in the narrow section between Preston Heights area and multi-use trail connections on King Street towards Riverside Park.

Other Business

- Nothing was discussed.

Next Meeting

Date & Time: Thursday, February 8th, 2024, at 7:00 p.m. - Hybrid Meeting (Cambridge City Hall, 50 Dickson St, Cambridge, ON N1R 8S1, in the Secord Room [2nd Floor]; and via Zoom Link)

Close of Meeting

Moved by: M. Jeans

Seconded by: S. Purdy

THAT the Advisory Committee meeting does now adjourn at 9:19 p.m.

In Favour (8): A. Cann, J. Graham, M. Rogers, M. Jeans, R. Billiau S. Purdy, S. Langlois , and S. Bangarth

CARRIED (8-0)
Chair

Stephanie Bangarth

Chairs Name

Committee Liaison

Claire McLoughlin

Name of Staff Member
**Item** | Notice of Motion re: Leasing and Licensing Review
---|---
**Mover** | Councillor Earnshaw
**Seconder** | Councillor _____________

**Recommendation**

**THAT** staff be directed to conduct a comprehensive inventory of City realty assets that are at present leased to, licensed for occupation by, or otherwise occupied by third parties, and submit a report ("report") to Council by or before the end of 2024;

**AND FURTHER THAT** staff simultaneously with submission of the report, propose for consideration by Council a draft leasing and licensing policy for rental, occupation of City realty assets by third party tenants, licensees, and occupiers.
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

BY-LAW 24-038

Being a by-law of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge to adopt Amendment No. 65 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012), as amended with respect to the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan

WHEREAS sections 17 and 22 of the Planning Act R.S.O. 1990 c. P. 13, as amended empower the City of Cambridge to adopt an Official Plan and make amendments thereto,

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

1. THAT Amendment No. 65 to the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012) applies to lands described as the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan.

2. THAT Amendment No. 65 to the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012) as amended, consisting of the text, and attached maps, is hereby adopted.

3. THAT the Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to make application to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo for approval of the aforementioned Amendment No. 65 to the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012), as amended.

4. AND THAT this by-law shall come into full force and effect upon the final passing thereof.

Enacted and Passed this 23rd day of April 2024.

________________________________________
MAYOR

________________________________________
CLERK
AMENDMENT NO. 65
TO THE
OFFICIAL PLAN OF THE
CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
PART A – THE PREAMBLE

1.0 TITLE AND COMPONENTS

This document is entitled ‘Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan’ and will be referred to as ‘Amendment No. 65’. ‘Part A – The Preamble’ provides an explanation of the amendment including the purpose and format of the amendment but does not form part of this amendment.

‘Part B – The Amendment’ forms Amendment No. 65 to the Official Plan of the City of Cambridge and contains a comprehensive expression of the new, deleted and amended text.

2.0 PURPOSE

The purpose of Amendment No. 65 is to amend the Official Plan to include the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan which will introduce a policy framework to guide growth and redevelopment in the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node.
3.0 BACKGROUND

Prior to preparing the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan, extensive public consultation occurred including stakeholder meetings, Public Information Centres and public meetings:

- October 2015 – Stakeholders meeting to allow property owners and interested parties to discuss ideas about the future of the Secondary Plan Area.

- April 2016 – Second stakeholders meeting to present initial draft of Secondary Plan to stakeholders.


- December 12, 2022 – Public Information Centre.

- May 16, 2023 – Statutory Public Meeting.

At the December 12, 2022, Public Information Centre. A proposed vision for the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan Area was shared with the community, along with proposed key principles to guide future development in the area related to land use and built form, transportation and mobility, parks and open space, and natural heritage. A land use concept was also presented to demonstrate how lands within the Secondary Plan Area could be organized. A question-and-answer period was held following the presentation to allow participants a chance to ask questions and provide comments on the project, presentation, and land use option presented. The Project Team provided responses to all questions received through a subsequent comment-response matrix.

At the May 16, 2023, Statutory Public Meeting the draft Secondary Plan, as revised based on the public and agency comments received, was presented to Council and the public for consideration. Responses to comments received at the Statutory Public Meeting were provided through a comment response matrix appended to the recommendation report.

4.0 LOCATION

Official Plan Amendment No. 65 applies to the lands identified as a Community Node and Future Study Area from Figure 3 of the Cambridge Official Plan and can generally be described as the lands south of McLaren Avenue, north of Franklin Lane, east of Dundas Street South and west of Wesley Boulevard.
5.0 BASIS OF THE AMENDMENT

5.1 Background

The City of Cambridge Official Plan (approved on November 21, 2012, by the Region of Waterloo) imagines Cambridge as a growing, well designed, compact, vibrant, and complete community. The city is planned to feature an appropriate mix of jobs, range of housing options, access to services and community infrastructure, and access to transportation options including public transit and active transportation. One of the keys to achieving this vision is the development and implementation of a robust policy framework that focuses growth and intensification in strategic locations within the existing built-up areas. These locations include the Urban Growth Centre, Community Core Areas, Nodes, Reurbanization Corridors and Major Transit Station Areas. These locations have been selected because they boast services and community infrastructure that support growth, they have land parcels with development and redevelopment potential, and they are located along existing or proposed transit routes including the Region of Waterloo’s rapid transit service (ION).

5.2 Existing Policy Framework

The Secondary Plan has been prepared as an amendment to the City of Cambridge Official Plan. The Secondary Plan Area is currently designated Low/Medium Density Residential, Community Commercial, Industrial and Natural Open Space System in the City’s Official Plan. The City’s Official Plan directs that secondary plans may be prepared for specific areas of the City to provide more detailed planning objectives and policies to direct and guide development (Section 10.2).
5.3 Secondary Plan

The purpose of the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan is to guide the future planning and development of the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node lands. The Secondary Plan supports and builds on the policies of the City of Cambridge Official Plan, and provincial and regional policies and plans, with respect to orderly development of the area.

The Secondary Plan establishes a vision and the principles for the design and development of the area. It also establishes the general land use patterns and conceptual locations of parks and trails, roads and infrastructure. The Secondary Plan includes goals, general policies, and land use policies.

5.4 Proposed Land Use Changes

The Main Street and Dundas Street South lands are currently designated Low/Medium Density Residential, Community Commercial, Industrial and Natural Open Space System in the City’s Official Plan. The proposed new land use designations are shown on Schedule B of the Secondary Plan and are generally described as follows:

- **Mixed Use Mid-Rise High Density** permits a range of medium and high-density residential uses in 5 to 8 storey buildings as well as limited commercial and office uses and is intended to provide a transition from lower density to higher density areas.

- **Mixed Use Medium Density** permits medium density residential uses such as street townhomes, stacked townhomes, and low-rise apartments as well as commercial and office uses.

- **Mixed Use Main Street** permits a range of multiple residential units, commercial uses including retail, service commercial and places of amusement as well as some office uses and are intended to provide a transition in scale, form, massing and height between the Mixed-Use Mid-Rise High Density designation and surrounding lower density residential areas.

- **High Density Residential** permits medium to high density residential uses such as mid-rise and high-rise apartments and other multiple dwellings.

- **Medium Density Residential** permits medium density residential uses such as street townhomes, stacked townhomes, low-rise apartments and other multiple dwellings (excluding semi-detached).

- **Low Density Residential** permits residential uses such as single and semi-detached dwellings as well as additional residential units and existing medium density multi-unit residential uses. The maximum building height is 4 storeys.

- **Prestige Industrial** permits a range of light industrial; office buildings and research uses ranging from hotel and office type uses through to research and development laboratories and permits accessory and complementary uses.
• **Natural Open Space System** is applied to core environmental features, such as wetlands, woodlands and tributaries, and the associated buffers identified in the applicable Subwatershed Study.

### 5.5 Compliance with Provincial Legislation and Policy

#### Provincial Policy Statement (2020)

Section 3 of the *Planning Act* requires that decisions affecting planning matters shall be consistent with policy statements issued under the Act. The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) was issued under the authority of Section 3 of the Act. The PPS provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development, including the protection of resources of provincial interest, public health and safety, and the quality of the natural and built environment.

The PPS directs growth to Settlement Areas on full municipal services (Policy 1.1.3) and directs that new development taking place in designated growth areas should occur adjacent to the existing built-up area and is to have a compact form, mix of uses and densities that allow for the efficient use of land, infrastructure, and public service facilities. The Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan lands will provide a mix of residential, commercial, institutional, and open space uses at densities to promote the efficient use of land, infrastructure, and public service facilities.

Policy 1.6.7.1 states that transportation systems should be provided which are safe, energy efficient, facilitate the movement of people and goods, and appropriate to address projected needs. The Secondary Plan proposes complete streets which prioritize active transportation, allow for vehicular movements and plan for future transit infrastructure.

Policy 1.8.1 directs municipalities to support energy conservation and efficiency, improved air quality, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and preparing for the impacts of a changing climate. The Secondary Plan promotes a compact built form and the use of active transportation and transit through transit supportive development. Further, it promotes sustainable design which maximizes energy efficiency and conservation and considers the mitigating effects of vegetation and green infrastructure.

The Secondary Plan is appropriate and consistent with the PPS.

#### A Place to Grow – Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Office Consolidation 2020)

In 2019, the Province of Ontario released an update to the provincial growth plan called "A Place to Grow – Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe" (Growth Plan). An Office Consolidation of the Growth Plan, which includes Amendment 1 (2020) was released in August of 2020. Planning applications are required to conform to Provincial plans.
The Growth Plan focusses on directing new development to existing settlement areas in order to support the development of complete communities that contain a diverse mix of uses and housing options in order to optimize existing infrastructure and public transit. The Growth Plan contains development targets for urban areas (referred to as Built-Up areas). The Main Street and Dundas Street S Secondary Plan area is located within a settlement area and is considered a Built-Up Area in the Growth Plan.


