Corporation of the City of Cambridge
Council Meeting
Agenda

Date: Tuesday, June 25, 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 5:00 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
   4.1 Paul Langan, Fuse Art re: Book of Cambridge Authors
       This presentation will be distributed on the addendum.
   4.2 Toula Theocharidis, Planner re: 24-078-CD Recommendation Report for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment - 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street North
       This presentation will be distributed on the addendum.
5. Delegations and Consideration of Related Reports
6. Closed Session
   THAT in accordance with section 239 (2) (e), (f) and (k) of the Municipal Act, 2001, Council to convene in Closed Session to consider the following subject matters:
(e) litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative
tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board (Confidential Litigation
Updates);

(f) advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications
necessary for that purpose (Confidential Litigation Updates); and,

(k) a position, plan, procedure, criteria or instruction to be applied to any
negotiations carried on or to be carried on by or on behalf of the municipality or
local board (Confidential Litigation Updates) (Confidential Negotiations).

7. Rise from Closed

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 Meeting Minutes - May 28, 2024 and June 4, 2024 4 - 23
8.2 Council Information Package - May 31 and June 14, 2024 24 - 75
8.3 24-081-CD Black Bridge Road Bridge Heritage Permit Application, Bridge
Alterations 76 - 106
8.4 24-030-CRS 2024 Operating Financial Update – April Forecast 107 - 119
8.5 24-004-CRE Request to Amend Development Covenants and
Restrictions 120 - 125
8.6 24-007-IFS Capital Status and Forecast – April 2024 126 - 171

9. Consideration of Reports
9.1 Corporate Services
9.1.1 24-034-CRS Fire Operational Implementation Plan – Phase One 172 - 181

9.2 Corporate Enterprise

9.3 Community Development
9.3.1 24-078-CD Recommendation Report for Official Plan
Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment - 777 Laurel Street
and 308 Dolph Street North
Note: Report 24-078-CD was deferred by Council during the
meeting on May 28th, 2024. Additional materials will be
included as appendix 'H' to this report on the meeting
addendum.

9.3.2 24-057-CD Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study Final
Report 228 - 511
9.3.3 24-085-CD Fence Variance Application Fee Waiver Request 512 - 516
9.3.4 24-083-CD Hamilton Street Watermain Extension 517 - 520
9.3.5 24-102-CD 19 Cambridge Street - Arts & Culture Hub 521 - 526

9.4 Infrastructure Services
9.5 Office of the City Manager

10. Other Business

11. Motions

12. Notices of Motion

13. Correspondence
13.1 Eowyn Spencer re: 24-078-CD Recommendation Report for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment - 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street North 527 - 527

14. Motion to Receive and File

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

* 24-058 Being a by-law to adopt Amendment No. 79 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012), as amended with respect to land municipally known as 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street

* 24-059 Being a By-law to amend Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended, with respect to land municipally known as 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street North

* 24-064 Being a by-law to amend By-law 21-065a, respecting the authorization of issuance of debentures for the rehabilitation of existing assets and construction of new assets contained in the Capital Funding Program (N. Cambridge Railway Grade Separation, Preston Auditorium Construction, Fountain Street Soccer Facility and East Side NS Collector Road Design)

* 24-065 Being a by-law to designate the stone building on the property located at 201 Water Street South as a property of cultural heritage value

16. Confirmatory By-law 545 - 546

17. Adjournment
1. Meeting Called to Order
The meeting of the Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge is held in Council Chambers and is live streamed to the City of Cambridge website. Mayor Liggett welcomes everyone present and calls the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m.

2. **Indigenous Territory Acknowledgement**

3. **Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest**

4. **Presentations**

4.1 KPMG re: 24-027-CRS 2023 Financial Report

4.2 Mary Lou Tanner, NPG Planning re: 24-077-CD - Recommendation Report for OPA and ZBA - 201 Water St and 66 Highman Ave

4.3 Mark Stone, Planner re: 24-077-CD - Recommendation Report for OPA and ZBA - 201 Water St and 66 Highman Ave

4.4 Sancy Sebastian, Planner re: 24-032-CD Recommendation Report for City initiated Zoning By-law Amendment - 214 and 216 Union St. N. and 229 and 231 Anne St.

4.5 Trevor Hawkins, MHBC Planning re: 24-078-CD Recommendation Report for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment - 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street North

4.6 Toula Theocharidis, Planner re: 24-078-CD Recommendation Report for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment - 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street North

4.7 Nordcity Group re: 24-033-CD 2024 Arts and Culture Action Plan Approval

5. **Delegations and Consideration of Related Reports**

5.1 Kristen Barisdale re: 24-032-CD Recommendation Report for City initiated Zoning By-law Amendment - 214 and 216 Union St. N. and 229 and 231 Anne St.

5.2 Fatima Pereira re: 24-032-CD Recommendation Report for City initiated Zoning By-law Amendment - 214 and 216 Union St. N. and 229 and 231 Anne St.

5.3 Jill Summerhayes re: 24-033-CD 2024 Arts and Culture Action Plan Approval

6. **Consent Agenda**

Motion: 24-151
Moved by Councillor Cooper
Seconded by Councillor Roberts

THAT all items listed under the heading of Consent Agenda for May 28, 2024, be adopted as recommended.

In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

Carried (9 to 0)

6.1 Council Information Package - May 17, 2024
6.2 24-084-CD Noise By-law Exemption – Region of Waterloo Dundas Street Phase 2 Reconstruction

7. Consideration of Reports

7.1 Corporate Services

7.1.1 24-027-CRS 2023 Financial Report

Motion: 24-152

Moved by Councillor Ermeta
Seconded by Councillor Earnshaw

THAT Report 24-027-CRS Financial Report be received;

AND FURTHER THAT the audited consolidated financial statements for the Corporation of the City of Cambridge be approved for the year ended December 31, 2023.

In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

Carried (9 to 0)

7.2 Community Development

7.2.1 24-077-CD - Recommendation Report for OPA and ZBA - 201 Water St and 66 Highman Ave

Motion: 24-153
Moved by Councillor Cooper
Seconded by Councillor Hamilton

THAT Report 24-077-CD Recommendation Report for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment - 201 Water Street South and 66 Highman Avenue be received;

AND THAT Council adopts proposed Official Plan Amendment No. 80 to redesignate the subject lands from Low / Medium Density Residential and Natural Open Space System to High Density Residential and Natural Open Space System with a Site Specific Policy 8.10.116 to permit an increased density with a maximum of 330 residential units and a maximum building height of up to 15 storeys, and that the adopted Official Plan Amendment be submitted to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo for approval;

AND THAT Council approves the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment to rezone the subject lands from Open Space - OS1 and Low Density Residential - R4 to Multiple Residential - (H)RM3 s.4.1.447 and Open Space - OS1 to facilitate the development of two 15-storey towers containing 330 dwelling units;

AND THAT Council is satisfied that the requirements for a public meeting in accordance with subsections 17(15) and 34(12) of the Planning Act have been met;

AND FURTHER THAT that the by-laws attached to Report 24-077-CD be passed.

In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

Carried (9 to 0)

7.2.2 24-032-CD Recommendation Report for City initiated Zoning By-law Amendment - 214 and 216 Union St. N. and 229 and 231 Anne St.

Motion: 24-154

Moved by Councillor Kimpson
Seconded by Councillor Shwery
THAT Report 24-032-CD Recommendation Report for City initiated Zoning By-law Amendment - 214 and 216 Union St. N. and 229 and 231 Anne St. be received;

AND THAT Council approves the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment to rezone the subject lands from RM3 s.4.1.299 to RM4 s.4.1.475, with a site specific provision for a reduced lot frontage, to legalize the two existing semi-detached dwellings;

AND THAT Council is satisfied that the requirements for a public meeting in accordance with subsection 34(17) of the Planning Act have been met;

AND FURTHER THAT that the by-law attached to report 24-032-CD be passed.

In Favour (8): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

Opposed (1): Councillor Devine

Carried (8 to 1)

7.2.3 24-078-CD Recommendation Report for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment - 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street North

Moved by Councillor Kimpson
Seconded by Councillor Roberts

THAT Report 24-078-CD Recommendation Report for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment - 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street North be received;

AND THAT Council adopt proposed Official Plan Amendment No. 79 to redesignate the subject lands from ‘Business Industrial’ to ‘High-Density Residential’ with Site-Specific Policy 8.10.115 to permit increased density with maximum of 1,215 residential units and a maximum building height of up to 19 storeys, and that the adopted Official Plan Amendment be submitted to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo for approval;

AND THAT Cambridge Council approves the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment to amend the zoning of the subject lands from
‘General Industrial’ - M3 to the ‘Multiple Residential’ - RM3
S.4.1.477, with Site-Specific provisions and a Holding (H) provision
to facilitate the development of 1,215 residential apartment units;

AND THAT Council is satisfied that the requirement for a public
meeting in accordance with subsections 17(15) and 34(17) of the
Planning Act has been met;

AND THAT the by-law(s) attached to this report 24-078-CD be
passed.

AND FURTHER THAT Council direct staff to require the
developer to either contribute $1000 per unit to the Affordable
Housing Fund within the proposed development or provide 20
affordable units as a condition of site plan approval.

Deferral:
Motion: 24-155

Moved by Councillor Devine
Seconded by Councillor Ermeta

THAT consideration of report 24-078-CD Recommendation
Report for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law
Amendment - 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street North be
deferred for at least 30 days to allow for a neighbourhood
public meeting on the increased heights of buildings with a
report back to Council during the June 25th, 2024 meeting.

In Favour (5): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor
Cooper, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

Opposed (4): Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor
Roberts, and Councillor Hamilton

Carried (5 to 4)

7.2.4 24-033-CD 2024 Arts and Culture Action Plan Approval

Motion: 24-156

Moved by Councillor Cooper
Seconded by Councillor Ermeta

THAT Report 24-033-CD 2024 Arts and Culture Action Plan
Approval be received;
AND THAT the Arts and Culture Action Plan outline Cambridge’s vision, strategic priorities and recommendations for developing and enhancing arts and culture services, facilities and programming for the City of Cambridge;

AND THAT the implementation plan including projected timelines and associated budget be received and brought forward for consideration during the appropriate annual budget process;

AND THAT the annual operating budget allocation for Special Events be increased by $25,000 to support the Cambridge Celebration of the Arts, to be considered as part of the 2025 budget process;

AND THAT both the Canada Day and Cambridge Santa Clause Parade annual events become directly sanctioned city-lead events with an operating budget increase of $57,000 to be considered as part of the 2025 budget process;

AND FURTHER THAT Council approve the 2024 Arts and Culture Action Plan as presented in 24-033-CD Appendix A – City of Cambridge 2024 Arts and Culture Action Plan.

In Favour (8): Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

Opposed (1): Councillor Shwery

Carried (8 to 1)

7.2.5 24-038-CD Neighbourhood Associations Support Services Policy Review

Motion: 24-157

Moved by Councillor Roberts
Seconded by Councillor Hamilton

THAT Report 24-038-CD Neighbourhood Associations Support Services Policy Review be received;

AND THAT Support Services to Neighbourhood Association Policy# C-80.020 revisions identified in report 24-038-CD be approved.
In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

Carried (9 to 0)

7.3 Motions

7.3.1 Motion re: Establishing safe and inclusive areas for the delivery of health services to better meet the needs of Cambridge’s most vulnerable residents

Note: This Motion has been withdrawn and will no longer be discussed at this meeting.

7.4 Community Development

7.4.1 24-030-CD – Approval of the Amended Grand River Source Protection Plan

Motion: 24-158

Moved by Councillor Earnshaw
Seconded by Councillor Roberts

THAT Report No. 24-030-CD Approval of the Amended Grand River Source Protection Plan be received as information;

AND FURTHER THAT Cambridge Council support the updates to the Amended Grand River Source Protection Plan.

In Favour (8): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

Absent (1): Councillor Devine

Carried (8 to 0)

7.5 Corporate Enterprise

7.5.1 24-005-CRE Core Areas Community Improvement Plan Minor Amendment

Motion: 24-159
Moved by Councillor Kimpson
Seconded by Councillor Devine

THAT Report 24-005-CRE Core Areas Community Improvement Plan Financial Incentive be received;

AND THAT Appendix A of the Core Areas Community Improvement Plan – Fee Waiver Program be replaced with Appendix B of this Report 24-005-CRE, effective retroactively as of June 29, 2021.

In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

Carried (9 to 0)

7.6 Community Development

7.6.1 24-069-CD Updated Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) Terms of Reference

Motion: 24-160

Moved by Councillor Kimpson
Seconded by Councillor Roberts

THAT Report 24-069-CD Updated Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) Terms of Reference be received;

AND THAT Council approve the updated HIA Terms of Reference, which also includes terms of references for a conservation plan, and documentation and salvage plan;

AND FURTHER THAT it is expected that the preferred protective and mitigative measures will be consistent with recognized standards for heritage conservation, including:

- The Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties;
- The Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties;
- The Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries Conservation Principles for Land Use Planning
- Well-Preserved: The Ontario Heritage Foundation’s Manual of Principals and Practice for Architectural Conservation
- The Parks Canada Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada
- The Appleton Charter for the Protection and Enhancement of the Built Environment
- The International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (the Venice Charter)

In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

Carried (9 to 0)

7.7 Infrastructure Services
7.8 Office of the City Manager

8. **Other Business**

**Road Safety Audit on Duke Street and Laurel Street Staff Direction**

THAT staff be directed to bring forward a pilot capital project for a Road Safety Audit on Duke Street and Laurel Street all the way through to Eagle Street as part of the 2025 Capital Budget process.

9. **Notices of Motion**

10. **Correspondence**

10.1 Chea Kirkham re: 24-077-CD - Recommendation Report for OPA and ZBA - 201 Water St and 66 Highman Ave

10.2 Cambridge Arts and Culture Advisory Committee re: 24-033-CD 2024 Arts and Culture Action Plan Approval
10.3 Chea Kirkham re: 24-077-CD - Recommendation Report for OPA and ZBA - 201 Water St and 66 Highman Ave

11. **Motion to Receive and File**

Motion: 24-161

Moved by Councillor Devine
Seconded by Councillor Shwery

THAT all presentations and correspondence from the May 28, 2024, Council meeting be received.

In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

**Carried (9 to 0)**

12. **Consideration of By-laws**

Motion: 24-162

Moved by Councillor Hamilton
Seconded by Councillor Cooper

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

24-056 Being a by-law to adopt Amendment No. 80 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012), as amended, with respect to lands municipally known as 201 Water Street South and 66 Highman Avenue

24-057 Being a by-law to amend Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended, with respect to lands municipally known as 201 Water Street South and 66 Highman Avenue

24-060 Being a by-law to amend Zoning By-law 150-85, as amended, with respect to lands municipally known as 214 and 216 Union Street North, and 229 and 231 Anne Street

In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

**Carried (9 to 0)**
13. **Confirmatory By-law**

Motion: 24-163

Moved by Councillor Roberts
Seconded by Councillor Ermeta

That By-Law 24-061 being a by-law to confirm the proceedings of the Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge be passed.

In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

**Carried (9 to 0)**

14. **Adjournment**

Motion: 24-164

Moved by Councillor Devine
Seconded by Councillor Roberts

THAT the Council meeting does now adjourn at 7:38 p.m.

In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

**Carried (9 to 0)**
MINUTES
Corporation of the City of Cambridge
Council Meeting

Date: June 4, 2024, 6:30 p.m.
Location: Council Chambers

Council Members In Attendance: Councillor Shwery - Ward 1, Councillor Devine - Ward 2,
Councillor Kimpson - Ward 3, Councillor Earnshaw - Ward 4,
Councillor Roberts - Ward 5, Councillor Cooper - Ward 6,
Councillor Hamilton - Ward 7, Councillor Ermeta - Ward 8, Mayor Liggett

Staff Members in Attendance: David Calder - City Manager, Hardy Bromberg, Deputy City
Manager - Community Development, Yogesh Shah, Deputy City
Manager - Infrastructure Services, Cheryl Zahnleiter, Deputy City
Manager - Corporate Enterprise, Sheryl Ayres - Chief Financial
Officer, Danielle Manton - City Clerk, Jennifer Shaw - Deputy
City Clerk, Michael Oliveri - Council Committee Services
Coordinator, Maria Barrantes Barreto - Council Committee
Services Coordinator, Rachel Latour - Administrative Assistant,
Lisa Prime - Chief Planner, Kevin De Leebeeck - Director of
Engineering, Bryan Boodhoo - City Solicitor

Others in Attendance: Michael Hausser - Director of Operations, Infrastructure
Services; Shannon Noonan - Manager of Transportation
Engineering; Krishna Katta - Support Technician

1. Meeting Called to Order
The meeting of the Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge is held in
Council Chambers and is live streamed to the City of Cambridge website. Mayor Liggett welcomes everyone present and calls the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m.

2. Indigenous Territory Acknowledgement

3. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest
None.

4. **Presentations**

5. **Delegations and Consideration of Related Reports**

6. **Closed Session**

7. **Rise from Closed Session**

   Motion: 24-165
   
   Moved by Councillor Shwery
   Seconded by Councillor Devine
   
   THAT Council rise from the Closed Session held on June 4, 2024 and reconvene in Open Session at 6:43 p.m.
   
   In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett
   
   **Carried (9 to 0)**

8. **Consent Agenda**

   Motion: 24-166
   
   Moved by Councillor Kimpson
   Seconded by Councillor Ermeta
   
   THAT all items listed under the heading of Consent Agenda for June 4, 2024 be adopted as recommended.
   
   In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett
   
   **Carried (9 to 0)**

8.1 **Special Council Meeting Minutes - March 5, 2024**

8.2 **Planning - Statutory Public Meeting Minutes - March 5, 2024**

8.3 **Council Meeting Minutes - May 2, 2024**

8.4 **Planning - Statutory Public Meeting Minutes - May 7, 2024**
9. **Motions**

9.1 Motion to Suspend Rules

Motion: 24-167

Moved by Councillor Earnshaw
Seconded by Councillor Kimpson

THAT the notice requirements of the procedure by-law be waived to consider Capital Projects Related to the Housing Accelerator Fund.

In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

Carried (9 to 0)

9.2 Capital Projects Related to the Housing Accelerator Fund

Motion: 24-168

Moved by Councillor Earnshaw
Seconded by Councillor Kimpson

WHERE the City of Cambridge received funding from the Canada Mortgage & Housing Corporation this past February as part of the Housing Accelerator Fund;

AND WHEREAS the purpose of this program and grant funding is to support municipalities with new and transformational change to create housing;

AND WHEREAS Council has previously approved report 23-318 CD in October 2023 which endorsed the City’s Action Plan for the Housing Accelerator Fund and to enter into a contribution agreement if the City was successful in its application;

AND WHEREAS staff have informed Council that the City is undertaking 9 initiatives to accelerate the supply of housing through this awarded grant funding;

AND WHEREAS due to timelines and competitive processes to secure
vendors, staff have identified a need to establish capital projects to allocate the $13 million in grant funding sooner rather than later;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED in order to ensure the city meets required timelines for the funding agreement with CMHC and to ensure the adequate provision of a full range of housing including affordable housing and ensure that the funds are appropriately allocated to the different projects to get them underway that Council direct staff to establish the necessary capital projects and allocation of funding from the Housing Accelerator Fund to allow the work to proceed to complete the 9 initiatives

AND FURTHER THAT staff be directed to report back to Council by September 2024.

In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

Carried (9 to 0)

10. Consideration of Reports

10.1 Community Development

10.1.1 24-075-CD Elgin Street North at Galt Avenue Pedestrian Crossover

Motion: 24-169

Moved by Councillor Earnshaw
Seconded by Councillor Hamilton

THAT Report 24-075-CD Elgin Street North at Galt Avenue Pedestrian Crossover be received;

AND THAT a Pedestrian Crossover (Level 2, Type C) be installed on the north side of Elgin Street North at Galt Avenue;

AND THAT the By-law to amend the Traffic and Parking Bylaw, included as Appendix C to Report 24-075-CD be passed:

AND FURTHER THAT the creation of capital project A/01545-40 Elgin Street Pedestrian Crossover with funding in the amount of $75,000 from the Capital Works Reserve Fund be approved.
In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

Carried (9 to 0)

10.2 Corporate Services

10.2.1 24-035-CRS 2025 Budget Timeline and Guidelines

Motion: 24-170

Moved by Councillor Roberts
Seconded by Councillor Earnshaw

THAT Report 24-035-CRS 2025 Budget Timeline and Guidelines be received;

AND THAT staff prepare the 2025 Budget including operating forecasts for years 2026 through 2028 and capital forecasts for years 2026 through 2034;

AND THAT staff be directed to prepare the 2025 Operating Budget in alignment with the City’s Council-approved Strategic Plan and consistent with the tax levy increase forecast through the approved 2024 Budget which includes an incremental 1% levy to the Infrastructure Renewal Fund (IRF) annually;

AND THAT staff be directed to prepare the 2025 Water Utility Budget consistent with the water and wastewater fees and charges forecast through the approved 2025-2034 Water and Wastewater Long-Range Financial Plan, while factoring in any adjustments that may be required as a result of the Region of Waterloo’s rate changes and any possible efficiencies that may be identified;

AND THAT staff be directed to present options to reduce the tax levy impact for the 2025 Budget as well as opportunities for additional investment;

AND THAT in accordance with the Downtown Business Improvement Area (BIA) By-Law 21-016, each BIA submit its 2025 budget to City staff by September 15, 2024;

AND FURTHER THAT the 2025 Budget and Business Plan timeline as set out in report 24-035-CRS be approved.
In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

Carried (9 to 0)

10.2.2 24-031-CRS Appointments to Citizen Advisory Committees

Motion: 24-171

Moved by Councillor Cooper
Seconded by Councillor Shwery

THAT Report 24-031-CRS Citizen Appointments to Advisory Committees be received;

AND THAT Confidential Appendices “C”, “D”, and “E” to Report 24-031-CRS be received and remain confidential;

AND THAT the following individual be appointed to the Accessibility Advisory Committee as a voting member for the term of Council ending November 14, 2026: Alison Fitzpatrick;

AND THAT the following individual be appointed to the Cultural Awards Advisory Committee as a voting member for the term of Council ending November 14, 2026: Sarah Loat;

AND THAT the following individual be appointed to the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee for the term of Council ending November 14, 2026: Meghan McKay

AND THAT the City Clerk be directed to notify all successful and unsuccessful applicants;

AND FURTHER THAT Council-Appointed Citizen Members to the City’s advisory committees who do not submit their signed Code of Conduct form within the first month after their appointment has been made shall forfeit their membership on the committee to which they have been appointed.

In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

Carried (9 to 0)
10.3 Corporate Enterprise
10.4 Infrastructure Services
10.5 Office of the City Manager

11. **Other Business**

12. **Notices of Motion**

13. **Correspondence**

14. **Motion to Receive and File**

Motion: 24-172

Moved by Councillor Devine
Seconded by Councillor Kimpson

THAT all presentations and correspondence from the June 4, 2024, Council meeting be received.

In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

**Carried (9 to 0)**

15. **Consideration of By-laws**

Motion: 24-173

Moved by Councillor Ermeta
Seconded by Councillor Roberts

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

- 24-062 Being a by-law to amend By-law 22-044 to Regulate Traffic and Parking on Highways Under the Jurisdiction of The Corporation of the City of Cambridge (Elgin Street North Pedestrian Crossover)

In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

**Carried (9 to 0)**
16. **Confirmatory By-law**

Motion: 24-174

Moved by Councillor Hamilton
Seconded by Councillor Cooper

That By-Law 24-063 being a by-law to confirm the proceedings of the Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge be passed.

In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

**Carried (9 to 0)**

17. **Adjournment**

Motion: 24-175

Moved by Councillor Kimpson
Seconded by Councillor Devine

THAT the Council meeting does now adjourn at 7:11 p.m.

In Favour (9): Councillor Shwery, Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

**Carried (9 to 0)**
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May 17, 2024

The Honourable Doug Ford, M.P.P.
Premier of Ontario
Via Email: premier@ontario.ca

Dear Premier Ford:

Re: Corrected - CAO-002-24 - The Perfect Storm - Impact of Provincial Changes on our Community

File Number: PG.25.06

This correspondence is the corrected version of the motion passed, please disregard the previous version dated April 25, 2024.

At a meeting held on April 22, 2024, the Council of the Municipality of Clarington approved the following Resolution #CC-044-24:

- That Report CAO-002-24, and any related delegations or communication items, be received;
- That Council request the Province stop using CMHC data to validate housing starts, but as a starting point, and allow Municipalities to identify any inconsistencies with tangible evidence prior to making a funding decision;
- That Fiscal Impact Assessments be undertaken for all Secondary Plans (inclusive of those completed) to understand the full impact of the legislative changes on each, in particular parkland and DC revenues, and report back to Council prior to any further approvals (inclusive of development application approvals); and that applications that continue to be processed;
- That a communications campaign be undertaken to explain the impact of the changes that are beyond our control, and how they will impact our community – both now and into the future;
That this report be forwarded to all Ontario municipalities with housing targets, the Province of Ontario, and the Members of Provincial Parliament representing Clarington; and

That all interested parties listed in Report CAO-002-24, and any delegations be advised of Council’s decision.

Yours truly,

_________________________
John Paul Newman
Deputy Clerk

JPN/lh

c:

The Honourable Paul Calandra, M.P.P., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing - minister.mah@ontario.ca
The Honourable Philip Lawrence, P.C., M.P., Northumberland—Peterborough South - Philip.Lawrence@parl.gc.ca
The Honourable Jamil Jivani, P.C., M.P., Durham – Jamil.jivani@parl.gc.ca
The Honourable Todd McCarthy, M.P.P., Durham - Todd.McCarthy@pc.ola.org
The Honourable David Piccini, M.P.P., Northumberland-Peterborough South - david.piccini@pc.ola.org

All Ontario Municipalities with housing targets
M. Dempster, Chief Administrative Officer
C. Salazar, Deputy CAO, Planning and Infrastructure
H. Anderson
C. MacDonald
J. O’Meara
May 21, 2024

The Honourable Andrea Khanjin, Ontario Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks
Honourable Sylvia Jones, Ontario Minister of Health and Long-Term Care
Honourable Shelly Spence, Auditor General of Ontario

VIA Email to: minister.mecp@ontario.ca
            sylvia.jones@ontario.ca
            comments@auditor.on.ca

RE: Recommended Phase out of free water well testing in the 2023 Auditor General's Report

Please be advised that at their last regular meeting on Tuesday, May 7, 2024, the Council of the Township of Lucan Biddulph passed the following resolution:

Resolution No. 2024 - 123
Moved by J. Hodgins
Seconded by A. Westman

WHEREAS the Ontario Auditor General's annual report on public health from December 2023 indicates that Public Health Ontario is proposing the phasing-out of free provincial water testing services for private drinking water; and

WHEREAS free private drinking water testing services has played a pivotal role in safeguarding public health, particularly in rural communities such as the Township of Lucan Biddulph; and

WHEREAS the removal of free private drinking water testing could lead to a reduction in testing, potentially increasing the risk of waterborne diseases in these vulnerable populations; and
WHEREAS the tragic events in Walkerton, Ontario underscored the critical importance of safe drinking water.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that The Township of Lucan Biddulph hereby requests that the Province reconsider and ultimately decide against the proposed phasing-out of free private drinking water testing services.

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that this resolution be sent to all Ontario municipalities, Minister of Environment Conservation and Parks, Minister of Health, Middlesex-London Health Unit, and MPP Elgin-Middlesex-London.

CARRIED

Please contact our office should you require any further information on this matter.

Sincerely,

**Ron Reymer**

Ron Reymer
CAO/Clerk

cc: MPP Rob Flack
May 21st, 2024

Premier's Office
Room 281
Legislative Building, Queen's Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1

ATTENTION: Hon. Doug Ford

Dear Premier Ford,

RE: Resolution – Request to the Province to Amend the Blue Box Regulation

Please be advised that the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Lanark Highlands passed the following resolution at their regular meeting held April 23rd, 2024:

Moved by Councillor Summers Seconded by Councillor Kelso

THAT, the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Lanark Highlands supports the resolution of the Town of Coburg regarding the request to the Province to amend the blue box regulation;

AND THAT, a copy of the support letter be sent to the Premier of Ontario, AMO and member municipalities.

Resolved

Sincerely,

Amanda Noël
Clerk/Acting CAO

Encls.

c.c. AMO
All Ontario Municipalities
Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building
Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A1

Delivered via email
doug.fordco@pc.ola.org
premier@ontario.ca

April 8, 2024

RE: Correspondence from the Township of Perry regarding a Request to the Province to Amend the Blue Box Regulation

Please be advised that the Town of Cobourg Council, at its meeting held on March 27, 2024, passed the following resolution:

THAT Council receive the correspondence from the Township of Perry regarding a Request to the Province to Amend the Blue Box Regulation for information purposes; and

FURTHER THAT Council support the recommendation of the Township of Perry and send a copy of the support letter to the Premier of Ontario, AMO and member municipalities.

Sincerely,

Kristina Lepik
Deputy Clerk/Manager, Legislative Services

Enclosure.

cc. AMO
All Ontario Municipalities
February 26, 2024

Via Email

The Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario
Premier’s Office
Room 281, Legislative Building, Queen’s Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1

Dear Premier Ford,

RE: Request to the Province to Amend Blue Box Regulation for ‘Ineligible’ Sources

At their last regular meeting on Wednesday February 21, 2024, the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Perry supported the following:

"Resolution #2024-52
Moved by: Paul Sowrey
Seconded by: Jim Cushman

Whereas under Ontario Regulation 391/21: Blue Box producers are fully accountable and financially responsible for their products and packaging once they reach their end of life and are disposed of, for ‘eligible’ sources only;

And Whereas ‘ineligible’ sources which producers are not responsible for include businesses, places of worship, daycares, campgrounds, public-facing and internal areas of municipal-owned buildings, and not-for-profit organizations, such as shelters and food banks;

And Whereas should a municipality continue to provide services to the ‘ineligible’ sources, the municipality will be required to oversee the collection, transportation, and processing of the recycling, assuming 100% of the costs;

Be it resolved that the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Perry hereby request that the province amend Ontario Regulation 391/21: Blue
Box so that producers are responsible for the end-of-life management of recycling products from all sources;

**And further that** Council hereby request the support of all Ontario Municipalities;

**And further that** this resolution be forwarded to the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario, the Honourable Andrea Khanjin, Minister of the Environment, Conservation, and Parks, the Honourable Graydon Smith, MPP Parry Sound-Muskoka, and to all Ontario Municipalities.

*Carried.*

Your attention to this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Beth Morton
Clerk-Administrator

BM/ec

c.c. Honourable Andrea Khanjin, Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks
Honourable Graydon Smith, MPP Parry Sound-Muskoka
All Ontario Municipalities
May 30th, 2024

Premier's Office
Room 281
Legislative Building, Queen's Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1

ATTENTION: Hon. Doug Ford

Dear Premier Ford,

Resolution – RE: Hastings County Motion regarding sustainable infrastructure funding for small rural municipalities

Please be advised that the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Lanark Highlands passed the following resolution at their regular meeting held May 14th, 2024:

Moved by Councillor Kelso    Seconded by Councillor Summers

THAT, Council supports the resolution from Hastings County regarding Sustainable Infrastructure Funding for Small Rural Municipalities;

AND THAT, this resolution be forwarded to The Honourable Justin Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, The Honourable Sean Fraser, Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities of Canada; Michel Tremblay Acting President and CEO, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation; The Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario; The Honourable Kinga Surma, Ontario Minister of Infrastructure; The Honourable Paul Calandra, Ontario Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing; MP Shelby Kramp-Neuman, Hastings-Lennox Addington; MPP Ric Bresee Hastings-Lennox Addington, AMO, ROMA, FCM, Eastern Ontario Wardens’ Caucus and all Municipalities in Ontario.

Resolved

Sincerely,

Amanda Noël
Clerk/Acting CAO
Encls.

c.c.  The Honourable Justin Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada
     The Honourable Sean Fraser, Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and
     Communities of Canada
     Michel Tremblay Acting President and CEO, Canada Mortgage and Housing
     Corporation
     The Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario
     The Honourable Kinga Surma, Ontario Minister of Infrastructure
     The Honourable Paul Calandra, Ontario Minister of Municipal Affairs and
     Housing
     MP Shelby Kramp-Neuman, Hastings-Lennox Addington
     MPP Ric Bresee Hastings-Lennox Addington
     AMO
     ROMA
     FCM
     Eastern Ontario Wardens’ Caucus
     All Municipalities in Ontario
April 17, 2024

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

Delivered via email
doug.fordco@pc.ola.org
premier@ontario.ca

RE: Hastings County Motion regarding sustainable infrastructure funding for small rural municipalities

Please be advised that Hastings County Council, at its meeting held on March 28, 2024, passed the following resolution:

WHEREAS Ontario’s small rural municipalities face insurmountable challenges to fund both upfront investments and ongoing maintenance of their capital assets including roads and bridges and water wastewater and municipally owned buildings including recreational facilities and libraries;

WHEREAS in 2018, the Ontario government mandated all Ontario municipalities to develop capital asset management plans with the stipulation that they be considered in the development of the annual budget;

WHEREAS small rural municipalities (of 10,000 people or less) are facing monumental infrastructure deficits that cannot be adequately addressed through property tax revenue alone;

WHEREAS the only application approved through the recently awarded Housing Accelerator Fund to a small rural municipality was to Marathon Ontario, who received an allocation of $1.9 million dollars while over $1.369 billion going to Ontario’s large urban centres, resulting in a 0.2% investment in rural Ontario;
WHEREAS the Ontario Government has committed $9.1 billion to Toronto alone to assist with operating deficits and the repatriation of the Don Valley and Gardner Expressway;

WHEREAS small rural Ontario cannot keep pace with the capital investments required over the next 20 years unless both the Provincial and Federal Governments come forward with new sustainable infrastructure funding;

WHEREAS it is apparent that both the Federal and Ontario Governments have neglected to recognize the needs of small rural Ontario;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Hastings County call on the Ontario and Federal Government to implement sustainable infrastructure funding for small rural municipalities;

AND THAT small rural municipalities are not overlooked and disregarded on future applications for funding;

AND THAT both the Federal and Ontario Governments begin by acknowledging that there is an insurmountable debt facing small rural municipalities;

AND THAT both the Federal and Ontario Governments immediately commission a Working Group that includes a member of the Eastern Ontario Wardens Caucus, to develop a plan on how to deal with the impending debt dilemma;

AND FINALLY THAT this resolution be forwarded to The Honourable Justin Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, The Honourable Sean Fraser, Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities of Canada; Michel Tremblay Acting President and CEO, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation; The Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario; The Honourable Kinga Surma, Ontario Minister of Infrastructure; The Honourable Paul Calandra, Ontario Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing; MP Shelby Kramp-Neuman, Hastings-Lennox Addington; MPP Ric Bresee Hastings-Lennox Addington, AMO, ROMA, FCM, Eastern Ontario Wardens’ Caucus and all Municipalities in Ontario.

If you have any questions regarding the above motion, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Sincerely,

Cathy Bradley
Director of Legislative Services
# COUNCIL INFORMATION PACKAGE

## June 14, 2024
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May 29, 2024

The Honourable Doug Ford  
Premier of Ontario  
premier@ontario.ca

DELIVERED VIA EMAIL

RE:  Township of Pelee Support County of Renfrew Resolution  
Rural and Small Urban Municipalities – Affordability of Water and Wastewater Systems

Please be advised that at the Township of Pelee’s Regular Meeting of Council held on May 28th, 2024, the following resolution was passed:

Resolution 2024 – 78
Moved By: Councillor Dave DeLellis
Seconded By: Councillor Michelle Taylor

WHEREAS the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) (Section 1.6.6.2) states that municipal sewage services and municipal water services are the preferred form of servicing for settlement areas to support protection of the environment and minimize potential risks to human health and safety and that intensification and redevelopment within these settlement areas should be promoted; and

WHEREAS the PPS (Section 2.2.1 (f)) states that planning authorities shall protect, improve, or restore the quality and quantity of water by implementing the necessary restrictions on development and site alteration to protect all drinking supplies and designated vulnerable areas, and protect, improve, or restore vulnerable surface and groundwater, sensitive surface water features and sensitive groundwater features, and their hydrologic functions; and

WHEREAS the PPS (Sections 2.2.1(h) and (i)) states that there is consideration of environmental lake capacity as well as stormwater management practices; and

WHEREAS the Ministry of the Environment, Protection and Conservation (MECP) Procedural Guideline B-1-5 Policy 2 provision states that water quality which presently does not meet the Provincial Water Quality Objectives shall not be further degraded and all practical measures shall be undertaken to upgrade the water quality to the Objectives;
and

WHEREAS in 2014 the Township of Whitewater Region authorized Jp2gConsultants Inc. to undertake a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) for the purpose of evaluating viable options to upgrade the 1979 Cobden Wastewater Treatment Plant. This plant did not meet guidelines for effluent flow into Muskrat Lake and Cobden Wetland being highly sensitive, at-capacity, inland lake, and Provincial Significant Wetland (PSW) and acknowledged as one of the most eutrophic in the province. The plant had ongoing seasonal overflow events, and was operating at maximum capacity; and

WHEREAS in 2018 the Council of the Township of Whitewater Region approved the construction of a new parallel mechanical system that would meet all provincial environmental and regulatory requirements including accommodating future growth. Federal and provincial contributions only covered 50% of the final construction costs, as there was no ability to renegotiate with federal and provincial partners once real costs were known. As a result, the balance of costs ($6M) was debentured over 30 years at interest rates that are slightly punitive to rural and small urban municipalities; and

WHEREAS in 2019 the Council of the Township of Whitewater Region conducted a Water and Wastewater Rate Study that demonstrated the need for rate increases of over 100% to fund the new wastewater treatment plant construction debenture and the significantly increased operating costs for a parallel mechanical system. Rural and small urban municipalities experience very limited growth as federal and provincial policies heavily support growth in urban centers. As there are no other sources of available operational funding, rural and small urban municipalities are expected to fund the construction and operation of these state-of-the-art systems from existing property owners and nominal forecasted growth; and

WHEREAS in 2023 the Township of Whitewater Region combined water and wastewater rates have risen to almost $3,000/year for its five hundred and eleven (511) users and are among the highest in the County of Renfrew and across the Province of Ontario. There are similarly high user rates in the Township of Madawaska Valley as a result of Provincial regulations and a small number of users. Other examples of rapidly increasing rates include the Towns of Deep River, Renfrew, Arnprior, Laurentian Hills, and Petawawa, and the Townships of Bonnechere Valley, Laurentian Valley and Killaloe, Hagarty and Richards, where significant upgrades in short periods of time are making rates unaffordable even with an increased number of users.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Township of Pelee support the County of Renfrew’s resolution to:
Advocate to the provincial and federal levels of government to make them aware that rural and small urban water and wastewater systems are financially unsustainable; and Advocate to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO), the Rural Ontario Municipalities Association (ROMA) and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) to examine if the unaffordability of water and wastewater system operational costs is systemic provincially and nationally.

AND THAT a copy of this resolution be circulated to The Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario; the Honourable Kinga Surma, Minister of Infrastructure (Ontario); the Honourable Dominic LeBlanc, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Infrastructure and Communities (Canada); the Honourable Paul Calandra, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the Honourable Andrea Khanjin, Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (Ontario), Dave Epp, MP, Chatham-Kent-Leamington; Trevor Jones, MPP, Chatham-Kent-Leamington; AMO; ROMA; FCM; and all Municipalities in Ontario.
RE: Urging the Government to Promptly Resume Assessment Cycle

Please be advised that the Council of the Corporation of the Municipality of Callander passed the following resolution at its Regular Meeting of Council held Tuesday, May 28, 2024.

Resolution No. 2024/05/184:

7.4(c) WHEREAS the assessment cycle is an essential process for maintaining the fairness and predictability of property taxes in our province;

AND WHEREAS the pause in the reassessment cycle has created uncertainty and instability in property taxation, impacting both residential and commercial property owners;

AND WHEREAS the government has delayed an assessment update again in 2024, resulting in Ontario's municipalities continuing to calculate property taxes using 2016 property values;

AND WHEREAS both current and outdated assessments are inaccurate, increase volatility, and are not transparent;

AND WHEREAS frequent and accurate reassessments are necessary to stabilize property taxes and provide predictability for property owners, residents, and businesses alike;

AND WHEREAS the staff at the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation would benefit from further skills enhancement and training in assessments, recognizing the importance of ensuring accurate evaluations for 100% of our municipality;

AND WHEREAS the Government has announced a review of the property assessment and taxation system with a focus on fairness, equity, and economic competitiveness, and therefore further deferring new property assessment;
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Municipality of Callander hereby calls upon the Premier to promptly resume the assessment cycle to ensure the stability and predictability of property taxes while the Government conducts its review of the property assessment and taxation system, or respond with an alternative method for every municipality in Ontario to achieve fair taxation;

AND THAT all Municipalities in Ontario and their constituents are encouraged to apply pressure to the Premier, daily, weekly, and monthly, to resolve the situation before it causes undo stress to everyone in the Municipality;

AND THAT a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Premier, the relevant provincial authorities, the Association of Municipality in Ontario, the Rural Ontario Municipalities Association, the Federation of Northern Ontario Municipalities, the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation, and all municipalities in Ontario for their consideration, to make proper changes as quickly and efficiently as possible.

Thank you,

[Signature]

Cindy Pigeau
Municipal Clerk

Copy to: Association of Municipalities of Ontario
          Rural Ontario Municipalities Association
          Federation of Northern Ontario Municipalities
          Municipal Property Assessment Corporation
          All Ontario Municipalities
June 6, 2024

Hon. Sylvia Jones, Minister of Health  
Ministry of Health  
5th Floor – 777 Bay St.  
Toronto, ON M7A 2J3

Dear Minister,

Re: Motion Regarding Public Health Labs.

Please be advised that at their last Regular Meeting of Council on Wednesday June 5th, 2024, the Council for the Corporation of the Township of Brudenell, Lyndoch and Raglan supported the following resolution:

Resolution # 2024-06-05-10  
Moved By: Councillor Kauffeldt  
Seconded by: Councillor Banks

"Be it resolved that the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Brudenell, Lyndoch and Raglan hereby supports the resolution passed by Loyalist Township urging the provincial government to take caution against acting on the recommendations stated in the audit report.

And further that Council directs staff to provide a copy of this resolution to Minister of Health, Sylvia Jones; Honourable John Yakabuski, Member of Provincial Parliament for Renfrew Nipissing Pembroke; Honourable Cheryl Gallant, Member of Parliament for Renfrew Nipissing Pembroke; the Association of Ontario (AMO); and all Ontario Municipalities."

CARRIED.

Sincerely,

Tammy Thompson  
Deputy Clerk
April 24, 2024

Hon. Sylvia Jones, Minister of Health
Ministry of Health
5th Floor - 777 Bay St.
Toronto, ON M7A 2J3

Dear Minister,

Re: Motion regarding Public Health Ontario Labs

Please be advised that at its regular meeting of April 23, 2024, Loyalist Township Council passed the following resolution:

Resolution 2024-94
Moved by Deputy Mayor Townend
Seconded by Councillor Willis

WHEREAS the mission of Public Health Ontario (PHO) is to "enable informed decisions and get actions that protect and promote health and contribute to reducing health inequities", there are grave concerns that the closure of six community-based PHO labs will increase health inequities, especially for rural communities; and

WHEREAS combined these labs collect and process thousands of water samples and time sensitive medical tests each day; and

WHEREAS there are grave concerns about the integrity of samples being compromised if travel time is increased by centralizing all tests to a few locations; and

WHEREAS these labs already process overflow tests and samples when labs such as Toronto and Ottawa cannot keep up to demand and many scaled up to meet demand during the COVID-19 pandemic; and

WHEREAS frequent drinking water testing services is vital for Ontarians who draw their water from private drinking water systems (i.e. wells) and protecting groundwater quality and quantity is a shared responsibility.
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT As stewards of care for the Safe Drinking Water Act, 2022, Council of Loyalist Township urges the provincial government to take caution against acting on the recommendations stated in the aforementioned audit report.

AND FURTHER THAT this motion be circulated to Honourable Sylvia Jones, Minister of Health, Shelby Kramp-Neuman MP of Hastings-Lennox and Addington, Ric Bresee MPP of Hastings-Lennox and Addington and all municipalities, for their support.

Motion carried.

Sincerely,

Anne Kantharajah
Township Clerk
akantharajah@loyalist.ca
613-386-7351 Ext. 121

cc: Shelby Kramp-Neuman MP - Hastings-Lennox & Addington
Ric Bresee, MPP Hastings - Lennox & Addington
Jim Hegedorn, Mayor, Loyalist Township
Rebecca Murphy, CAO, Loyalist Township
Deputy Mayor Townend, Loyalist Township
Councillor Willis, Loyalist Township
Ontario Municipalities
June 6, 2024

The Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario
Premier’s Office
Room 281, Legislative Building, Queen’s Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1

Dear Premier Ford,

Re: Mental Health and Addictions

Please be advised that at their last Regular Meeting of Council on Wednesday June 5th, 2024, the Council for the Corporation of the Township of Brudenell, Lyndoch and Raglan supported the following resolution:

Resolution # 2024-06-05-06
Moved By: Councillor Kauffeldt
Seconded by: Councillor Banks

"Be it resolved that the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Brudenell, Lyndoch and Raglan hereby supports the request from the City of Pembroke calling upon the Province of Ontario to allocate funding specifically for the establishment of a mental health, addiction, and residential drug treatment rehabilitation facility serving the County of Renfrew.

And further that Council directs staff to provide a copy of this resolution to the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario; Sylvia Jones, Deputy Premier and Minister of Health; Michael Tibollo, Associate Minister of Mental Health and Addictions; Robin Martin, Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Health; the Honourable John Yakabuski, Member of Provincial Parliament for Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke; the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO); the Eastern Ontario Wardens Caucus; Eastern Ontario Mayor’s Caucus; Peter Emon, Warden, for the County of Renfrew; and all neighbouring County of Renfrew lower-tier municipalities."

CARRIED.

Sincerely,

Tammy Thompson
Deputy Clerk
April 8, 2024

Honourable Doug Ford
Via email: premier@ontario.ca

Dear Premier Ford:

Please be advised that Council of the Corporation of the City of Pembroke passed the following resolution at its meeting of April 2, 2024:

Resolution #011 (April 2, 2024)

Moved by Deputy Mayor Brian Abdallah
Seconded by Councillor Troy Purcell

Whereas the well-being of our community members is of paramount importance, and addressing mental health and substance use disorder is crucial for the overall health and safety of all our residents; and

Whereas the County of Renfrew, like many other regions, faces significant challenges related to mental health and addiction, with individuals and families grappling with the devastating impact of these conditions; and

Whereas timely access to specialized treatment and residential rehabilitation services and transitional housing is essential for those struggling with mental health issues and substance use disorders; and

Whereas we need to address the urgent need for additional treatment beds, especially for adults requiring intensive supports, and to improve access to care in rural, Northern, and Indigenous communities; and

Whereas the number of drug-related deaths in the County of Renfrew, as a whole, is on the rise underscoring the critical importance of accessible treatment options for those at risk of negative impacts including overdose and death; and

Whereas the establishment of a mental health, drug addiction treatment and residential rehabilitation facility serving the County of Renfrew would provide the following benefits:

1. Local Accessibility: Residents would have access to specialized services without the burden of traveling long distances, ensuring timely intervention and continuity of care.

2. Holistic Approach: The facility could offer integrated care, addressing both mental health and substance use disorders concurrently, thereby improving outcomes for clients.

3. Community Support: By providing a safe and supportive environment, the facility would contribute to reducing stigma and fostering community understanding of mental health and addiction.

4. Collaboration with Existing Services: The facility could collaborate with existing community organizations, healthcare and social service
providers, and law enforcement agencies to create a comprehensive network of support (i.e. County of Renfrew MESA program).

Now Therefore, be it resolved that Council of the Corporation of the City of Pembroke:

1. Urgently requests the Province of Ontario to allocate funding specifically for the establishment of a mental health, addiction, and residential drug treatment rehabilitation facility serving the County of Renfrew.

2. Advocates for a facility that offers evidence-based, trauma-informed care, addressing both addiction and concurrent mental health issues.

3. Commits to working collaboratively with neighbouring municipalities, all community stakeholders, and provincial authorities to ensure the successful implementation of this vital facility.

Furthermore, the City of Pembroke Council encourages all residents to support this resolution and join the collective effort to enhance mental health and addiction services in our region.

Be It Further Resolved that copies of this motion be distributed to the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario; Sylvia Jones, Deputy Premier and Minister of Health; Michael Tibollo, Associate Minister of Mental Health and Addictions; Robin Martin, Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Health; the Honourable John Yakabuski, Member of Provincial Parliament for Renfrew~Nipissing~Pembroke; the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO); the Eastern Ontario Wardens Caucus; Eastern Ontario Mayor’s Caucus; Peter Emon, Warden, for the County of Renfrew; and all neighbouring County of Renfrew lower-tier municipalities.

Carried

Sincerely,

David Unrau
Chief Administrative Officer

/nr
June 6, 2024

The Honourable Paul Calandra,
Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Dear Hon. Calandra,

Re: Jurisdiction of Ontario’s Ombudsman

Please be advised that at their last Regular Meeting of Council on Wednesday June 5th, 2024, the Council for the Corporation of the Township of Brudenell, Lyndoch and Raglan supported the following resolution:

Resolution # 2024-06-05-08
Moved By: Councillor Kauffeldt
Seconded by: Councillor Banks

"Be it resolved that the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Brudenell, Lyndoch and Raglan hereby supports the request from the City of Peterborough that the Honourable Paul Calandra, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing be requested to Introduce a Bill to amend the Ombudsmen Act.

And further that Council directs staff to provide a copy of this resolution to the Honourable Paul Calandra, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing; the Honourable John Yakabuski, Member of Provincial Parliament for Renfrew Nipissing Pembroke; the Association of Municipalities of Ontario; and all Ontario Municipalities."

CARRIED.

Sincerely,

Tammy Thompson
Deputy Clerk
April 11, 2024

Hon. Paul Calandra  
Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing  
via Email: minister.mah@ontario.ca

Re: Jurisdiction of Ontario’s Ombudsman

The following resolution, adopted by City Council at their meeting on April 8, 2024, is forwarded for your information and necessary action.

That Council approve the recommendations outlined in Report LSOC524-005, dated April 2, 2024 of the Commissioner, Legislative Services, as follows:

a) That the Honourable Paul Calandra, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, be requested to introduce a Bill to amend the Ombudsman Act to require the Ontario Ombudsman to provide to each municipality, if requested by the municipality, sufficient particulars of each investigation, matter or case respecting the municipality that is referred to in each of the Ombudsman’s Annual Reports to permit the municipality to fully understand and address the subject matter of each such investigation, matter or case including:

i) a copy of each complaint, as applicable, redacted only to the extent of individuals’ personal information contained therein;

ii) the identities of the municipality’s employees, officers and members of Council with whom the Ombudsman was consulting in respect of the investigation, matter or case; and

iii) particulars of the outcome of the investigation, matter or case including the Ombudsman’s findings, conclusions and recommendations, if any.

b) That the City Clerk forward Council’s resolutions resulting from Council’s approval of these recommendations to Minister Calandra, MPP David Smith, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and to the municipal Clerks of Ontario’s municipalities.
Sincerely,

J. Kennedy

John Kennedy, City Clerk

cc: David Smith, MPP
    Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO)
    All Ontario Municipalities
June 6, 2024

The Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario
Premier’s Office
Room 281, Legislative Building, Queen’s Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1

Dear Premier Ford,

Re: Household Food Insecurity.

Please be advised that at their last Regular Meeting of Council on Wednesday June 5th, 2024, the Council for the Corporation of the Township of Brudenell, Lyndoch and Raglan supported the following resolution:

Resolution # 2024-06-05-09
Moved By: Councillor Quade
Seconded by: Councillor Banks

"Be it resolved that the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Brudenell, Lyndoch and Raglan hereby supports the resolution passed by Public Health Sudbury & Districts on January 18, 2024, regarding household food insecurity.

And further that Council directs staff to provide a copy of this resolution Premier Doug Ford; Minister of Children, Community and Social Services, Michael Parsaco; Minister of Finance, Peter Bethlenfalvy; Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Paul Calandra; Deputy Premier and Minister of Health, Sylvia Jones; Honourable John Yakabuski, Member of Provincial Parliament for Renfrew Nipissing Pembroke; the Association of Ontario (AMO); and all Ontario Municipalities."

CARRIED.

Sincerely,

Tammy Thompson
Deputy Clerk
January 24, 2024

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

The Honourable Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building, Queen’s Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1

Dear Recipient:

Re: Household Food Insecurity

At its meeting on January 18, 2024, the Board of Health carried the following resolution #06-24:

WHEREAS food security is a chronic and worsening health issue as documented by annual local data on food affordability and as recognized by multiple Association of Local Public Health Agencies (alPHA) resolutions: A05-18 (Adequate Nutrition for Ontario Works and Ontario Disability Support Program), A18-02 (Minimum Wage that Is a Living Wage), A15-04 (Basic Income Guarantee), and A23-05 (Monitoring Food Affordability in Ontario and the Inadequacy of Social Assistance Rates)

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Board of Health for Public Health Sudbury & Districts call on the provincial government to incorporate local food affordability findings in determining adequacy of social assistance rates to reflect the current costs of living and to index Ontario Works rates to inflation going forward; and

THAT in the context of the Public Health Strengthening roles and responsibilities deliberations, the Board of Health urge all health system partners to remain committed to population health assessment and surveillance as it relates to monitoring food environments and, specifically, to monitoring food affordability; and share this motion broadly with local and provincial stakeholders.
Household food insecurity is one of the strongest predictors of poor health, making it a serious public health issue (PROOF, 2023). Individuals who are food insecure are at higher risk of diet-related diseases like diabetes and are at higher risk for a wide range of chronic conditions such as depression and anxiety disorders, arthritis, and chronic pain. Household food insecurity leaves an indelible mark on children's health and well-being (PROOF, 2023). The experience of food insecurity in childhood is associated with mental health concerns throughout childhood and into early adulthood (PROOF, 2023). In Ontario, the healthcare costs of individuals who are the most food insecure can be more than double that of individuals who are food secure (PROOF, 2023, Tarasuk et al., 2015).

Thank you for your attention to this important issue – the solutions for which will not only help many Ontarians in need but also protect the sustainability of our critical health and social services resources.

Sincerely,

Penny Sutcliffe, MD, MHSc, FRCPC
Medical Officer of Health and Chief Executive Officer

cc: Honourable Michael Parsa, Minister of Children, Community and Social Services
Honourable Peter Bethlenfalvy, Ministry of Finance
Honourable Paul Calandra, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Honourable Sylvia Jones, Deputy Premier and Minister of Health
France Gélinas, Member of Provincial Parliament, Nickel Belt
Jamie West, Member of Provincial Parliament, Sudbury
Michael Mantha, Member of Provincial Parliament, Algoma-Manitoulin
Dr. Kieran Moore, Chief Medical Officer of Health
Jacqueline Edwards and Jennifer Babin-Fenske, Co-chairs, Greater Sudbury Food Policy Council
Richard Lathwell, Local Food Manitoulin
Colleen Hill, Executive Director, Manitoulin Family Resources
All Ontario Boards of Health
Association of Local Public Health Agencies

June 6, 2024

The Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario
Premier’s Office
Room 281, Legislative Building, Queen’s Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1

Dear Premier Ford,

Re: National Fire Fighting Strategy

Please be advised that at their last Regular Meeting of Council on Wednesday June 5th, 2024, the Council for the Corporation of the Township of Brudenell, Lyndoch and Raglan supported the following resolution:

Resolution # 2024-06-05-11
Moved By: Councillor Banks
Seconded by: Councillor Keller

"Be it resolved that the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Brudenell, Lyndoch and Raglan hereby supports the resolution from the Council of the Municipality of Calvin regarding a review of the National Fire Fighting Strategy.

And further that Council directs staff to provide a copy of this resolution to The Right Honourable Justin Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada; the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario; the Honourable Bill Blair, Minister of National Defense; the Honourable Graydon Smith, Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry of Ontario; the Honourable Vic Fidel, Minister of Economic Development Ontario; the Honourable John Yakabuski, Member of Provincial Parliament for Renfrew Nipissing Pembroke; the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FMC); the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO); and all Ontario Municipalities.”

CARRIED.

Sincerely,

Tammy Thompson
Deputy Clerk
Corporation of the Municipality of Calvin Council Resolution

Date: January 30, 2024
Resolution Number: 2024-31
Moved By: Councillor Moreton
Seconded By: Councillor Manson

Background: Before Calvin township became a township, it was burned by numerous forest fires. This was before the time of fire towers, water bombers, and municipal fire departments. A 1881 report from Lawrence Tallan, Provincial Land surveyor, states: "The township of Calvin has been traversed by repeated and severe fires – so well have the flames done their work that with the exception of an insignificant portion, scarcely a vestige of the original timber remains."

History has a way of repeating itself, and now rural municipalities and remote areas need more than ever to be prepared to respond to forest fires. Invasive pests like the emerald ash borer and the spruce bud worm are killing large numbers of trees, leaving copious amounts of dry kindling in our forests just waiting for a careless human or a lightning strike. Our forests are choked with deadfall and forest fires are becoming increasingly difficult to control. Add to this the effects of rising temperatures and drier seasons, or climate change, and we could be facing increasingly disastrous forest fires. This is not the time to be caught short with limited forest fire-fighting resources.

Jordan Omstead of the Canadian Press recently wrote: "But as Canada's water bombers age – and wildfire seasons are expected to intensify – some wildland
firefighters and emergency preparedness experts say the country needs to prop up its fleet of firefighting aircraft, even though several provinces are playing down concerns about capacity.” He quotes Eric Davidson, president of the Ontario Professional Association of Wildland Firefighters, “We’re really starting to see the effect of the aging fleet.”

The article further states the John Gradek, lecturer at McGill University estimates that almost half of the larger water bombers used to fight Canadian forest fires are nearing the end of their service life.

However, a Canadian company making a large skimmer-style water bomber is backed up with orders from European countries until the end of the decade.

Ontario has its own fleet of aircraft. They have 20 fixed-wing aircraft which includes 9 CL215 and CL415 water bombers that are 24 years old on average. The remaining 11 aircraft are an average of 54 years old. Melissa Candelaria, a spokesperson for Minister Graydon Smith says the MNR can handle Ontario fires with these aircraft, but Jennifer Kamau, communications manager for the Canada Interagency Forest Fire Centre, CIFFC, noted that other provinces contract out firebombers and last year there was a strain in Canada to get the resources to areas in need because there were so many fires across the country at the same time and very few aircraft available.

Peter Zimoni of the CBC quoted the Canadian Association of Fire Chiefs (CAFC) President Ken McMullen, “It's not often that the fire chiefs sound the alarm. We are very concerned about this impending crisis that the summer of 2024 and beyond is going to bring our sector.”

In 2023 we all smelled the smoke and saw the sky turn brown. Buildings can be replaced, but lives cannot. And once an area is burned it takes more than a lifetime for it to return to its original state.

WHEREAS Forest fires are a very real threat to rural municipalities.
AND WHEREAS smoke from forest fires put people's health at risk. This is especially true of children and the elderly. The David Suzuki Foundation reports that wildfires kill many thousands of people per year and most of the deaths are from smoke inhalation.

AND WHEREAS forest fires are a very real danger to the climate and according to The Guardian, in 2023 they emitted three times as much carbon as the entire carbon footprint of Canada.

AND WHEREAS according to the John Crace interview in The Guardian with William Kurz, a retired scientist with Natural Resources Canada, around two billion tonnes of carbon have been released into the atmosphere from forest fires in 2023.

AND WHEREAS carbon emissions from forest fires are not counted against Canada's Paris agreement commitments, according to Kurz, but they far exceeded all of the emissions tied to Canada's economy (670 mega tonnes, or 0.67 billion tonnes, according to Environment and Climate Change Canada).

AND WHEREAS that standing healthy forest serves as a carbon sink, drawing in carbon, but once destroyed by fire, even though second growth takes its place, it is much less effective for many decades.

AND WHEREAS the federal government owns no water bombers and assists the provinces through the CIFFC, Canadian Interagency Forest Fire Centre, a spokesperson with CIFFC says that last year there were too many requests and not enough inventory to meet the needs of the country.

AND WHEREAS as reported by De Havilland Canada who manufacture the Canadian made water bomber, they have contracts with European countries for the next 22 of its new DHC-515 planes, which will take until 2029 or 2030 to complete and there will be very little production available to replace the aging water bombers in Ontario and the rest of Canada.
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the council of the Corporation of Calvin Township urges and encourages the Federal Government to commit additional funds for cost sharing of provincial firefighting and to consider the development of a national strategy of firefighting. Furthermore, we urge the federal government to consider the measures necessary for acquiring a national fleet of Canadian-made waterbombers, with home bases strategically located to best serve and respond to the needs of rural communities, and a national fire administration to better coordinate and manage efforts across the country. We also encourage the introduction of a program similar to the Joint Emergency Preparedness Program (JEPP) which was ended in 2013.

And we encourage Minister Graydon Smith to step up the on-the-ground firefighting capability and water bomber acquisitions in Ontario.

AND THAT this resolution be forwarded to The Right Honourable Justin Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, The Honourable Bill Blair, Minister of National Defence, The Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario, The Honourable Graydon Smith, Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry of Ontario, The Honourable Vic Fidel, Minister of Economic Development Ontario, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FMC) and the Association of Municipalities Ontario (AMO).

AND THAT this resolution be shared with all 444 municipalities in Ontario for their consideration and adoption.

Results: Carried

Recorded Vote:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member of Council</th>
<th>In Favour</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Gould</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Moreton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Latimer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Manson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 11, 2024

Sent via Email

The Honourable Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario

Dear Premier Ford,

Re: Township of Clearview Support Resolution
Cemetery Administration Management

At the March 11, 2024, Regular Council meeting for the Town of Saugeen Shores, the following resolution was passed:

Moved by Deputy Mayor D. Huber, Seconded by: Vice Deputy Mayor M. Myatt

Whereas at the Committee of the Whole meeting held February 12, 2024, a motion was passed to direct staff to prepare a resolution based on the Township of Clearview’s circulated resolution on Cemetery Administration Management but with the added reference to Pioneer Cemetery’s unique situation; and

Whereas the Pioneer Cemetery in Southampton is a historical marker for the Town that holds significant information about its past, not to mention the emotional connection for residents whose ancestors are buried in its boundary area; and

Whereas the Cemetery is located along a steep slope adjacent to the Saugeen River. Closed in 1902, the annual slope erosion (.78 meters) is impacting burial plots and has resulted in the exposure of human remains. The Town of Saugeen Shores has diligently worked with all applicable authorities to date and has projected the full cost of the required remediation at $800,000; and

Whereas this work requires the execution of a sensitive multi-year remediation project potentially lasting between five and ten years. The Town would like to ensure this is done with care and respect; however, it is outside of the Town’s area of expertise and capacity to undertake this project without multiple disciplinary subject matter experts, as well as Provincial financial support to remediate existing damage and prevent further deterioration of the site; and

Whereas this is a complex situation requiring a solid understanding of the erosion rate along the Saugeen Riverbank near the Southampton Pioneer Cemetery. There are both complexities in the history of the site and changing river dynamics due to climate change. The work also requires identifying at-risk burial site(s) and then creating a plan to relocate those sites, while ensuring all artifacts and human remains are intact and appropriately relocated; and
Whereas cemeteries are not only symbols of respect, they also serve as the reservation of family memories, prominent citizens, and local history, in addition to some being local landmarks themselves and hold great historical and cultural value nationally; and

Whereas remediation and preservation repairs to older cemeteries are very costly and may require specialized services like archaeologists or anthropologists; and

Whereas the care, remediation costs, and ongoing maintenance funds of cemeteries are generally non-existent and continue to rise; 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 revenue earned from the care and maintenance funds(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 the Council of the Town of Saugeen Shores support other municipalities recommendations, including the Township of Clearview, and request that the Province of Ontario immediately provide a funding stream to municipalities for the preservation, repair, and ongoing maintenance of active and inactive cemeteries; and

Further that this resolution be forwarded to Jim Cassimatis, Interim CEO/Registrar, the Bereavement Authority of Ontario, the Honourable Todd McCarthy, Minister of Public and Business Service Delivery, the Honourable Lisa Thompson, MPP Huron-Bruce, the Association of Municipalities Ontario, and all municipalities in Ontario.

Sincerely,

Sarah Bonderud,
Deputy Clerk

Encl.