Regional Official Plan

The Secondary Plan area is located in the Built-up Area within the Urban Area Boundary as identified in the Region of Waterloo Official Plan. It is intended that land within the Urban Area is “to accommodate the majority of the Region’s growth within the planning horizon” of the Plan (Section 2.B.2).

The Built-Up Area identifies all lands within the built boundary of the Urban Area. Area municipalities are required to establish policies in their official plans and other supporting documents to ensure that “a minimum of 61 per cent of all new residential development occurring annually within the region as a whole will be constructed within the Built-Up Area” (Section 2.C.2).

Section 2.D.1 requires planning for new development within the Urban Area that:

b) is serviced by a municipal drinking-water supply system and a municipal wastewater system;

c) contributes to the creation of complete communities with development patterns, densities and an appropriate mix of land uses that supports walking, cycling and the use of transit;

d) protects the natural environment, and surface water and groundwater resources;

e) conserves cultural heritage resources and supports the adaptive reuse of historic buildings;

f) respects the scale, physical character, and context of established neighbourhoods in areas where reurbanization is planned to occur; and

h) promotes building designs and orientations that incorporate energy conservation features and the use of alternative and/or renewable energy systems.

The Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan was prepared based on the principles supporting the creation of complete communities, 15-minute neighbourhoods, transit supportive design and uses, and alternative transportation modes. The policy framework was developed to ensure appropriate and efficient growth.

Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 6 has been approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Amongst other changes and modifications, the density for Designated Greenfield Areas has been increased to 59 persons and jobs per hectare which has been reflected in the policies of this amendment.
The proposed Official Plan Amendment conforms to the Regional Official Plan, as amended.

**City of Cambridge Official Plan**

The Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan area is located in the Built-Up Area according to the City’s Official Plan, and is designated Low/Medium Density Residential, Community Commercial, Industrial and Natural Open Space System.

Uses such as single detached dwellings, townhouses and/or walk-up apartments are permitted on lands designated Low/Medium Density Residential where municipal water supply and wastewater systems are available (8.4.6.9).

The City’s Official Plan directs that secondary plans may be prepared for specific areas of the City to provide more detailed planning objectives and policies to direct and guide development (10.2.1) provided the secondary plan is in conformity with the City and Regional Official Plans (10.2.2), and in consideration of the following Section 10.2.4 criteria:

a) patterns of land use;

b) population and employment projections;

c) mix and range of housing types and densities;

d) phasing of development in an efficient manner;

e) provision for adequate and appropriate areas for commercial, institutional and community-oriented facilities;

f) provision for trails, parks, and open space;

g) natural features;

h) cultural heritage resources;

i) incorporating intensification opportunities;

j) development of a transportation network that facilitates the efficient movement of vehicular and pedestrian traffic including active transportation considerations;

k) municipal services;

l) incorporating opportunities for mixed-use and higher density development in appropriate locations;

m) designation of land; and

n) any other matters as deemed appropriate by the City.

Section 5.2.1 states that the design of the built environment will promote sustainable, healthy, active living through:
a) well-connected and maintained streets, paths and trails that are able to safely accommodate different modes of transportation;

b) safe, accessible, aesthetically pleasing, well-serviced and inclusive developments;

c) resilient natural environments that support wildlife and their habitat and are better connected to residential areas; and

d) walkable neighbourhoods that offer a mix of uses, and range and variety of housing types with convenient access to public transit.

Chapter 5 of the Official Plan establishes urban design policies to achieve a high standard of urban design across the City. The Secondary Plan builds on the policies of the Official Plan to achieve design excellence in the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan Area. It is planned to promote sustainable, healthy, and active living (Section 5.2), support transit usage (Section 5.3), build a high-quality, attractive public realm (Section 5.5) and consider sustainability and energy efficiency in the design of both private and public realms (Section 5.8).

The Secondary Plan conforms to the City of Cambridge Official Plan.

6.0 SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO THE OFFICIAL PLAN

The following is a summary of OPA No. 65:

• Amends Policy 1.2 by adding Chapters for secondary plans.

• Deletes Policy 8.7.2.B

• Deletes the following site specifics:
  o 8.10.9 – 200 Franklin Boulevard;
  o 8.10.38 – Green Gate Boulevard;
  o 8.10.40 – 95 McLaren Avenue;
  o 8.10.46 – Northeast Quadrant of Franklin Boulevard and Main Street;
  o 8.10.69 – 825-875 Main Street and 0 Sparrow Avenue; and
  o 8.10.79 – 400-410 Dundas Street South

• Adds site specifics for the following properties:
  o 8.10.101 – 486 Main Street – Grand Valley Fortifiers;
  o 8.10.102 – 840 and 940 Main Street and 0 Franklin Boulevard;
  o 8.10.103 – 61 – 65 Nottinghill Drive; and
• Deletes definitions for Active Transportation and Major Facilities

• Adds definitions for:
  o 15-minute neighbourhoods;
  o active at-grade uses;
  o active transportation;
  o build-out;
  o gross floor area;
  o ground floor area;
  o intensification target;
  o large-format commercial;
  o low-rise;
  o mid-rise;
  o major facilities;
  o missing middle housing;
  o privately owned public spaces (POPS);
  o public service facilities;
  o transit supportive; and
  o walking, cycling, and rolling.

• Adds Chapter 20: Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan

• Amends Map 1A to align the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node boundaries to match the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan Boundary.

• Amends Map 2 by adding the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan Boundary

• Amends Map 2A by deleting site specific policy figures 10, 13, 42, 44, 77 and 81 and by adding special policy figures 101-104

• Deletes figures 10, 13, 42, 44, 77 and 81 from Chapter 16

• Adds figures 101-104 to Chapter 16
7.0 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Previous drafts of the proposed Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan have been presented to the public during stakeholder meetings in 2015 and 2016. A Statutory Public Meeting was held on May 10, 2016 and a Public Information Centre (PIC) was held on December 12, 2022. The draft secondary plan was posted on the City of Cambridge website for review and comment. A second Statutory Public Meeting was held on May 16, 2023.

All comments received during this process were considered when preparing the Secondary Plan. Posting of related reports to the City’s website was included as part of the public report process.

PART B – THE AMENDMENT

1.0 INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

All of this part of the document entitled ‘Part B - The Amendment’, consisting of the following text, constitutes Amendment No. 65 to the Official Plan of the City of Cambridge.

2.0 FORMAT OF THE AMENDMENT

This section of Amendment No. 65 sets out additions and changes to the text in the Official Plan.

Text that is proposed to be amended is illustrated by various font types (e.g., struck-out text is to be deleted, new text identified in Bold font and defined terms are identified with italics). New sections that are proposed to be added to the Official Plan are shown in standard font type with titles appearing in bold. Italicized font within the body of the text indicates defined terms or the name of a provincial act or title of a document.

3.0 IMPLEMENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

The implementation of this amendment shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act. The further implementation and associated interpretation of this amendment shall be in accordance with the relevant text and mapping schedules of the existing Official Plan of the City of Cambridge and applicable legislation. Amendment No. 65 should be read in conjunction with the current Official Plan (2012) as amended, which is available on the City’s website at cambridge.ca or at the Planning Services kiosk located at 50 Dickson Street in the 1st Floor lobby.

4.0 DETAILS OF THE AMENDMENT

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

Chapter 1 is hereby amended by adding Policy “1.2.h) Secondary Plans starting at Chapter 17”

Chapter 8 is hereby amended by deleting Policy “8.7.2.B Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node” and replacing it with “8.7.2.B - The Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan is found in Chapter 20.”
Chapter 8 is hereby further amended by:

A - deleting the following site specific policies from Policy 8.10:

8.10.9 – 200 Franklin Boulevard;
8.10.38 – Green Gate Boulevard;
8.10.40 – 95 McLaren Avenue;
8.10.46 – Northeast Quadrant of Franklin Boulevard and Main Street;
8.10.69 – 825-875 Main Street and 0 Sparrow Avenue; and,
8.10.79 – 400 – 410 Dundas Street South

B – adding the following site specific policies:

8.10.101 - 486 Main Street – Grand Valley Fortifiers

Grand Valley Fortifiers is a livestock feed production company that has existing industrial uses and facilities at 486 Main Street (Figure 101). Notwithstanding the land uses permitted for the Mixed-Use Medium Density designation, the following land uses are permitted on the lands identified in Figure 101:

Light industrial uses in an enclosed building including assembling, fabricating, manufacturing, processing, storage, packaging;

Offices;

Research and development including laboratories;

Retail Commercial; and

Accessory uses to the permitted uses above.

No residential and other sensitive land uses are permitted during the continuance of industrial uses on this site. Should Grand Valley Fortifiers’ industrial operations on this site permanently cease, the industrial land use permissions in Policy 20.3.2.4 will no longer apply, in which case the land use permissions for the Mixed-Use Medium Density designation identified for this site on Schedule B of the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan will apply.

8.10.102 - 840 and 940 Main Street and 0 Franklin Boulevard

The lands subject to this subsection are identified in Figure 102.

A. Notwithstanding the maximum building height permitted in the Mixed-Use Main Street designation in Section 20.3.2.6, a maximum building height of twenty storeys is permitted. In addition, notwithstanding the minimum non-residential gross floor area requirements of Section 20.3.2.2, on lands designated Mixed-Use Main Street, a mid-rise apartment building may be constructed on these lands with the ground floor
comprised of non-residential uses, which may include the lobby and residential amenity areas. A minimum non-residential gross floor area of 300 square metres is required. All of the above require the submission and approval of a noise impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Region of Waterloo and City of Cambridge.