CC: Jim Cassimatis, Interim CEO/Registrar, Bereavement Authority of Ontario
Honourable Todd McCarthy, Minister of Public and Business Service Delivery
MPP Lisa Thompson
Association of Municipalities Ontario
All Municipalities in Ontario
WHEREAS, the Public Sector Accounting Board (PSAB) establishes accounting standards for the public sector which must be followed by all Ontario municipalities; And

WHEREAS, the Municipal Act, 2001 section 294.1 states that a municipality shall, for each fiscal year, prepare annual financial statements for the municipality in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles for local governments as recommended, from time to time, by the Public Sector Accounting Board of the Chartered Professional Accountants of Canada; And

WHEREAS, PS 3280 is a new accounting standard covering asset retirement obligations (ARO) that was approved by PSAB in March 2018; And

WHEREAS, the standard must be applied by all public sector entities who prepare their financial statements under PSAB, including all Canadian municipalities; And

WHEREAS, many small municipalities do not have accountants or engineers on staff to complete the ARO obligations and this major accounting change will force small municipalities to hire consultants to complete this work and cause a significant financial burden to municipalities;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT The Corporation of the Township of Larder Lake hereby calls upon the province of Ontario to provide financial assistance to municipalities to complete the ARO; And

FINALLY, THAT a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honourable Paul Calandra, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the Association of Municipal Clerks and Treasurers

Recorded vote requested: ☐ For Against

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Hull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Kelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Paquette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Quinn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I declare this motion

☐ Carried

☐ Lost / Defeated

☐ Deferred to: (enter date)

Because:

☐ Referred to: (enter body)

Expected response: (enter date)

Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest*

Chair:

*Disclosed his/her (their) interest(s), abstained from discussion and did not vote on this question.
The Corporation of the Township of Larder Lake
69 Fourth Avenue, Larder Lake, ON
Phone: 705-643-2158 Fax: 705-643-2311

Moved by: Thomas Armstrong
Seconded by: Thomas Armstrong

Motion #: 13
Resolution #: 
Date: June 11, 2024

Recorded vote requested: □

For Against
Tom Armstrong
Patricia Hull □
Paul Kelly □
Lynne Paquette □
Patty Quinn □

I declare this motion

Carried
Lost / Defeated
Deferred to: (enter date)
Because:
Referred to: (enter body)
Expected response: (enter date)

Chair:

Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest*

*Disclosed his/her (their) interest(s), abstained from discussion and did not vote on this question.
May 29, 2024

The Right Honourable Justin Trudeau
Prime Minister of Canada
justin.trudeau@parl.gc.ca

DELIVERED VIA EMAIL

RE: Township of Pelee Support Township of Georgian Bay Resolution Sustainable Infrastructure Funding for Small Rural Municipalities

Dear Prime Minister Trudeau,

Please be advised that at the Township of Pelee’s Regular Meeting of Council held on May 28th, 2024, the following resolution was passed:

Resolution 2024 – 77
Moved By: Mayor Cathy Miller
Seconded By: Councillor Michelle Taylor

WHEREAS Ontario’s small rural municipalities face insurmountable challenges to fund both upfront investments and ongoing maintenance of their capital assets including roads and bridges and water wastewater and municipally owned buildings including recreational facilities and libraries;

AND WHEREAS in 2018, the Ontario government mandated all Ontario municipalities to develop capital asset management plans with the stipulation that they be considered in the development of the annual budget;

AND WHEREAS small rural municipalities (of 10,000 people or less) are facing monumental infrastructure deficits that cannot be adequately addressed through property tax revenue alone;

AND WHEREAS the only application approved through the recently awarded Housing Accelerator Fund to a small rural municipality was to Marathon Ontario, who received an allocation of $1.9 million dollars while over $1.369 billion going to Ontario’s large urban centres, resulting in a 0.2% investment in rural Ontario;

AND WHEREAS the Ontario Government has committed $9.1 billion to Toronto alone to assist with operating deficits and the repatriation of the Don Valley and Gardner Expressway;
AND WHEREAS small rural Ontario cannot keep pace with the capital investments required over the next 20 years unless both the Provincial and Federal Governments come forward with new sustainable infrastructure funding;

AND WHEREAS it is apparent that both the Federal and Ontario Governments have neglected to recognize the needs of small rural Ontario;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Township of Pelee hereby support Township of Georgian Bay’s resolution calling on the Ontario and Federal Government to implement sustainable infrastructure funding for small rural municipalities;

AND THAT small rural municipalities are not overlooked and disregarded on future applications for funding;

AND THAT both the Federal and Ontario Governments begin by acknowledging that there is an insurmountable debt facing small rural municipalities;

AND THAT both the Federal and Ontario Governments immediately commission a Working Group to develop a plan on how to deal with the impending debt dilemma;

AND FINALLY THAT this resolution be forwarded to The Honourable Justin Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada; The Honourable Sean Fraser, Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities of Canada; Michel Tremblay Acting President and CEO, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation; The Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario; The Honourable Kinga Surma, Ontario Minister of Infrastructure; The Honourable Paul Calandra, Ontario Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing; MP Dave Epp, Chatham-Kent-Leamington; MPP Trevor Jones, Chatham-Kent-Leamington; AMO, ROMA, FCM, and all Municipalities in Ontario.
WHEREAS, Ontario’s small rural municipalities face insurmountable challenges to fund both upfront investments and ongoing maintenance of their capital assets including roads and bridges and water wastewater and municipally owned buildings including recreational facilities and libraries;

WHEREAS, in 2018, the Ontario government mandated all Ontario municipalities to develop capital asset management plans with the stipulation that they be considered in the development of the annual budget;

WHEREAS, small rural municipalities (of 10,000 people or less) are facing monumental infrastructure deficits that cannot be adequately addressed through property tax revenue alone;

WHEREAS, the only application approved through the recently awarded Housing Accelerator Fund to a small rural municipality was to Marathon Ontario, who received an allocation of $1.9 million dollars while over $1.369 billion going to Ontario’s large urban centres, resulting in a 0.2% investment in rural Ontario;

WHEREAS, the Ontario Government has committed $9.1 billion to Toronto alone to assist with operating deficits and the repatriation of the Don Valley and Gardner Expressway;

WHEREAS, small rural Ontario cannot keep pace with the capital investments required over the next 20 years unless both the Provincial and Federal Governments come forward with new sustainable infrastructure funding;

WHEREAS, it is apparent that both the Federal and Ontario Governments have neglected to recognize the needs of small rural Ontario;

Recorded vote requested:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Hull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Kelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Paquette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Quinn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I declare this motion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost / Defeated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred to:</td>
<td>(enter date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to:</td>
<td>(enter body)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected response:</td>
<td>(enter date)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest*

*Disclosed his/her (their) interest(s), abstained from discussion and did not vote on this question.
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Township of Larder Lake call on the Ontario and Federal Government to implement sustainable infrastructure funding for small rural municipalities; And

THAT small rural municipalities are not overlooked and disregarded on future applications for funding; And

THAT both the Federal and Ontario Governments begin by acknowledging that there is an insurmountable debt facing small rural municipalities; And

THAT both the Federal and Ontario Governments immediately commission a Working Group that includes a member of the Eastern Ontario Wardens Caucus, to develop a plan on how to deal with the impending debt dilemma; And

FINALLY THAT this resolution be forwarded to The Honourable Justin Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, The Honourable Sean Fraser, Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities of Canada; Michel Tremblay Acting President and CEO, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation; The Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario; The Honourable Kinga Surma, Ontario Minister of Infrastructure; The Honourable Paul Calandra, Ontario Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing; Timiskaming-Cochrane MPP, AMO, ROMA, FCM, Eastern Ontario Wardens’ Caucus and all Municipalities in Ontario.
Dear Prime Minister Trudeau,

Re: Infrastructure Small Rural Municipalities

Please be advised that at their last Regular Meeting of Council on Thursday, June 6, 2024, the Council for the Corporation of the Township of North Dundas supported the following resolution:

Resolution #2024-138
Moved By: Councillor Uhrig
Seconded By: Councillor Lennox

THAT the Council of the Township of North Dundas supports resolution number C-2024-165 from the Township of Georgian Bay dated May 13, 2024 regarding the implementation of sustainable infrastructure funding for small rural municipalities and actions to address the impending debt dilemma facing small rural municipalities;

AND THAT a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honourable Justin Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, The Honourable Sean Fraser, Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities of Canada; Michel Tremblay Acting President and CEO, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation; The Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario; The Honourable Kinga Surma, Ontario Minister of Infrastructure; The Honourable Paul Calandra, Ontario Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing; MP Eric Duncan, Stormont-Dundas-South Glengarry; MPP Nolan Quinn, Stormont-Dundas-South Glengarry, AMO, ROMA, FCM, Eastern Ontario Wardens’ Caucus and all Municipalities of Ontario.

Result: Carried.

A copy of the resolution from the Township of Georgian Bay is attached.

Yours Sincerely,

Nancy Johnston, MBA
Director of Corporate Services/Clerk

Encl. (2)
Item 12.(a)

Date: May 13, 2024

Moved by Councillor Stephen Jarvis
Seconded by Councillor Peter Cooper

WHEREAS Ontario's small rural municipalities face insurmountable challenges to fund both upfront investments and ongoing maintenance of their capital assets including roads and bridges and water wastewater and municipally owned buildings including recreational facilities and libraries;

WHEREAS in 2018, the Ontario government mandated all Ontario municipalities to develop capital asset management plans with the stipulation that they be considered in the development of the annual budget;

WHEREAS small rural municipalities (of 10,000 people or less) are facing monumental infrastructure deficits that cannot be adequately addressed through property tax revenue alone;

WHEREAS the only application approved through the recently awarded Housing Accelerator Fund to a small rural municipality was to Marathon Ontario, who received an allocation of $1.9 million dollars while over $1.369 billion going to Ontario's large urban centres, resulting in a 0.2% investment in rural Ontario;

WHEREAS the Ontario Government has committed $9.1 billion to Toronto alone to assist with operating deficits and the repatriation of the Don Valley and Gardner Expressway;

WHEREAS small rural Ontario cannot keep pace with the capital investments required over the next 20 years unless both the Provincial and Federal Governments come forward with new sustainable infrastructure funding;

WHEREAS it is apparent that both the Federal and Ontario Governments have neglected to recognize the needs of small rural Ontario;

NOW THERFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Township of Georgian Bay call on the Ontario and Federal Government to implement sustainable infrastructure funding for small rural municipalities;

AND THAT small rural municipalities are not overlooked and disregarded on future applications for funding;

AND THAT both the Federal and Ontario Governments begin by acknowledging that there is an insurmountable debt facing small rural municipalities;
AND THAT both the Federal and Ontario Governments immediately commission a Working Group that includes a member of the Eastern Ontario Wardens Caucus, to develop a plan on how to deal with the impending debt dilemma;

AND FINALLY THAT this resolution be forwarded to The Honourable Justin Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, The Honourable Sean Fraser, Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities of Canada; Michel Tremblay Acting President and CEO, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation; The Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario; The Honourable Kinga Surma, Ontario Minister of Infrastructure; The Honourable Paul Calandra, Ontario Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing; MP Shelby Kramp-Neuman, Hastings-Lennox Addington; MPP Ric Bresee Hastings-Lennox Addington, AMO, ROMA, FCM, Eastern Ontario Wardens’ Caucus and all Municipalities in Ontario.

Carried □ Defeated □ Recorded Vote □ Referred □ Deferred

Recorded Vote:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Brian Bochek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Peter Cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Kristian Graziano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Allan Hazelton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Stephen Jarvis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Steven Predko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Peter Koetsier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peter Koetsier, Mayor
COUNCIL RESOLUTION # 2024-176

Date: May 30, 2024

MOVED BY: 
☑ Beaucage, Keven
☐ Pateman, Heather
☐ Rickward, Michael – Deputy Mayor
☐ Sharer, Jill

SECONDED BY: 
☐ Beaucage, Keven
☐ Pateman, Heather
☐ Rickward, Michael – Deputy Mayor
☑ Sharer, Jill

WHEREAS the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Kearney received Discussion Item 7.10 regarding the Town of Puslinch recommendation to stop the Phase Out of Free Well Water Testing; and
WHEREAS the Town of Kearney is in receipt of the February 26, 2024 letter from the Ausable Maitland Valley Source Protection Committee (via the Lake Erie Source Protection Committee Meeting of March 28, 2024) to Honourable Lisa Thompson, Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs concerned Public Health Ontario’s recommended phase out of free well water testing; and
WHEREAS the residents of the Town of Kearney do not have access to a municipal water supply and rely exclusively on well water; and
WHEREAS the phasing of free well water testing will impose an additional barrier to ensuring safe drinking water when it is already difficult to encourage residents to test their water;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Town of Kearney supports the letter from the Ausable Bayfield Maitland Valley Source Protection Committee to Minister Lisa Thompson and requests staff to send a similar letter of concern Minister Lisa Thompson, Honourable Sylvia Jones Minister of Health and Long-Term Care, Honourable Andrea Khanjin Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, all Ontario Municipalities, AMO, Hon. Ted Arnott, and MPP Graydon Smith.

CARRIED ☑ DEFEATED ☐ __________________

Recorded Vote Requested by: ___________________

Recorded Vote: 
Beaucage, Keven ☐ For ☐ Opposed
Pateman, Heather ☐ ☐
Philip, Cheryl – Mayor ☐ ☐
Rickward, Michael – Deputy Mayor ☐ ☐
Sharer, Jill ☐ ☐
June 6, 2024

The Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario
Premier's Office
Room 281, Legislative Building, Queen's Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1,

Dear Premier Ford,

Re: Public Health Ontario proposes phasing out free water testing for private wells.

Please be advised that at their last Regular Meeting of Council on Wednesday June 5th, 2024, the Council for the Corporation of the Township of Brudenell, Lyndoch and Raglan supported the following resolution:

Resolution # 2024-06-05-07
Moved By: Councillor Quade
Seconded by: Councillor Keller

"Be it resolved that the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Brudenell, Lyndoch and Raglan hereby supports the request from the Township of Archipelago for the Province to reconsider and ultimately decide against the proposed phasing-out of free private drinking water testing services.

And further that Council directs staff to provide a copy of this resolution to the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario; Sylvia Jones, Deputy Premier and Minister of Health; Andrea Khanjin, Minister of Environment Conservation and Parks; the Honourable John Yakabuski, Member of Provincial Parliament for Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke; the Renfrew County District Health Unit; and all Ontario Municipalities."

CARRIED.

Sincerely,

Tammy Thompson
Deputy Clerk
WHEREAS the Ontario Auditor General's annual report on public health from December 2023 indicates that Public Health Ontario is proposing the phasing-out of free provincial water testing services for private drinking water; and

WHEREAS free private drinking water testing services has played a pivotal role in safeguarding public health, particularly in rural communities, including the entire Township of The Archipelago, that rely predominantly on private drinking water; and

WHEREAS the removal of free private drinking water testing could lead to a reduction in testing, potentially increasing the risk of waterborne diseases in these vulnerable populations; and

WHEREAS the tragic events in Walkerton, Ontario underscored the critical importance of safe drinking water.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that The Township of The Archipelago hereby requests that the Province reconsider and ultimately decide against the proposed phasing-out of free private drinking water testing services.

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that this resolution be sent to all Ontario municipalities, Minister of Environment Conservation and Parks, Minister of Health, North Bay Parry Sound District Health Unit, Graydon Smith, MPP Parry Sound-Muskoka.
WHEREAS, the Ontario Auditor General's annual report on public health from December 2023 indicates that Public Health Ontario is proposing the phasing-out of free provincial water testing services for private drinking water; And

WHEREAS, free private drinking water testing services has played a pivotal role in safeguarding public health, particularly in rural communities, that rely predominantly on private drinking water; And

WHEREAS, the removal of free private drinking water testing could lead to a reduction in testing, potentially increasing the risk of waterborne diseases in these vulnerable populations; And

WHEREAS, the tragic events in Walkerton, Ontario underscored the critical importance of safe drinking water.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that The Township of Larder Lake hereby requests that the province reconsider and ultimately decide against the proposed phasing-out of free private drinking water testing services.

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that this resolution be sent to all Ontario municipalities, Minister of Environment Conservation and Parks, Minister of Health, Temiskaming Public Health Unit, and Timiskaming-Cochrane MPP.

Recorded vote requested:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Hull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Kelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Paquette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Quinn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I declare this motion

- Carried
- Lost / Defeated
- Deferred to: (enter date)
- Referred to: (enter body)
- Expected response: (enter date)

Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest*

*Disclosed his/her (their) interest(s), abstained from discussion and did not vote on this question.
RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 24-081-CD: Black Bridge Road Bridge Heritage Permit Application, Bridge Alterations be received;

AND FURTHER THAT Council approve the Heritage Permit application for the proposed alterations to the Black Bridge Road Bridge, converting the structure from vehicular to pedestrian use, as outlined in Report 24-081-CD with the list of alterations detailed in Appendix C, subject to the following conditions:

1) Following Council approval, any minor changes to the plans and elevations shall be submitted to the satisfaction of Heritage Planning staff, prior to an application for a building permit and/or the commencement of any alterations; and

2) That the implementation of alterations, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than two (2) years following Council approval. If the alterations are not completed by such a time, then this approval expires as of that date and no alterations shall be undertaken without a new approval issued by the City of Cambridge.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

This report has been prepared to provide a recommendation to Council on a Heritage Permit application for the Black Bridge Road Bridge to permit proposed alterations required to repair the designated bridge and convert it from vehicular to pedestrian use.
Key Findings

- The Black Bridge Road Bridge is a single-lane Pratt steel truss bridge constructed in 1916 to cross over the Speed River.
- The property was designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act in 2003 and is located within the Black Bridge Cultural Heritage Landscape.
- A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (2017) and Strategic Conservation Plan (2022) both identified that the structure should be converted to pedestrian use.
- The conversion to a pedestrian bridge is consistent with both the Trails Master Plan and the Cycling Master Plan and would link the future trails on either side of the Speed River.
- The alterations proposed include removing vehicular signage, replacing concrete curbs, installing new cycle height railings, installing cover plates over bridge expansion joints, and removing steel beam guide rails.

Financial Implications

The cost of the alterations to the heritage bridge are estimated at $600,000. Approximately $60,000 has been allocated to supporting studies, plans, and design. No funds have yet been spent on the bridge alterations.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action

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

OR

☒ Core Service

- **Program:** Community Development
- **Core Service:** Heritage Conservation

BACKGROUND:

The Black Bridge Road Bridge is located on Black Bridge Road, crossing the Speed River, between Townline Road to the east and the Canadian National Railway line to the west (Figure 1). The pin-jointed Pratt-style steel truss bridge was constructed in 1916 to replace an earlier wooden bridge at the same location.
The property is located within the Black Bridge Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL) (Figure 2), formalized through Official Plan Amendment No. 15 and subject to the policies of Section 9 of the Official Plan. The bridge is identified as a key Character Defining Attribute of the Black Bridge CHL. Section 9.2.3 of the Official Plan outlines that a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) is required for development or other alterations that may impact the Character Defining Attributes of the CHL.

In 2003, the bridge was designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act through Designation By-law No. 16-03 (attached as Appendix A). In 2010, a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) was initiated for the Black Bridge Road and Townline Road Study Area wherein it was identified that the bridge did not meet capacity and safety requirements for continued vehicular traffic in its current condition. The EA also recommended a road realignment that would result in the retention of the bridge in-situ while discontinuing vehicular use of the bridge.

In 2016, the bridge was damaged by vehicular traffic twice. As such, the bridge underwent emergency repairs, as outlined in Report 08-2016 (MHAC). In 2016, the bridge was included within the Black Bridge Cultural Heritage Landscape, approved by Council through Official Plan Amendment No. 15, and integrated within the Official Plan.

Figure 1: Aerial image of the vicinity of subject property with the bridge indicated by a red arrow (City of Cambridge, 2024)
In 2017, a CHIA was submitted that identified alternatives for the heritage bridge and focused on its functional replacement. The CHIA was brought before MHAC in 2020 through Report 20-036 (MHAC).

In 2021, a transport truck struck the bridge while travelling east along Black Bridge Road. The collision caused structural damage to the steel truss superstructure on the west elevation. Subsequently, in 2021, a Condition Survey Report of the bridge was completed by a team of structural engineers. The report, which was later updated in
2023, identified that the bridge was receiving excessive traffic for a small, single-lane bridge.

In 2022, a Strategic Conservation Plan (SCP) was completed for the bridge, in accordance with SCP Terms of Reference. The SCP identified an action plan for the bridge including the timing and scope of repairs and other alterations. The SCP was brought before MHAC in 2022 through Report 22-011 (MHAC).

On April 9, 2024, a Heritage Permit application (Appendix B) was submitted to Heritage Planning along with a letter outlining proposed alterations (Appendix C), a set of bridge drawings (Appendix D), and the Condition Survey Report.

A Notice of Complete Application, a requirement under Section 33 of the Ontario Heritage Act, was sent to the applicant on May 3, 2024. The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) was consulted on the Heritage Permit application on May 16, 2024.

The work on the bridge is expected to be completed in 2025.

ANALYSIS:

The proposed alterations to the Black Bridge Road Bridge include a series of repairs to address 2021 collision damage; a series of repairs to rehabilitate and strengthen bridge members; and a series of alterations to convert the bridge to pedestrian use. These changes include the installation of new cycle height railings, cover plates to remove trip hazards, and the removal of vehicular signage at each end of the bridge. A full list of the proposed alterations can be found in Appendix C.

As identified within Designation By-law No. 16-03, the single-lane pin-jointed steel truss bridge, in its entirety, is a protected heritage attribute. As such, alterations proposed to the bridge require a Heritage Permit under Section 33 of the Ontario Heritage Act.

The proposed alterations represent, in part, necessary maintenance work designed to repair and rehabilitate the 1916 bridge structure and extend its lifespan for continued use. The proposed alterations also seek to successfully convert the structure from vehicular to pedestrian use. These changes include installing new cycle height railings and cover plates over joints to ensure safe use by both pedestrians and cyclists. The proposed alterations are guided by the Strategic Conservation Plan (2022), which was undertaken to manage the change planned to the bridge including ensuring that the cultural heritage value of the bridge is retained through its conversion to a pedestrian structure.

Heritage Planning staff support the proposed alterations and the Heritage Permit application, as submitted. The proposal seeks to extend the life of the original structure,
ensuring that the bridge is safe and accessible for future generations. The proposal also seeks to enable greater use and appreciation of the heritage resource by removing vehicular traffic and allowing better access by pedestrians and cyclists.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

Ontario Heritage Act (R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18)

Alteration of property

33 (1) No owner of property designated under section 29 shall alter the property or permit the alteration of the property if the alteration is likely to affect the property’s heritage attributes, as set out in the description of the property’s heritage attributes in the by-law that was required to be registered under clause 29 (12) (b) or subsection 29 (19), as the case may be, unless the owner applies to the council of the municipality in which the property is situate and receives consent in writing to the alteration. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 11.

Application

(2) An application under subsection (1) shall be accompanied by the prescribed information and material. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 11.

Other information

(3) A council may require that an applicant provide any other information or material that the council considers it may need. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 11.

Notice of complete application

(4) The council shall, upon receiving all information and material required under subsections (2) and (3), if any, serve a notice on the applicant informing the applicant that the application is complete. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 11.

Notification re completeness of application

(5) The council may, at any time, notify the applicant of the information and material required under subsection (2) or (3) that has been provided, if any, and any information and material under those subsections that has not been provided. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 11.

Decision of council

(6) The council, after consultation with its municipal heritage committee, if one is established, and within the time period determined under subsection (7),
(a) shall,

(i) consent to the application,

(ii) consent to the application on terms and conditions, or

(iii) refuse the application; and

(b) shall serve notice of its decision on the owner of the property and on the Trust.

2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 11.

Same

(7) For the purposes of subsection (6), the time period is determined as follows:

1. Unless paragraph 2 applies, the period is 90 days after a notice under subsection (4) is served on the applicant or such longer period after the notice is served as is agreed upon by the owner and the council.

2. If a notice under subsection (4) or (5) is not served on the applicant within 60 days after the day the application commenced, as determined in accordance with the regulations, the period is 90 days after the end of that 60-day period or such longer period after the end of the 60-day period as is agreed upon by the owner and the council. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 11.

Deemed consent

(8) If the council fails to notify the owner under clause (6) (b) within the time period determined under subsection (7), the council shall be deemed to have consented to the application. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 11.

9. BLACK BRIDGE CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE SITE SPECIFIC POLICY AREA

1. Preamble:

The Black Bridge CHL is an area of cultural heritage significance in which the modifications resulting from human activities can be identified and are valued by the community. The Black Bridge CHL possesses cultural associations, as well as groupings of individual heritage features, such as the built structures, open spaces, archaeological sites, and natural elements that together comprise a significant heritage form, distinctive from that of its constituent elements or parts. The CHL should be conserved in such a way that the area’s heritage values, attributes and integrity are retained, and the awareness, appreciation, and enjoyment of the Black Bridge CHL should be promoted.
1.1 The following heritage themes provide a foundation for the Black Bridge Cultural Heritage Landscape:

   a. Settlement: Aboriginal and Early European;

   b. Community Development: Grist Mills and Sawmills;

   c. Transportation: Road, River, and Rail; and

   d. The Rivers and the Land.

1.2 The following are the key Character Defining Attributes of the Black Bridge CHL, as identified through the Black Bridge CHL Technical Study (January 2016):

   a. The Mill, 4860 Townline Road, City of Cambridge;

   b. The Mill Races, located in City of Cambridge and Township of Puslinch;

   c. The Irish Creek Pond and Dam, Township of Puslinch;

   d. The Speed River Dam, Township of Puslinch;

   e. The Mill Manager's House, 4880 Townline Road, City of Cambridge;

   f. The Mill Boarding House, 4790 Townline Road, City of Cambridge;

   g. The Black Bridge, Black Bridge Road at the Speed River, City of Cambridge;

   h. 537 River Road, City of Cambridge;

   i. The Roszell Farm, 6542 Roszell Road, Township of Puslinch;

   j. Crossroads Memorial Church and Brethren in Christ Cemetery, 4614 Wellington Road, Township of Puslinch;

   k. The Speed River, and the Irish Creek their valleys and floodplains, City of Cambridge, and Township of Puslinch;

   l. Views of the Speed River valley, from Black Bridge Road, views of the Black Bridge along the road and across the valley, and views along Townline Road from Black Bridge Road to the hilltop near River Road, City of Cambridge, and Township of Puslinch; and

   m. Views and viewsheds associated with these Character Defining Attributes, City of Cambridge, and Township of Puslinch
2. Policies: In addition to the policies and permitted uses in this Plan, the lands designated as the Black Bridge Cultural Heritage Landscape (Black Bridge CHL) as identified on Schedule ‘A’, Figure 67 of this Plan, are subject to the following policies:

2.1 Conservation

The Black Bridge Cultural Heritage Landscape shall be conserved.

2.2 Education and Awareness

The community is encouraged to promote continued education, awareness and interpretation of the Black Bridge CHL, as detailed in the Management Strategy contained within the Black Bridge CHL Technical Study, and through undertakings such as a coordinated signage program for the area that interprets the themes and significant features, walking or cycling tours, interpretive brochures, and digital media, as appropriate.

2.3 Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA)

A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment shall be required for a development proposal on all properties within, or directly adjacent to, the Black Bridge CHL in order to ensure that development is context sensitive and mitigates impacts to Character Defining Attributes.

The Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment shall be undertaken in accordance with the requirements under Section 4.10 of this Plan.

Where a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment has been undertaken in respect to a development proposal and where the development proposal has been reviewed by the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee and approved by Council, a further Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment will not be required.

2.4 Infrastructure

“Infrastructure” development, upgrades and/or improvements shall be planned and designed in such a way as to minimize impacts and be sympathetic to the Black Bridge CHL’s Character Defining Attributes and to the broader context of the area.

2.5 Property Listing and Designation

Character Defining Attributes of the Black Bridge CHL located within the City of Cambridge shall be listed in the Municipal Register and property owners shall be encouraged to seek designation under the Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

2.6 Amendments to Black Bridge CHL

The Black Bridge CHL policies, Character Defining Attributes and/or boundary may need to be amended from time to time.
Amendments shall be prepared by the City of Cambridge’s Planner – Heritage and brought forward to MHAC for review. MHAC shall provide a recommendation regarding the amendment for consideration and approval by Council. All amendments will be pursuant to the Planning Act.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

The Black Bridge Road and Bridge Reconstruction project (A/00492-40) has an overall approved budget of $20.6 million and is funded through the Capital Budget. The alterations to the heritage bridge comprise approximately $600,000. Approximately $60,000 has been allocated to supporting studies, plans, and design. No funds have yet been spent on the bridge alterations.

**PUBLIC VALUE:**

**Transparency:**

To ensure transparency, Council meeting agendas are posted on the City’s website.

**Sustainability:**

This project will support sustainability by retaining an existing structure in situ and supporting the conservation of a heritage resource valued by the community.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:**

The MHAC was consulted on May 16, 2024, through Report 24-014 (MHAC) and was provided with Heritage Planning staff’s recommendations as presented in this report. MHAC passed the following recommendations to Council:

Moved By: Rosemary Minella

Seconded By: Nancy Woodman

THAT Report 24-014 (MHAC) Black Bridge Road Bridge Heritage Permit Application, Bridge Alterations be received; PP 009 pp 022

AND FURTHER THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommend that Council approve the Heritage Permit application for the proposed repairs and alterations for the conversion of the Black Bridge Road Bridge from a vehicular bridge to a pedestrian bridge as outlined in Report 24-014 (MHAC), with the list of alterations detailed in Appendix C, subject to the following conditions:

1) Following Council approval, any minor changes to the plans and elevations shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner or designate, prior to
an application for a building permit and/or the commencement of any alterations; and

2) That the implementation of alterations, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than two (2) years following Council approval. If the alterations are not completed by such a time, then this approval expires as of that date and no alterations shall be undertaken without a new approval issued by the City of Cambridge.

PUBLIC INPUT:
Council meetings are open to the public via the City’s YouTube channel.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:
Heritage planning staff have consulted with staff from Engineering and Transportation Services in the writing of this report.

CONCLUSION:
For the reasons outlined in this report, Heritage Planning staff recommend that Council approve the Heritage Permit application for alterations proposed to repair the Black Bridge Road Bridge and to convert it from vehicular to pedestrian use, subject to the conditions outlined in this report.

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. 24-081-CD Appendix A – Designation By-law No. 16-03
2. 24-081-CD Appendix B – Heritage Permit Application
3. 24-081-CD Appendix C – List of Proposed Alterations Prepared by WSP
4. 24-081-CD Appendix D – Heritage Bridge Drawings Prepared by WSP
January 23, 2003

Ms. Rita Calderone  
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation  
400 University Avenue  
4th floor  
Toronto, ON M7A 2R9

Dear Ms. Calderone:

Re: By-law Designating City of Cambridge Property under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act

In accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act, I am sending the attached City of Cambridge By-law 16-03 designating the Black Bridge Road Bridge under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act R.S.O. 1990.

Should there be any questions or concerns, please me at (519) 740-4650, extension 4580.

Yours truly,

Valerie Spring, B.A., M.A.,  
L.A.C.A.C. Co-ordinator

VS/jb

Attach.
BY-LAW NO. 16-03
OF THE
CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Being a by-law of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge to designate the
structure known as the Black Bridge Road Bridge, Cambridge, Ontario as a
property of cultural heritage value or interest.

WHEREAS the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter 0.18 authorizes the Council
of a municipality to enact by-laws to designate real property including the structure thereon, to be of
cultural heritage value or interest;

AND WHEREAS Notice of Intention to Designate the Black Bridge Road Bridge,
Cambridge, Ontario has been duly published and served;

NOW THEREFORE, THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF
CAMBRIDGE ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. THAT there is designated as being of cultural heritage value or interest the structure, more
   particularly described in Schedule "A" attached hereto, known as the Black Bridge Road Bridge,
   Cambridge, Ontario. The reasons for designation, including a description of the heritage
   attributes of the property, are as set out in Schedule "B" attached hereto.

2. THAT the City of Cambridge is hereby authorized to cause a copy of this by-law to be served
   upon the owner of the said property and upon the Ontario Heritage Foundation and to cause
   notice of this by-law to be published in a newspaper having general circulation in the City of
   Cambridge.

READ A FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD TIME
ENACTED AND PASSED, THIS 20TH DAY OF JANUARY, A.D., 2003

MAYOR

CLERK
SCHEDULE "A"

TO BY-LAW NO. 16-03
OF THE
CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

ALL AND SINGULAR that certain parcel or tract of land and structure, situate, lying and being in the City of Cambridge, in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, and being composed of Concession 4 Beasley's Lower Block Part Lot 13 on Black Bridge Road Bridge and known as the Black Bridge Road Bridge.
This property is recommended for designation because of its cultural heritage value and interest. The current Black Bridge Road Bridge was constructed in 1916 but there is evidence of a wooden bridge structure on this site from as early as 1910. The Waterloo Township Minutes of July 1916 indicate that the Hamilton Bridge Works Company was awarded the contract to build a "steel superstructure at a bridge at Cole's Mill, near Hespeler" for $5575.00.

Historically, the Black Bridge Road was the Block Line that divided Wilson's Upper Block and Wilson's Lower Block and was a point of reference on early maps dating back to 1805.

The Black Bridge Road Bridge is a single-lane pin-jointed steel truss bridge and is typical of the bridges built in that era. It has undergone extensive repair work beginning in 1931 when the wooden deck was replaced, and most recently in 1996. Despite these repairs, the bridge has retained its original form and is the only steel bridge of its kind in Cambridge.

The heritage attribute of this property is the single-lane pin-jointed steel truss bridge in its entirety.

REASONS FOR DESIGNATION

The property was evaluated in terms of the criteria for designation in accordance to the Heritage Policies within the City of Cambridge Official Plan:

Heritage Value or Interest

a) it dates from an early period in the development of the City's communities

Architectural Value or Interest

a) it is a good, representative example of a method of construction now rarely used;
b) it is a good, representative example of its architectural style of period of building;
c) it terminates a view or otherwise makes an important contribution to the urban composition or streetscape of which it forms a part.

Further information about this property can be found in the L.A.C.A.C. building file.
DATED: JANUARY 20TH, A.D., 2003

BY-LAW NO. 16 - 03
OF THE
CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Being a By-law of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge to designate the structure known as the Black Bridge Road Bridge, Cambridge, Ontario as a property of cultural heritage value or interest.


JAMES ANDERSON
CITY CLERK
CITY CLERK
Heritage Permit Application Form

The following application form is pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O 1990, Sections 33, 34, and 42. The City of Cambridge will issue a Notice of Receipt within the receipt of a complete application, including all required supporting documentation. Please attach to this form any photographs, plans, drawings, studies, etc, required to fully describe and support the proposed alterations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part A – Heritage property information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address: Black Bridge Road Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward: Border between Ward 1 and Ward 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By-law: By-law 16-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Code: N3C2V3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province: Ontario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part B – Applicant information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner: Scott MacDonald on behalf of City of Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 50 Dickson Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: City of Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number: 519-623-1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:macdonaldsct@cambridge.ca">macdonaldsct@cambridge.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Code: N1R5W8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province: Ontario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part C – Agent information (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent: WSP Canada Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 3450 Harvester Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number: 416514-0145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:heidy.schopf@wsp.com">heidy.schopf@wsp.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Code: L7N3W5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province: Ontario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part D – Scope of work:

A. Select which types(s) of work apply in the boxes below:

☐ Alteration (including landscape alterations and signage)
☐ Demolition (partial or full)
☐ New Construction or Addition
☐ Relocation

B. Clearly describe all the changes you are undertaking to the property and which heritage features will be impacted. Attach additional pages if needed.