B. Notwithstanding the maximum building height permitted in the Medium Density Residential designation in Section 20.3.2.6, a maximum building height of twenty storeys is permitted subject to the submission and approval of a noise impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Region of Waterloo and City of Cambridge.

C. Notwithstanding the minimum required building height and density in the High Density Residential designation in Section 20.3.2.6, a minimum height of eight storeys and a minimum density of 110 Units Per Hectare (UPH) shall be required.

   i. The minimum required height may be reduced without amendment to this plan where a noise impact assessment indicates that an eight storey building is not feasible.

The minimum height / storey requirements related to lands designated Medium Density Residential in Section 20.3.2.6 may also be reduced, without further amendment to this plan, due to land use compatibility measures that may be required as a result of the site’s proximity to lands within the Eastern Industrial Park, subject to the approval of the City and the Region.

8.10.103 - 61 – 65 Nottinghill Drive

Notwithstanding the permitted density in this Plan, the land identified in Figure 103 will be permitted a maximum residential density of 2.2 Floor Space Index (FSI).

8.10.104 - 115 Dundas Street North and 5 McLaren Avenue

The lands identified in Figure 104 may only develop in accordance with the policies of the Mixed Use Medium Density designation, where it can be demonstrated that land use compatibility with surrounding existing industrial uses, including Rockwell Automation, can be achieved to the satisfaction of the City. Notwithstanding the permissions for residential uses within the Mixed Use Medium Density designation, where the outcomes of such studies indicate that land use compatibility cannot be achieved, sensitive land uses, including residential, will not be permitted.

Chapter 13 is hereby amended by deleting the definitions for active transportation and major facilities, and adding the following definitions:

15-minute neighbourhoods - Compact, well-connected places such as mixed-use neighbourhoods or other areas within the Urban Area. They are places that offer and support and opportunities for people of all ages and abilities and at all times of year to conveniently access the necessities for daily living with a 15-minute trip by walking, cycling, and rolling, and where other needs can be met by taking direct, frequent, and convenient transit, wherever possible. The neighbourhoods should include an appropriate mix of jobs, local stores, and services, a full range
of housing, transportation options and public service facilities. They are also age-friendly places and may take different shapes and forms appropriate to their contexts.

**active at-grade uses** – uses at grade with the street that generate activity, in particular pedestrian activity, on the street. Uses may be street-related commercial and/or community uses such as retail stores, restaurants, personal or business services, professional or medical offices, libraries, community centres, and parks/public squares.

**active transportation** - movement of people or goods that is powered by human activity. Active transportation includes walking, cycling, and the use of human-powered or hybrid mobility aids such as wheelchairs, scooters, e-bikes, and rollerblades.

**build-out** - the time in the future when the subject area of land is fully developed in accordance with the vision, objectives, and policies of this Plan.

**gross floor area** – the total of all floor areas of a building or structure, which floor areas are measured between the exterior faces of the exterior walls of the building at each floor level or from the centrelines of partition walls and the exterior faces of the exterior walls, but does not include any underground floor area, unenclosed porch or verandah, mechanical room or penthouse, amenity area and private amenity area, and areas used for parking within the building or structure. The walls of an inner court shall be deemed to be exterior walls.

**ground floor area** – the area of the ground floor of a building or structure measured between the exterior faces of the exterior walls or from the centrelines of partition walls and the exterior faces of the exterior walls.

**intensification target** – the minimum percentage of development each year that are expected to occur within the built-up area.

**large-format commercial** – a commercial use with greater than 2,000 square metres of ground floor area, such as large footprint supermarkets, big box retail stores, warehouse stores, and standalone movie theatres.

**low-rise** - any building that is 2 to 4 storeys in height.

**mid-rise** - any building that is 5 to 8 storeys in height.

**major facilities** - facilities which may require separation from sensitive land uses, including but not limited to airports, manufacturing uses, transportation infrastructure and corridors, rail facilities, marine facilities, sewage treatment facilities, waste management systems, oil and gas pipelines, industries, energy generation facilities and transmission systems, and resource extraction activities. (PPS, 2020)

**missing middle housing** - multi-unit housing types with gentle density that are compatible in scale with single-detached neighbourhoods while providing additional housing options. For example, laneway housing, garden suites, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, rowhouses, townhouses, and low and mid-rise apartments.

**privately owned public spaces (POPS)** – A privately owned and maintained open or landscaped
space that is designed to promote public access and use, which may include but is not limited to courtyards, enhanced walkways, and urban greens and squares. The spaces are meant to be open and accessible to the public and may complement, extend or integrate with public parks.

**public service facilities** - lands, buildings, and structures for the provision of programs and services provided or subsidized by a government or other body, such as social assistance, recreation, police and fire protection, health and educational programs, long-term care services, and cultural services. Public service facilities do not include infrastructure. (PPS, 2020).

**transit-supportive** - relating to development that makes transit viable and improves the quality of the experience of using transit. It often refers to compact, mixed-use development that has a high level of employment and residential densities. Transit-supportive development will be consistent with Ontario’s Transit Supportive Guidelines.

**walking, cycling, and rolling** - Methods of active transportation, which means movement of people or goods that is powered by human activity. Active transportation includes walking, cycling, and the use of human-powered or hybrid mobility aids such as wheelchairs, scooters, e-bikes, and rollerblades.

### 5.0 SCHEDULES

- **SCHEDULE 1 – MAP 1A – URBAN STRUCTURE**
- **SCHEDULE 2 – MAP 2 – GENERAL LAND USE PLAN**
- **SCHEDULE 3 – MAP 2A – SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES**
- **SCHEDULE 4 – FIGURE 3**
- **SCHEDULE 5 – FIGURES 101 - 104**
- **SCHEDULE 6 – Chapter 20: Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan**

**SCHEDULE 1 – MAP 1A – URBAN STRUCTURE**

Official Plan Map 1A Urban Structure in Chapter 14: Maps is hereby amended by expanding the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node boundary to match the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan Boundary area as depicted in the following mapping.
SCHEDULE 2 – MAP 2 – GENERAL LAND USE PLAN

Official Plan Map 2 General Land Use Plan in Chapter 14: Maps is hereby amended by adding the boundary of the Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan area as depicted in the following mapping.
SCHEDULE 3 – MAP 2A – SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES

Official Plan Map 2A Site Specific Policies in Chapter 14: Maps is hereby amended by deleting site specific policy figures 10 13, 42, 44, 77 and 81 and by adding site specific policy figures 101-104 as depicted in the following mapping.
SCHEDULE 4 – FIGURE 3

Official Plan Figure 3 - Community Node Main St and Dundas St S in Chapter 16: Figures is hereby amended by aligning the Community Node boundary with the Secondary Plan Area boundary as depicted in the following mapping.
SCHEDULE 5 – FIGURES 101 - 104

Chapter 16: Figures is hereby amended by deleting Figures 10, 13, 42, 44, 77 and 81 and by adding Figures 101-104 as depicted in the following mapping.
SCHEDULE 6 – CHAPTER 20: Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan

The Cambridge Official Plan is hereby amended by adding the following new Chapter 20: Main Street and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan.
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Chapter 20

20.1 INTRODUCTION

The preparation of a Secondary Plan is required by the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012), as amended, for the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node. The Main and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan (“the Secondary Plan”) provides detailed boundaries and land use policies for this community node to achieve a significant density increase and become a medium to high density mixed-use centre.

20.1.1 VISION FOR CHANGE

The Secondary Plan Area is expected to function as one of the City’s main intensification nodes and accommodate up to 1,700 new residential units and 100 additional jobs by 2031 through a combination of new development, infilling, and redevelopment. Over the longer term, the Plan Area has the potential to accommodate up to 6,200 units and 1,400 jobs at build-out, depending on the scale of intensification and the mix of uses proposed.

It is envisioned that the Plan Area will transition into a compact, complete, sustainable, vibrant, and integrated node that supports active transportation and transit service. The Plan Area will integrate a diverse mix of uses to build 15-minute neighbourhoods while continuing to have an important commercial function to support the needs of the broader southeast Cambridge community. This mixed-use and higher density node will be supported by new parks, public spaces, trails, and community amenities that are well connected to the existing public realm network. The transportation network in the Plan Area will provide a full range of mobility options but will prioritize and facilitate active transportation and transit. This vision is to be achieved through a combination of public realm improvements and private sector land development and re-development.

20.1.2 SECONDARY PLAN GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The Plan Area is planned to achieve an overall minimum density of 100 residents and jobs combined per hectare to support growth management, the efficient use of land, and frequent transit service. This is a gross minimum density requirement that is measured within all of the lands delineated by the Plan Area, inclusive of environmental features and constraints. Several of the land use designations set out in this Plan identify minimum net density targets for freestanding residential development within the designation to support achieving the overall minimum density target, along with the other policies of the Plan. As part of any development application, the City will require applications to demonstrate how the application supports the overall gross density target for the Plan Area, and the applicable minimum density requirements of this Plan have been met.
Planning and development within the Plan Area will be guided by the following principles:

a) Intensify and increase the supply of housing, employment, and amenities to accommodate anticipated future growth and contribute to meeting the intensification target;

b) Maintain the node’s important commercial function and transition to become a vibrant and complete community providing a mix of residential, commercial, employment, institutional, and community uses;

c) Build 15-minute neighbourhoods where people can meet their daily needs for goods, services, and employment within a 15-minute trip from home by active transportation, and where other needs can be met by using direct, frequent, and convenient transit;

d) Support transit service and ridership through transit-supportive built-forms, densities, mix of uses, and urban design of the public and private realm;

e) Improve connectivity within the Plan Area and to the Plan Area from surrounding neighbourhoods for active transportation by enhancing safety, permeability, accessibility, and the pedestrian experience;

f) S sensitively integrate with adjacent existing neighbourhoods and ensure compatibility in land use and built form;

g) Provide an appropriate range and mix of housing types, forms, tenures, and affordability that responds to the demography of the community;

h) Support the prosperity of existing businesses and provide opportunities for new economic development and employment;

i) Be well-designed and provide diverse and contextually compatible built form and high quality architectural and urban design in public realm improvements and private realm developments;

j) Create a connected, functional and attractive network of parks, public spaces, natural open spaces, and trails using the process and principles of place-making;

k) Implement sustainable design to minimize environmental impact, conserve energy, manage stormwater, protect natural areas, enhance biodiversity, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and

l) Phase implementation to align with market demand and infrastructure investment.
20.2 PURPOSE

20.2.1 PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

The purpose of the Secondary Plan is to provide a detailed land use plan and policy framework to guide development and redevelopment within the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node ("the Community Node") to achieve a significant level of intensification.