Black Bridge has been subject to a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) (MHBC 2017) and Strategic Conservation Plan (SCP) (Wood 2022), which both identified that the structure should be converted from a vehicular crossing to a pedestrian bridge. A structural condition survey of the bridge completed by Wood in 2021 found that Black Bridge is currently receiving excessive traffic for a single lane load posted bridge and concluded that conversion to a pedestrian bridge is required. In addition, On November 4, 2021, an 18-wheeler transport truck struck Black Bridge while travelling east along Black Bridge Road. The collision caused structural damage to the steel truss superstructure on the west elevation, considered to be a heritage attribute. Consultation with the City of Cambridge determined that Black Bridge was damaged by vehicular traffic twice in 2016, which also resulted in damages to the portals. The collisions and resulting damages to heritage attributes highlight the need to convert Black Bridge to a pedestrian bridge since continued vehicular traffic will threaten the long-term viability of this structure.

A list of the proposed alterations to convert the structure from a vehicular bridge to a pedestrian bridge is appended to this form.

Part E – List of supporting documentation:

Check all that apply:

☐ Photographs (existing and historical)
☐ Plans, Drawings, and Sample Materials
☐ Historical Documentation
☐ Contractor Quotes
☐ Heritage Impact Assessment or Conservation Plan
☐ Documentation for Building Code or Planning Act applications (Pre-Consultation, Site Plan, Minor Variance, Consent, Zoning By-law Amendment, Official Plan Amendment, etc)
**Part F – Declaration**

Check the appropriate statement:

- [ ] I, the Applicant, am the sole owner of the property for which this application is made.
- [x] I, the Applicant, am one of the owners of this property and have received express authorization from all other property owners to make this application for alteration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Scott MacDonald</th>
<th>Date: 2024-06-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part G - For office use only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received by:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed by:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- [ ] Approved
- [ ] Not approved
- [ ] Approved with the following terms and/or conditions:

**Part H – Authorization and Appointment of an Agent**

I, ___________________________ being the registered owner of property legally described as:

Civic Address: ________________________________________________________________

Legal Description: ____________________________________________________________________________

hereby give authorization for ____________________________ to act as my agent

in the matter of ____________________________________________

It is understood that until the City of Cambridge is advised otherwise, the City shall deal exclusively

with the above-noted person with respect to the matter noted above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 7, 2024

City of Cambridge
50 Dickson Street
Cambridge, ON, N1R 5W8

Attention: Laura Waldie, Senior Planner Heritage

Dear Laura,

Subject: Heritage Permit Application Form for Black Bridge Road Bridge, City of Cambridge, Ontario
Project Number.: IM21106003

Dear Laura,

The following text was prepared for the Strategic Conservation Plan (SCP) for the Black Bridge Road Bridge (Black Bridge) by Wood PLC (now WSP Canada Limited) (WSP) in 2022. The text details the proposed changes to Black Bridge to convert the structure from a vehicular bridge to a pedestrian bridge and integrate the bridge with the proposed multi-use trail (MUT). Please consider this list of proposed alterations to support the Heritage Application Form to complete the alterations to Black Bridge.

BLACK BRIDGE FUTURE PLANS AND NEEDS

The Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) prepared by MHBC in 2017 determined that retention of Black Bridge in situ and rehabilitation of the bridge to serve as a pedestrian bridge was the preferred alternative for Municipal Class Environmental Assessment for Black Bridge Road and Townline Road (MHBC 2017). The Structural Condition Survey completed by Wood (now WSP) in 2023 included a detailed evaluation of the structural capacity of the existing heritage truss bridge (WSP 2023). The Structural Condition Survey found that under some design load combinations, stresses in the end diagonal truss members, and the central vertical members of the lateral trusses, exceed capacity. Also, it is noted that the design live loading under pedestrians is actually higher than the existing posted vehicle loading, and the stresses will become worse in the new configuration. Therefore, strengthening of the end diagonal members is required in order to achieve code compliance when converting the bridge from a vehicular crossing to a pedestrian bridge. These findings support MHBC’s conclusion that conversion of Black Bridge to be part of a Multi-Use Trail is the preferred alternative to conserve Black Bridge.

On November 4, 2021, an 18-wheeler transport truck struck Black Bridge while travelling east along Black Bridge Road. The collision caused structural damage to the steel truss superstructure on the west elevation, considered to be a heritage attribute. Consultation with the City of Cambridge determined that Black Bridge was damaged by vehicular traffic twice in 2016, which also resulted in damages to the portals. The collisions and resulting damages to heritage attributes highlight the need to convert Black Bridge to a pedestrian bridge since continued vehicular traffic will threaten the long-term viability of this structure.
PROPOSED REPAIRS

REPAIRS TO ADDRESS COLLISION DAMAGE

The following repairs were designed by WSP and carried out by Marbridge Construction Ltd in April 2022 to address damage caused by the collision on November 4, 2021:

- Install a temporary lateral bracing system to laterally support the bridge during the removal and replacement of the bottom lateral brace at the west end of the bridge;
- Heat straighten all lateral frame members designated to remain that have deformed as a result of the collision, including gusset plates;
- Remove and replace diagonal cross bracing and vertical brace at right lateral truss frame including replacing all riveted connections with new bolted connections;
- Remove and replace bottom lateral brace including all gusset plates and all riveted connections to bottom lateral brace with new gusset plates and bolted connections;
- Remove and replace knee braces including gusset plates connected to main vertical truss members and bolted connections;
- Heat straighten main vertical truss member at deformed section near knee brace connection; and,
- Steel sections were weathering steel, matching the existing steel section properties to repair damaged sections in a “like for like” manner.

MINOR REHABILITATION TO STRENGTHEN BRIDGE MEMBERS

WSP recommends to strengthen certain members of the bridge in order that all bridge members satisfy the requirements of the Canadian Highway Bridge Design Code. The following work should be carried out:

- Weld strengthening plates to outer side faces of the end diagonal truss members
- Replace rivets with high strength bolts in the area of the end diagonal trusses between the bottom of the lateral brace and the knee brace
- Add an additional angle to the back of the existing angle that forms the central vertical member of each lateral truss.

MINOR REHABILITATION TO ADDRESS STRUCTURAL DEFECTS

WSP’s Condition Survey Report recommended the following minor rehabilitations to address current structural defects of Black Bridge:

- Remove deteriorated concrete from abutments and wingwalls and deck;
- Patch repair abutments and wingwalls and deck;
- Remove deteriorated concrete from concrete railings on approaches;
- Patch repair concrete railings on approaches;
- Seal cracks wider than 0.5mm in deck, deck soffit, abutment and wingwalls, by injecting with colour matching epoxy;
- Abrasive blast clean deck surface and apply migratory corrosion inhibitor, comprising a silane sealer and an organic corrosion inhibitor;
- Locally power tool clean corroded areas of structural steelwork and coat areas with a 3 coat (epoxy zinc/epoxy/polyurethane) system, compatible with the existing coating and with a top coat to match the colour of the existing coating; and
— Place riprap on embankments for erosion protection.

PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO CONVERT BRIDGE TO MULTI-USE TRAIL

WSP’s Condition Survey Report included a list of modifications required to convert Black Bridge to a multi-use trail. Proposed modifications include:

— Construct new concrete footings on approaches, extending to ends of wingwalls, to support new cycle height railings;
— Install new cycle height railings on existing bridge curbs and new approach footings;
— Install cover plate over expansion joint at each end of bridge. Cover plate prevents edges of joint from becoming trip hazard to pedestrians and cyclists;
— Remove steel beam guide rails on approaches; and,
— Remove vehicular signage at each end of bridge.

CONCLUSION

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned should you have any questions regarding the proposed alterations to Black Bridge and accompanying Heritage Permit Application.

Yours sincerely,

Heidy Schopf, MES, CAHP
Cultural Heritage Team Lead
Email: heidy.schopf@wsp.com
Phone: 416-514-0145

Matthew Galloway, M.Eng., MICE, MIstructE, P.Eng.
Associate Bridge Engineer
Email: matthew.galloway@wsp.com
Phone: 905-220-6718
RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 24-030-CRS 2024 Operating Financial Update – April Forecast be received;

AND THAT operating forecast changes for the April 2024 reporting period that are reportable to Council under the Budget Control By-Law be approved;

AND FURTHER THAT transfers to and from reserve and reserve funds as identified in report 24-030-CRS be approved.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

As per the City’s budget control by-law, Council is to be provided with regular updates related to operating budget variances. This report is an update on the City’s operations for 2024 based on information as of April 30, 2024, for both tax-supported and the water utility budget.

Key Findings

The tax-supported operations are currently forecasting a year-end surplus for 2024 of $515,532 based on information to date. This variance may continue to be impacted by fluctuations in revenues and expenditures throughout the year; therefore, this preliminary figure is not a certain indication of what may be expected as the year progresses.

The main drivers of the April forecasted surplus include:

- Increased investment income of $865,500;
- Partially offsetting the additional revenues are a reduction in lease revenues of $161,000 along with increase in cost of taking on utilities and minor maintenance work of $82,000 to operationalize the City’s 1300 Bishop Street building;

- The addition of a contract sponsorship position, partially offset by 2024 sponsorship dollars realized and projected increased program revenues in Aquatics due to higher program enrollment and higher grant revenues for Older Adult programs; and

- Increased cost of $88,000 due to increase Clerks operations cost including integrity and related inquiries, investigations, and advice.

The water utility operations are not projecting a year-end surplus or deficit for this reporting period.

**Financial Implications**

The following tables summarize the forecasts in tax-supported operations and the water utility operations.

The tax-supported operations are forecasting a year end surplus of $515,532, as seen in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Total Restated Budget</th>
<th>April Forecast Changes</th>
<th>Revised Forecast</th>
<th>YTD Actuals as at April 30th</th>
<th>% Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor and Council</td>
<td>$1,334,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,334,000</td>
<td>$407,676</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the City Manager</td>
<td>$3,103,700</td>
<td>$171,756</td>
<td>$3,275,456</td>
<td>$1,036,495</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
<td>$51,344,750</td>
<td>$70,600</td>
<td>$51,415,350</td>
<td>$17,626,568</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Enterprise</td>
<td>$7,390,700</td>
<td>$82,000</td>
<td>$7,472,700</td>
<td>$2,035,254</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>$10,123,700</td>
<td>$45,112</td>
<td>$10,168,812</td>
<td>$1,703,368</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Services</td>
<td>$28,758,700</td>
<td>($19,500)</td>
<td>$28,739,200</td>
<td>$5,694,504</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Expenditures</td>
<td>($110,656,750)</td>
<td>($865,500)</td>
<td>($111,522,250)</td>
<td>($53,874,400)</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea Exchange</td>
<td>$8,601,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,601,200</td>
<td>$3,449,939</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Tax Supported         | $0                    | ($515,532)             | ($515,532)       | ($21,920,756)               | N/A     |

The water utility operations are not forecasting a year end surplus or deficit, as seen in the table below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Total Restated Budget</th>
<th>April Forecast Changes</th>
<th>Revised Forecast</th>
<th>YTD Actuals as at April 30th</th>
<th>% Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Expenses</td>
<td>$41,590,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$41,590,300</td>
<td>$7,012,167</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Revenues</td>
<td>($41,590,300)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($41,590,300)</td>
<td>($10,163,793)</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Water</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>($3,151,626)</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Expenses</td>
<td>$38,821,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$38,821,800</td>
<td>$7,512,436</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Revenues</td>
<td>($38,821,800)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($38,821,800)</td>
<td>($9,135,218)</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Wastewater</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>($1,622,782)</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total City of Cambridge Water Utility</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($4,774,408)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:**

☐ Strategic Action

**Objective(s):** Not Applicable

**Strategic Action:** Not Applicable

OR

☒ Core Service

**Program: Finance**

**Core Service:** Financial Planning

Providing updates to Council on operating budget variances supports responsible oversight of financial resources. It also ensures program managers and departments are accountable for the programs they manage and provide transparency as to where public dollars are spent.

**BACKGROUND:**

**Economic Outlook**

The Bank of Canada, in its latest Monetary Policy Report from April 2024¹, reports that inflation is easing as high interest rates cool the economy.

The growth in the Canadian economy began to stall in the second half of last year and created excess supply. Businesses reduced the frequency of prices raises and price pressures have eased for many goods and services. Additionally, the very overheated

---

¹ Monetary Policy Report - April 2024 (bankofcanada.ca)
labour market has slowed as growth in the working-age population outpaces employment growth, the unemployment rate was at 6.1% in March.

The Bank of Canada indicates economic growth is expected to strengthen in 2024 as population growth increases demand as well as the supply of workers and household spending.

The Consumer Price Index (CPI), a key measure of inflation in the economy, remains close to 3% and is expected to ease below 2.5% in the second half of the year and reach the 2% target in 2025.

ANALYSIS:

Tax-Supported Operating Variance

The City is forecasting a year-end surplus of $515,532 for 2024 based on April year to date information. This variance may continue to be impacted by fluctuations in revenues and expenditures throughout the year, therefore this preliminary figure is not a certain indication of what may be expected as the year progresses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Total Restated Budget</th>
<th>April Forecast Changes</th>
<th>Revised Forecast</th>
<th>YTD Actuals as at April 30th</th>
<th>% Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor and Council</td>
<td>$1,334,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,334,000</td>
<td>$407,676</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the City Manager</td>
<td>$3,103,700</td>
<td>$171,756</td>
<td>$3,275,456</td>
<td>$1,036,495</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
<td>$51,344,750</td>
<td>$70,600</td>
<td>$51,415,350</td>
<td>$17,626,568</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Enterprise</td>
<td>$7,390,700</td>
<td>$82,000</td>
<td>$7,472,700</td>
<td>$2,035,254</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>$10,123,700</td>
<td>$45,112</td>
<td>$10,168,812</td>
<td>$1,703,368</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Services</td>
<td>$28,758,700</td>
<td>($19,500)</td>
<td>$28,739,200</td>
<td>$5,694,504</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Expenditures</td>
<td>($110,656,750)</td>
<td>($865,500)</td>
<td>($111,522,250)</td>
<td>($53,874,400)</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea Exchange</td>
<td>$8,601,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,601,200</td>
<td>$3,449,939</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further explanation of variances in spending to date and forecast changes are provided in the following sections by department.

Mayor & Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Total Restated Budget</th>
<th>April Forecast Changes</th>
<th>Revised Forecast</th>
<th>YTD Actuals as at April 30th</th>
<th>% Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor and Council</td>
<td>$1,334,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,334,000</td>
<td>$407,676</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mayor and Council</td>
<td>$1,334,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,334,000</td>
<td>$407,676</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Office of the Mayor and Council is not projecting a year-end surplus or deficit for this reporting period.

Office of the City Manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Total Restated Budget</th>
<th>April Forecast Changes</th>
<th>Revised Forecast</th>
<th>YTD Actuals as at April 30th</th>
<th>% Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of the City Manager</td>
<td>$530,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$530,500</td>
<td>$184,033</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Communications</td>
<td>$1,056,400</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,056,400</td>
<td>$339,713</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal and Realty Services</td>
<td>$1,516,800</td>
<td>$171,756</td>
<td>$1,688,556</td>
<td>$512,749</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Office of the City Manager</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,103,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$171,756</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,275,456</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,036,495</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Office of the City Manager is projecting a year-end deficit of $171,756 for this reporting period within the Legal and Realty Services division. This is driven by a decrease in lease revenues due to no longer leasing 1300 Bishop Street (formerly leased Magnotta building until early 2024).

Corporate Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Total Restated Budget</th>
<th>April Forecast Changes</th>
<th>Revised Forecast</th>
<th>YTD Actuals as at April 30th</th>
<th>% Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
<td>$273,000</td>
<td>($17,800)</td>
<td>$255,200</td>
<td>$102,985</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$3,936,000</td>
<td>$88,400</td>
<td>$4,024,400</td>
<td>$1,137,968</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>office of the City Clerk</td>
<td>$3,781,750</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,781,750</td>
<td>$1,789,525</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>$30,731,300</td>
<td>$83,300</td>
<td>$30,814,600</td>
<td>$8,554,573</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Services</td>
<td>$3,082,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,082,200</td>
<td>$1,146,343</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>$9,540,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,540,500</td>
<td>$4,895,174</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Corporate Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51,344,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>$70,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51,415,350</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,626,568</strong></td>
<td><strong>34.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Corporate Services department is forecasting a net deficit of $70,600. Corporate Services Administration is recognizing savings of $17,800 in other staffing costs and program supplies. Fire Services’ forecasting exercise has identified that their workplans remain stable and mostly on track. Fire has reported net zero overall forecast change, but are experiencing pressures of $83,300 including one-time costs of a confidential labour relations matter, and the cost of an 11-month contract extension for the Gas Detection devices (frontline equipment) due to the delayed completion of the Gas Monitoring Equipment Replacement capital project (arising from unexpected 2023 capital cost increases, needing council approval). Fire Services also includes a net zero
forecast for the purchase of a Fire Prevention Vehicle that was delayed from 2023 due to supply-chain issues with an offsetting draw from the Equipment Reserve Fund. At this time, Fire has identified salary gaping savings to offset these pressures and will work diligently to mitigate these impacts.

Office of the City Clerk is projecting a year-end deficit of $88,400 for this reporting period due to an increase cost for retention of storage, shredding, mailing cost, along with an increase cost for integrity commissioner inquiries, investigations & advice related to MCIA (Municipal Conflict of Interest Act) and a forecast increase for Council meeting expenses. All other areas are not forecasting a surplus or deficit at this reporting period.

Corporate Enterprise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Total Restated Budget</th>
<th>April Forecast Changes</th>
<th>Revised Forecast</th>
<th>YTD Actuals as at April 30th</th>
<th>% Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Enterprise Administration</td>
<td>$418,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$418,000</td>
<td>$139,142</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Strategy</td>
<td>$460,100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$460,100</td>
<td>$138,698</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>$874,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$874,200</td>
<td>$219,151</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk and Facilities</td>
<td>$5,638,400</td>
<td>$82,000</td>
<td>$5,720,400</td>
<td>$1,538,263</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Corporate Enterprise</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,390,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$82,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,472,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,035,254</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Corporate Enterprise department is projecting a year-end deficit of $82,000 within Risk and Facilities due to taking on utilities and maintenance work required for 1300 Bishop Street to operationalize the building (formerly leased Magnotta Building until early 2024).

For 2024, Economic Development anticipates an abundance of projects stemming from the Economic Development Action Plan in late 2024, in addition the group continues with core economic development programming such as business retention and expansion, investment attraction, business support, and film services with expectation of not projecting a year-end surplus or deficit for this reporting period.

Community Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Total Restated Budget</th>
<th>April Forecast Changes</th>
<th>Revised Forecast</th>
<th>YTD Actuals as at April 30th</th>
<th>% Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Administration</td>
<td>$443,400</td>
<td>$25,100</td>
<td>$468,500</td>
<td>$161,090</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($700,096)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Total Restated Budget</th>
<th>April Forecast Changes</th>
<th>Revised Forecast</th>
<th>YTD Actuals as at April 30th</th>
<th>% Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Transportation Services</td>
<td>$3,828,700</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,828,700</td>
<td>$1,044,070</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Services</td>
<td>$2,086,300</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$2,089,800</td>
<td>$738,830</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Culture</td>
<td>$3,765,300</td>
<td>$16,512</td>
<td>$3,781,812</td>
<td>$459,474</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Community Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,123,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45,112</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,168,815</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,703,368</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Development department is forecasting a deficit of $45,112 for 2024. Recreation and Culture reflects the addition of a contract sponsorship position, partially offset by 2024 sponsorship dollars realized and projected increased program revenues in Aquatics due to higher program enrollment and higher grant revenues for Older Adult programs. The savings is further partially offset by higher expenses in Community Development Administration due to the delay in the implementation of the Community Energy Investment Strategy (CEIS) as the City contribution planned for 2023 was delayed to 2024, additional overtime in Planning Services due to a higher workload and additional $10,000 towards the Cambridge Celebration of the Arts event. There is no change in the forecast for Building Services, and Engineering and Transportation Services.

### Infrastructure Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Total Restated Budget</th>
<th>April Forecast Changes</th>
<th>Revised Forecast</th>
<th>YTD Actuals as at April 30th</th>
<th>% Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Services Administration</td>
<td>$438,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$438,800</td>
<td>$348,110</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management and Project Management</td>
<td>$334,900</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$334,900</td>
<td>$280,196</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>$7,232,100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,232,100</td>
<td>$238,135</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>$20,752,900</td>
<td>($19,500)</td>
<td>$20,733,400</td>
<td>$4,828,063</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Infrastructure Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$28,758,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>($19,500)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$28,739,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,694,504</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Infrastructure Services department is forecasting a surplus of $19,500 for this reporting period, driven by the following impacts:

- Parks surplus of $19,500 is attributed to net additional external recovery revenue partially offset by an increase in contracted services for goose control at Fountain Street Soccer Complex;
- Cemeteries is not projecting a surplus or deficit as all forecast changes net to zero. An increase in general maintenance was funded by a donation to perform monument restorations at Preston Cemetery;

- Forestry is not projecting a surplus or deficit as all forecast changes net to zero. An increase in general maintenance contracts is offset by a decrease in professional services to align with anticipated contract and professional service expenditures; and

- Fleet is not projecting a surplus or deficit as all forecast changes net to zero. An increase in general maintenance contracts is offset by a draw from the Equipment Reserve Fund for:
  - The removal of an in-ground hydraulic hoist that failed due to age and became unsafe to operate ($20,000);
  - The replacement of failed fleet wash bay equipment in the Bishop Operations Centre to support corrosive salt and debris removal from fleet assets ($25,000); and
  - The replacement of electrical cord reels throughout the Bishop Operations Centre maintenance shop and lean-to were required to be replaced as a result of ESA and electrical inspections ($7,500).

### Corporate Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Restated Budget</th>
<th>April Forecast Changes</th>
<th>Revised Forecast</th>
<th>YTD Actuals as at April 30th</th>
<th>% Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Financing</td>
<td>($913,300)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($913,300)</td>
<td>($1,298,691)</td>
<td>142.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Levy</td>
<td>$10,431,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,431,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Funding</td>
<td>$2,066,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,066,800</td>
<td>$1,873,761</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$1,684,100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,684,100</td>
<td>$167,974</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income From Investment</td>
<td>($4,284,500)</td>
<td>($865,500)</td>
<td>($5,150,000)</td>
<td>($1,304,798)</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation Revenue</td>
<td>($122,590,950)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($122,590,950)</td>
<td>($54,673,853)</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment in Lieu</td>
<td>($1,060,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($1,060,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Grants</td>
<td>($70,100)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($70,100)</td>
<td>($35,050)</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Allocations</td>
<td>($3,309,400)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($3,309,400)</td>
<td>$23,079</td>
<td>(0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Debt Finance</td>
<td>$2,673,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,673,600</td>
<td>$516,439</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Incentives</td>
<td>$4,715,700</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,715,700</td>
<td>$856,739</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Corporate Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>($110,656,750)</strong></td>
<td><strong>($865,500)</strong></td>
<td><strong>($111,522,250)</strong></td>
<td><strong>($53,874,400)</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Corporate Expenditures are forecasted to be in a surplus position of $865,500 from increased investment income. The continued elevated interest rates by Bank of Canada are driving the City’s overall investment income. Additional forecasts within this division that net to zero are:

- Gain on disposal for the sale of 0 Savage Drive for $325,000 and the sale of a portion of Lane Plan 522 for $100,000 transferred to the Capital Works Reserve Fund, previously approved through 23-070-OCM and 23-072-OCM, respectively; and
- Additional Hydro Dividend of $519,161 offset by a forecasted contribution to the Hydro Dividend Reserve Fund.

### Idea Exchange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Total Restated Budget</th>
<th>April Forecast Changes</th>
<th>Revised Forecast</th>
<th>YTD Actuals as at April 30th</th>
<th>% Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idea Exchange</td>
<td>$8,601,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,601,200</td>
<td>$3,449,939</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Idea Exchange</td>
<td>$8,601,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,601,200</td>
<td>$3,449,939</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Library, operating as Idea Exchange, is projecting no surplus or deficit for this reporting period.

### Water Utility Variance

The following summary shows the variance between the annual Council approved budget and year to date actuals for each department, for water utility operations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Total Restated Budget</th>
<th>April Forecast Changes</th>
<th>Revised Forecast</th>
<th>YTD Actuals as at April 30th</th>
<th>% Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Expenses</td>
<td>$41,590,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$41,590,300</td>
<td>$7,012,167</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Revenues</td>
<td>($41,590,300)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($41,590,300)</td>
<td>($10,163,793)</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Water</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($3,151,626)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Expenses</td>
<td>$38,821,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$38,821,800</td>
<td>$7,512,436</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Revenues</td>
<td>($38,821,800)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($38,821,800)</td>
<td>($9,135,218)</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Wastewater</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($1,622,782)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total City of Cambridge Water Utility</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($4,774,408)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the April 2024 reporting period, the water utility operations are not projecting a surplus or deficit.
EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):
The Budget Control By-Law 152-14 identifies roles, responsibilities, and spending authorities for accountability around the City’s financial management. It also identifies reporting requirements to ensure both accountability and transparency around the City’s finances. Under the By-law, Council approval is required for the following operating spending deviations:

- Transfers between divisions exceeding the lesser of 10% or $100,000;
- Any net overall deficit within a department.

The Reserve Fund By-Law 2-17, as amended by By-law 19-144, and corporate policy COR-260.010 identify how tax-supported operating surpluses are to be treated.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
This report provides a comprehensive financial update on the City’s operations as of April 30, 2024, for both tax-supported and water utility operations.

The tax-supported operations are currently forecasting a surplus of $515,532 driven by increased investment income. Incorporated impacts are a reduction in lease revenue and additional costs for 1300 Bishop Street to house City staff, and additional costs in Clerks and Recreation and Culture. This variance may continue to be impacted by fluctuations in revenues and expenditures throughout the year, therefore this preliminary figure is not a certain indication of what may be expected as the year progresses. Any realized surplus/deficit at year-end it will be addressed according to the reserve fund by-law.

The water utility operations are not projecting a year end surplus or deficit for the reporting period.

Certain forecast changes result in impacts to reserve and reserve funds; these are reported in Appendix A.

Restatements
Changes in operations have resulted in restatements of the 2024 approved budget for comparative purposes. The changes reallocate certain costs and revenues between accounts and/or divisions and have no net effect on the total approved budget for 2024.

The restatement for 2024 is the restructure of minor facility work transferring from Recreation and Culture to Risk and Facilities for $258,200.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>In Year Changes</th>
<th>Total Restated Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor and Council</td>
<td>$1,334,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,334,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the City Manager</td>
<td>$3,103,700</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,103,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
<td>$51,344,750</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$51,344,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Enterprise</td>
<td>$7,132,500</td>
<td>$258,200</td>
<td>$7,390,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>$10,381,900</td>
<td>($258,200)</td>
<td>$10,123,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Services</td>
<td>$28,758,700</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$28,758,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Expenditures</td>
<td>($110,656,750)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($110,656,750)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea Exchange</td>
<td>$8,601,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,601,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Tax Supported</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUBLIC VALUE:**

**Sustainability and Transparency:**
This work supports the financial sustainability of the City by ensuring appropriate oversight and governance towards the City’s financial resources. It also provides transparency as to where public dollars are spent.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:**
Not Applicable

**PUBLIC INPUT:**
Posted publicly as part of the report process.

**INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:**
Staff delegated with budget responsibility have been consulted with respect to their budget variances in the writing of this report.

**CONCLUSION:**
The report provides a comprehensive financial update on the City’s operations as of April 30, 2024, for both the tax-supported and water utility operations. Tax-supported operations are currently forecasting a net year-end surplus of $515,532 for 2024 and the water utility operations is not projecting a year-end surplus or deficit.

**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. 24-030-CRS Appendix A – Impacts to Reserve and Reserve Funds
### Equipment Reserve Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Balance as of April 30, 2024</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease) to Reserve Fund</th>
<th>Revised Balance Following Forecast Changes</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,620,236</td>
<td>($82,848)</td>
<td>$2,537,388</td>
<td>Draw on reserve to offset additional expenses encountered due to a need to perform critical work that wasn't anticipated and to offset the purchase of the Fire Prevention Vehicle that was delayed from 2023 due to supply-chain issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hydro Dividend Stabilization Reserve Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Balance as of April 30, 2024</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease) to Reserve Fund</th>
<th>Revised Balance Following Forecast Changes</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,748,428</td>
<td>$519,161</td>
<td>$3,267,589</td>
<td>The dividends received form Energy+/GrandBridge Energy were above the amount budgeted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: COUNCIL
Meeting Date: 6/25/2024
Subject: Request to Amend Development Covenants and Restrictions
Submitted By: Michael Launslager, Director Economic Development
Prepared By: Laura Pearce, Senior Economic Development Officer
Report No.: 24-004-CRE
File No.: C1101
Wards Affected: Ward 1

RECOMMENDATION(S):
THAT report 24-004(CRE), re: Request to Amend Development Covenants and Restrictions be received;

AND THAT Council authorize the Mayor and Clerk to execute documentation to amend the Development Covenants and Restrictions to allow for a one (1) year extension to the construction start date AND a one (1) year extension to the substantial completion date, without penalties, to be granted to 50 Goddard Crescent, subject to the satisfaction of the City Solicitor.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

- A request for Council to approve an additional extension to the start of construction dates and substantial completion dates for 50 Goddard Crescent within the Boxwood Business Campus to provide additional time for the proponent to complete site planning activities for the consolidation of their operations.

Key Findings

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

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

- Due to the various economic impacts and material shortages due to COVID-19, industrial development was delayed within the prescribed timelines for several properties within Boxwood. As part of the City of Cambridge’s Economic Response Plan, Staff proposed an additional one (1) year extension as noted above to allow eligible businesses time to procure materials while continuing on with their respective developments in Boxwood which was subsequently approved by way of reports 21-326-CRE and 23-032-CRE.

- The subject property current permit date requirement is December 6, 2024 with completion and occupancy by December 6, 2025. This extension request has been made prior to the property being in default and the request is to allow additional time to plan for the consolidation of their Toronto based operations to Cambridge, which was not part of their original plan when acquiring the property.

Financial Implications

Registration costs to amend the development covenants is $83.11 inclusive of tax. This cost will be funded by the City from the Economic Development budget.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action

Objective(s): Not Applicable

Strategic Action: Not Applicable

OR

☒ Core Service

Program: Business Attraction & Retention

Core Service: Business Atraction & Retention

The development of the Boxwood Business Campus supported the City’s objective to assist with the creation of high quality and diverse employment opportunities. Providing latitude with an additional one-year extension for the time of development will assist this
company and provide the necessary additional time for them to plan the new operational layout of their building.

BACKGROUND:
In 2021 and 2023, Council approved an extension to the start of construction dates and substantial completion dates for the remaining eligible developments within the Boxwood Business Campus by one year respectively due to the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The recommendation from staff is to allow for an additional one (1) year extension to the start of construction date AND an additional one (1) year extension to the substantial completion date, without penalties, to be granted to 50 Goddard Crescent to allow time to plan for this new consideration of consolidated operations in Cambridge.

ANALYSIS:
The COVID-19 pandemic created economic uncertainty and a financial strain on the City, its residents, and its businesses. Additionally, developers experienced delays in the development process due to the previous mandated Provincial shutdown and more material shortages. Those delays lengthened the time necessary for the development of the industrial facilities in Boxwood. As such, Council approved extensions to development covenants without penalties by way of reports 21-326-CRE and 23-032-CRE.

At the time of 21-326-CRE, the subject property had not yet been conveyed and was still in the City’s ownership however it was included in this report as it was anticipated that material shortages will be ongoing for some time.

In consideration of the property owner looking to merge all business operations in Cambridge, and therefore increasing employment and possibly the square footage of the building, Staff recommend assisting the proponent with additional time through the request of an additional one (1) year extension for the time of development, without penalty.

It is recommended that no additional extensions be provided to this subject property and should future extension requests be received, the City may consider exercising its right to charge penalties or reacquire the property as per the Development Covenants.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):
Timing of development and penalties are regulated as per the respective Development Covenants and Restrictions registered on title on the subject properties.
FINANCIAL IMPACT:
Registration costs to amend the development covenants is $83.11 inclusive of tax. This cost will be funded by the City from the Economic Development budget.

PUBLIC VALUE:

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

ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:
Not Applicable

PUBLIC INPUT:
Posted publicly as part of the report process.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:
Legal and Financial Services has been consulted on this report.

CONCLUSION:
Staff recommends that an additional one (1) year extension to the construction start date and substantial completion date be granted without penalties to 50 Goddard Crescent, as outlined in this report.

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. 24-004-CRE Appendix A – Location Map
To: COUNCIL  
Meeting Date: 6/25/2024  
Subject: Capital Status and Forecast – April 2024  
Submitted By: Yogesh Shah, Deputy City Manager Infrastructure Services; and Sheryl Ayres, Chief Financial Officer  
Prepared By: Mary Kennedy, Project Management Office Analyst; and Victoria Terella, Manager of Financial Planning  
Report No.: 24-007-IFS  
File No.: C11  
Wards Affected: All Wards  

RECOMMENDATION(S):  
THAT Report 24-007-IFS Capital Projects Status and Forecast – April 2024 be received;  
AND THAT the closure of capital projects as identified in Appendix A and Appendix B of Report 24-007-IFS be approved;  
AND THAT the cancellation of capital projects as identified in Appendix C of Report 24-007-IFS be approved;  
AND THAT the capital forecast changes requiring approval under the Budget Control By-law as identified in Appendix D of Report 24-007-IFS be approved;  
AND THAT transfers to and from reserve and reserve funds as identified in Appendix G of Report 24-007-IFS be approved;  
AND FURTHER THAT the by-law to amend debenture By-law #21-065a, as amended, included as Appendix I of Report 24-007-IFS, be passed.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

- To inform Council of the status and performance of the capital portfolio through April 30, 2024, including the status of key projects.
- As per the City’s Budget Control By-law, Council is to be provided updates related to capital forecast and status twice a year.