The policies of this Secondary Plan are intended to result in a complete, vibrant, well-designed, and sustainable community node that meets the objectives and policies of Provincial plans, the Region of Waterloo Official Plan, and the City of Cambridge Official Plan.

The Secondary Plan must be read in conjunction with the applicable policies within the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012), as amended. In addition to the policies of this Secondary Plan, all other parts of the City of Cambridge Official Plan shall apply. The land use designations for the Secondary Plan are intended to complement the broader land use designations provided in the Official Plan. In most cases, the land use policies and permissions described in the Secondary Plan are more detailed than those provided for within the Official Plan. In the event of a policy conflict, the Secondary Plan will prevail unless otherwise specified.

20.2.2 ORGANIZATION

The Secondary Plan document is organized into three main sections:
Section 20.1: Introduction
Section 20.2: Vision and Guiding Principles
Section 20.3: Policies

The contents of Sections 20.2 and 20.3 are considered to be the formal Secondary Plan, including Schedules A through F. Any alterations to the policies in Sections 20.2 and 20.3 or Schedules A through F shall require an Official Plan Amendment (unless otherwise stated in the Plan). Alterations to the contents of Section 20.1 including all text, images, figures, formatting, footnotes, and graphics are not subject to an Official Plan Amendment and are provided for explanatory purposes only.

20.2.3 LOCATION AND BOUNDARY

The limits of the Secondary Plan (the "Plan Area") are depicted on Schedule A, covers approximately 82 gross hectares (202 acres) of land and is generally centred around the major intersections of Main Street and Dundas Street, Main Street and Franklin Boulevard, and Dundas Street and Franklin Boulevard. The northern boundary of the Plan Area abuts the Eastern Industrial Park. The western boundary generally abuts the
Lincoln Oaks and Glenview residential neighbourhoods. The southern boundary traverses through a small portion of the Branchton Park residential neighbourhood. The eastern boundary traverses through the vacant lands north of Main Street and abuts the residential subdivisions south of Main Street in the Eastview neighbourhood.

Schedule A also identifies the finalized limits of the Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node. Unless otherwise stated, the policies of this Secondary Plan apply to the lands located within the Secondary Plan limits as depicted on Schedule A. Changes to the boundary of the Secondary Plan will require an Official Plan Amendment.

20.2.4 COMMUNITY STRUCTURE

The land use designations implement the vision for the Plan Area to transform into a compact and complete community with 15-minute neighbourhoods.

Lands within the Plan Area are designated one of the following land use designations as indicated on Schedule B:

a) Mixed-Use Mid-Rise High Density
b) Mixed-Use Medium Density
c) Mixed-Use Main Street
d) High Density Residential
e) Medium Density Residential
f) Low Density Residential
g) Prestige Industrial
h) Natural Open Space System
20.3 POLICIES

20.3.1 GENERAL POLICIES

20.3.1.1 Uses Permitted in All Designations

With the exception of the Natural Open Space System designation, the Official Plan permits certain land uses within all land use designations in the City, subject to the provision of adequate infrastructure and other criteria. Those land uses are also generally permitted within all land use designations of the Secondary Plan, subject to the policies of the Official Plan and provided that the long-term vision of this Secondary Plan is not precluded.

20.3.1.2 Uses Prohibited in All Designations

The Official Plan prohibits a list of uses in all land use designations of the Official Plan. Those land uses are also prohibited in all designations of this Secondary Plan. In addition, the following uses will be prohibited in all designations of the Secondary Plan:

a) New drive-through facilities subject to Section 20.3.1.4;

b) New auto-related uses subject to Section 20.3.1.4;

c) New large-format commercial uses subject to Section 20.3.1.5; and

d) Noxious uses as defined in the City’s Zoning By-law.

20.3.1.3 Active At-Grade Uses

Portions of certain public streets in the Plan Area are envisioned to transform into vibrant, engaging, and active streetscapes that foster pedestrian-oriented commercial and community activity in the Plan Area.

Developments that front onto streets identified for Active Frontages on Schedule D shall provide active at-grade uses at the street level, where possible taking into consideration existing topographical and engineering constraints. These uses will be street-related, provide visual interest, animate the streetscape, and be designed in accordance with the Urban Design policies in Section 20.3.3.

Residential entrances and lobbies within the ground floor of mixed-use buildings are permitted along Active Frontages but shall consist of a limited portion of a development’s frontage.

Surface parking and structured parking are not permitted along Active Frontages. Driveways and direct vehicular access along Active Frontages shall be in accordance with the policies of this Plan.
20.3.1.4 Drive-Through Facilities and Auto-Related Uses

Auto-related uses include gas bars/stations, motor vehicle service and repair shops (including body shops), motor vehicle sales and rental, and motor vehicle washing establishments.

Existing drive-through facilities and auto-related uses in the Plan Area that legally existed before the date of adoption of this Secondary Plan are permitted to continue. Over the long term and upon build-out of this Secondary Plan, existing drive-through facilities and auto-related uses should be redeveloped and replaced with pedestrian-oriented and transit-supportive development.

For the purpose of transition and to facilitate redevelopment, existing drive-through facilities may be relocated on the same lot or block on an interim basis subject to the following conditions:

a) Relocated drive-through facilities shall not be situated along Active Frontages;

b) The commercial use to which the drive-through facility is ancillary must be a permitted use on the lands the drive-through facility is being relocated to; and

c) A site plan approval application for relocation must include a Build-out Demonstration Plan.

Existing drive-through facilities are not permitted to increase the number of drive-through lanes existing on the date of adoption of this Secondary Plan.

20.3.1.5 Large-Format Commercial Uses

New large-format commercial uses with more than 2,000 square metres of ground floor area are not permitted within the Plan Area. The purpose of this policy is to limit land-intensive commercial uses to facilitate opportunities for intensification.

Existing large-format commercial uses in the Plan Area that legally existed before the date of adoption of this Secondary Plan are permitted to continue. Over the long term and upon build-out of this Secondary Plan, existing large-format commercial uses should be redeveloped into compact medium to high density mixed-use developments that integrate commercial with residential and other uses. Surface parking should be significantly reduced.

For the purpose of transition and to facilitate redevelopment, existing large-format commercial uses may be relocated on the same lot or block subject to the following conditions:

a) Relocated large-format commercial uses shall not be situated along Active Frontages; and

b) A site plan approval application for relocation must include a Build-out Demonstration Plan.
20.3.1.6 Housing

Housing developments in the Plan Area shall comprise a range and mix of rental and ownership housing types, unit sizes, and tenure, including adequate numbers of dwelling units to accommodate households with children, larger families, seniors and people with special needs.

Affordable housing, including community housing, supportive housing, and other types of subsidized non-market housing units, is encouraged to be provided in the Plan Area. Development that includes residential in the Plan Area will be in accordance with the affordable housing policies of the Official Plan.

The City will collaborate with the Region of Waterloo, non-profit organizations and private developers to promote, encourage and maximize opportunities for affordable housing.

To support the development of affordable housing units, the City, in conjunction with the Region, will explore potential incentives such as reduced or deferred development charges, reduced application fees, grants, and loans.

The development of intrinsically more affordable ownership and rental housing, which may include buildings constructed using innovative and cost-effective techniques, basic in-unit amenities, modest finishes, minimal details, and flexibility within units, is encouraged.

Residential developments and dwelling units designed, constructed, and maintained as purpose-built rental units are encouraged in the Plan Area. Purpose-built rental development should include units for various levels of affordability, including for households with low and moderate income.

To achieve a mix of unit types, and to support the creation of housing suitable for larger households, development containing more than 80 new residential units will include larger units, as follows:

a) A minimum of 20 percent of the total number of units as 2-bedroom units; and

b) A minimum of 5 percent of the total number of units as 3-bedroom or larger units.

For clarity, one bedroom plus den units will not constitute a 2-bedroom unit, and a two-bedroom plus den unit will not constitute a 3-bedroom unit.

Where appropriate, private, public, and non-profit housing developments designed to provide housing options for seniors, that facilitate “aging-in-place”, are encouraged, including small ownership and rental units as well as retirement and assisted living facilities.

A minimum of 20 percent of new affordable units and new purpose-built rental units shall be constructed accessible with barrier-free, universal or flex design. Housing units geared towards seniors are encouraged to provide accessibility features that
meet the City’s Facility Accessibility Design Manual.

*Additional residential units* will be permitted in accordance with the policies of this Secondary Plan and the City of Cambridge Official Plan, and the provisions of the Zoning By-law.

### 20.3.1.7 Employment Areas

Land use decisions regarding lands within or adjacent to *employment areas* will be consistent with the *employment area* policy direction in the Region of Waterloo Official Plan until such time the City of Cambridge Official Plan has been updated.