Key Findings

As of April 30, 2024, there are 295 open projects. This includes:

- Two hundred twenty-three active projects underway (Approved, In Progress, Delayed);
- Forty projects where work is substantially complete (In Maintenance, Project work complete);
- Twenty-nine projects ready for closure; and
- Three projects to be cancelled.

Through the years 2020-2024 the City of Cambridge has approved a total of 405 capital projects with an original investment of $499 million to maintain existing infrastructure and build new infrastructure. This figure includes the $102.3 million for Recreation Complex Construction approved in the 2024 budget. Based on the current forecast as of April 30, 2024, the estimated cost to implement these capital projects has increased by 4.0% for a revised total cost of $447 million.

Financial Implications

The impact of all forecast changes as of April 30, 2024, result in a net decrease in funding requirement totalling $2,122,069. The components of this impact are summarized below.
Reserves

The forecast changes result in a net return to reserve funds of $507,365 as follows:

Table 1: Net Reserve Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects to be closed</td>
<td>$1,050,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancelled projects</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast changes (Council approval required)</td>
<td>($942,435)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast changes (Council approval not required/already approved)</td>
<td>($451,148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Return of Reserves</td>
<td>$507,365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debentures

- $1,360,248 decrease in tax funded debentures as per Council report 24-019-CRS on May 14, 2024, which approved the transfer of $1,360,248 of the 2023 Year End Surplus through the Capital Works Reserve Fund to decrease the tax-supported debt needs on the Preston Auditorium Expansion Construction;

- $293,396 decrease in growth funded debentures due to reduced need for East Side Lands Interim Pumping Station Construction; and

- Increase required to By-law 21-065a of $1,454,020 resulting from previous Council-approved forecast changes for project A/00420-40 Preston Auditorium Construction.

External Funding

- $161,060 reduced external funding driven by reduction in funding from the Region for Blenheim Road Reconstruction, removal of funding from the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) for the Riverside Park Sports Netting partially offset by increased contribution from Conestoga College for Fountain Street Soccer Facility Construction; and

- Additional grant funding in the amount of $200,000 for the Carbon Reduction Strategy from the Green Municipal Fund’s Community Building Retrofit Initiative as announced on March 25, 2024.
STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action

Objective(s): Not Applicable

Strategic Action: Not Applicable

OR

☒ Core Service

Program: Project Management Services

Core Service: Project Management Governance and Leadership

Regular status reports provide an update on capital project status to Council and the community. This update is in addition to the project specific communication being provided to Council by various project managers through the project life cycle.

BACKGROUND:

The purpose of the capital investment program is to replace and maintain existing infrastructure and build new infrastructure required to support growth and intensification. Infrastructure built and maintained through the capital investment program supports and improves existing services provided by the City. Each year Council provides approval to fund a portfolio of projects and reviews a nine-year forecast for future projects.

It is the mandate of the Project Management Office (PMO) to keep Cambridge’s management team and the project management community informed. This is achieved by providing a variety of regular updates ranging from monthly status of projects to an annual report on the organization’s progress at institutionalizing project management. Further, the PMO seeks to deliver successful capital projects by providing project management mentoring and coaching, and oversight for capital projects.

To enable project managers to operate efficiently and effectively while remaining accountable and transparent, the Budget Control By-Law (By-Law 152-14) identifies policies pertaining to budget control, including the requirement for status and forecast change updates to Council.
ANALYSIS:

Project Changes

**Hespeler Trail (A/00002-30) – Scope Change**

The City is in the design phase of a new trail between Queen Street West and the Speed River. The trail will connect downtown Hespeler to the Winston Boulevard area, future developments and the proposed Hespeler Pedestrian bridge which connects to the Mill Run Trail on the north side of the river.

Through the 30% design, property constraints were identified, and the design consultant is now conducting a feasibility study that will review a realignment of the trail to address these constraints. The feasibility study is a project scope change that requires further detailed design to be placed on hold. The realignment feasibility study is scheduled to be completed in late September and will guide the remaining design of the project, which will be budgeted and scheduled for completion in 2025.

**Beverly Street Underpass Construction (A/01043-41) – Budget Change**

The Beverly Street Reconstruction and Pedestrian Underpass project is underway. The nature of the work, in particular mandatory consultation and coordination with CP Rail, carries a higher risk of financial over runs and schedule delays than a typical road reconstruction project. The greatest uncertainty, and therefore likelihood of change orders, is normally encountered early on in a project. While minimal change orders have officially been received by the City project manager at the time of report writing the team is aware of several items that may result in change orders. These include: a conflict with Telus fibre optic line and bedrock that is more than 1 m higher than shown in two separate geotechnical investigation reports during the design phase.

At this time, the project team is seeking a top up of contingency funds to 10% of the project value. The current project contingency is $814,401 or 7% of the project value. Adding $331,565 brings the contingency to 10% of the project value. Project contingency in the range of 5-10% of a project is typical for construction projects, for a project with this risk profile a 10% contingency is appropriate. The full project contingency will be $1,145,966. Increasing the contingency at this time will allow the project team to respond quickly to unexpected conditions as they arise in the field. Key project milestones will be reached in June that will decrease uncertainty, and the project team will monitor the overall contract and contingency values. Unused contingency will be returned to the appropriate Reserve Funds.
Myers Road Phase 1 (A/00678-42 Region Project) – Budget Change

The Region of Waterloo has tendered reconstruction of Myers Road from Branchton Road to Franklin Boulevard (Phase 1). The City will benefit from the Region completing work on our behalf with this reconstruction project, including installation of pedestrian crossings, and construction of a ramp from California Road to Myers Road. The tender values came back over budget for the City’s portion of work, and a forecast change to increase the project budget by $248,000 to $1,268,000 is included in this report (see Appendix D).

Portfolio Disruptors

Technology Services

To mitigate the risk of cyber security attacks (in particular ransomware attacks) it is advisable to move software applications fully to the cloud. The City had plans to move fully to the cloud over a five-year period, which will be accelerated to a two-year phase in.

Expediting the move will require a significant level of effort and will disrupt existing projects and planned work. These changes will be outlined in a program summary and addressed through the 2025 Capital Investment Plan.

Housing Accelerator Fund Projects

The City was successful in a proposal for Provincial funding under the Housing Accelerator Funding Program. Several projects were identified to streamline City planning processes and to support and facilitate the development of more homes in Cambridge. The Planning team is working on a program charter and governance structure to ensure efficient delivery of these projects. There will be implications for the existing funded policy planning projects and one technology project. More information will be communicated to Council about this program, governance structure, and project objectives in the coming months.

Status of Key Projects – as of May 2024

Decommissioning of Arenas

On June 18, 2019, Council approved decommissioning of ice facilities at Karl Homuth Arena upon completion of Preston Auditorium Improvement and Expansion to a twin-pad arena. Council also approved the decommissioning of Dickson and Duncan McIntosh arenas upon successful completion of Cambridge Sports Park improvement and expansion to a quad-pad arena.
Through annual inspection and condition assessment of these ice facilities, it has been found that ice making components at Karl Homuth Arena require an expenditure of $95,000 for continued operation for another season. Staff proposes that the Karl Homuth Arena be closed for the upcoming season.

It is proposed that Dickson Arenas be kept open for another season in lieu of lost ice at Karl Homuth Arena, and that Duncan McIntosh Arena be kept open until the Preston Auditorium Expansion and Improvement is complete.

Recreation Complex Construction (A/00463-41)

On May 14, 2024, three shortlisted General Contracting firms were invited to prepare and submit bids on the Recreation Complex construction scope, the tender period is currently underway. Construction is expected to kick off late summer.

Progress continues with the Waterloo Region District School Board (WRDSB), Waterloo Catholic District School Board (WCDSB) and Idea Exchange coordinating joint-use agreements between the project partners.

Preston Auditorium Expansion Construction (A/00420-40)

The construction phase of work began in December 2023, with significant work completed to date. The project remains on target for fall 2025 arena operation.

This project was approved for debt financing at budget creation, but subsequently required additional funding which Council has approved through separate staff reports and forecasting. In order for the Region of Waterloo to issue this increased amount of debt on the City’s behalf, the originating By-law must be amended.

The overall increase required to debenture By-law 21-065a is $1,454,020. This is a result from Council-approved forecast changes for project A/00420-40 Preston Auditorium Construction via Council report 21-144-CRS Cambridge Preston Arena Renovation and Addition on November 28, 2023, offset by $1,360,248 allocated from the 2023 Year End Surplus as approved by Council on May 14, 2024.
Debt By-law 21-065a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Current Debt Funding</th>
<th>Revised Debt Funding</th>
<th>Increase/ (Decrease)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00431-42 North Cambridge Railway Grade Separation</td>
<td>$10,115,500</td>
<td>$10,115,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00420-40 Preston Auditorium Construction</td>
<td>$26,211,000</td>
<td>$28,015,020</td>
<td>$1,804,020</td>
<td>21-144-CRS Nov 28, 2023 24-019-CRS May 14, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00471-40 Fountain Street Soccer Facility Construction</td>
<td>$9,806,595</td>
<td>$9,806,595</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00481-30 North-South Collector Road Design (Allendale to Middle Block Road)</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($350,000)</td>
<td>23-028-IFS Jun 27, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$46,483,095</strong></td>
<td><strong>$47,937,115</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,454,020</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fountain Street Soccer Facility Construction (A/00471-40)**

Facility construction is now completed. Soccer play began on the synthetic turf fields in April, and on the natural fields in May. The official Grand Opening took place on June 15, 2024, and was well attended by the community with positive feedback. The sponsorship and community donation campaign continues.

**2024 Road and underground infrastructure construction**

Construction is underway on five City streets. Watermain Lining on Holiday Inn Drive, Sanitary Sewer Lining (Citywide) and Asphalt Renewal program (Citywide) are also underway. Dickson Street Storm Rehabilitation, Storm Pond Rehabilitation (20 Lyndsay Road), Glendale Place and Ash Street reconstruction have all been awarded and construction is planned to start summer 2024.

Up to date information about project scope, construction schedule, current status and contact information for respective projects can be found on the Current Projects website at: www.cambridge.ca/construction.
**Dunbar Road, Phase 2 Multi-use Trail**

Construction of a new multi-use trail along the south side of Dunbar Road between Industrial Road and Hespeler Road took place in April and May of 2024. The project is now complete and in maintenance. Work included; the narrowing of Dunbar Road, relocation of storm catch basins, construction of new driveway aprons, landscaping, signs and markings. This new section completes the full length of multi-use trail, extending from Concession Road to Hespeler Road. This is an important east/west active transportation route through the centre of the City connecting the Preston area to Hespeler Road.

**Sidewalk Infill Design**

The 30% design has been completed for new sidewalks on Edward Street between Jardine Street and Strathcona Street and Preston Parkway between Woods Lane and Fountain Street South. An in person Public Information Centre was held on May 1st and on-line consultation was held from May 2nd to 16th. Comments received from the public engagement will be reviewed and considered in preparation of the final design stages. Final designs of both projects are anticipated to be completed late June 2024. Construction is scheduled for early fall 2024.

**Parks**

Stirling MacGregor Park and Sault Park playground replacements have been tendered under budget. Equipment is being ordered for a fall or spring installation depending on equipment arrival schedule.

Design bids for the Accessible Baseball Diamond have been received, and the project team is moving to award the contract.

**Energy Assessment – Carbon Reduction Strategy (A/01230-20)**

Grant funding was obtained from the Green Municipal Fund’s Community Building Retrofit program in the amount of $200,000 to support the Energy Assessment and Carbon Reduction Strategy project. The work is aimed at developing an actionable plan to reduce the City’s GHG emissions to help it meet its stated targets. Work is currently underway at the pilot site (Hespeler Memorial Arena) to evaluate opportunities to reduce GHG emissions. A further nine City facilities will be evaluated throughout the remainder of 2024.
Facilities

Heritage restoration work planned for 2024 includes:

- Farmer’s Market Building and Hespeler Town Centre heritage restoration design (A/00553-30) is in early procurement stages. The design work will establish specifications for brick wall repointing, stone base, cast stones and damaged brick replacements, window restoration, painting of cast stones, sills, columns, wood door, and new concrete stairs with railings. Follow-on construction projects for both projects are included in the Capital forecast.

- Community Theatre Restoration work (A/00460-40) is planned for the summer of 2024. The scope of work includes heritage brick replacement and repointing along the south elevation primarily along grade within the courtyard area improving the visual façade appearance. Separate pricing items for added wood window frame restoration and additional brick replacement and repointing will be considered if the budget allows.

- Landreth Cottage will also see restoration work occur in summer of 2024 (A/01474-40). The scope of work will include heritage stone repointing along the east and south elevation of the main portion of the house and north chimney with new added lead coated copper flashings. All windows on the west elevation will be restored and preserved. Separate pricing items for repointing all other stone elevations will be considered if the budget allows.

A consultant has been hired to produce the architectural and electrical drawings for tender of four new door sets (an exterior and interior vestibule door set on either side of the building) at Galt Arena. Push-button access will be implemented as a new feature when the doors are replaced, improving accessibility to the building from both arena parking lots. Construction is expected to be completed in late summer 2024.

Roof replacements and/or refurbishment projects at Fire Station 1, Allan Reuter Centre, and Preston Scout House have been tendered; all tenders came within budget. Work will be completed in the spring/summer of 2024.

Renovations at Dickson Stadium and Riverside Park Stadium are expected to be fully complete by the end of June.
Portfolio Status – April 30, 2024

As of April 30, 2024, there are 295 open projects. This includes:

- Two hundred twenty-three active projects underway (Approved, In Progress, Delayed);
- Forty projects where work is substantially complete (In Maintenance, Project work complete);
- Twenty-nine projects ready for closure; and
- Three projects to be cancelled.

The open portfolio includes two projects that were reported as ready for closure in December of 2023, and which have been re-opened because of late financial charges. One of the projects is being closed again with this report, the other will remain open for further financial reconciliation.

Appendix H: Capital Project Status Report provides detailed information for all active and substantially complete projects. Note: The Plan Cost in Appendix H do not reflect forecast changes from December 2023, the changes were approved by Council after April 30, 2024. That said, the December 2023 forecast changes have been included in the analysis included in the Budget Summary, Budget Comparison and Financial Analysis sections below.

Budget Summary (2020-2024)

Since 2020, the City of Cambridge has approved $430.3 million for community investments to maintain existing infrastructure and build new infrastructure. This includes capital projects approved during the annual capital budget process, as well as supplementary projects approved throughout the year, for a total of 482 capital projects approved over five years. Infrastructure built and maintained through the capital program supports and improves services provided by the City. Total approved capital projects by budget year are 72, 63, 91, 92, and 87 for the budget years 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024 respectively.

Budget Comparison

The following chart (Figure 1) illustrates approval year, original budget and current forecast budget including the forecast changes proposed in this report. Based on the current forecast (as of April 30, 2024) the estimated cost to implement the approved 2020 - 2024 capital program is $447.4 million. This current forecast is 4.0% higher than the original approved budget. By approval year, the current plan cost is 1.2% more,
34.0% more, 5.1% less, 2.1% more, and 1.8% less than original approved budgets for 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024 respectively.

The significant differential in 2021 original budget versus current plan cost, can primarily be attributed to the increased scope of work for the Preston Auditorium Improvement and Expansion project. The lower forecast for 2022 projects can be attributed to several development and infrastructure engineering projects being completed under budget. Estimating budgets for construction projects was difficult through the pandemic, therefore it is not surprising to see swings in planned versus actual costs for these types of projects.

Guidelines suggest that a variance of within +/- 5% of the approved budget is an indication of efficient project planning process including scope, schedule, and budget management.

As illustrated in the chart below (Figure 2), according to the current forecast 56%, 51%, 68%, 77%, and 94% of projects are expected to be completed within the original approved budget for the approval years 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024 respectively. It is customary that as projects linger open the financial performance degrades, as a result it is not surprising to see the early years showing lower per cent to complete in budget numbers.
Ready for Financial Close

There are twenty-nine projects to be closed during this reporting period. For these projects:

- A combined net savings of $1,489,789 is being realized. In many cases, construction efficiencies and savings realized for provisional items and contingency allowed for the projects to be completed under budget.

- Six projects require Council approval to draw additional funds from reserve funds under the Budget Control By-Law and are reported in Appendix A. None of these projects exceed the less of 10% or $250,000 in additional funding.

- Twenty-three projects were completed below previous forecasted amount for all funding sources and are reported in Appendix B.

Projects to be Cancelled

There are three projects to be cancelled in this reporting period, with savings of $850,000 as reported in Appendix C.

- Project A/00465-10 Land Acquisition – Confidential was originally planned to purchase lands to support the development of a connector trail in the North Boxwood trail development area. At present, the landowners (the Province and a private company) are not interested in selling and may welcome a land lease to
support this use. City staff will continue to pursue a lease agreement for the trail connection which would be funded through the operating budget. There are related future trail construction projects included in the 2024 Capital Investment Plan, these projects will be prioritized and evaluated through the 2025 Budget process.

- Project A/00757-30 Highway 24 Pump Station Assessment and Design is to be cancelled as a staff led assessment has confirmed that the pump station cannot be decommissioned, and infrastructure renewal is required. A future project will be included in the 2025 Capital Investment Plan to replace aging components in the pump station.

- Project A/01387-20 Alternative Transportation Strategy was delayed to 2025 because of competing planning priorities and staff availability. As the regulatory environment for planning projects continues to evolve, it is recommended that this project be cancelled and re-budgeted in a future year if and when appropriate.

Cancellation of projects is a natural and important part of project portfolio management. It is the responsibility of the Project Manager to identify when environmental conditions, project expectations, or resource availability has changed substantially on a project. The Project Management Office then works with the Project Manager and leadership team to determine if a project change or full project cancellation is appropriate. A key to this analysis is reviewing the intended value and outcomes of the project, and if they are still relevant and important for the organization.

**Forecast Changes Requiring Approval**

Under the Budget Control By-law 152-14, if the project is anticipated to have an overage exceeding the lesser of 10% or $250,000 the additional spending requires Council approval. Additionally, if funds are required to be drawn from a reserve or reserve fund this requires Council approval.

There are eighteen forecast changes for this reporting period that require approval due to the need for additional funding from reserves or change in funding sources resulting in a draw from reserves. The net overall additional funding request is $704,435 and is reported in Appendix D.
Of note the following projects have an overage that exceeds the lesser of 10% or $250,000 in additional funding:

- Project A/01043-41 Beverly Street Reconstruction and Pedestrian Underpass is requesting an additional $331,565 or 3% increase, as noted above, to maintain a 10% contingency on all project components to reflect the complex nature of this project and Railway's requirements and timelines.

- Project A/00678-42 Region – Myers Road – Phase 1 is requesting an additional $248,000 or 24% increase, as previously noted, to reflect the additional costs for the City's portion of this project as confirmed by the Region after tendering.

- Project A/01063-40 Customer Relationship Management Implementation is requesting $78,884 or 53% increase to combine project A/00365-40 Customer Portal & Phone System due to similar scope. Therefore, request to draw $78,884 Capital Works RF that were returned though closure of A/00365-40.

- Project A/00595-10 Library Computer Equipment (2024) is requesting an additional $60,000 or 12% increase as it is anticipated that this project will be over budget. It is requested that $60,000 be transferred from project A/00565-10 Library Computer Equipment (2023).

**Forecast Changes Not Requiring Approval**

During this reporting period, there were thirteen forecast changes made within the limits of staff delegated authority under the Budget Control By-law. These are reported for information only and do not require Council approval. The forecast changes not requiring approval are forecasting a decrease in funding of $2,707,011 and are reported in Appendix E.

Additionally, during the reporting period, seven forecast changes were made through separate reports to Council. These are included in this report for information only, in support of financial transparency, by consolidating all forecast change impacts to reserve funds during the reporting period. The forecast changes previously approved by Council are forecasting an increase in funding of $1,982,296 and are reported in Appendix F.

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

The Budget Control By-law 152-14 provides necessary guidelines to ensure accountability and controls for the financial management of the City. The By-law includes capital budget financial controls.
By-law 21-065a authorizes the issuance of debentures for North Cambridge Railway Grade Separation, Preston Auditorium Construction, and Fountain Street Soccer projects.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

The forecast changes as reported in the analysis above result in transfers to and from reserve and reserve funds as well as changes to other sources of funding such as debentures and external recoveries. The funding impacts of the forecast changes result in an overall net decrease of $2,122,069 of required funding, as follows and summarized in Table 2 below:

- Net return of $507,365 to various reserve and reserve funds as shown in Appendix G;
- Decrease of $161,060 in external funding driven by a reduction in funding from the Region for Blenheim Road Reconstruction and from the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) for the Riverside Park Sports Netting partially offset by increased contribution from Conestoga College for Fountain Street Soccer Facility Construction;
- $1,360,248 decreased requirement for debenture as $1,360,248 of the 2023 Year End Surplus was transferred through the Capital Works RF to Preston Auditorium Expansion Construction to decrease the tax-supported debt needs as approved through report 24-019-CRS on May 14, 2024;
- Decreased growth funded debt requirement of $293,396 for the East Side Lands Interim Pumping Station Construction; and
- Additional grant funding in the amount of $200,000, attributed to the Carbon Reduction Strategy from the Green Municipal Fund’s Community Building Retrofit as announced on March 25, 2024.

**Table 2: Summary of Net Forecast Changes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Return of Reserves</td>
<td>$507,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in External Funding</td>
<td>$161,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in Tax-Supported Debt</td>
<td>$1,360,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in Growth-Funded Debt</td>
<td>$293,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Grant Funding</td>
<td>($200,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Forecast Deficit</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,122,069</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC VALUE:
To ensure transparency, regular updates on the capital investment program are provided to Council. Live capital project status information is available on the Current Projects web page, and project specific web pages are available for key projects.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:
Advisory Committees Consulted: Not applicable.

PUBLIC INPUT:
Posted publicly as part of the report process.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:
This report is prepared using information provided by respective project managers through the project management software. The PMO Analyst and Senior Financial Analysts meet regularly with project managers to review the status of their projects and to provide mentoring and coaching.

The PMO provides the Capital Project Status Report to the members of the Corporate Leadership Team and Senior Management Team monthly.

CONCLUSION:
This report provides a summary of the capital portfolio performance through April 30, 2024. After closing twenty-nine projects and cancelling three projects the current capital project portfolio includes 263 ongoing projects. Forecast changes are reported in accordance with the Budget Control By-law, and result in transfers to and from reserve funds as well as changes to other sources of funding such as debenture and external recoveries.

In order for the Region of Waterloo to issue an increased amount of debt on the City’s behalf, the originating By-law must be amended. The overall increase required to debenture By-law 21-065a is $1,454,020.

REPORT IMPACTS:
Agreement: No
By-law: Yes
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. 24-007-IFS Appendix A – Project Closures Requiring Council Approval to Draw Additional Funds
2. 24-007-IFS Appendix B – Project Closures Requiring Council Approval Completed Below Previous Forecast
3. 24-007-IFS Appendix C – Cancelled Projects Requiring Council Approval
4. 24-007-IFS Appendix D – Forecast Changes Requiring Council Approval
5. 24-007-IFS Appendix E – Forecast Changes Not Requiring Approval
6. 24-007-IFS Appendix F – Previously Reported to Council
7. 24-007-IFS Appendix G – Impact to Capital Reserve Funds
8. 24-007-IFS Appendix H – Capital Project Status Report
9. 24-007-IFS Appendix I – Draft Amending By-law to By-law 21-065a, as amended
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Previous Forecast</th>
<th>Actual Cost to April 2024</th>
<th>Over / (Under)</th>
<th>Funding Source / Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00178-40 Riverside Park - Sports Netting (16K016)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>142,449</td>
<td>142,449</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Draw $142,449 from Capital Works RF. Funding source originally budgeted as Contribution from Others with the intention of recovering costs from the MTO however MTO will not be reimbursing costs therefore the funding source has been changed to Capital Works RF to close the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00444-30 INFRASTRUCTURE DESIGN (20C013)</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>509,952</td>
<td>9,952</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Draw $2,986 from Capital Works RF, $3,483 from Wastewater Capital RF and $3,483 from Water Capital RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00679-30 Blenheim Road Design</td>
<td>1,051,600</td>
<td>274,800</td>
<td>275,661</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Draw $861 from DC-Roadways RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00802-30 cityONE (SAP) 5 Yr Assessment And Plan</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>501,281</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Draw $1,281 from Capital Works RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00922-10 IT Security Enhancements (2020)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,794</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Draw $794 from Capital Works RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00924-40 Microsoft Office 365 Migration</td>
<td>575,000</td>
<td>225,972</td>
<td>227,127</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>Previously closed project with new transactions. Draw $1,155 from Capital Works RF. Small overage due to reversal of pre-paids from 2023.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,043</td>
<td>Overspending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Closures Requiring Council Approval Completed Below Previous Forecast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Previous Forecast</th>
<th>Actual Cost to April 2024</th>
<th>Over / (Under)</th>
<th>Funding Source / Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00263-10 Sanitary Sewer Easement Acquisition (16Y010)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>21,130</td>
<td>(278,870)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Return $185,913 to Wastewater Capital RF and $92,957 to Water Capital RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00329-20 18D004 Enterprise Risk Management (18D004)</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>28,792</td>
<td>(46,208)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Return $46,208 to Capital Works Committed RF. The remaining scope of work will be considered for future funding a part of comprehensive plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00347-10 18F071 Disaster Recovery Site Enhance (18F071)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>81,227</td>
<td>(68,773)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Return $68,773 to Capital Works RF. Completed work with internal staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00365-40 18G017 Customer Portal &amp; Phone System (18G017)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>21,116</td>
<td>(78,884)</td>
<td>Request to close this project and combine project with A/01063-40, due to similar scope/work plan. Return $78,884 to Capital Works RF and then draw same amount to be applied to A/01063-40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00425-40 Cemetery Improvements (19M002)</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>438,122</td>
<td>403,687</td>
<td>(34,435)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Return $34,435 to the Cemetery Improvement RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00433-40 East Side Lands 3401 Stage1 Lands Interim Pumping Station - Construction (19S010)</td>
<td>3,978,000</td>
<td>3,978,000</td>
<td>3,557,866</td>
<td>(420,134)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Return $126,738 to DC Wastewater RF and reallocate $293,396 to another growth debt funded project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00484-40 Cam West Princess St Storm Sewer Outlet</td>
<td>810,000</td>
<td>817,500</td>
<td>815,534</td>
<td>(1,966)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Return $1,966 to DC Stormwater RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00521-40 Newland Pool Repairs</td>
<td>462,600</td>
<td>1,357,971</td>
<td>1,356,691</td>
<td>(1,280)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Return $677 to Capital Works RF and $603 to Facility Maintenance RF.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project Closures Requiring Council Approval Completed Below Previous Forecast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Previous Forecast</th>
<th>Actual Cost to April 2024</th>
<th>Over / (Under)</th>
<th>Funding Source / Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00533-40 Parklawn Columbarium - Phase 1, Part 1</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>50,510</td>
<td>35,980</td>
<td>(14,530)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Return $14,530 to Columbarium RF. There were inscriptions originally planned for the top caps of the mausoleum structure, but it has been decided to hold off on the inscriptions for now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00547-40 Server &amp; Infrastructure Life Cycling</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>199,902</td>
<td>(98)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Return $98 to Capital Works RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00548-40 Storage Systems Life Cycling</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>199,901</td>
<td>(99)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Return $99 to Capital Works RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00615-40 Playground Replacement - Angewood Park</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>117,595</td>
<td>(14,405)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Return $14,405 to Canada Community Benefit Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00676-40 Railway Improvements</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>102,084</td>
<td>(197,916)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Return $197,916 to Capital Works RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00698-41 Fire Station 4 Renovation</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>96,178</td>
<td>84,081</td>
<td>(12,097)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Return $12,097 to Capital Works RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00910-20 Blair/Preston Pedestrian Bridge - EA</td>
<td>179,052</td>
<td>250,831</td>
<td>247,835</td>
<td>(2,996)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Project funded by external funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00959-40 Riverside Skateboard Park</td>
<td>126,200</td>
<td>95,105</td>
<td>84,234</td>
<td>(10,871)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Return $10,871 to Canada Community Benefit Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01265-10 Cambridge Sports Park Expansion</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Return $200,000 to the Capital Works RF. Given the delay in the opening of the Cambridge Sports Park the building permit fees are not being returned as per the agreement with Buckingham Sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Original Budget</td>
<td>Previous Forecast</td>
<td>Actual Cost to April 2024</td>
<td>Over / (Under)</td>
<td>Funding Source / Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01275-30 Soper Park - Amenity Replacement Design</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>177,337</td>
<td>164,785</td>
<td>(12,552)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Return $12,552 to Capital Works RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01391-40 Gymnasium Building Demolition</td>
<td>522,300</td>
<td>88,734</td>
<td>49,063</td>
<td>(39,671)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Return $39,671 to DC Park and Recreation RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01392-40 1400 Hamilton Street Building Demolition</td>
<td>332,600</td>
<td>77,260</td>
<td>49,920</td>
<td>(27,340)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Return $27,340 to Park and Recreation RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01408-10 Auto Extrication Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>50,427</td>
<td>(1,573)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Return $1,573 from Capital Works RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01428-20 Asset Retirement Obligations Reporting (2022)</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>76,218</td>
<td>(3,782)</td>
<td>April 2024 project closure. Return $3,782 to Capital Works RF.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                                                |                 |                   |                           | (1,503,832)    | Underspending                                                                            |
## Cancelled Projects Requiring Council Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Previous Forecast</th>
<th>Actual Cost to April 2024</th>
<th>Over / (Under)</th>
<th>Funding Source / Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00465-10 Land Acquisition - Confidential</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(650,000)</td>
<td>April 2024 forecast change to cancel project. The land purchase was not realized. Return funding of $650,000 to Parkland Cash in Lieu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00757-30 Hwy 24 Pump Station Assess and Design</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(80,000)</td>
<td>April 2024 project cancellation. Return $80,000 to Wastewater Capital RF. Assessment work was completed by internal staff. Work that was intended will be captured in a future capital project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01387-20 Alternative Transportation Strategy</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(120,000)</td>
<td>April 2024 forecast change to cancel project. Return $12,000 to Capital Works RF and $108,000 to DC Roadways RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(850,000)</td>
<td>Funding Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Original Budget</td>
<td>Previous Forecast</td>
<td>Actual Cost to April 2024</td>
<td>Forecast Increase / (Decrease)</td>
<td>Funding Source / Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00595-10 Library Computer Equipment (2024)</td>
<td>503,000</td>
<td>503,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>At the April 2024 forecast, it was anticipated that this project will be over budget. It is requested that $60,000 be transferred from project A/00565-10 to A/00595-10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00677-40 Parking Lot Renewal - Library Queen Sq Lot</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>178,949</td>
<td>190,681</td>
<td>14,185</td>
<td>Draw $14,185 from Capital Works RF. Project not yet closing will remain in Maintenance until September.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00678-42 Region - Myers Road - Phase 1</td>
<td>1,020,000</td>
<td>1,020,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>248,000</td>
<td>Draw $248,000 from Capital Works RF. The region has tendered for this project and the City's portion requires additional funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00698-40 City Hall – Curtain Wall &amp; Parapet Flashing - Construction</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,271</td>
<td>Draw $10,271 from Facility Maintenance RF. Construction cost are anticipated to be overbudget as of April/24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00739-20 Galt Core Heritage Conservation District Study (2020)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>106,991</td>
<td>112,949</td>
<td>5,958</td>
<td>Draw $5,958 from the Capital Works RF. The PM investigated more options for Council’s consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00892-10 Equipment Growth (2022)</td>
<td>614,600</td>
<td>674,695</td>
<td>170,683</td>
<td>3,816</td>
<td>Draw $3,816 from DC PW Facilities and Fleet. Purchase of a mechanical sweeper as per Q22-91.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00896-10 Equipment Replacement (2020)</td>
<td>3,147,400</td>
<td>3,583,170</td>
<td>2,719,054</td>
<td>29,167</td>
<td>Draw $29,167 from Equipment RF. Purchase an asphalt spreader (replacement for 10189). As per FPO24-65, the purchase has exceeded budget for the individual unit due to inflationary costs and reductions in manufacturer incentives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Original Budget</td>
<td>Previous Forecast</td>
<td>Actual Cost to April 2024</td>
<td>Forecast Increase / Decrease</td>
<td>Funding Source / Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00898-10 Equipment Replacement (2022)</td>
<td>1,495,000</td>
<td>1,476,262</td>
<td>512,491</td>
<td>17,166</td>
<td>Draw $17,166 from Equipment RF. Additional funding of the purchase of two replacement mid-sized tractors (unit #12205 and #12206). As per FPO24-61, the purchases have exceeded budget due to inflationary costs and reductions in manufacturer incentives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00899-10 Equipment Replacement (2023)</td>
<td>2,765,800</td>
<td>2,765,800</td>
<td>785,817</td>
<td>90,397</td>
<td>Draw $90,397 from the Equipment RF. Purchase of: a) cargo van $36,608. This is for the replacement of unit #17341 due to an accident as per FPO24-62. b) outfront mower $36,799. This is for the replacement of unit #12880. Additional funding is required due to a change of mower type, inflationary costs and reductions in manufacturer incentives as per FPO24-63. c) cab and chassis $16,990. This is for the replacement of unit #9933. The purchase has exceeded budget for the individual unit due to inflationary costs and reductions in manufacturer incentives as per Q23-73.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01015-30 Design - Decomm. outdoor pools</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>403,000</td>
<td>403,584</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>Draw $145 from Capital Works RF and $439 from Facility Maintenance RF. Actuals are slightly overbudget with project near completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01043-40 Beverly Street Utility Relocations</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>117,463</td>
<td>5,468</td>
<td>Draw $5,468 from the Capital Works RF as more utility relocations required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Forecast Changes Requiring Council Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Previous Forecast</th>
<th>Actual Cost to April 2024</th>
<th>Forecast Increase / Decrease</th>
<th>Funding Source / Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/01043-41 Beverly Street Reconstruction and Pedestrian Underpass</td>
<td>10,861,600</td>
<td>12,274,063</td>
<td>236,810</td>
<td>331,565</td>
<td>Contingency of 10% on all project components to reflect the complex nature of this project and Railway's requirements and timelines. Draw $24,867 from Capital Works RF, $82,891 from Water Capital RF, $82,891 from Wastewater Capital RF and $140,916 from DC Roadways RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01063-40 Customer Relationship Management Implementation</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78,884</td>
<td>Request to combine project A/00365-40 due to similar scope. Therefore request to draw $78,884 Capital Works RF that were returned through closure of A/00365-40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01098-40 Active Transportation - Dunbar Rd Phase 2</td>
<td>336,000</td>
<td>366,000</td>
<td>2,325</td>
<td>(13,129)</td>
<td>Draw $7,000 from Capital Works RF and return $20,129 to Canada Community Building Fund as per tender report T24-12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01229-40 City Hall Green Wall</td>
<td>254,500</td>
<td>254,500</td>
<td>262,960</td>
<td>8,460</td>
<td>Draw $8,460 from Facility Maintenance RF. Project is near completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01536-40 Library Window Replacement</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,352</td>
<td>April 2024 forecast change to increase the budget by the savings in A/01472-30. Requesting draw of $35,352 from Canada Community Benefit Fund be transferred from A/01472-30 to A/01536-40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01543-40 New Hope Chapel Foundation Repairs</td>
<td>106,900</td>
<td>106,900</td>
<td>8,074</td>
<td>7,919</td>
<td>Draw $7,919 from Cemetery Improvements RF. Construction along with consulting costs are anticipating to be overbudget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>942,435</strong></td>
<td>Over Previous Forecast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Forecast Changes Not Requiring Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Previous Forecast</th>
<th>Actual Cost to April 2024</th>
<th>Forecast Increase / (Decrease)</th>
<th>Funding Source / Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00471-40 Fountain Street Soccer Facility Construction</td>
<td>8,968,000</td>
<td>14,147,081</td>
<td>13,857,674</td>
<td>124,342</td>
<td>Additional change orders at request of Conestoga College in the amount of $124,342 offset by increased contribution from Conestoga College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00565-10 Library Computer Equipment (2023)</td>
<td>334,000</td>
<td>334,000</td>
<td>234,043</td>
<td>(60,000)</td>
<td>At the April 2024 forecast, it is anticipated that this project will be under budget by $60,000. It is requested that this amount be transferred to project A/00595-10 Library Computer Equipment (2024) where the project is expected to come in over budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00578-40 Roof Replace - Fire Station 1</td>
<td>193,600</td>
<td>193,600</td>
<td>5,083</td>
<td>(2,247)</td>
<td>Return $2,247 to Facility Maintenance RF. Favorable tender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00987-40 Asphalt Resurfacing Program (2024)</td>
<td>945,000</td>
<td>945,000</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>(96,672)</td>
<td>Return $96,672 to Capital Works RF as per tender T24-32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01080-40 Argyle Street North and South Reconstruction</td>
<td>1,618,000</td>
<td>1,618,000</td>
<td>26,224</td>
<td>(263,580)</td>
<td>Return $122,778 to Water Capital RF, $8,734 to Wastewater Capital RF and $203,750 to Capital Works RF and add $71,682 in external recovery revenue from Bell as per Tender T24-04.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01081-40 Glendale Place and Ash Street Reconstruction</td>
<td>1,723,000</td>
<td>1,723,000</td>
<td>3,655</td>
<td>(572,494)</td>
<td>Return $235,153 to Capital Works RF, $119,021 to Wastewater Capital RF and $218,320 to Water Capital RF as per tender T24-07.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01082-40 Oxford Street Reconstruction</td>
<td>2,990,000</td>
<td>2,990,000</td>
<td>21,624</td>
<td>(604,863)</td>
<td>Return $105,257 to Capital Works RF, $146,267 to Wastewater Capital RF, $144,205 to Water Capital RF and $209,134 to Canada Community Benefit Fund as per tender T24-02.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Original Budget</td>
<td>Previous Forecast</td>
<td>Actual Cost to April 2024</td>
<td>Forecast Increase / (Decrease)</td>
<td>Funding Source / Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01083-40 Albert Street Reconstruction</td>
<td>2,665,000</td>
<td>2,665,000</td>
<td>25,553</td>
<td>(253,745)</td>
<td>Return $37,367 to Capital Works RF, $60,750 to Wastewater Capital RF, $62,835 to Water Capital RF and $92,793 to Canada Community Benefit Fund as per tender T23-101 and subsequent revision to increase contingency by $50,000 due to unforeseen soil issues found during design Geotech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01228-40 Roof Replace - New Hope Cemetery</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>4,746</td>
<td>(3,150)</td>
<td>Favourable tender. Return $3,150 to Cemetery Improvements RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01230-20 Energy Assess - Carbon Reduction Strategy</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>14,216</td>
<td>199,494</td>
<td>Federal Funding announcement on March 25, 2024. Green Municipal Fund's Community Building Retrofit (CBR) of $200K, along with anticipated return of $506 to Capital Works RF, due to favourable tender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01294-40 Blenheim Road Reconstruction (2024)</td>
<td>3,440,000</td>
<td>3,440,000</td>
<td>5,472</td>
<td>(920,535)</td>
<td>Return $131,225 to Capital Works RF, $210,250 to Water Capital RF and $367,421 to Canada Community Benefit Fund. Additional $160,209 of Regional funding and $51,430 of Other funding no longer required as per tender T24-08.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01313-40 Sanitary Lining Citywide (2024)</td>
<td>1,950,000</td>
<td>1,950,000</td>
<td>6,959</td>
<td>(250,322)</td>
<td>Return $ 250,322 to Wastewater Capital RF as per tender T24-20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01436-40 151 Burnham - Wastewater Servicing</td>
<td>97,700</td>
<td>100,939</td>
<td>100,939</td>
<td>(3,239)</td>
<td>Previously closed project with new transactions. This project will be fully recovered from External Recovery - Other and will be closed when final payment is settled. Return $3,239 to Wastewater Capital RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total net project decrease</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,707,011)</td>
<td>Under Previous Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Original Budget</td>
<td>Previous Forecast</td>
<td>Actual Cost to April 2024</td>
<td>Forecast Increase / (Decrease)</td>
<td>Funding Source / Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00102-40 Historic Post Office Renovations (15D001)</td>
<td>10,619,000</td>
<td>14,984,597</td>
<td>16,577,521</td>
<td>1,274,000</td>
<td>As per Council report 24-007-OCM on February 27th 2024 draw $1,274,000 from Rate Stabilization RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00420-40 Preston Auditorium Expansion - Construction</td>
<td>13,015,600</td>
<td>33,112,172</td>
<td>3,596,133</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>As per Council report 24-019-CRS on May 14th 2024 transfer of $1,360,248 of the 2023 Year End Surplus through the Capital Works RF to decrease the tax-supported debt needs on this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00492-40 Blackbridge Road and Bridge Reconstruction</td>
<td>20,600,000</td>
<td>20,600,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>As per Council report 24-049-CD reallocate the budgeted funds in construction of $570,000 toward project contingencies change nets to zero.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01279-10 Fire Fleet Apparatus (2024)</td>
<td>1,780,800</td>
<td>1,780,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(200,955)</td>
<td>As per Council report 24-006-CRS on February 8th 2024 advance project from 2025 to 2024 to facilitate pre-payment discount. Vendor pre-payment discount provided of $150,000 US ($200,955 CDN). Return $200,955 to Equipment RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01308-40 Watermain Lining Citywide (2023)</td>
<td>3,700,000</td>
<td>4,400,000</td>
<td>1,162,996</td>
<td>869,000</td>
<td>As per Council report 24-022-CRS on April 16th 2024 draw $869,000 from Water Capital RF to complete the Watermain CIPP Rehabilitation on Holiday Inn Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01439-40 Public Art 50th Anniversary</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>18,016</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Council Report 24-040-CD approve an increase of $10,000 to capital project A/01439-40 Public Art 50th Anniversary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01444-40 Dickson Street Parking Lot Storm Improvements</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>30,251</td>
<td>As per Council report 24-023-CRS on May 14, 2024 draw $30,251 from Core Area Transformation RF to complete project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total net project increase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,982,296</strong></td>
<td><strong>Over Previous Forecast</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Impact to Capital Reserve Funds