### 20.3.1.8 Land Use Compatibility

The development of *sensitive land uses*, *major retail uses* or *major office uses* will, in accordance with provincial guidelines, avoid, or where avoidance is not possible, minimize and mitigate adverse impacts on industrial, manufacturing or other uses that are particularly vulnerable to encroachment.

Proposed developments of *sensitive land uses*, *major retail uses* or *major office uses* adjacent to existing or planned *employment areas* or within the influence area of *major facilities* will provide a Land Use Compatibility Assessment based on provincial guidelines.

New industrial uses on lands designated Prestige Industrial in the Plan Area may be required to demonstrate that the use(s) will not detrimentally impact adjacent existing *sensitive land uses* and/or preclude the potential development of *sensitive land uses* on adjacent lands where envisioned by this Secondary Plan. Supporting studies, including a Land Use Compatibility Assessment, may be required to support approval of the new industrial use.

Where required, methods of abatement and mitigation of potential adverse impacts will be part of site plan agreements, severance agreements, and subdivision/condominium agreements.

### 20.3.1.9 Source Water Protection

Lands in the Plan Area are identified as being part of the Region’s Wellhead Protection Areas. Refer to the Official Plan for additional guidance regarding development within the Wellhead Protection Areas.

No policies or permissions of this Secondary Plan take precedence over the Wellhead Protection Area policies contained in the Official Plan. In the event of a policy conflict, the parent policies of the Official Plan shall take precedence.

### 20.3.1.10 Contaminated Sites

Refer to Contaminated Sites policies of the Official Plan for guidance on redevelopment of potentially contaminated sites and need for a Record of Site Condition.
20.3.2 LAND USE POLICIES

20.3.2.1 Relationship with the Official Plan Land Use Categories and Permissions

The land use designations for the Secondary Plan are intended to complement the broader land use designations provided in the Official Plan. In most cases, the land use policies and permissions described in the Secondary Plan are more detailed than those provided for within the Official Plan. Where there are inconsistencies between a particular policy in the Official Plan and the Secondary Plan, the policies of the Secondary Plan will prevail.

20.3.2.2 Mixed-Use Designations

Lands designated with a Mixed-Use designation are intended to be the centre of the Community Node and generally provide the greatest mix of uses and highest densities within the Plan Area. These areas are intended to continue to provide retail and service commercial uses, while integrating residential housing, office, institutional, and community uses through infill and/or redevelopment.

Lands designated with a Mixed-Use designation are intended to intensify and transition to a compact urban form including medium to high density development and a reduction of surface parking. These lands shall be supported by a generous public realm including gateways, vibrant and active streetscapes, active transportation connections, and new parks/public spaces.

The Mixed-Use designations include:

- Mixed-Use Mid-Rise High Density;
- Mixed-Use Medium Density; and
- Mixed-Use Main Street.

The Mixed-Use designations permit a wide range of compatible uses. The following land uses are permitted on lands within the Mixed-Use designations:

b) Multiple unit residential buildings, including apartments and stacked townhouses;

c) Street townhouses;

d) Additional residential units;

e) Live-work units and home occupations;

f) Special needs housing;

g) Commercial uses including retail, service commercial, and places of amusement uses, except any commercial uses prohibited in Section 20.3.1.2;

h) Public service facilities; and
i) Office uses.

The Mixed-Use Medium Density and Mixed-Use Main Street designations are intended to provide transition in scale, form, massing, and height between envisioned high-density developments in the Mixed-Use Mid-Rise High-Density designation and surrounding lower density residential developments. These areas are intended to provide mixed-use developments consisting of active at-grade uses that frame the street while ensuring compatibility with abutting low-rise residential developments through the implementation of setbacks, landscaping, and mitigation measures as needed. Lot consolidation to support intensification and redevelopment is encouraged.

The implementing Zoning By-law may further refine the permitted land uses to ensure that new development is appropriate in the context of the adjacent and surrounding community.

To create a complete community and support economic activity within the Plan Area, new development within the Mixed-Use designations will provide a minimum of 10 percent of the gross floor area of the development as non-residential uses in one or multiple buildings.

20.3.2.3 Residential Designations

Lands with predominantly residential land uses are designated Residential. The Residential designations include the High Density, Medium Density Residential and Low Density Residential designations. These neighbourhoods are intended to:

a) Provide a wide range and mix of housing types, forms, tenures, and affordability that addresses demographic needs of the immediate and broader Cambridge community;

b) Incorporate public service facilities, such as schools and parks, and compatible commercial uses, such as convenience commercial establishments, to create 15-minute neighbourhoods;

c) Develop at transit-supportive densities and provide missing middle housing where appropriate;

d) Provide accessible, pedestrian-oriented, and high-quality public realm with short walking distances to parks, trails, schools, other public service facilities, and transit services; and,

e) Contribute to providing safe and convenient active transportation connections to commercial, employment, service, and other community destinations in the Plan Area and surrounding areas.

The following land uses are permitted on lands within the Residential designations:

a) Additional residential units;

b) Live-work units and home occupations;
c) Special needs housing;

d) Convenience commercial uses in accordance with Section 8.6.1.5 of the Official Plan; and

e) Public service facilities

In addition to the uses permitted within all Residential designations, the following uses are also permitted on lands within the High Density Residential designation:

a) Mid and high-rise apartments; and

b) Other multiple buildings.

In addition to the uses permitted within all Residential designations, the following uses are also permitted on lands within the Medium Density Residential designation:

a) Low and mid-rise apartments;

d) Stacked townhouses; and

e) Street townhouses.

In addition to the uses permitted within all Residential designations, the following uses are also permitted on lands within the Low Density Residential designation:

a) Stacked townhouses;

b) Street townhouses;

c) Duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes;

d) Semi-detached dwellings; and

e) Single-detached dwellings.

The implementing Zoning By-law may further refine the permitted land uses to ensure that new development is appropriate in the context of the adjacent and surrounding community.

20.3.2.4 Prestige Industrial

Lands designated Prestige Industrial are intended to provide transition between the planned mixed-use areas within the Plan Area and the industrial uses north of the Plan Area. The predominant land uses within this designation shall be light industrial, office buildings and research uses. Intensification and increased employment densities are encouraged through expansion or redevelopment for existing and new businesses, contributing to employment growth in the Plan Area.

The following land uses are permitted on lands in the Plan Area designated Prestige Industrial provided such uses are compatible with residential and other sensitive land uses:

a) Light industrial uses in an enclosed building including assembling, fabricating,
manufacturing, processing, storage, packaging, and industrial service trades;

b) Offices;

c) Research and development including laboratories;

d) Information technology related uses including data centres and information processing establishments;

e) Hotel, conference centre, and banquet facilities;

f) Accessory uses to the permitted uses above; and

g) Service commercial and ancillary retail uses on a limited basis subject to the conditions set out in the Regional Official Plan and the City’s Official Plan.

Outdoor storage of raw materials and finished products is not permitted. Any storage of raw materials and finished products which is accessory to the primary use shall be contained within a building.

20.3.2.5 Natural Open Space System

Core Environmental Features, watercourses and shorelines, the regulatory one-zone floodplain, the floodway of a two-zone floodplain, additional hazard lands such as steep slopes, approved buffers as determined through the planning process, and publicly owned natural open space have been designated Natural Open Space System on Schedule B of this Secondary Plan. Core Environmental Features and Environmentally Sensitive Policy Areas in and around the Plan Area are identified on Schedule C of this Secondary Plan. The boundaries of Core Environmental Features and Environmentally Sensitive Policy Areas may be refined and expanded without further amendment to this Plan, provided any refinements are minor in nature and supported through an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) in conformity with the policies of this Plan.

The planned function, permitted uses, and policies of the Natural Open Space System designation are as set out in the Cambridge Official Plan. In addition, Chapter 3 of the Official Plan sets out policies regarding natural features and environmental management.

20.3.2.6 Height and Density

The lot area to be used for calculating density shall exclude the following areas:

a) Lands with natural features including any required buffers, provided that development is prohibited on these lands; and

b) Floodplain in a One-Zone Policy Area or the floodway in a Two-Zone Policy Area; and

c) Hazardous lands.

It is the intent of this Secondary Plan that the planned densities will be achieved at build-out.
The minimum densities for freestanding residential development, and minimum and maximum heights of new buildings within the Residential and Mixed-Use designations will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Minimum density for free standing units -- (UPH-units per hectare)</th>
<th>Minimum Height</th>
<th>Maximum Storeys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Mid-Rise High Density</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Medium Density</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Main Street</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maximum heights of new buildings within the Prestige Industrial designation will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Maximum Height (Storeys)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestige Industrial</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum building heights as identified in this Secondary Plan may be exceeded without an amendment to this Plan, subject to Council approval through a Zoning By-law amendment, in the following circumstances:

a) To achieve the maximum permitted density on a site where land is to be conveyed to the City for a publicly owned park or space; or

b) Where the maximum permitted density is exceeded as permitted.

The density and scale of development must be contextually appropriate with the planned context and must support the public realm.
20.3.2.7 Ongoing Development Applications

In the event an Official Plan amendment application for lands within the Plan Area has been deemed complete but a decision has not been made by Council prior to the date of adoption of this Secondary Plan, the following shall apply:

a) Applications in the public consultation phase of the Official Plan amendment process shall take into consideration the policies of this Secondary Plan; and

b) The resulting Site-Specific Policy, if any, shall be considered an amendment and Site-Specific Policy of this Secondary Plan.

20.3.2.8 Site Specific Policies

Site specific policies can be found in Chapter 8.10 and are identified on Map 2A.

20.3.3 URBAN DESIGN AND BUILT FORM

20.3.3.1 Intent of Urban Design and Built Form Policies

The following section provides the urban design policies for the Secondary Plan Area. The policies of this section are intended to complement and build upon the urban design policies in Chapter 5 of the Official Plan and be implemented through the site plan process. The purpose of these policies is to provide guidance for enhancing the character of the area, including both the private and public realm. The policies are intended to provide a degree of flexibility, allowing for a range of design styles and expressions which will contribute to creating a unique sense of place. Urban Design and Built Form Vision.

The Main Street and Dundas Street South Community Node is a gathering place for shopping, living, and working. Today, the area is dominated by auto-oriented commercial uses, vacant lands, and large surface parking lots. During the Secondary Plan consultation process, stakeholders expressed a desire for an enhanced public realm, more diverse mix of uses and activities, and a comfortable pedestrian environment. The Main Street and Dundas corridors are intended to provide local retail activity and the surrounding blocks offer a diverse range of employment, commercial, and residential uses that enhances the character of the area.

The intent of the Secondary Plan is to encourage an active commercial frontage along Dundas and Main Streets with pedestrian-scaled buildings. Internal blocks provide safe and efficient pedestrian and vehicular access within a vibrant and friendly streetscape. To achieve an enhanced streetscape environment, the urban design policies promote the development that provides a more compact mixed-use built form to fill in the gaps and pockets to create a consistent commercial streetscape. Designed for walking and anchored by a range of mixed-use buildings, the area is both a place to live and a commercial destination. As the heart of the local neighbourhoods, it is a gathering place with unique amenities and supported by a mix of land uses.
20.3.3.2 Public Realm Improvement Strategy

The expectation is that as the Main and Dundas Area intensifies that over time there will be demand for a number of public realm improvements. These improvements are intended to enhance the attractiveness and functionality of the area. The planned Public Realm Improvement Plan is depicted on Schedule D and considers the following:

a) Major Gateway Improvements
b) Minor Gateway Improvements
c) Major Streetscape Improvements;
d) Minor Streetscape Improvements;
e) Potential New Public Spaces; and,
f) Active Transportation Connections.

20.3.3.3 Gateways

Gateways are intended to function as formal entranceways into the Main and Dundas Area and are intended to create a strong sense of place. Presently, the Secondary Plan Area does not feature any prominent public space treatments at Gateway locations and accordingly, the Plan contemplates two levels of improvement:

a) Major Gateway Improvements; and,
b) Minor Gateway Improvements.

20.3.3.4.1 Major Gateway Improvements

Major Gateway Improvements should include signage, flags/banners, enhanced lighting, intensive landscaping (such as seasonal floral displays, tree planting), public art and other types of public realm enhancements. There are two Major Gateway Improvement Areas:

a) Main Street and Dundas Street intersection and surrounding area; and,
b) Franklin Boulevard and Dundas Street.

20.3.3.4.2 Minor Gateway Improvements

Minor Gateway Improvements should include a smaller scale of public realm enhancements, such as landscaping, public art, lighting and appropriately scaled way-finding queues. There are two Minor Gateway Improvement Areas in the Secondary Plan:

a) McLaren Avenue and Dundas Street; and,
b) Main Street and Franklin Boulevard.
20.3.3.4 Streetscape Improvements

Streetscape improvements are intended to provide direction for future enhancements to the non-travel portion of the roads within the Secondary Plan Area. Two levels of improvement area contemplated in this Plan:

a) Major Streetscaping Improvements; and,

b) Minor Streetscaping Improvements.

20.3.3.5.1 Major Streetscape Improvements

Major Streetscape Improvements are proposed for Main Street and Dundas Street. Key improvements should include (but are not limited to) completion of sidewalk networks (on both sides of the street), tree plantings on both sides of the street to provide shade and comfort for pedestrians, improved lighting, bike lanes and occasional street furniture. Where possible, efforts should be made to consolidate access points and improve visibility for pedestrians.

20.3.3.5.2 Minor Streetscape Improvements

Minor Streetscape Improvements are proposed for portions of Main Street and Franklin Boulevard. Key improvements should include (but are not limited to) completion of sidewalk networks (on both sides of the street), tree plantings on both sides of the street to provide shade and comfort for pedestrians and bike lanes.

20.3.3.5 Adjacent Development

Where new development or redevelopment is planned near a Gateway Improvement Area, the proposed development/redevelopment should be designed in a manner which enhances the function of the Gateway, through:

a) Complementary building orientation and massing;

b) Enhanced architectural detailing;

c) Linked private and public pedestrian connectivity;

d) Enhanced private realm landscaping; and,

e) Other elements as appropriate.

20.3.3.6 Potential New Public Spaces

20.3.3.7.1 New Public Spaces

Where new major mixed-use development or redevelopment is planned, new public spaces should be provided. New public spaces should be designed to be barrier free and should be designed to include a mix of design, including but not limited to enhanced landscaping shade trees, ample locations for seating and public art. New public spaces
may include playgrounds, community parks, and other similar spaces that serve a primary function of supporting existing and future needs in the surrounding neighbourhoods. These spaces should be located close to the street and be connected to the pedestrian network. New public spaces should also be connected with existing or planned transit stops. The icons depicted on Schedule D are for illustrative purposes only and the need, location and design of public spaces shall occur through the site plan application process.

20.3.3.7.2 Urban Greens and Squares

Urban Greens and Squares will be established in accordance with the following:

a) Urban Greens and Squares are expected to be small-scale components of the parks system and are intended to provide passive open space areas, both landscaped or hardscaped, and serve as focal points within sub-areas of each neighbourhood by provide stopping points throughout the community.

b) Urban Greens and Squares will be generally greater than 75 square metres but less than 1000 square metres in size.

c) Urban Greens and Squares will be connected to pedestrian movement, accessible, located at grade, provide barrier-free access to people with disabilities, and will have frontage on at least one public street.

d) The adjacent built form will have primary or active frontages facing or flanking the Urban Green or Square, where appropriate.

e) Urban Greens and Squares within the Low/Medium Density Residential designation will reflect the needs of surrounding residents, providing areas to sit and socialize, junior play areas for children, bicycle parking, and a significant tree canopy for shade.

f) Urban Greens and Squares within the Mixed-Use Node will include seating and a full furniture program, including lighting and bicycle parking, opportunities for outdoor cafes and restaurants, and facilities that promote a passive, relaxing urban atmosphere. These facilities will improve mid-block permeability and complement adjacent land uses.

g) Urban Greens and Squares may be publicly owned or considered for a privately owned public space.

h) The City will not accept Urban Greens and Squares as parkland dedication where the City is of the opinion a Neighbourhood Park or Community Park is necessary or desirable.

i) Public access to privately owned public space Urban Greens and Squares will be secured through the development approval process.
20.3.3.7 Potential Active Transportation Connection

Potential Active Transportation Connections are illustrated for the private realm on Schedule D. The network is intended to provide a finer grain network of pedestrian connections and is provided for illustration purposes. The expectation is that improvements to the on-site pedestrian networks be made through the redevelopment process and/or through a Community Improvement Planning exercise.

20.3.3.8 Signage and Wayfinding

The City may consider preparing a signage and wayfinding strategy for the Secondary Plan Area that enhances the public realm and support the land use vision for this corridor. The signage and wayfinding strategy would be implemented through a new signage by-law.

20.3.3.9 Street Tree Guidelines

The combination of both public realm improvements and the design guidelines for the private realm are intended to increase the overall tree canopy in the Secondary Plan Area and support the overall City-wide target for a 30% tree canopy. To support the achievement of the target, the City will:

a) Promote an extensive tree canopy over main pedestrian connections in the Secondary Plan Area;
b) Ensure that sufficient space is provided within the right-of-way to maximize opportunities for trees (in collaboration with the Region);
c) Promote the use of Silva cells and/or raised beds on both public and private lands to allow for healthy soil volumes; and,
d) Promote best practices in arboricultural maintenance.

20.3.3.10 Implementation of Public Realm Improvements

The public realm improvements depicted on Schedule D shall be implemented through a future Community Improvement Plan. The improvements depicted on Schedule D are intended to support growth and intensification within the Secondary Plan Area. Section 20.3.6 of this Plan provides additional details regarding implementation.

20.3.3.11 Private Realm Urban Design Guidelines

The Private Realm Design Guidelines identify the desired future character and function of the built environment, including massing, building articulation, parking and movement, and landscaping. The intent is to ensure that new buildings reinforce a coherent, harmonious and appealing urban environment, are compatible in scale, form, massing and height transition with existing urban forms as well as contribute to the enhancement of the public and private realm.
20.3.3.12.1 Building Frontages and Street Edges

Within the Mixed-Use designations, the design, use and animation of the ground level of buildings define the character and experience of the street. Ensuring that buildings provide an attractive and animated face, especially at the ground level, is a priority.

Buildings and structures should be organized on their sites to have landscaped setbacks adjacent to streets, mid-block open space areas and landscaped pedestrian connections to support and enhance a green and well-treed character.

The siting of buildings, location, and orientation are critical in creating a comfortable and safe pedestrian environment by providing an active and attractive interface conditions that:

a) Orient buildings toward public streets and other public spaces, in order to clearly define the public realm, create a consistent street wall, and to create a safe and attractive street environment for pedestrians. Grading and topographical constraints that may limit orientation to a street are to be taken into consideration.

b) Ensure pedestrian comfort and adequate light penetration.

c) Locate buildings along a build-to-line to provide a consistent edge to the street or public space. Deviation from the general built edge is permitted for building articulations, step-backs/recesses, openings, and other architectural treatments.

d) Buildings in general shall be designed to create mid-block connections and shall be massed and articulated to avoid creating excessively long continuous building facades. Buildings shall generally be not more than 75 metres long. For any building longer than 60 metres in length, articulation and materials of the façade must be varied to break up the massing to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner. Mid-block connections should be pedestrian oriented with appropriate pavement treatment, providing a safe and attractive environment.

e) All buildings oriented toward public streets must have clearly defined primary entry points that open directly on to the public sidewalk.

f) Provides a double frontage for corner buildings to address all streets and provides special design features of with equal architectural expression.

g) Ensures that architectural features and articulation are encouraged at all corner building locations, including residential buildings, to enhance the visual prominence and identity of the area and to enhance the corner.

h) For all commercial buildings, minimum glazing should be 70% and up to 80% glazing is permitted at-grade; second levels and above should be approximately 50% glazing.

i) Discourage blank walls, loading doors and other servicing areas from being located at grade along street frontages, parks, publicly accessible open space, and pedestrian connections.
j) In residential areas, architectural styles that help to foster neighbourhood identity and sense of place, such as front porches and balconies are encouraged.