### Appendix G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve Fund</th>
<th>Estimated Balance as of April 30, 2024</th>
<th>Committed to Open Capital Projects</th>
<th>Uncommitted Balance</th>
<th>Forecast Change Impact</th>
<th>Revised Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Works</td>
<td>10,359,317</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,359,317</td>
<td>(503,411)</td>
<td>9,855,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Works Committed</td>
<td>1,912,066</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,912,066</td>
<td>46,208</td>
<td>1,958,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Capital</td>
<td>18,749,183</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,749,183</td>
<td>767,872</td>
<td>19,517,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Improvements</td>
<td>208,610</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>208,610</td>
<td>29,666</td>
<td>238,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbarium Purchase</td>
<td>423,228</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>423,228</td>
<td>14,530</td>
<td>437,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Equipment</td>
<td>2,620,236</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,620,236</td>
<td>64,225</td>
<td>2,684,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Capital</td>
<td>602,222</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>602,222</td>
<td>(16,320)</td>
<td>585,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>189,283</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>189,283</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td>179,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate Stabilization</td>
<td>16,917,723</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,917,723</td>
<td>(1,274,000)</td>
<td>15,643,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Area Transformation</td>
<td>12,666,920</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,666,920</td>
<td>(30,251)</td>
<td>12,636,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Community-Building Fund*</td>
<td>8,576,109</td>
<td>(6,582,321)</td>
<td>1,993,788</td>
<td>714,753</td>
<td>2,708,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland Cash in Lieu</td>
<td>8,751,330</td>
<td>(650,000)</td>
<td>8,101,330</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>8,751,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges-San. Sewer</td>
<td>(862,241)</td>
<td>(3,971,032)</td>
<td>(4,833,273)</td>
<td>126,738</td>
<td>(4,706,535)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges-Storm Sew.</td>
<td>314,810</td>
<td>(1,371,044)</td>
<td>(1,056,234)</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>(1,054,268)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges-Roadways</td>
<td>26,382,327</td>
<td>(11,266,540)</td>
<td>15,115,787</td>
<td>(33,777)</td>
<td>15,082,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges-Parks &amp; Rec</td>
<td>28,927,206</td>
<td>(30,495,641)</td>
<td>(1,568,435)</td>
<td>67,011</td>
<td>(1,501,424)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges-Works Yard</td>
<td>4,546,311</td>
<td>(733,146)</td>
<td>3,813,165</td>
<td>(3,816)</td>
<td>3,809,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>163,861,367</strong></td>
<td><strong>(55,069,724)</strong></td>
<td><strong>108,791,643</strong></td>
<td><strong>507,365</strong></td>
<td><strong>109,299,008</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The CCBF balance includes the 2024 funding allotment of $4.3 million, which will be received later in 2024.*
## Community Development

### ET - Development Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unspent Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A00421-40</td>
<td>SE Galt Sir &amp; W/M Grth Related</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Adam Ripper</td>
<td>The Westley Blvd extension and creek crossing has been constructed by the developer of the adjacent subdivision and is substantially complete.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>Jan-2017 to Nov-2024</td>
<td>$921,053.00</td>
<td>$40,019.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00231-40</td>
<td>SE Galt Sir 2102 Insite Westley Blvd. P</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Adam Ripper</td>
<td>Surface asphalt and remaining Moffat Creek landscaping to be completed in 2024.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Nov-2024</td>
<td>$5,883,376.00</td>
<td>$229,153.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00232-30</td>
<td>SE Galt 3236 Dundas St Water Gravity Sewer Repair</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Adam Ripper</td>
<td>Project is being led by the developer through a CFSA. Work is substantially complete. Infiltration repairs are being reviewed.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>Jan-2017 to Mar-2024</td>
<td>$625,000.00</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00391-40</td>
<td>-Region - King Street (Dover to Bishop) Reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Austin</td>
<td>The Region has released holdback on the original contractor for this project. It is understood they are preparing a separate RFO for outstanding sidewalk deficiencies.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Jun-2019 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$7,844,000.00</td>
<td>$406,205.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00431-30</td>
<td>-East side EW and NS Collector Rd Design</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Alex Darrell Nichols</td>
<td>Design is complete. Negotiations continue with CPR with regards to construction and cost sharing agreements, and with adjacent land owners for property use</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Sep-2018 to May-2024</td>
<td>$1,860,600.00</td>
<td>$71,446.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00431-40</td>
<td>-East Side EW Collector Rd</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Alex Darrell Nichols</td>
<td>Design has been completed Negotiations with CPR to continue with regards to execution of cost sharing agreements.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Jul-2023 to Nov-2025</td>
<td>$750,000.00</td>
<td>$665,729.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00431-42</td>
<td>-N Camb Railway Grade Separation</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Sarah Austin</td>
<td>Design has been completed and the City continues to negotiate with CP Railway continue with regards to execution of cost sharing agreements. At this time, it is unknown when the negotiations will be complete.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Oct-2021 to Jun-2025</td>
<td>$19,306,500.00</td>
<td>$19,150,142.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00432-40</td>
<td>-East Side NS Collector (EW Rd-Allendale)</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Alex Darrell Nichols</td>
<td>All Holdbacks Released as of July 2023. Construction is complete.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Sep-2019 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$14,554,674.00</td>
<td>$1,293,241.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00434-40</td>
<td>-SE Galt Upper Greengate/LVH Moffat Creek</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Adam Ripper</td>
<td>Construction underway on the Moffat Creek subdivision. OC credits for work completed to date on municipal infrastructure has been applied against the executed subdivision agreement.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Aug-2022 to Sep-2025</td>
<td>$2,883,700.00</td>
<td>$2,657,039.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00435-40</td>
<td>-SE Galt Dundas ST PS, Forcemain, Trunk S</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Adam Ripper</td>
<td>The project is being completed by the developer through a CFSA. Construction is substantially complete. Pumping Station working towards City turnover.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>Dec-2021 to Mar-2024</td>
<td>$8,660,000.00</td>
<td>$375,743.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00436-40</td>
<td>-SE Galt Vanier Dr WM Upsizing (Wexley BI)</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Adam Ripper</td>
<td>The project was led by the developer through a CFSA. Construction is substantially complete. Surface asphalt was installed in Fall 2023 but has deficiencies.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>Mar-2022 to Aug-2024</td>
<td>$406,900.00</td>
<td>$133,158.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00449-40</td>
<td>-East Side Allendale Rd (Fountain St-N)</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Alex Darrell Nichols</td>
<td>Construction is complete.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Oct-2020 to Oct-2024</td>
<td>$5,945,182.00</td>
<td>$323,555.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00444-40</td>
<td>-Neighbourhood Park Dev - Highland Ridge</td>
<td>Park Development</td>
<td>Vicki Armilatte</td>
<td>The developer has completed additional works within the park to address poor soils and drainage conditions and turf growth and the works have been accepted for maintenance.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Apr-2020 to Aug-2024</td>
<td>$292,700.00</td>
<td>$241,832.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00481-30</td>
<td>-East Side NS Collector Rd Design</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Alex Darrell Nichols</td>
<td>The design has been led by the developer through a CFSA and is complete. The developer has submitted invoices under the terms of the CFSA which are under review.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Jul-2020 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$190,000.00</td>
<td>$116,574.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00481-40</td>
<td>-East Side NS Collector Rd (Allendale Rd)</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Alex Darrell Nichols</td>
<td>Construction ongoing SWM pond, sanitary trunk servicing, storm servicing underway</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Jul-2023 to May-2025</td>
<td>$8,977,300.00</td>
<td>$8,590,940.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00482-40</td>
<td>-CamWest Biaermal Dr Sanitary Trunk Sewer</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Alex Darrell Nichols</td>
<td>Primary construction complete, on maintenance. Reimbursement under terms of CFSA has been completed for works to date.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>Feb-2022 to Feb-2025</td>
<td>$610,000.00</td>
<td>$2,937.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00483-40</td>
<td>-CamWest Central SWM Facility Oversizing</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Alex Darrell Nichols</td>
<td>Completed by developer under credit for service agreement. Primary construction complete, with landscape work yet to be complete. Reimbursement under CFSA for works completed to date has occurred.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>Feb-2022 to May-2025</td>
<td>$2,955,000.00</td>
<td>$254,566.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00485-40</td>
<td>-CamWest Watermain Extension</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Alex Darrell Nichols</td>
<td>Construction is complete Under maintenance</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>Feb-2022 to Aug-2025</td>
<td>$4,351,000.00</td>
<td>$227,297.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00486-40</td>
<td>-Region - Fountain St N (Maple Grove to K)</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Alex Darrell Nichols</td>
<td>The Region has awarded Phase 1 of the project to Regional Sewer and Water. The pre-construction meeting has been held.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Mar-2026</td>
<td>$356,000.00</td>
<td>$356,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00508-40</td>
<td>-CamWest Infrastructure Upsize</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Alex Darrell Nichols</td>
<td>Construction completed by developer through a credit for service agreement. Primary construction complete.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>Feb-2022 to Feb-2025</td>
<td>$577,400.00</td>
<td>$204.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Id</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Work Completed</td>
<td>Project Status</td>
<td>% Completed</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Plan Cost</td>
<td>Unexpended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00527-40</td>
<td>Carl West Bismark Park South</td>
<td>Park Development</td>
<td>Vicki Armitage</td>
<td>Staff resources have been focused on supporting the development of Bismark Park, donated by the developer.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Mar-2024 to Oct-2026</td>
<td>$390,000.00</td>
<td>$390,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00571-30</td>
<td>ES Middle Block Rd (Fountain to NS Rd)</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Alex Darrell Nichols</td>
<td>Not yet started</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$670,700.00</td>
<td>$670,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00572-41</td>
<td>Middle Block Road Trunk Sanitary Sewer</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Alex Darrell Nichols</td>
<td>Not started yet</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,953,000.00</td>
<td>$2,953,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00679-40</td>
<td>Blanchard Road Construction</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Alex Darrell Nichols</td>
<td>Construction completed by developer through credit for service agreement. On maintenance. Reimbursement under CFSA has occurred for work completed to date.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>Feb-2022 to Feb-2025</td>
<td>$8,382,200.00</td>
<td>$10,309.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00712-40</td>
<td>CarlWest SWM Facility</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Alex Darrell Nichols</td>
<td>Construction being completed by developer through credit for service agreement, with reimbursement completed for work to date. Primary construction complete, on maintenance.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>Feb-2024 to Feb-2025</td>
<td>$721,500.00</td>
<td>$109,267.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00713-40</td>
<td>CarlWest Derry's Creek SWM Facility</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Alex Darrell Nichols</td>
<td>Construction being completed by developer under credit for service agreement and reimbursement has been completed for works to date. Primary construction complete.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Feb-2022 to Feb-2025</td>
<td>$285,900.00</td>
<td>$42,494.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00714-40</td>
<td>Region - Dundas St East Hospers to Shade Road</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Adam Ripper</td>
<td>Primary Stage 2 works completed.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>May-2022 to Jan-2025</td>
<td>$3,099,039.00</td>
<td>$375,824.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00722-41</td>
<td>Region - Water St (Ainslie to Simcoe St)</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Sarah Austin</td>
<td>These works were ready for tender by the developer in Spring 2024 pending an agreement between the developer and the Region/City.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Jan-2022 to Sep-2025</td>
<td>$780,000.00</td>
<td>$780,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00795-20</td>
<td>Stormwater Master Plan Update</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Sarah Austin</td>
<td>Preparation of a Terms of Reference begun, but was paused due to resource availability.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Mar-2022 to Mar-2025</td>
<td>$275,000.00</td>
<td>$275,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00110-30</td>
<td>Park Dev Isherwood Design</td>
<td>Park Development</td>
<td>Vicki Armitage</td>
<td>Trails plan design has been finalized and preliminary cost estimates submitted for review.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Sep-2023 to Aug-2025</td>
<td>$679,400.00</td>
<td>$669,852.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00102-40</td>
<td>Trail Dev - Cambridge West</td>
<td>Park Development</td>
<td>Vicki Armitage</td>
<td>The trail has been constructed by the developer with cost recovery as outlined in the executed Subdivision Agreement.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Jan-2022 to Jul-2024</td>
<td>$247,500.00</td>
<td>$247,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01107-40</td>
<td>Trail Dev - South Point Ph 2 (Bisdale)</td>
<td>Park Development</td>
<td>Vicki Armitage</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$356,700.00</td>
<td>$356,700.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01112-40</td>
<td>Trail Develop - South Point Phase 1</td>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>Vicki Armitage</td>
<td>Trail construction has been initiated and will be completed by developer through a cost sharing agreement.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Jun-2022 to Sep-2025</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
<td>$363,111.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01194-20</td>
<td>Sanitary Sewer Model Update (2022)</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Sarah Austin</td>
<td>A final draft calibration report has been submitted for review. Staff have forwarded information for the building of the short term future scenario to the consultant.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Jan-2022 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$73,568.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01195-31</td>
<td>Limetick Road Design</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Alex Darrell Nichols</td>
<td>Not yet started.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$202,500.00</td>
<td>$202,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01212-30</td>
<td>Park Dev Lakesview/Morrison Design</td>
<td>Park Development</td>
<td>Vicki Armitage</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$71,700.00</td>
<td>$71,700.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01301-20</td>
<td>North Cambridge Collector Road Network</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Alex Darrell Nichols</td>
<td>The commencement of the EA requires the approval of the corresponding Secondary Plan, which has yet to occur.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01303-20</td>
<td>River Road Secondary Plan Road Network</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Adam Ripper</td>
<td>An RFQ has been issued to retain a consultant to complete the Municipal Class EA document. The Statement of Work within the RFQ builds on the previous Secondary Plan work.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01351-30</td>
<td>Jumpstart Accessible Sports Amenity Des.</td>
<td>Park Development</td>
<td>Vicki Armitage</td>
<td>Final design details are being reviewed with Jumpstart and a final cost estimate is being prepared.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>Aug-2022 to May-2026</td>
<td>$140,000.00</td>
<td>$84,744.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01351-40</td>
<td>Jumpstart Accessible Sports Amenity Cons</td>
<td>Park Development</td>
<td>Vicki Armitage</td>
<td>Completion of project design is anticipated in spring 2024.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>May-2024 to May-2026</td>
<td>$1,318,000.00</td>
<td>$1,300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01463-40</td>
<td>Park Dev Saginaw Subdivision</td>
<td>Park Development</td>
<td>Vicki Armitage</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$235,000.00</td>
<td>$235,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ET - Development Engineering**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00024-21</td>
<td>Riverside Dam Detailed Design</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Scott Murray Macdonald</td>
<td>City has completed review of 90% drawings and provided comments to the design consultant. Staff update report is being finalized.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Feb-2025</td>
<td>$625,000.00</td>
<td>$308,518.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ET - Infrastructure Engineering**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00024-21</td>
<td>Riverside Dam Detailed Design</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Scott Murray Macdonald</td>
<td>City has completed review of 90% drawings and provided comments to the design consultant. Staff update report is being finalized.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Feb-2025</td>
<td>$625,000.00</td>
<td>$308,518.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ET - Development Engineering**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00024-21</td>
<td>Riverside Dam Detailed Design</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Scott Murray Macdonald</td>
<td>City has completed review of 90% drawings and provided comments to the design consultant. Staff update report is being finalized.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Feb-2025</td>
<td>$625,000.00</td>
<td>$308,518.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Id</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Work Completed</td>
<td>Project Status</td>
<td>% Completed</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Plan Cost</td>
<td>Unexpended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01076-40</td>
<td>Clemens Ave Reconstruction</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Xin Huang</td>
<td>Construction is completed.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Dec-2022 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$2,449,213.00</td>
<td>$601,265.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01086-40</td>
<td>Argyle St and S Reconstruction</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Steven Huckabone</td>
<td>All underground work complete for both blocks</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$1,618,000.00</td>
<td>$1,588,058.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01081-40</td>
<td>Isendale Place and Ash St Reconstruction</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Scott Murray MacDonald</td>
<td>Construction plans to start construction the beginning of August 2024.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Mar-2024 to Oct-2025</td>
<td>$1,723,000.00</td>
<td>$1,719,344.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01082-40</td>
<td>Oxford Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Matt Holland</td>
<td>Project underway with underground works being completed in stage 1. This includes storm, sanitary, and watermain. Temporary water has been installed and asphalt has been removed.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$2,990,000.00</td>
<td>$2,968,234.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01083-40</td>
<td>Albert Street Reconstruction</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Xin Huang</td>
<td>Construction of phase 1(Summit Ave - Prospect Pl) is at 20% complete.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Dec-2023 to Jan-2027</td>
<td>$2,665,000.00</td>
<td>$2,638,541.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01099-40</td>
<td>Trail Bridges (2023)</td>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>Steven Huckabone</td>
<td>Both Woodland park trail and Churchill park bridges are complete and Bomar has advertised substantial completion</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Mar-2024</td>
<td>$250,791.00</td>
<td>$51,301.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01130-30</td>
<td>Trail Bridge Design 1</td>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>Steven Huckabone</td>
<td>Tender ready package for mill run redesign submitted. Council approved recommended option to rebuild bridge 3 and permanently remove bridge 2 for Mill Race pedestrian bridges.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Jan-2022 to Jun-2023</td>
<td>$120,000.00</td>
<td>$60,632.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01159-20</td>
<td>Hesslee Pedestrian Bridge Environ Asses</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Matt Holland</td>
<td>Remaining geotechnical work has been completed. Outstanding final Archaeological and Geotechnical reports need to be received and then project can be closed after final invoicing.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>Jan-2021 to Mar-2023</td>
<td>$320,000.00</td>
<td>$119,830.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01170-30</td>
<td>Edward St Retaining Wall Design</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Xin Huang</td>
<td>100% Design work completed.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Jan-2022 to Nov-2024</td>
<td>$82,500.00</td>
<td>$28,375.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01171-40</td>
<td>Edward St Retaining Wall Renewal</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Xin Huang</td>
<td>Tender issued.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Mar-2024 to May-2028</td>
<td>$715,000.00</td>
<td>$714,023.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01173-40</td>
<td>Roseview Ave. and Gladstone Ave. Recor (2024)</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Matt Holland</td>
<td>Work on Gladstone Avenue has been completed to base asphalt including restorations. Work on Roseview Avenue phase 1 is complete. Work on Roseview Avenue phase 2 is complete. Surface asphalt planned for 2024.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Jan-2023 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$3,433,895.00</td>
<td>$692,263.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01210-40</td>
<td>Sport Court Refurb - Greenway &amp; Willard</td>
<td>Park Renewal</td>
<td>Claire Mcloughlin</td>
<td>Tender documentation preparation.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Jan-2024 to Sep-2026</td>
<td>$482,000.00</td>
<td>$474,368.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01218-30</td>
<td>Riverside Park Roads Design</td>
<td>Park Renewal</td>
<td>Steven Huckabone</td>
<td>90 percent design submitted and Geotech submitted. Review complete and comments provided. Tree Management added to the scope.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Mar-2022 to Dec-2023</td>
<td>$155,000.00</td>
<td>$61,790.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01240-30</td>
<td>W River Rd Trunk Sanitary Access- Design</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Scott Murray MacDonald</td>
<td>Preparing Request for Quotation documents.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Apr-2024 to Jun-2025</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01291-20</td>
<td>Excav Soils Compliance Updates (2023)</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Jamie Croft</td>
<td>Second Round of Drilling underway March 2024.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Jan-2023 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$285,000.00</td>
<td>$143,079.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01293-30</td>
<td>Bill Road Retaining Wall Design (2023)</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Matt Holland</td>
<td>Repair option is being explored as an addition to the technical memo submission. Once repair option has been explored, an updated council report will then be brought forward to Council.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$148,000.00</td>
<td>$97,395.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01294-40</td>
<td>Bienheim Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Xin Huang</td>
<td>Tender awarded.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Dec-2023 to Jan-2027</td>
<td>$3,440,000.00</td>
<td>$3,434,182.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01306-40</td>
<td>Fisher Mills Drainage (2023)</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Xin Huang</td>
<td>Landscaping restoration is complete.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Feb-2023 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$66,000.00</td>
<td>$20,490.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ET-Transportation Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A01002-30</td>
<td>Hespeler Trail Project - Queen to Guelph</td>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>Jason Leach</td>
<td>Options to address property constraints being reviewed.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>Mar-2021 to Dec-2023</td>
<td>$183,840.00</td>
<td>$39,224.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00083-40</td>
<td>LED Street Lighting Installation</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Shannon Noonan</td>
<td>Installation of decorative and post top LED lights anticipated to be complete end of April early May</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>Jan-2016 to Sep-2023</td>
<td>$3,535,000.00</td>
<td>$76,416.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00877-40</td>
<td>Parking Lot Renew - Library Queen Sq Lot</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Dennis Lopes</td>
<td>Parking Lot Reconstruction In Maintenance (September 2024)</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>Apr-2022 to Dec-2023</td>
<td>$210,000.00</td>
<td>$19,319.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00735-40</td>
<td>Newman Drive Sidewalk Installation</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Dennis Lopes</td>
<td>Next step is to close project.</td>
<td>Project work complete</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Mar-2019 to Aug-2024</td>
<td>$180,000.00</td>
<td>$170,084.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00973-40</td>
<td>King Street Decorative Lighting</td>
<td>Community Improvement</td>
<td>Shannon Noonan</td>
<td>Commissioning of the system has been completed. Lights are in use.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Aug-2023</td>
<td>$630,000.00</td>
<td>$53,595.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01018-20</td>
<td>Bishop St N (Franklin-Carliamer) - EA</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Dennis Lopes</td>
<td>Reviewing scope of work for project and developing terms of reference</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$210,100.00</td>
<td>$210,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01019-20</td>
<td>Intersection Assessment Study</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Shannon Noonan</td>
<td>Preferred alternative for Sagrane Parkway at Green Villa Drive has been identified as part of the Region’s Franklin Boulevard Preliminary Design Study. Preferred alternative shared with the public on April 25th as part of Region’s project.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Mar-2021 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01097-20</td>
<td>Residential Parking Bylaw Review</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Melissa Lachance</td>
<td>Preparing to commence project in second quarter (Q2) 2024.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Mar-2021 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01068-40</td>
<td>-Active Transport – Dunbar Road Phase 2</td>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>Jason Leach</td>
<td>Construction has commenced. The old sidewalk and curb have been removed and new catch basins have been installed.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Nov-2022 to May-2024</td>
<td>$366,000.00</td>
<td>$363,675.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01000-40</td>
<td>-Trail Bridges (2024)</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Jason Leach</td>
<td>The tender for the Thompson Park Boardwalk Repairs has closed and submissions are being reviewed. The design for the Mill Run Trail Bridge is being finalized.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Mar-2024 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$450,000.00</td>
<td>$450,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01117-40</td>
<td>-Active Transportation (2023), Trail Con</td>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>Jason Leach</td>
<td>Project is scheduled to be tendered in May 2024.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Nov-2023 to Sep-2024</td>
<td>$148,800.00</td>
<td>$146,145.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01133-40</td>
<td>-Soper Park Pedestrian Tunnel Repairs</td>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>Jason Leach</td>
<td>An initial site inspection and assessment has been completed.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Jan-2022 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$345,000.00</td>
<td>$345,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01159-30</td>
<td>-Hespeler Pedestrian Bridge Design</td>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>Jason Leach</td>
<td>Preparing to start work on project in Q2 2024</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Sep-2025</td>
<td>$521,200.00</td>
<td>$521,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01168-30</td>
<td>-Sidewalk Infill Design</td>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>Jason Leach</td>
<td>The 30% design has been completed and public consultation has commenced.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Dec-2023 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$65,500.00</td>
<td>$57,878.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01204-40</td>
<td>-Sidewalk Installation – Preston Parkway</td>
<td>Community Improvement</td>
<td>Jason Leach</td>
<td>Work will begin when the project design has been completed.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Jul-2024 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$293,000.00</td>
<td>$293,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01358-40</td>
<td>-City-Wide Speed Limit Sign Implant</td>
<td>Community Improvement</td>
<td>Melissa Lachance</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Area Speed Limit Implementation Report received and approved at May 14 Council Meeting</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$287,500.00</td>
<td>$287,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01359-40</td>
<td>-Active Transportation - Speedsville Road</td>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>Jason Leach</td>
<td>Construction is complete and the pedestrian crossing is in service.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Nov-2023</td>
<td>$139,200.00</td>
<td>$16,435.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01360-40</td>
<td>-Summer Patio Road Closure Electrical Upg</td>
<td>Community Improvement</td>
<td>Dennis Lopes</td>
<td>City streetlight contractor completing a review of Hespeler Village electrical requirements</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Mar-2026</td>
<td>$149,200.00</td>
<td>$148,700.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01431-40</td>
<td>-Old Mill Rd Traffic Calming</td>
<td>Community Improvement</td>
<td>Shannon Noonan</td>
<td>Consultant is reviewing expanded project scope based on PIC comments</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Jan-2022 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$112,000.00</td>
<td>$58,584.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ET-Infrastructure Engineering**