20.3.3.12.2 Transitional Areas

New development should be designed to ensure that larger developments provide adequate transition to existing and smaller scale built form to reduce negative impacts on adjacent areas. The approach allows for smoother transitions between intensification areas and the adjacent, lower density residential areas. New buildings within the Secondary Plan Area will be located in the following manner to provide appropriate transition between new development and the surrounding stable residential areas:

a) New development must be sympathetic to the existing residential uses and be developed in a way that does not detract, hide from view, or impose negative impacts for light and shadow.

b) Where applicable, taller buildings should transition from the height of adjacent buildings through the use of building step backs, increased setbacks, and terracing building mass.

20.3.3.12.3 Building Entrances, Facades, Corner Sites

Primary building entrances will be located adjacent to the public street, or a publicly accessible courtyard physically and visually connected to the street, unless there are compelling topographical or other engineering related constraints that limit conformity with these policies, as determined by the City and the Region.

Residential building entrances will be located and oriented to have direct access from the street where possible. Porches, stoops, and balconies are encouraged at all entrances to create opportunities for overlook and social interaction along the street.

Entrances to individual grade-related residential units are encouraged to be provided along streets and park edges where possible. A modest grade change will create a threshold between public and semi-private space at the entrance and limit direct views into residential units.

Retail activities and other non-residential or commercial activities within buildings should be oriented towards the street and have direct access from sidewalks through storefront entries to promote overlook and enliven and support the public street.

a) The ground floor of new developments should be transparent to establish a strong visual connection to the street and create a welcoming and comfortable pedestrian environment.

b) Any facade facing a public street shall be considered a primary façade. A minimum of one pedestrian entrance shall be provided for any primary façade, where possible. Buildings on corner lots must be designed to have primary façades on both the front and side streets, where possible.
c) Pedestrian entrances should be architecturally distinct and identifiable as an entry point and designed to be universally accessible from a street or a publicly accessible open space.

d) Entrances to buildings must be clearly defined with maximum visibility to ensure ease of access directly from the street and from open spaces. Architectural treatment, and where appropriate, landscaping, should be used to accentuate entrances.

e) All buildings must be designed to be universally accessible and must provide an unobstructed walkway or pathway between the principal building(s) and the street.

f) Entrances should be designed with attractive weather protection to add to the pedestrian experience and comfort of users.

20.3.3.12.4 Landscaped Setbacks and Other Private Open Spaces

Buildings will have landscaped setbacks along streets and park edges to enhance the attractiveness of the street and to provide a privacy buffer for residential and other at-grade uses. In general, the following should be considered.

a) For any new high-density development, private open space enhancements are required as part of the built form design in order to contribute to the visual aesthetics and quality of the public realm.

b) Landscape treatments should be designed to edge streets, frame, and soften structures, define spaces, and screen undesirable views.

c) Trees and shrubs should be selected having regard to their scale and plating characteristics.

d) Plant materials should be grouped to frame buildings, add visual interest, to blank areas, accentuate entrances, and screen service areas.

e) Larger areas that may have deeper setbacks may take the form of courtyards, forecourts, mid-block connections, or small plazas.

f) On any commercial street, outdoor spill-out activities such as patios are encouraged to further animate the street.

g) Courtyards, forecourts, and other intimate spaces accessible to the public and animated with at-grade uses are encouraged.

h) For mixed-use, commercial, and residential apartment developments, portions of a lot not occupied by a building or structure or used for parking or loading must be landscaped.

i) All mixed-use and multiple residential buildings (e.g., townhouses and condominiums) will provide at-grade open space and outdoor amenity areas.

j) Outdoor amenity areas will include generously scaled areas of soft landscaping
capable of supporting shade trees.

k) Landscaped courtyards may be either partially open to streets or parks or surrounded by buildings on all sides. Courtyards will be designed to extend and enhance the public realm of streets, parks and open spaces.

l) The courtyard character will be green and well-treed with outdoor uses that promote pedestrian circulation as well as recreational, gathering and other social uses. Vehicular access and servicing areas will generally be discouraged from being located within a courtyard.

20.3.3.12.5 Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation

The Secondary Plan area should be connected to the broader community, utilizing a network of pedestrian paths, walkways, and cycling. Future redevelopment will provide the opportunity to improve pedestrian and bicycle linkages within the area and the adjacent neighbourhoods. Permeability and connectivity throughout the Secondary Plan area are key aspects of the overall objectives for a more walkable and connected environment. In the future mid-block walkways and active transportation connections are encouraged within the Secondary Plan area. To facilitate enhanced pedestrian connectivity, the following guidelines shall be considered:

a) Sidewalks connections should be provided between all building entrances and the public sidewalk within a comprehensive network.

b) Landscaped mid-block pedestrian walkways and/or bicycle trails should be approximately 6 metres wide to provide room for the path and soft landscaping. Narrower spaces that limit visibility and safety are discouraged.

c) Fencing along neighbourhood connections, pedestrian walkways and/or bicycle trails should be low and allow for views from surrounding buildings and areas to promote safety. A coordinated approach to fencing design, location and height along these routes will be encouraged.

d) Where possible, pedestrian crossings should be designed to be distinct from the street by using paving materials, textures, and colours to enhance the legibility of the crossing.

e) Locate bicycle racks near entrances of buildings with connectivity to the public sidewalk.

f) Align pedestrian paths with transit stops to provide a more direct connection for users.

g) Private outdoor spaces should be designed as barrier free with appropriate lighting to improve route legibility, access, safety, and comfort.

h) Limit planting along edges of pedestrian walkways and cycling trails to low lying vegetation or other that does not restrict visibility and safety.
20.3.3.12.6 Parking, Access and Servicing

This Secondary Plan encourages a future block pattern and street network that supports opportunities for walking, cycling, and connectivity with surrounding areas.

Site specific vehicular access, ramps, servicing and loading should be provided from local streets wherever possible to minimize impacts on vehicular and pedestrian traffic on arterial streets. Ramps, servicing and loading facilities should be integrated into the buildings they serve to minimize impacts on landscaped open space. At-grade parking will be minimized. Where permitted, surface parking areas will be carefully located and screened to minimize impacts on adjoining streets or parks. The following shall be considered in designing parking and servicing facilities:

a) Parking areas are discouraged from being located along street frontages.
b) For structured parking, the facility should be integrated into the built form such that it relates to the design and façade treatment of the building. Solid blank walls are not permitted.
c) Wherever possible, surface parking and servicing for new developments should be placed at the rear of buildings and accessed by a rear or side yard lane.
d) Where surface parking or service areas are exposed, a generous separation should be provided from the public realm and designed to include additional street trees or landscaping and buffered with hedges or shrub planting or other mitigating design measures.
e) Parking lot lighting, pedestrian pathways and other street furniture should be used to create a comfortable, safe, and connected pedestrian environment.
f) The edges of parking facilities should receive architectural and design treatments to be consistent with the streetscape design and complement adjacent buildings.

20.3.3.12.7 Internal Streets

Redevelopment in the Secondary Plan may include internal streets to support development. The following guidelines shall be considered for proposed new internal streets:

a) Internal streets should be developed with the “look and feel” of local City streets.
b) Streets should be designed at the pedestrian scale with sidewalks, street trees, and street furniture for an enhanced pedestrian environment and for seamless integration with the public realm.
c) Pedestrian scale lighting should be provided along the street edge.
20.3.4 TRANSPORTATION

20.3.4.1 Planned Transportation Network

The existing and planned transportation network is depicted on Schedules E and F and is designed to accommodate a variety of modes, including automobiles, trucks, transit, cycling and pedestrians. As the Community Node evolves over time, the expectation is that major improvements will be made to enhance automobile, transit, cycling and walking networks within and into the area to ensure that an appropriate balance of transportation options is provided.

20.3.4.2 Improvements and Enhancements to Transportation Network

The Secondary Plan contemplates the following potential improvements to the transportation network:

- Road improvements;
- Transit improvements; and,
- Active transportation improvements.

20.3.4.3 Existing and Planned Road Network

The existing and planned road network is depicted on Schedule E and is expected to accommodate the planned growth and intensification potential for the Area up to 2031. Intersections of major arterial roads should consider effective vehicle movements while providing safe pedestrian and cycling crossings.

Appendix A provides illustrations depicting the future planned cross-sections for Main Street, Dundas Street and Franklin Boulevard based on the Region of Waterloo’s Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines. Although the arterial roads are all Regional roads, streetscaping along these roads is a City of Cambridge responsibility. Note that the cross-sections are provided for illustration purposes.

20.3.4.4 Reconstruction of Main Street from Franklin Boulevard to Chalmers Street

This is an excellent opportunity to coordinate active transportation and streetscaping with the Region of Waterloo. Main Street and Franklin Boulevard are Regional roads but streetscaping is a City of Cambridge responsibility. It is important to ensure sufficient setbacks and coordinated implementation of streetscaping as these projects proceed.