- **Cost**
  - **Schedule**
  - **Plan Cost**
  - **Unexpended**

$81,968,049.00
$63,209,553.31
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### Planing Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A00003-20</td>
<td>Zoning By-Law Update</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Bryan Cooper</td>
<td>Working on correcting numerous mapping errors and site specific amendment text in order to bring to a public meeting in Fall 2024. Timing on PM is dependent on mapping review.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Jul-2013 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$260,483.00</td>
<td>$5,339.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00007-20</td>
<td>Assessing Infilling &amp; Infrascturation</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>John Matthew Blevins</td>
<td>Staff and consultants working on finalizing Hespeler Rd secondary plan. The Main and Dundas Street South Secondary Plan was deferred by Council, staff are working to address comments from a property owner regarding a site specific provision.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Apr-2015 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$463,386.00</td>
<td>$10,627.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00223-20</td>
<td>East Side Lands MESP</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Katherine Padgett</td>
<td>Statutory Public Meeting was held June 28, 2022. The Master Drainage Plan has been completed and posted to the Region's website for 30 day comment period. Secondary Plan recommendation to Council in 2024 (anticipated June 25).</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Jan-2016 to Jul-2024</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00390-20</td>
<td>EGalt Htsc Conservation District Study</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Laura Walde</td>
<td>This project has been paused due to reprioritization of other heritage work.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Oct-2021 to Jun-2025</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$40,581.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00378-20</td>
<td>Growth Management Study Update (2019)</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Bryan Cooper</td>
<td>Project delayed until further details of Regional growth allocation work is known. Project may require rescoping depending on what work is being completed by the Region. Project is expected to restart June 2024.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Jul-2023 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$209,884.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00735-20</td>
<td>Galt Core Heritage Conservation District</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Laura Walde</td>
<td>Heritage Planning staff are exploring expanded boundary options for the Galt Core HCD.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Oct-2020 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$106,991.00</td>
<td>-$5,561.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00740-20</td>
<td>Heritage Conservation District Study (He</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Jeremy Edward Daniel Parsons</td>
<td>Consultant has now completed final report. Staff review of report is complete. Final MHAC review took place April 18, 2024 and Council's review and decision will take place May 20th.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$68,474.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01054-20</td>
<td>Official Plan Review (2023)</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Bryan Cooper</td>
<td>Drafted project charter and sent for review.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Feb-2023 to Dec-2025</td>
<td>$360,000.00</td>
<td>$360,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01055-20</td>
<td>Inclusionary Zoning</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>John Matthew Blevins</td>
<td>Council Information Package Memo being brought forward to Cambridge Council with Discussion paper attached. Inclusionary Zoning project team are working on draft instruments to take forward to their respective Councils.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Jan-2023 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01163-20</td>
<td>Consulting Services - Planning</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Sheryl Ayres</td>
<td>Financial analysis is being completed to determine next steps</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Mar-2021 to Oct-2023</td>
<td>$97,000.00</td>
<td>$21,290.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01249-20</td>
<td>River Road Cultural Heritage Landscape</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Jeremy Edward Daniel Parsons</td>
<td>The River Road CHL project has been put on hold. To proceed in 2025.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Jan-2025 to Jun-2026</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01286-40</td>
<td>Streamline Dev Approvals - Planning</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Lisa Prime</td>
<td>Work completed.</td>
<td>Project work complete</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Mar-2022 to Nov-2023</td>
<td>$520,000.00</td>
<td>-$4,901.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Id</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Work Completed</td>
<td>Project Status</td>
<td>% Completed</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Plan Cost</td>
<td>Unexpended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A004523-30</td>
<td>Preston Auditorium - Design</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Shane Taylor</td>
<td>Contract administration phase of work continues.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Jan-2022 to Dec-2025</td>
<td>$1,914,474.00</td>
<td>$446,669.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A004520-40</td>
<td>-Preston Auditorium Expansion - Construct</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Shane Taylor</td>
<td>Demolition work completed, foundation excavations completed, foundation pouring underway and starting on laying block walls. Construction is on schedule.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Jan-2022 to Jul-2026</td>
<td>$27,349,588.00</td>
<td>$23,713,855.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00463-30</td>
<td>-Recreation Complex - Design</td>
<td>New Facility</td>
<td>Shane Taylor</td>
<td>Preparing to issue tender mid-May 2024. Pre-qualification for GC's currently underway. Final contract documentation being completed. SPA 2 submissions completed, Building Permit final comments being addressed.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Dec-2028</td>
<td>$6,384,380.00</td>
<td>$2,317,397.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00463-41</td>
<td>-Recreation Complex - Construction</td>
<td>New Facility</td>
<td>Shane Taylor</td>
<td>Building permit application underway. GC pre-qualification underway. Tender targeted mid-May 2024.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$102,303,000.00</td>
<td>$101,866,143.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00471-40</td>
<td>-Fountain St Soccer Facility Construction</td>
<td>New Facility</td>
<td>Shane Taylor</td>
<td>Substantial completion on amenity building March 2024. Deficiencies underway on building and site.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>Sep-2021 to Jun-2025</td>
<td>$14,147,981.00</td>
<td>$289,406.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00582-20</td>
<td>-Older Adult Strategy</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Ails Adkins</td>
<td>Draft deliverables review meetings completed throughout corporation. Consultant currently drafting report. Staff to book dates for CLT Review Council Workshop, and graphics support for the final document.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Jan-2022 to Oct-2024</td>
<td>$76,000.00</td>
<td>$44,241.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01036-30</td>
<td>-Rec Facility Sponsorship &amp; Naming Plan</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Lesley Head</td>
<td>Staff resource in place. Development of website content and print resources underway to support the sponsorship campaign. Conversations &amp; networking with potential sponsors underway.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>May-2022 to Dec-2025</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$37,327.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01439-40</td>
<td>-Public Art 50th Anniversary</td>
<td>Community Improvement</td>
<td>Wanda Schaeffer-Stilting</td>
<td>50th Public Art Recommendation was received by Council on April 18 who directed staff to award the contract and approved the commissioning of the Public Art piece, providing delegated authority to execute a Public Art contract with the approved artist.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Aug-2024</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$231,083.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01540-20</td>
<td>-Recreation Services Rates &amp; Fees Review</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Lesley Head</td>
<td>Delayed 0%</td>
<td>Sep-2024 to Dec-2025</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recreation and Culture $152,651,433.00 | $129,058,781.83 |

Community Development $356,917,493.00 | $243,766,622.15 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A00103-40</td>
<td>Elevator Refurb - David Dunward Centre</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Wayne Ramsey</td>
<td>Project is complete. Next step is to close project.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Feb-2020 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$493,060.00</td>
<td>$684.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00118-40</td>
<td>Elevator Refurb - Centre for Arts</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Wayne Ramsey</td>
<td>Work is complete. Next step is to close project.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Dec-2023</td>
<td>$278,800.00</td>
<td>$148,568.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00129-40</td>
<td>City Hall Green Wall</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Wayne Ramsey</td>
<td>Project work addressed. Warranty work will continue after project closure.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Apr-2023 to Nov-2023</td>
<td>$254,500.00</td>
<td>$8,459.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00139-40</td>
<td>Hespeler Arena Dehumidifiers</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Wayne Ramsey</td>
<td>Procurement has specs and waiting for their release</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Feb-2023 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$1,043,400.00</td>
<td>$982,453.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00143-40</td>
<td>Fire Station 5 Sewer Pipe</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Wayne Ramsey</td>
<td>Project will expand through CLT and council approval for Project change, increase to budget</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Jul-2023</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00195-40</td>
<td>Station 6 Construction</td>
<td>New Facility</td>
<td>Steven Ruffin</td>
<td>LEED submission documentation are under review for submission. City staff met with Consultant and Contractor for status update</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Nov-2016 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$4,272,470.00</td>
<td>$140,664.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00246-40</td>
<td>Heritage Restore - Community Theatre</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>William Alan Vongkasasikamame</td>
<td>Drawings are finalized and specifications are being reviewed.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Feb-2024 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$173,700.00</td>
<td>$161,947.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00283-40</td>
<td>Rec Complex - Site Prep &amp; Servicing</td>
<td>New Facility</td>
<td>Slobodanka Lekic</td>
<td>Sidewalks were done up to the city’s property.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Sep-2019 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$4,400,000.00</td>
<td>$165,289.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00467-40</td>
<td>-Renovation - Riverside Park (Mickler) St</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Steven Ruffin</td>
<td>Construction ongoing</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Jan-2023 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$591,400.00</td>
<td>$186,645.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Id</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Work Completed</td>
<td>Project Status</td>
<td>% Completed</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Plan Cost (00)</td>
<td>Unexpended (00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00553-30</td>
<td>Heritage Reno - Hospeder Town Centre</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>William Alan Vongsasanoubane</td>
<td>Plans to start project mid-May 2024.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>May-2024 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00578-40</td>
<td>Roof Replace - Fire Station 1</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>William Alan Vongsasanoubane</td>
<td>Atlantic Roofers have mobilized to site on April 29, 2024. Construction schedule provided by Contractor is 10 working days to complete.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$193,800.00</td>
<td>$188,517.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00698-30</td>
<td>Design – Facility Renovations [2022]</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Slobodanka Lekic</td>
<td>Tender submissions are reviewed, the lowest compiled company is awarded.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>Jan-2022 to Oct-2024</td>
<td>$87,478.00</td>
<td>$26,791.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00698-40</td>
<td>City Hall - Curtain Wall Parapet Flashing</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>William Alan Vongsasanoubane</td>
<td>Bids received and Recommendation Report is being internally circulated for approval.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Nov-2024</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00770-30</td>
<td>Dickson Stadium Renovation – Design</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Slobodanka Lekic</td>
<td>Regular site inspection with reports with follow up.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>Jan-2022 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$74,242.00</td>
<td>$6,632.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00770-40</td>
<td>Dickson Stadium Renovation – Construction</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Slobodanka Lekic</td>
<td>Railing and concrete cap installation in progress.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$1,505,600.00</td>
<td>$160,037.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00981-40</td>
<td>Roof Repair - Allan Reuter Centre</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Steven Ruffini</td>
<td>Contractor prices have been received</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Feb-2023 to Mar-2024</td>
<td>$303,000.00</td>
<td>$293,993.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01148-40</td>
<td>Roof Refurb - Peason Scout House</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>William Alan Vongsasanoubane</td>
<td>Pre-construction meeting was held on April 19, 2024. Construction to begin on June 17, 2024.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Aug-2024</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$57,488.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01228-40</td>
<td>Roof Replace - New Hope Cemetery</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>William Alan Vongsasanoubane</td>
<td>Pre-construction meeting was held on April 19, 2024. Construction tentatively scheduled to begin June 17, 2024.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Aug-2024</td>
<td>$185,000.00</td>
<td>$180,254.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01230-20</td>
<td>Energy Assess - Carbon Reduction Strategy</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Ryan Hoeksma</td>
<td>Pilot site audit and operator interviews completed, energy modeling and other pilot site analyses underway with consultant. Arranging pre-assignment testing walkthrough with subconsultant.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Jan-2022 to Oct-2025</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$74,167.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01236-20</td>
<td>Building Condition Assessments [2024]</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Siobodanka Lekic</td>
<td>Draft RFP is prepared.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Mar-2024 to Jun-2025</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01398-40</td>
<td>Galt Arena Door Replacement</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Ryan Hoeksma</td>
<td>awaiting proposal from architectural consultant</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$140,000.00</td>
<td>$140,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01437-40</td>
<td>Newland Pool Accessibility improvements</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Wayne Ramsey</td>
<td>Project design is complete...... will be going to procurement for posting and to advisory committee for update</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Sep-2023 to Nov-2023</td>
<td>$114,700.00</td>
<td>$96,386.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01474-40</td>
<td>Heritage Restore - Landreth Cottage</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>William Alan Vongsasanoubane</td>
<td>Design phase is close to complete. Drawings are finalized and specifications are being reviewed.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Feb-2024 to Dec-2025</td>
<td>$172,000.00</td>
<td>$160,910.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01479-40</td>
<td>WJ Johnson Lunch Room and Storage</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Steven Ruffini</td>
<td>hire consultant</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Jun-2024 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$130,700.00</td>
<td>$130,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01480-40</td>
<td>City Campus Concrete paver replacement</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Steven Ruffini</td>
<td>Consultant selected</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Apr-2024 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01483-30</td>
<td>Soper Park Outdoor Pool Design and Plan</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Steven Ruffini</td>
<td>create RFP</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Jun-2024 to May-2025</td>
<td>$450,000.00</td>
<td>$450,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01543-40</td>
<td>New Hope Chapel Foundation Repairs</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>William Alan Vongsasanoubane</td>
<td>Contracts are executed. Purchase order to be issued to Contractor. Pre-construction meeting is on May 1, 2024. Construction to begin on May 13, 2024 and schedule duration is 3 weeks.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Dec-2023 to Aug-2024</td>
<td>$106,900.00</td>
<td>$98,825.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sustainable Design & Dev $14,160,790.00 $3,822,256.74
Corporate Enterprise $16,931,518.00 $5,447,039.27
### Corporate Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A001495-20</td>
<td>Records and Information Management</td>
<td>Strategy &amp; Governance</td>
<td>Veronica Mary Carr</td>
<td>Project Charter and Statement of Work in progress</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Mar-2024 to Feb-2025</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00549-20</td>
<td>Development Charges Update (2022)</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Katherine Hyde</td>
<td>Public Meeting was held April 16th, 2024. Watson consulting presented the DC Background study and impacts of the most recent proposed changes in BS 185.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Jul-2022 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$175,942.00</td>
<td>$96,249.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00906-40</td>
<td>SWM Funding Study - Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Sheryl Ayres</td>
<td>Project kick off held. First stage of requirements listing received from consultants. Preliminary meeting held on communications plan. Gills data provided to consultants, working on financial budget info.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Jul-2022 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$158,303.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financial Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A001410-10</td>
<td>Gas Monitoring Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>Brad Michael Churchill</td>
<td>No change, will commence in Nov. 2024</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Jan-2024</td>
<td>$68,300.00</td>
<td>$68,300.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fire Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A001411-10</td>
<td>Automated External Defibrillator Replace</td>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>Darned Jamieson</td>
<td>Research being done by training division. Selection of units in the next month. Then will be ordered.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Mar-2024 to Nov-2024</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A001412-10</td>
<td>SCBA Air Packs</td>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>Brad Michael Churchill</td>
<td>Confirming equipment availability with vendor and working on order with DCMO Peachey</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Mar-2024 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$84,000.00</td>
<td>$84,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A001461-10</td>
<td>Fire Fleet Growth (2024) - AD Vehicle</td>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>Brad Michael Churchill</td>
<td>Vehicle on order - Award Notice Document Completed - May/June delivery</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Mar-2024 to Aug-2024</td>
<td>$3,760,000.00</td>
<td>$3,760,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Technology Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A00778-40</td>
<td>Active Net Roadmap Implementation 2019</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Ravasti Devendran</td>
<td>Printpads have been installed and are operational at all open facilities.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Mar-2019 to Jul-2024</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$40,541.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00791-40</td>
<td>Corporate BI, Dashboard and Reporting</td>
<td>New Enterprise Application</td>
<td>Randolph Libby</td>
<td>Moving to closing phase of the project soon.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Feb-2024</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$8,039.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00793-20</td>
<td>Corporate Payment System Assess/Upgrade</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Mohammad Mamun</td>
<td>TS completed the demo with ActiveNet Payment Manager. 7th May 2024 - Demo with Stakeholders.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Mar-2019 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$8,700.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00796-40</td>
<td>Enterprise Content Mgmt Implementation</td>
<td>Networks &amp; Information Mgmt</td>
<td>Ravasti Devendran</td>
<td>Revisiting the scope and making sure everything is completed before putting it as Ready for Financial Close</td>
<td>Project work complete</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
<td>$5,939.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00797-40</td>
<td>GIS Strategy Implementation 2019</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Randolph Libby</td>
<td>2024 Strategy work plan initial draft created and currently under review.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>Jan-2021 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$40,508.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Id</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Work Completed</td>
<td>Project Status</td>
<td>% Completed</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Plan Cost</td>
<td>Unexpended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00708-40</td>
<td>Service Desk Configuration Management</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Ryan Small</td>
<td>Implementation for tracking hardware assets in the IT Service Management application is ongoing. Items brought through integrations have been reviewed and completed.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Sep-2019 to Dec-2023</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
<td>$23,666.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00804-40</td>
<td>Corporate Payment System Lifecycle</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Mohammad Mamun</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00937-40</td>
<td>Work Order Mgmt System Enhance 2024</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Kirby Childerhose</td>
<td>2024 Maximo Workplan priorities being identified.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$350,000.00</td>
<td>$350,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00926-10</td>
<td>Laptop/Desktop Replacement 2023</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Ryan Small</td>
<td>Assets are actively being replaced.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Jan-2023 to May-2024</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$18,429.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00927-10</td>
<td>Laptop/Desktop Replace Lifecycle 2024</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Ryan Small</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01028-40</td>
<td>cityONE Lifecycle Updates &amp; Replace 2024</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Kirby Childerhose</td>
<td>Start 2024 work plan.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$650,000.00</td>
<td>$650,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01066-40</td>
<td>SharePoint/ECM Roadmap Implementation</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Devendran</td>
<td>SharePoint servers shutdown on 15th April. Fileshare servers to be decommissioned on 31st May 2024</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Sep-2021 to May-2024</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$31,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01061-40</td>
<td>Digital Transform Citizen Portal Enhance</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Devendran</td>
<td>Parking Digitization: Parking Exemption form went live on 5th March 2024</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Sep-2021 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$183,111.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01062-40</td>
<td>Amanda Roadmap Implementation</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Kirby Childerhose</td>
<td>2024 Workplan roadmap being discussed with Amanda working group</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Jan-2022 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$450,000.00</td>
<td>$285,989.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01063-40</td>
<td>Customer Relationship Management Implementation</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Mohammad Mamun</td>
<td>Working with consultants and stakeholders to finalize the RFP.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Jan-2023 to Apr-2024</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01252-40</td>
<td>4-Wi-Fi Equipment Upgrade and Enhancement</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Ryan Small</td>
<td>All the hardware have been installed. Currently doing a wireless site survey for City Hall.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Jan-2022 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$380,000.00</td>
<td>$85,189.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01253-40</td>
<td>Bi/BW Strategy Development &amp; Enhancement</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Kirby Childerhose</td>
<td>Third draft received, currently under review, and providing feedback to consultant.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Jan-2022 to Mar-2024</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$29,403.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01254-40</td>
<td>Fire Record Mgmt System Implementation</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Mohammad Mamun</td>
<td>Working with Fire Services for next steps</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Jan-2023 to Dec-2023</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01255-30</td>
<td>Database Middleware Integration/Process</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Ryan Small</td>
<td>Nearing completion on the Migration of existing integrations to a new integration platform.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Jun-2022 to Apr-2024</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$67,840.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01256-40</td>
<td>IT Security Operations Centre (SOC)</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Kirby Childerhose</td>
<td>Deployment completed. Project work complete</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Apr-2022 to Aug-2024</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$224,402.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01419-10</td>
<td>Amanda Roadmap Implementation (2023)</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Kirby Childerhose</td>
<td>Will be starting work July 1st 2024</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Jan-2023 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01420-10</td>
<td>Network Eq. Lifecycle/Replace 2024</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Ryan Small</td>
<td>Reviewing the requirements and design.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01510-40</td>
<td>Amanda Roadmap Implementation (2024)</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Kirby Childerhose</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01511-40</td>
<td>GIS Roadmap Implementation (2024)</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Kirby Childerhose</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$350,000.00</td>
<td>$350,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01512-40</td>
<td>SharePoint Roadmap Implementation (2024)</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Devendran</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Id</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Work Completed</td>
<td>Project Status</td>
<td>% Completed</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Plan Cost</td>
<td>Unexpended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV1513-40</td>
<td>ActiveNet Roadmap Implementation (2024)</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Revathi Devendran</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV1514-40</td>
<td>Security Camera Hardware &amp; App 2024</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Ryan Small</td>
<td>PoC of a new system is being installed at the Lindon St. soccer facility. In progress</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV1515-40</td>
<td>Telephone Modernization - Teams 2024</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Ryan Small</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV1516-40</td>
<td>Connected City (2024)</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Mohammad Mamun</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV1517-40</td>
<td>Parking System &amp; Process Digitization 24</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Mohammad Mamun</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV1518-40</td>
<td>Bowman Room Technology Retrofit</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Ryan Small</td>
<td>Working through procurement and reviewing initial proposals and quotes. In progress</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Dec-2023 to May-2024</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Technology Services**

|                     |                                                 |                               |                     |                                                    |                | $6,320,000.00 | $5,003,457.40 |

**Corporate Services**

|                     |                                                 |                               |                     |                                                    |                | $10,605,642.00 | $9,168,009.82 |
### Project Information

#### Infrastructure Services

#### Asset Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A00786-20</td>
<td>Asset Management Plan - Phase 3</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Johannes Krijnen</td>
<td>Kick off meeting completed. Review of 2019 Asset Management Policy ongoing. Data collection required for 2024 interim Asset Management Plan ongoing.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Nov-2023 to Jun-2025</td>
<td>$357,000.00</td>
<td>$357,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01243-20</td>
<td>Heritage Condition Assessment – Phase 2</td>
<td>Condition Assessment</td>
<td>Ellis Patser</td>
<td>RFFQ Q24-25 closed April 10, 2024. Review and evaluation of bids is in progress.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$242,100.00</td>
<td>$242,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A001353-40</td>
<td>Renewal Capital Planning Decision Support</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Johannes Krijnen</td>
<td>Development with supplier of life cycle models for Core infrastructure, combined with staff training</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$193,930.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ES - Wastewater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A00756-30</td>
<td>-King St Sanitary Pumping Station - Design</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Robert James Black</td>
<td>Project work is complete for A00756-30, but project is tied to construction side of the King St. SPS Upgrade (A00756-40). PO will remain open until the construction is completed.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Jan-2021 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$208,154.00</td>
<td>$78,432.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00756-40</td>
<td>-King St Sanitary Pump Station - Construc</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Robert James Black</td>
<td>Generator FAT completed. Awaiting for mobilization plan and dates from MTE, Eramosa and Xterra.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Oct-2022 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$1,170,300.00</td>
<td>$599,705.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00960-30</td>
<td>-Corydon Pump Station Upgrade – Design</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Robert James Black</td>
<td>Reality services working on Easement agreement</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Jan-2024 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01246-40</td>
<td>-Water Meter Replacement Program (2024)</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Jason Alexander</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$499,400.00</td>
<td>$499,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01367-40</td>
<td>-Large Diameter Trunk Main Cleaning</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Robert James Black</td>
<td>Flushing, maintenance and CCTV completed on sanitary trunk main. Bypassing process completed. Equipment cleaned up with sanitary wastewater flowing normally now.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Jul-2024 to May-2024</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$61,020.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01438-40</td>
<td>-151 Burnham - Wastewater Servicing</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Ronald James Rooka</td>
<td>Project work complete: 100% Project Work Complete.</td>
<td>Project work complete</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Oct-2022 to Mar-2023</td>
<td>$97,700.00</td>
<td>$-0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ES - Wastewater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A01246-40</td>
<td>-Water Meter Replacement Program (2023)</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Jason Alexander</td>
<td>Contractor has installed 443 new meters and 8 appointment are booked for the next 2-3 weeks.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>Jan-2023 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$293,800.00</td>
<td>$73,506.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ES - Water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A01438-40</td>
<td>-151 Burnham - Wastewater Servicing</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Ronald James Rooka</td>
<td>Project work complete: 100% Project Work Complete.</td>
<td>Project work complete</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Oct-2022 to Mar-2023</td>
<td>$97,700.00</td>
<td>$-0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fleet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A00337-10</td>
<td>-Rep. Equip. 3 Ton Roll Off Unit (7968)</td>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>Michael Hewlett</td>
<td>Cab and Chassis ordered from Altruck - Altruck arranging new On-Truck body. Chassis Delivery anticipated Jan 2024 (originally October 2023) Lifttrat will require 6 months after initial delivery (July 2024).</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Feb-2018 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$1,066,139.00</td>
<td>$61,305.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00952-10</td>
<td>-Equipment Growth (2022)</td>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>Michael Hewlett</td>
<td>Delsoo ES mechanical sweeper order placed. Anticipated delivery May 2024.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Jan-2024 to Jul-2024</td>
<td>$654,238.00</td>
<td>$483,556.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00893-10</td>
<td>-Equipment Growth (2023)</td>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>Michael Hewlett</td>
<td>Order has been placed for a bucket truck (Late 2024 delivery anticipated). Bucket truck and Wide Area Aower (April 2024) are the only items remaining in this project.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Mar-2023 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$1,084,300.00</td>
<td>$477,349.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00895-10</td>
<td>-Equipment Replacement (2019)</td>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>Michael Hewlett</td>
<td>Cab and Chassis ordered from Altruck - Chipper body to be transferred to new chassis. Expected Delivery February 2024. Chipper is the only item remaining in this project.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>May-2019 to Apr-2024</td>
<td>$1,035,567.00</td>
<td>$85,221.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Project Id | Project Name | Project Type | Project Manager | Work Completed | Project Status | % Completed | Schedule | Plan Cost | Unexpended
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
AV0899-10 - Equipment Replacement (2021) | Equipment Purchase | Michael Hewlett | Review of a roll-off deck was determined impractical. Similar replacement order for skid steer and equipment ongoing. Post truck delivery dates late 2024. | In progress | 10% | Jan-2021 to Dec-2024 | $2,571,975.00 | $1,269,404.35
AV0986-10 - Equipment Replacement (2022) | Equipment Purchase | Michael Hewlett | Plow trucks awarded, significant delivery delays as a result of manufacturing constraints (late 24/25 delivery anticipated). Final tractor specification under review. | In progress | 70% | Jan-2022 to Feb-2025 | $1,476,262.00 | $963,770.89
AV0989-10 - Equipment Replacement (2023) | Equipment Purchase | Michael Hewlett | Plow trucks are on order with delivery anticipated for late 2024/25. Other items in this project have been ordered and/or delivered. | In progress | 60% | Mar-2023 to Apr-2025 | $2,765,800.00 | $1,979,982.99
AV0990-10 - Equipment Replacement (2024) | Equipment Purchase | Michael Hewlett | Five plow trucks are ordered, anticipated delivery October 2024 followed by 3 month uplift (April 2025). Procurement of other items ongoing. | Approved | 25% | | $4,170,000.00 | $3,850,473.60
AV1260-10 - Equipment Growth (2024) | Equipment Purchase | Michael Hewlett | Working through requirement and product identification. | Approved | 0% | | $326,600.00 | $326,600.00
AV1444-10 - Mobile Security Guards Vehicle | Equipment Purchase | Michael Hewlett | Working through user requirements and product availability. | Approved | 0% | | $50,000.00 | $6,613.62
Fleet |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  

### Operations

| Project Id | Project Name | Project Type | Project Manager | Work Completed | Project Status | % Completed | Schedule | Plan Cost | Unexpended |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
AV1531-40 - Pedestrian Bridges Deck Replacements | Review | Michael Hausser | Mill Creek bridge deck completed November 2023 as well as Park Rail trail bridge in October | In progress | 50% | Mar-2023 to Mar-2026 | $218,000.00 | $198,519.50
AV1438-20 - Winter Sidewalk Services Study | Community Improvement | Michael Hausser | Project on hold due to staff capacity. | Delayed | 0% | Mar-2023 to Feb-2024 | $120,000.00 | $120,000.00

### Ops - Cemeteries

| Project Id | Project Name | Project Type | Project Manager | Work Completed | Project Status | % Completed | Schedule | Plan Cost | Unexpended |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
AV0894-20 - Cemeteries Master Plan | Community Improvement | Michael Hausser | Information being provided to Consultant for initial review and analysis | In progress | 5% | Sep-2023 to Nov-2024 | $100,000.00 | $54,556.00

### Ops - Parks

| Project Id | Project Name | Project Type | Project Manager | Work Completed | Project Status | % Completed | Schedule | Plan Cost | Unexpended |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
AV0858-40 - Cuthbert Park - Hardscape/Signs | Park Renovate | Michael Hausser | Path replacements and other park improvements made. | Delayed | 65% | Jul-2016 to Nov-2023 | $200,000.00 | $117,411.14
AV0786-20 - Operations Facility Master Plan | Community Planning | Michael Hausser | Bid submittal received. In process of awarding through procurement. Selected propane is within budget. | In progress | 8% | Apr-2022 to Jun-2024 | $250,000.00 | $243,894.40
AV0691-20 - Parkland Strategy | Community Planning | Paul Wilms | Initial extensive consultation completed. Existing levels of service being developed for Council workshop and approval (for regulatory AM Plan deadlines). May/June. Draft Plan started, anticipated released for comment in Sept/Oct. | In progress | 60% | Aug-2022 to Apr-2025 | $227,300.00 | $104,927.81
AV0154-20 - Cricket Feasibility Study | Park Development | Michael Hausser | Approved | 0% | | | $50,000.00 | $50,000.00

### Ops - Parks

| Project Id | Project Name | Project Type | Project Manager | Work Completed | Project Status | % Completed | Schedule | Plan Cost | Unexpended |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---

| Infrastructure Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  

### Operations

| Operations |  | Fleet |  |  |  |  |  |  |  

### Ops - Cemeteries

| Operations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  

### Ops - Parks

| Operations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  

### Infrastructure Services

| Infrastructure Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A00477-40</td>
<td>Library Roof Replace - Queen Square (92)</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Mirna Raponi</td>
<td>Request for proposals for design and project management services to be issued in summer 2024.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Jul-2024 to Jun-2025</td>
<td>$418,000.00</td>
<td>$418,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00536-40</td>
<td>Library Roof Replace - Preston</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Mirna Raponi</td>
<td>Hazardous materials survey completed.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Nov-2023 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$698,000.00</td>
<td>$684,469.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00569-10</td>
<td>Library Computer Equipment (2023)</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Mirna Raponi</td>
<td>The majority of scheduled computer, infrastructure and server replacements are complete.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Jan-2023 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$334,000.00</td>
<td>$99,056.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00594-10</td>
<td>Library Materials (2024)</td>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>Mirna Raponi</td>
<td>Purchase of new library materials.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Jan-2024 to Sep-2024</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00595-10</td>
<td>Library Computer Equipment (2024)</td>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>Mirna Raponi</td>
<td>Request for proposals and quotes for equipment replacements and infrastructure enhancements are planned and/or have been issued.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Jan-2024 to Feb-2025</td>
<td>$503,000.00</td>
<td>$503,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00879-40</td>
<td>Library Queens Sq Entrance Renovations</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Mirna Raponi</td>
<td>Project planning has started. Hazardous materials survey completed. Request for proposals for design services to be issued in spring 2024.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Dec-2021 to Mar-2025</td>
<td>$120,000.00</td>
<td>$118,376.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A00878-40</td>
<td>Library HVAC Replacement (Preston)</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Mirna Raponi</td>
<td>Planning for request for proposal for design and project management.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Jan-2024 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$245,000.00</td>
<td>$245,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01123-40</td>
<td>Library - Bldg Envelope Repair (Preston)</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Mirna Raponi</td>
<td>Majority of construction is complete.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Jan-2022 to Jun-2024</td>
<td>$376,800.00</td>
<td>$62,239.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01368-40</td>
<td>Library HVAC Replacement (Queen's Square)</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Mirna Raponi</td>
<td>Planning for request for proposal for design and project management.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Jan-2024 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$86,000.00</td>
<td>$86,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01538-40</td>
<td>Library Window Replacement</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Mirna Raponi</td>
<td>Tender documents in process.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Apr-2024 to Dec-2024</td>
<td>$350,000.00</td>
<td>$345,295.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

$3,238,700.00  $2,674,397.63
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

By-law 24-XXX

Being a by-law of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge to amend By-law 21-065a, respecting the authorization of issuance of debentures for the rehabilitation of existing assets and construction of new assets contained in the Capital Funding Program (N. Cambridge Railway Grade Separation, Preston Auditorium Construction, Fountain Street Soccer Facility and East Side NS Collector Road Design)

WHEREAS the Corporation of the City of Cambridge (the "City") enacted By-law 21-065a amended by By-law 22-039 for the rehabilitation of existing assets and the construction of new assets for the City as identified in the City's capital program for the capital projects of: North Cambridge Railway Grade Separation, Preston Auditorium Construction, Fountain Street Soccer Facility Construction, East Side NS Collector Road Design (Allendale to Middle Block), and debenture monies to pay for the costs thereof at an amended estimated cost of $46,483,095;

AND WHEREAS the cost estimate of the aforementioned projects has further increased;

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

1. THAT By-law 21-065a is hereby amended as follows:
   a. Delete and replace the estimated cost of $46,483,095 in section 1, section 3, and in subsection 3.a. with a revised estimated cost of $47,937,115;

2. AND THAT this by-law shall come into force and effect on the day it is passed.

Enacted and Passed this 25th day of June, 2024.

__________________________________
MAYOR

__________________________________
CLERK
RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 24-034-CRS Fire Implementation Plan Phase One (1) be received;

AND THAT Council receives the proposed Fire Implementation Plan Phase One (1) Report 24-034-CRS as a strategic planning framework for the delivery of fire protection services within the City of Cambridge for the next three-year community planning horizon;

AND FURTHER THAT Council directs the Fire Chief to submit the Council approved recommendations for consideration as part of the City’s budgeting process as applicable.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

- The review of the 2023-2033 Master Fire and Emergency Services Plan (MFESP) illustrated the need for a division of the ten-year strategy into three distinct phases. This report addresses Phase One. A phase one implementation plan of the MFESP provides Council with near term objectives building on the strategic framework to inform the provision of fire protection services with identified community risk over the next 10-year community planning horizon.