Reference Area(s): Main Street, west of Dundas Street
20.3.4.5 Local Road Connections

New local connections are required to facilitate development and/or redevelopment in some locations. The alignment of the proposed new connections are intended to be conceptual (except where the rights-of-way are already established). Detailed alignments and locations of local streets and private laneways shall be determined through further engineering studies and through the development approvals process.

20.3.4.6 Consolidate Entranceways

Development or redevelopment will seek the consolidation of access points and common traffic circulation in accordance with the provisions of this Plan and the Region of Waterloo’s access guidelines.

20.3.4.7 Transit Network

The existing and planned transit network is depicted on Schedule F. Grand River Transit is undergoing a new 5-year Business Plan which will review transit needs. The Land Use Plan (Schedule B) promotes infilling and intensification at a scale which would support increased transit ridership through the Main and Dundas Area.

20.3.4.8 Potential Transit Improvements

The City encourages the Region of the Waterloo to improve the provision of transit pedestrian amenities such as shelters, bike racks seating and lighting at all transit stops.

20.3.4.9 Improving On-site Linkages

Where new or expansions to existing development is proposed, the City will work with private sector applicants to improve on-site linkages and pathways to existing and planned transit stops.

20.3.4.10 Active Transportation Network

The existing and planned Active Transportation Network is depicted on Schedule F. The network is planned to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists.

20.3.4.11 Active Transportation Improvements

Active transportation infrastructure should provide continuous facilities and connectivity to transit stops, multi-use trails, parks, schools, recreational facilities, and on-street cycling network. Proposed active transportation improvements for the area include:

- Streetscape Improvements depicted on Schedule D which are intended to enhance both pedestrian comfort and connectivity;
- Completion of sidewalk network within the Plan Area; and,
- Potential pedestrian crossing/safety improvements along Franklin Boulevard at Green Gate Boulevard, and also at Main Street.

20.3.4.12 Franklin Boulevard and Green Gate Boulevard

The City of Cambridge will work with the Region of Waterloo to implement a pedestrian refuge island to improve pedestrian safety at the intersection of Franklin Boulevard and Green Gate Boulevard. The refuge island will connect pedestrians and cyclists across Franklin Boulevard and provide access to transit stops and the multi-use trail.

20.3.4.13 Sidewalk Improvements

Sidewalk infrastructure is provided throughout the Secondary Plan Area; however there remain parts of the network which are incomplete. Over time, the expectation is that sidewalks will be provided on both sides of the street for all existing and new roads within the Plan Area.

20.3.4.14 Secure Bike Parking Facilities

The implementing Zoning By-law may require the provision of secure bicycle parking facilities in a conspicuous location, long-term bike parking areas within buildings and on-site shower facilities and lockers for employees who bike to work. The City may allow for the reduction in the number of required parking spaces where bicycle parking facilities are provided.

20.3.4.15 Transportation Demand Management

Council may require that development applications include a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan, prepared to the satisfaction of the City. The intent of the TDM Plan shall be to implement and promote measures to reduce the use of low-occupancy automobiles for trips and to increase transit use, cycling and walking.

20.3.4.16 Parking

Through the development approvals process, the City may consider alternative parking requirements for mixed use and high density developments including shared parking standards.

20.3.4.17 Coordination with the City’s Transportation Master Plan

At the time of drafting of this secondary plan, the City was in the process of launching a new city-wide Transportation Master Plan. The expectation is that the growth assumptions, vision and other relevant aspects of this Secondary Plan will be considered in the preparation of the City-wide Transportation Master Plan. Amendments to the Secondary Plan may be required to ensure alignment between the Secondary Plan and the Transportation Master Plan.
20.3.5 INFRASTRUCTURE

20.3.5.1 Water and Sanitary Servicing

As part of the implementation of this Secondary Plan, the City will work with the Region of Waterloo to ensure that there is adequate water and sanitary servicing and capacity to accommodate the long term planned development for the Secondary Plan Area.

20.3.5.2 Municipal Servicing Study

As part of the implementation of this Secondary Plan, and the policies of Chapter 6 of the Official Plan, the City will undertake an analysis of local infrastructure to ensure that adequate servicing is in place to accommodate the planned growth for the area. The City will update its municipal master servicing strategy as required.

20.3.5.3 Development Applications and Servicing Requirements

The City may also require development applications to be supported by site-specific servicing studies.

20.3.5.4 Sustainable Stormwater Management

The municipality encourages innovative measures to help reduce the impacts of urban run-off and maintain base groundwater flow. Such measures may include bioswales, permeable pavers, rain barrels and green roofs.

20.3.5.5 Coordination of Public Works

The City will work with the Region to ensure that planned public works for the area are coordinated to minimize the impacts of construction on the residents and businesses within the Plan Area. Coordination efforts will consider the phasing of streetscape improvements, any future road works, and maintenance, as well as any upgrades to water and sanitary networks.
20.3.6 IMPLEMENTATION

20.3.6.1 General Implementation

20.3.6.1.1 Implementation Tools

The Secondary Plan shall be implemented through a variety of tools, including but not limited to:

a) The planning and development application process, through tools such as site plan approval, plans of subdivision and condominium and consents to sever;

b) The City of Cambridge Zoning by-law;

c) Community Improvement Plan; and,

d) Other tools as described in this Chapter.

20.3.6.1.2 Development Proposal Complete Application Requirements

Development applications within the Secondary Plan are subject to any complete application requirements set out in the Official Plan. The City may update these complete application requirements to account for additional supporting studies that may be needed to support growth within the Secondary Plan, including a shadow impact study.

20.3.6.1.3 Municipal Works within the Secondary Plan

All future municipal works undertaken by the City of Cambridge within the Secondary Plan Area shall be consistent with the policies of this Plan.

20.3.6.1.4 Official Plan Amendments

Unless otherwise stated in this Plan or the City’s Official Plan, applications for development which do not align with the Policies or Schedules of this Plan shall require an Official Plan Amendment. Amendments to the Official Plan shall be subject to policies of the Official Plan and shall require a planning justification report, along with any other supporting studies identified through the pre-consultation process.

20.3.6.1.5 Zoning By-Law

The City will update its zoning by-law to ensure that the land use and design policies for this Secondary Plan are reflected in the City’s zoning by-law.

Applications for development within the Plan Area shall be subject to the policies of this Secondary Plan and the City’s Official Plan (where applicable). Amendments to the zoning by-law shall be subject to policies of the Official Plan and shall require a planning justification report, along with any other supporting studies identified through the pre-consultation process.
20.3.6.1.6 Site Plan Approval, Plans of Subdivision, Plans of Condominium and Severances

Applications for site plan approval, plans of subdivision, plans of condominium and consents to sever shall be consistent with the policies of this Secondary Plan and City of Cambridge’s Official Plan.

20.3.6.1.7 Main Street and Dundas Street Area Community Improvement Plan

To assist and accelerate intensification redevelopment and facilitate further public realm improvements within the Secondary Plan Area, the City will consider modifying its Community Improvement Plan (CIP) programs or creating a new CIP for intensification areas. The rationale for completing a CIP as part of the Secondary Plan’s implementation is to ensure that:

- The proposed public realm improvement projects are appropriately planned and accounted for in the City’s capital budget, including any property acquisitions which may be required to complete the proposed streetscaping, public space and gateway improvements; and,

- There is a competitive suite of financial incentives to promote intensification and redevelopment, such as but not limited to incentives for greyfield and brownfield redevelopment, lot consolidation/assembly, residential infilling and/or mixed-use intensification, etc.

20.3.6.1.8 Coordination with the Region of Waterloo

The City will work with the Region of Waterloo, who is the approval authority for this Plan, to ensure that the policies of this Plan are implemented, including any opportunities to implement the urban design and public realm improvements through any future Regional works. The City also encourages the Region of Waterloo to consider opportunities for affordable housing development within the Community Node area.

20.3.6.2 Phasing and Financial Tools

20.3.6.2.1 Municipal Capital Improvements

The City will prepare a phasing strategy as to assist with the implementation of this Secondary Plan. The Phasing Strategy should consider the following:

a) The expecting timing of development, including the expected built-out of vacant lands and redevelopment of existing areas;

b) The timing of any potential transportation, infrastructure, and public realm improvements; and,

c) Any other projects or initiatives which may impact the timing of development.
20.3.6.2.2 Development Charges

The City will include any growth-related infrastructure identified in this plan as part of the next Development Charges By-law update.

20.3.6.2.3 Updating the Plan

The City will comprehensively review the policies of this Secondary Plan at the 10 year review of the City’s Official Plan. Depending on the outcomes of the review, the City may decide to update the Plan.

20.3.6.3 Interpretation

20.3.6.3.1 Conflicts with Official Plan

In the event of a conflict between the Official Plan and this Secondary Plan, the Policies of the Secondary Plan shall prevail.

20.3.6.3.2 Boundaries

The boundaries shown on the Secondary Plan Schedules are approximate, except where they meet with existing roads, river valleys or other clearly defined physical features. Where the general intent of this Secondary Plan is maintained to the satisfaction of the Municipality, minor boundary adjustments will not require an amendment to this Secondary Plan.
Schedules
Appendix A: Conceptual Street Cross Sections

Figure 20-1: Community Connector, Typical Cross Section

Reference Area(s): Franklin Boulevard; Main Street, between Franklin Boulevard and Dundas Street

Figure 20-2: Neighbourhood Connector, Typical Cross Section

Reference Area(s): Dundas Street; Main Street, between Franklin and Dundas; Franklin Boulevard, south of Dundas Street
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

BY-LAW 24-039

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 23rd day of April 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 23rd day of April 2024

_________________________________
MAYOR

_________________________________
CLERK