Key Findings

- The proposed phase one implementation plan upholds the five (5) strategic priorities as guiding principles for future decision-making. The five (5) strategic priorities were developed in alignment with the City’s Strategic Plan.
The phase one plan has been informed by the ‘identified risks’ and ‘key findings’ presented within the new Community Risk Assessment (CRA) and has considered the impacts of mandatory firefighter certification over the next two (2) to four (4) years.

The phase one implementation plan incorporates the recently completed Cambridge Fire Department (CFD) Information Technology Strategic Plan. The plan provides immediate, mid-term and long-term direction to modernize the CFD’s workflows and integration of technologies to improve effectiveness and efficiencies within the CFD.

The phase one plan addresses resource efficiencies, closes structural gaps and advance business intelligence tools for evidence-based decision making.

The phase one plan incorporates operational changes to manage call volume, growth and prepare for future changes anticipated due to Medical Priority Dispatching System implementation anticipated in 2026.

The fire master planning process is intended to provide a strong focus on developing and implementing strategies for providing the most effective and efficient delivery of fire protection services that provide the most value to a community.

Financial Implications

- The Phase One Operational Implementation Plan includes staffing resource requests over a three-year period.
- The Phase One Operational Implementation Plan includes Capital Projects forecasted in the 2025 and 2027 Capital Budgets
- Council approved recommendations are subject to the annual departmental business planning budget cycle process.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☑ Strategic Action

Objective(s): RESILIENCY - Use a future-oriented, proactive approach to climate action and emergency preparedness

Strategic Action: Prepare for emergency prevention and recovery

OR
BACKGROUND:

Fire Master Plans

- Fire master plans review all aspects of the department in order to ensure that performance standards and guidelines reflect evidence/historic data, industry best practices and complies with legislation, in particular, the Fire Protection and Prevention Act, 1997 and its regulations.

- The goal is to identify and prioritize existing and future requirements of the service, provide recommendations, and offer fiscally responsible solutions. The master plan provides a road map for the fire service to address the needs for the city and its citizens by identifying future opportunities for service improvements over the coming years.

- The previous MFESP was received by Council in July of 2013. Fire master plans are typically updated every 7 to 10 years to address current and emerging needs. Fire master plans entail a detailed review of service provision as well as the staff, apparatus, equipment, and facilities required to meet present-day and future service needs for the community.

Community Risk Assessment

- Present and future fire protection needs are based on an assessment of risk, which informs decision making, and guides the development of strategies to mitigate the risk.

- O. Reg. 378/18: Community Risk Assessments, mandates that municipalities must complete a community risk assessment no later than July 1, 2024 and conduct annual reviews thereafter. The updated MFESP is informed by the City of Cambridge Community Risk Assessment, completed in September 2022.

- Due to proprietary and sensitive business information, consistent with the city’s Hazard Identification and Risk Analysis document, this is not a public document. This document, however, has been provided in confidence to Council.

Fire IT Strategic Plan

- The use of technology and the data it produces has become increasingly essential to fire services. The analysis of emergency incidents, inputs, key performance
indicators and outcomes is increasingly becoming the primary driver of program prioritization and resource allocation decisions. Further, opportunities exist to enhance delivery of services that rely on information and systems in true mission critical situations where livelihoods, properties and lives are at stake. The MFESP reviewed and incorporated many aspects of the CFD IT Strategic Plan, completed in December 2022.

- The City received $39,528 in grant funding from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing’s Audit and Accountability Fund to offset the $62,000 budget. The final report has been previously distributed to Council. It is a public document and can be located on the Cambridge Fire Department website at Cambridge Fire Department IT Strategic Plan: Summary Report – Final

ANALYSIS:

A comprehensive review and analysis of the Fire Master Plan was completed by the Fire Leadership Team to assess and evaluate each of the 15 Council recommendations.

Of the 15 Council recommendations four (4) were chosen for implementation in Phase One:

1. **Recommendation 2**

   That consideration be given to the creation of a new Administrative Assistant position.

   Current business intelligence gaps exist, and a need has been identified to review data, create real-time dashboards and utilize predictive modelling to measure key performance indicators (KPI's) and find efficiencies in our service delivery. We have a unique opportunity to convert a Division Chief position to an Administrative Assistant and contract a data analyst while still saving approximately $40,000 annually. This is a critical step required to develop and assess recommendations for Phase Two and Phase Three of the Implementation Plan.

2. **Recommendation 3**

   Transition the hybrid inspector/educator to a dedicated inspector; and hire a new Fire Inspector.

   The proposed Fire Prevention Strategy within the MFESP Update indicates that the Fire Prevention Division is functioning at optimal utilization of existing staff. Although they are meeting the municipalities legislated fire inspection requirements, they are unable to complete routine inspections of identified risks from our CRA. The hybrid inspector/educator has been converted with no
impact to the operating budget. The hiring of a new Fire Inspector transitions our strategy from a reactive position to a proactive position. Routine inspection cycles of identified at risk occupancies assist in reversing the trend of increasing fire and emergency calls.

3. **Recommendation 6**

That Council consider allocating sufficient funding within the City’s 2025 operating budget to hire eight additional firefighters to maintain the CFD's current minimum on-duty staffing levels.

New (over the last 5 to 10 years) employment standards and workplace legislation have created significant pressures on the 1:1.25 staffing model utilized by Fire Services for years. To meet our daily staffing, we require an average of two (2) overtime firefighters to complete the roster. This constant overtime has obvious financial implications, but it also contributes to the increase in injury claims. Dependency on overtime leads to burnout and an increase in both chemical and traumatic exposures.

4. **Recommendation 11**

It is recommended that Council consider adding a Pumper staffed with a crew of four (4) firefighters (requiring the hiring of 22 firefighters) to a renovated Station 4. As the city continues to grow and the population intensifies, there is an increasing demand for services. Continued pressures in the downtown Galt locations (identified on page 183 of the MFESP) are drawing resources from other station districts within the city, affecting the department response times and standards of coverage. Completion of this MFESP Update and subsequent Phased Implementation Plan recognizes the continued commitment of Council and senior municipal staff in striving to achieve the most effective and efficient level of fire protection services supporting community well-being and community-building.

Neither this Council, nor future Councils, are bound to any or all of the recommendations contained within the MFESP or this Phase One report. As future fiscal, regulatory, and environmental circumstances can change priorities and timing of actionable items.

While there are numerous recommendations presented within the MFESP, these priorities lay out a strategic approach to decision making. They are guiding principles for future Council deliberations pertaining to the delivery of fire protection services within the city.
EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

1. **By-law 20-016: Establish, Maintain and Operate a Fire Department**

   An Establishing and Regulating (E&R) by-law articulates Council’s policy and direction for the fire protection services it provides to meet the municipality’s needs and circumstances. The E&R by-law should further state the type and level of fire protection services that the municipality provides. Staff intends to bring forward an updated E&R by-law later this year.

2. **O. Reg. 378/18: Community Risk Assessments**

   Effective July 1, 2024, every municipality must complete and review annually its community risk assessment (CRA) and use it to inform decisions about the provision of fire protection services. The CRA serves to inform the needs and circumstances of the municipality when completing a fire master plan. It is prudent to create or review and revise the CRA in order to ensure that the most current hazards are identified and assessed in determining fire protection services and resultant resource allocations within a municipality to address those risks. The CRA for the City of Cambridge has been completed and was utilized in the creation of the MFESP.

3. **O. Reg. 343/22: Firefighter Certification**

   Effective July 1, 2026, every municipality must ensure that its firefighters perform fire protection services that they are certified to perform.

   The fire protection services provided are based on the municipality’s needs and circumstances and are to be approved by Council through an Establishing and Regulating by-law. If a service is approved by Council, Council must fund the staffing, training, and equipping of personnel to perform those services safely and according to the applicable standard.

   Current and previous Councils have provided support to Fire Services in fulfilling its requirements and the Cambridge Fire Department already has its firefighters certified to the various NFPA standards required by July 1, 2026, and is working on additional technical certifications well ahead of the July 1, 2028 deadline.
FINANCIAL IMPACT:

- Phase One Operational Plan recommendations and the estimated costs are listed in the charts below.
- These are estimates which may or may not be approved, in whole or in part by Council.
- Approved recommendations are subject to the annual budget process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Addition</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>FTE Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firefighter</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Prevention Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Operating (Existing - Conversion of CCO to AA and Data Analyst)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analyst and Business Intelligence</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Operating (Existing - Conversion of CCO to AA and Data Analyst)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCO Position</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Operating (Existing - Conversion of CCO to AA and Data Analyst)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Operating Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE Salary Cost</td>
<td>$1,253,040</td>
<td>$1,558,000</td>
<td>$1,558,000</td>
<td>Costing as per Fire Master Plan</td>
<td>$4,369,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Savings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$(40,000)</td>
<td>Annual savings from conversion</td>
<td>$(40,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Savings</td>
<td>$(480,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Renegotiated dispatch professional services</td>
<td>$(480,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Operating Cost</td>
<td>$773,040</td>
<td>$1,558,000</td>
<td>$1,518,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$3,849,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Annual Net Property Tax Increase (%)</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station 4 Design</td>
<td>$228,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Approved in the Capital Forecast – DC</td>
<td>$228,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A/00621-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 4 Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$3,012,500</td>
<td>Approved in the Capital Forecast – DC</td>
<td>$3,012,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A/00621-40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 4 Bunker Gear</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$126,000</td>
<td>Approved in the Capital Forecast - CWRF</td>
<td>$126,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A/00622-10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Fleet Growth</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Approved in the Capital Forecast – DC</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A/01426-10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$4,767,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC VALUE:

Leadership:

This report serves to action and implement recommendations from the updated MFESP. The MFESP positively reflects the future-facing strategic approach of the Fire Leadership team and the professional level of service provided by CFD personnel. This should contribute to residents’ pride of place by knowing that Cambridge Fire Department is positively contributing to the City of Cambridge’s reputation as a world-class city.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:

Not Applicable

PUBLIC INPUT:

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:

The Phase One (1) framework was created with the support of:

**Technology Services:** Meetings to discuss the Fire Department’s need for business intelligence tools, current internal capacity and expertise and corporate alignment with cyber security.

**Financial Services:** Financial implications and budget charts were created in conjunction with financial analyst.

**Corporate Strategy:** Discussions and consultation through meetings and review of this document were arranged to ensure alignment with corporate vision for the future of the city of Cambridge.

All recommendations for edit and suggestions for content were adopted.

CONCLUSION:

The Fire Implementation Plan Phase One (1) is the first phase of implementing the 2023-2033 MFESP. The recommendations in phase one (1) set a solid foundation to address resource efficiencies, close structural gaps and advance business intelligence tools for evidence-based decision making.

The recommendations will enhance service delivery, manage growth and provide key analytics required for critical decision making to provide fire protection services with identified community risk over the next 10-year community planning horizon.

This framework is designed to follow the annual budget process to ensure fiscal
responsibility and alignment with city’s vision and priorities.

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:
None.
To: COUNCIL
Meeting Date: 5/28/2024
Subject: Recommendation Report for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment - 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street North
Submitted By: Sylvia Rafalski-Misch, MCIP, RPP, Manager, Development Planning
Prepared By: Toula Theocharidis, MCIP, RPP, Senior Planner, Meridian Planning Consultants
Report No.: 24-078-CD
File No.: OR05-23
Wards Affected: Ward 3

RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 24-078-CD Recommendation Report for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment - 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street North be received;

AND THAT Council adopt proposed Official Plan Amendment No. 79 to redesignate the subject lands from 'Business Industrial' to 'High-Density Residential' with Site-Specific Policy 8.10.115 to permit increased density with maximum of 1,215 residential units and a maximum building height of up to 19 storeys, and that the adopted Official Plan Amendment be submitted to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo for approval;

AND THAT Cambridge Council approves the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment to amend the zoning of the subject lands from 'General Industrial' - M3 to the 'Multiple Residential' - RM3 S.4.1.477, with Site-Specific provisions and a Holding (H) provision to facilitate the development of 1,215 residential apartment units;

AND THAT Council is satisfied that the requirement for a public meeting in accordance with subsections 17(15) and 34(17) of the Planning Act has been met; and,

AND FURTHER THAT the By-law(s) attached to this report 24-078-CD be passed.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide a recommendation on the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications for a rental residential apartment development consisting of 1,215 units.

Key Findings

- The Subject Lands are located within the City’s existing delineated Built-Up Area and the proposal represents an opportunity to transform the lands into a vibrant redevelopment. The proposed development is within the City’s Regeneration Area in the City of Cambridge Official Plan, which anticipates a transition of use from employment uses to non-employment uses and where intensification is encouraged.

- The proposed development offers the intensification of lands at a higher density within the Built-Up Area where municipal services are available, and where increased density is encouraged and anticipated.

- The Subject Lands border the draft Preston Major Transit Station Area (MTSA) and are located within a 15 minute walking distance of the future Preston Transit Station. The proposal provides an opportunity for a transit-supportive development offering additional housing options, contributing to the creation of a complete community or a 15 minute neighborhood.

- The Subject Lands will be serviced with the existing municipal water and wastewater systems. The proposed development aligns with Provincial, Regional and City goals and objectives with respect to intensification.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

- A planning application fee in the amount of $40,000 has been paid to the City of Cambridge to process the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments.

- This application was submitted prior to the Planning Act changes resulting from Bill 109 and therefore is not subject to fee refunds.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action

Objective(s): Not Applicable

Strategic Action: Not Applicable
BACKGROUND:

Subject Property

The Subject Lands are municipally known as 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street North ("the Subject Lands"), and are legally described as Plan 716, Lot 216, Part of Lot 217, Plan 533, Part of Lot 3 to Part of Lot 6, RP-58R9554, Parts 1 to 5, City of Cambridge, Regional Municipality of Waterloo.

The Subject Lands have frontage on the north side of Laurel Street, as well as on the west side of Dolph Street North and have a total area of approximately 3.17 hectares (7.83 acres). The Subject Lands have approximately 150 metres (492 feet) of frontage along Laurel Street and 110 metres (361 feet) of frontage along Dolph Street North. The northern limit of the lands is bounded by a Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) freight line, which is still in use.

The Subject Lands are currently occupied by one large industrial multi-tenant building, containing various warehousing and manufacturing units, as well as outdoor storage facilities. The proposal involves demolishing the existing building in order to facilitate the proposed development. An aerial image of the Subject Lands is provided below on Figure 1.

Surrounding Land Uses

The Subject Lands are located within an established neighbourhood that is generally characterized by low-density residential and commercial/industrial lands. Immediately north of the Subject Lands is a railway line that provides active freight service with low train volumes and speeds. Further north, there are primarily industrial and residential lands as well as Lawrence Park. To the immediate west, there is a craft brewery operation and low-density residential dwellings along Laurel Street, beyond which is Civic Legion Park. To the south there are low-density detached and townhouse dwellings along Dolph Street North and Laurel Street, as well as residential lands along Duke Street. To the east there are residential and industrial lands. Further north and west is the Preston Core Area, which places the Subject Lands within walking distance to a range of local services and amenities.
ANALYSIS:

Proposal

The applicant is proposing an Official Plan Amendment to redesignate the Subject Lands from ‘Business Industrial’ to ‘High-Density Residential’ with site-specific policies to permit an increased density on the subject lands to a maximum of 1,215 units and a maximum building height of up to 19 storeys. The applicant is also proposing a Zoning By-law Amendment to change the zoning of the Subject Lands from ‘General Industrial’ - M3 to the ‘Multiple Residential’ - RM3 with site-specific provisions to facilitate the development of 1,215 residential apartment units.

Following the September 5, 2023 Public Meeting, Council and staff expressed a desire for additional parking for the proposal on a per unit basis. In response to this request, the applicant has revised the concept plan by increasing the supply of parking through
the addition of another level of structured parking within the podium of the building. To offset the significant extra cost of the additional parking, the applicant has revised their plan to increase the number of units, which resulted in increased building height.

Table 1 below compares the proposed building heights presented at the Public Meeting with the current updated proposal:

Table 1: Proposed Building Height Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Buildings</th>
<th>Public Meeting Concept Plan, September 2023</th>
<th>Current Concept Plan, March 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tower A</td>
<td>12 and 14 storeys</td>
<td>16 and 19 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower B</td>
<td>12 storeys</td>
<td>15 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower C</td>
<td>12 and 14 storeys</td>
<td>16 and 19 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower D</td>
<td>12 storeys</td>
<td>15 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower E</td>
<td>7 storeys</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower F</td>
<td>7 storeys</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Towers A through D sit on top of the proposed podium, which ranges in height from 3 storeys along Dolph Street North to 4 storeys at the western end of the lands due to sloping topography from east to west. The tower height provided in Table 1 includes the podium height.

To achieve a more balanced approach between parking supply and demand, the applicant has worked with staff to accommodate a higher parking rate to the satisfaction of Planning and Transportation staff. The following tables provide an overview of the proposed parking breakdown comparing the current plan (March 2024) with the plan presented at the Statutory Public Meeting (September 2023):
Table 2A: Proposed Parking Breakdown, Current Resubmission, March 2024

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Space Type</th>
<th>Required Rate per ZBL</th>
<th>Required Spaces per ZBL</th>
<th>Proposed Parking Rate</th>
<th>Proposed Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>1.0 spaces per unit</td>
<td>1,215 spaces</td>
<td>1.0 spaces per unit</td>
<td>1,215 spaces</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td>0.25 spaces per unit</td>
<td>304 spaces</td>
<td>0.15 spaces per unit</td>
<td>183 spaces</td>
<td>121 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,519 spaces</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>*1,398 spaces</td>
<td>121 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1398 spaces calculated, the plan provides for 1401 total spaces

Table 2B: Proposed Parking Breakdown, Public Meeting Submission, September 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Space Type</th>
<th>Required Rate per ZBL</th>
<th>Required Spaces per ZBL</th>
<th>Proposed Parking Rate</th>
<th>Proposed Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>1.0 spaces per unit</td>
<td>1,046 spaces</td>
<td>0.9 spaces per unit</td>
<td>942 spaces</td>
<td>104 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td>0.25 spaces per unit</td>
<td>262 spaces</td>
<td>0.1 spaces per unit</td>
<td>105 spaces</td>
<td>157 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,308 spaces</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,047 spaces</td>
<td>261 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current plan proposes a total of 1,215 apartment units and a total of 1,401 parking spaces provided on site, whereas the plan presented at the Public Meeting proposed 1,046 apartment units and a total of 1,047 spaces. Although the total unit count has increased on the current plan, the applicant is providing a higher parking rate, at 1.15 spaces per unit for residential and visitor parking, which is closer to meeting the minimum parking requirement of 1.25 spaces in the Zoning By-law.

The current plan provides additional parking spaces. At the request of staff, the applicant has updated the concept plan to implement a slightly narrower parking stall width of 2.75 metres, reduced from 2.9 metres per the Zoning By-law. The reduction in the stall width applies to all proposed podium parking and surface parking spaces and excludes the proposed barrier free spaces. The proposed car parking will be unbundled, whereby future residents have the option to reserve a parking space as part of their tenancy, which would attract non-auto users. Staff find that this option can contribute to reducing the overall parking demand on site.
The proposed development will be rental tenure and subject to a future Site Plan application to implement the proposed development. The concept site plan is included in Appendix A, and the concept elevations and renderings are included in Appendix B to this report.

**Policy Overview**

The Subject Lands are within the Built-Up Area as identified in the Growth Plan, the Regional Official Plan (ROP), and the City Official Plan (City OP).

The Subject Lands are designated ‘Business Industrial’ and are within the City’s Regeneration Area, which is described in the City OP as an area intended to experience a land use transition from Industrial to Residential. Policy 2.7.3.2 of the City OP identifies Regeneration Areas as one of the areas in the City where intensification is encouraged to support and ensure the viability of existing and planned transit service levels.

An Official Plan Amendment is required to redesignate the lands from ‘Business Industrial’ to ‘High-Density Residential’ with a site-specific policy to permit an increased density that would accommodate up to 1,215 residential units and a maximum building height of 19 storeys.

Section 2.8.3.3 of the City OP establishes a maximum Floor Space Index (FSI) of 2.0 for development in Regeneration Areas. The proposed FSI including the podium parking is approximately 4.65. Excluding the podium parking, the proposed development has an FSI of approximately 3.39. In both instances, the proposed FSI exceeds the maximum FSI permission in the Official Plan. To appropriately reflect how density is controlled on this site, staff recommend implementing a density based on a maximum number of units for the site rather than applying FSI. Additional building and tower setbacks are also included in the proposed site specific policies and zoning by-law provisions. The maximum density requirement in the Zoning By-law for the RM3 zone is based on units per hectare and not FSI, therefore, staff recommend including a maximum unit cap in both the site specific Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments.

Further, Section 2.8.3.3 of the City OP prescribes a maximum building height of 8 storeys in Regeneration Areas. In this regard, the Towers which flank Laurel Street meet this policy. However, Towers A to D, which range in height between 15 and 19 storeys exceed this maximum and require an amendment to the Official Plan. While a maximum building height of 8 storeys is prescribed, the City’s Regeneration Areas are intended to accommodate intensification through mixed and higher density land uses. In the absence of City led planning studies or Secondary Plans for the City’s Regeneration Areas, site specific Official Plan Amendments are required to facilitate land use changes and establish appropriate height and densities on a site-specific basis. The Subject
Lands and surrounding lands are planned for intensification and the density, scale, height and massing of built forms in the area will continue to evolve over time as redevelopment occurs.

Further, land use compatibility between the proposed residential development and the existing industrial uses and the adjacent CPR line will be addressed through the submission of an updated Stationary Noise Study that will be required through the use of a Holding provision as part of the implementing Zoning By-law Amendment. The Stationary Noise Study will also assess any potential noise impacts from the proposed development (e.g. rooftop or HVAC equipment) on nearby residential properties. In addition, staff has included a site specific provision that requires as part of future Site Plan application, the submission of an affidavit and a report from a qualified engineering consultant that the proposed development meets all noise levels and all safety standards of the Railway Association of Canada (RAC) *Guidelines for New Development in Proximity to Railway Operations*, to the satisfaction of City Planning in consultation with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Overall, the proposal is consistent with the Provincial, Regional and City policy direction to build healthy, sustainable communities and provide for intensification within the Built-Up Area. The Subject Lands provide an opportunity for residential infill redevelopment that will be compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood. Additionally, the proposal will maximize the use of existing infrastructure available in the vicinity and overall represents appropriate development providing more housing options within the Built-Up Area of Cambridge.

The Subject Lands are zoned ‘Industrial’ - M3 under Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended. A Zoning By-law Amendment to change the use from the current ‘Industrial’ - M3 zone to the ‘Multiple Residential’ - RM3 zone with the following site-specific provisions:

- To allow a maximum density of 385 units per hectare whereas a maximum density of 75 units per hectare is permitted;
  
  - The intent of this provision is to ensure that the proposal is compatible with the character of the surrounding area. The Subject Lands are located within a Regeneration Area in the City OP where intensification is encouraged and transition from employment uses is anticipated, with the intent that in the future, the surrounding area will accommodate significantly higher forms of density. Further, the proposed density will help achieve the City’s goal of ensuring the creation of 65 percent of new housing units through infill and intensification of Built-Up Area of the City. The proposed density, although higher than the maximum allowable density outlined in the current Zoning By-
law, is being proposed in an efficient, compact form that integrates well with the surrounding area.

- In addition, the Subject Lands are outside of the Preston Core Area and border the City’s draft Preston Major Transit Station Area (MTSA), which is intended to attract the highest forms of density to support the City’s continued growth. The proposal is transit-supportive and within walking distance of the future Preston Transit Station. Given the proximity of the Subject Lands to the Preston Core Area, the proposal to permit increased density on the Subject Lands is appropriate.

- It is staff’s opinion that the Subject Lands are well positioned to accommodate the level of density proposed on-site as the lands are located in an excellent location to accommodate future population growth, given the walkable nature of the community and convenient access to a number of community amenities and local infrastructure.

- To permit a maximum building height between 8 to 19 storeys, subject to meeting additional minimum building setbacks from various lot lines;

  - The RM3 zone does not regulate building height. The maximum building height of 8 storeys is a requirement of the Official Plan policy for Regeneration Areas. The applicant is proposing maximum building heights ranging from 8 to 19 storeys. The building design positions the two 8 storey buildings along Laurel Street and the tallest buildings in behind and further from the street to reduce massing. Further, for buildings that are 8 storey in height or taller, the building design has incorporated additional building setbacks from the property line along Laurel and Dolph Streets and the adjacent properties to provide appropriate spacing and transition between the proposed development and the surrounding properties. All required minimum building setbacks applicable to the RM3 zone in the Zoning By-law will be met or exceeded.

  - The massing of the proposed towers has been oriented to limit shadow impacts over the surrounding properties, particularly during the spring and fall equinoxes. The applicant submitted a Shadow Study in support of the proposed development. During the spring and fall equinoxes, the adjacent properties in the area will have partial shadowing caused by the development from late morning until noon. The criteria to evaluate shadowing is that at least 50% or more of the property should not be shaded for more than two interval times (a 4-hour period), or at least 50% of the property should be in full sun for at least two interval periods (a 4-hour equivalency). In consideration of the criteria used to evaluate shadow impacts, and due to the
placement of the buildings and the significant setbacks, the shadow impacts are minimal and meet the criteria.

- The Province’s Growth Plan and the City’s Official Plan provides policies that guide growth and development. The Subject Lands are situated outside of the Preston Core Area and border the City’s draft Preston Major Transit Station Area (MTSA), and as such the proposed increased density and population will increase the ridership necessary to have a successful transit system in the area. Further, the addition of residents in this location will support existing local businesses. It is staff’s opinion that due to the location of the Subject Lands, the requested increase in maximum building height for the proposed development is appropriate.

- To permit a total minimum parking rate of 1.15 spaces (residents and visitors) per unit whereas a minimum of 1.25 spaces per unit or a minimum of 1,519 parking spaces are required;
  
  - The proposed rate of 1.15 spaces provides a minimum of 1.0 space per residential unit and 0.15 spaces per unit for visitor parking. Under the Zoning By-law, the parking rate would require 1,519 parking spaces based on 1,215 apartment units, whereas the applicant is proposing 1,401 parking spaces, a shortage of 121 parking spaces. This is an improvement from the applicant’s previous submission proposing 0.9 spaces per residential unit and 0.1 spaces per unit for visitor parking.
  
  - The applicant submitted a Parking Justification Study prepared by Crozier, dated June 2023 and a Parking Justification Study Comment Response memo prepared January 4, 2024 with justification for the reduction, indicating that the proposed parking rate is sufficient based on requirements for similar uses across neighbouring municipalities. Furthermore, the Transportation Impact Study (TIS), prepared by Crozier, dated January 2024 also supports the proposed parking reduction. The applicant proposes unbundled parking, whereby future residents have the option to reserve a parking space as part of their tenancy. This option would attract non-auto users, while reducing the overall parking demand on-site. To further support the proposed parking reduction, the applicant has committed to implement Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures, including incorporating on-site bicycle parking and securing bicycle storage through the future Site Plan application.
  
  - Overall, the reduced parking is considered acceptable given the subject land’s proximity to existing transit options. The Subject Lands border the draft Preston Major Transit Station Area (MTSA) and are located within a 15
minute walking distance of the future Preston Transit Station. Staff are comfortable in supporting the reduced number of parking spaces in order to promote the use of transit and other forms of transportation in the City. The proposed development supports the revitalization of this area. It is staff's opinion that the requested parking rate reduction is appropriate and will not create any adverse impacts.

- To permit a minimum required width of a parking stall (not including barrier free stalls) of 2.75 metres (9.02 feet), whereas a minimum stall width of 2.9 metres (9.5 feet) is required;
  
  - The general intent of this provision is to ensure that parking spaces provide a minimum width and length to provide adequate spacing for vehicular parking. Staff suggested increasing the parking supply by slightly reducing the size of the parking stall width. This resulted in additional 37 parking spaces for the proposed development. The reduction in the stall width is comparable to other parking standards across neighbouring municipalities and will not result in adverse impacts. The reduction does not include barrier free stalls. Staff are of the opinion that the reduction of the parking stall width is appropriate.

- To permit a minimum required amenity area of 15 square metres (161 square feet) per unit, which shall include both private and common amenity area, whereas a minimum amenity area of 20 square metres (215 square feet) per unit is required;
  
  - The Zoning By-law requires that a multi-unit residential building provides a minimum amenity area of 20 square metres per studio or one bedroom dwelling unit and a minimum of 30 square metres per each two-bedroom dwelling unit or more. The intent of this provision is to provide private amenity space for the exclusive use of the residential units (e.g. balconies, patios etc.). The applicant is proposing a reduction, which applies to all of the units regardless of the number of bedroom units. The reduction impacts residential units that have 2 or more bedrooms.

  - The applicant has provided sufficient amenity space including indoor amenity areas, private balconies, ground floor outdoor amenity space and a rooftop terrace. The applicant has identified all proposed private and common amenity areas on the concept plan. Staff find that the reduction in required amenity area (5.0 square metres / 54 square feet) is not considered to be significant given the proximity to a range of outdoor amenity spaces provided on-site in addition to recreational park spaces in the area.
Staff find that the request is a minor reduction and continues to meet the intent of the Zoning By-law, and therefore is considered appropriate.

- To establish a minimum setback of 30 metres from the lot line abutting the CPR line provided that the setback can be achieved through a combination of horizontal separation (being a building setback from the property line) and vertical separation (being the vertical distance between the average finished grade and the closest residential dwelling unit);

- The applicant is requesting a horizontal building setback of 15 metres from the rear lot line abutting the CPR line, and an additional vertical setback of 15 metres from the finished grade to the closest residential unit, achieving the 30 metres in total required by the RAC Guidelines. The intent of this provision is to ensure that properties have sufficient spacing from a railway. In this case, the CPR corridor abuts the Subject Lands along the rear portion of the proposed development. The podium acts to provide increased distance from the railway corridor, thus reducing the noise and providing safe distance from the railway corridor. Section 3 of the RAC Guidelines apply a 30 metre setback, which will be achieved for this development through the combined design of the podium/garage wall and the horizontal setback to the property line whereby the horizontal and vertical setbacks are totaled to meet the required setback.

In summary, the proposed development provides an opportunity to transform an industrial site to a vibrant transit supportive residential development that is within walking distance to the Preston Core Area. The proposal will support the growing population of the City by providing additional housing options in proximity to existing and future planned higher order transit.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff gave consideration to Provincial, Regional and City policies and agency comments, and compatibility with the surrounding neighbourhood with respect to height and density. The proposed increase in height and in the total number of residential units will not result in unacceptable impacts related to land use compatibility with the surrounding community, impacts on local traffic, proposed parking and the adjacent CPR line.

It is the opinion of Planning Staff that the proposed applications are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, conform with the policies of the Provincial Growth Plan 2020 and the Regional Official Plan and meet the general intent of the City Official Plan and the City of Cambridge Zoning By-law No. 150-85.
Should Council approve the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments, a Site Plan application will be required to implement the proposed site specific policies and zoning by-law provisions.

Planning decisions are subject to appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT). An appeal may be filed if the application is refused, approved, or if a decision is not made within the timeline for processing the applications set out in the Planning Act. The application was received in June 2023, prior to revised Planning Act legislation and is not subject to fee refunds. The timelines for making a decision were exceeded, providing additional time for alterations to the original submission.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

City of Cambridge Official Plan, 2012, as amended:

Existing Land Use Designation(s): Built-Up Area and Business Industrial as per Maps 1A and 2 in the City’s Official Plan. The lands are also identified as being within a Regeneration Area as per Map 6 of the Official Plan.

Proposed Site-Specific Official Plan Designation: Built-Up Area and High-Density Residential with Site-Specific Policy 8.10.115.

Proposed Site-Specific Official Plan Policies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standard</th>
<th>Existing Official Plan Policy or Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed OPA 79, Site-Specific Policy 8.10.115</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td>19 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density</td>
<td>2.0 FSI</td>
<td>A minimum and maximum FSI shall not apply. A maximum of 1,215 units shall apply.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The existing and proposed land use designation in the City’s Official Plan is shown on Figure 2.
Figure 2 – Existing and Proposed Land Use Designation in the City Official Plan

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

Existing Zoning: General Industrial (M3) zone

Proposed Zoning: Multiple Residential (RM3) s.4.1.477 with site-specific provisions

Proposed Site-Specific Zoning Provisions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standard</th>
<th>Existing RM3 Zoning By-law No. 150-85 Requirements</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning Standards for RM3 S.4.1.477</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density (units per net residential hectare or “UPH”)</td>
<td>75 UPH</td>
<td>385 UPH (1,215 total units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Amenity Area (square metres per dwelling unit)</td>
<td>20 square metres per one-bedroom unit; 30 square metres per two or more-bedroom unit</td>
<td>15 square metres per unit; includes private and common amenity area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Required Parking Rate</td>
<td>1.25 spaces per unit</td>
<td>1.15 spaces per unit; (1.0 space per unit and 0.15 spaces per unit for visitors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Parking Stall Width</td>
<td>2.9 metres</td>
<td>2.75 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Standard</td>
<td>Existing RM3 Zoning By-law No. 150-85 Requirements</td>
<td>Proposed Zoning Standards for RM3 S.4.1.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Height</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8 to 19 storeys, subject to meeting additional minimum setbacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Setback from Railway</td>
<td>This standard is not part of the Zoning By-law</td>
<td>30 metres (or 15 metres horizontal and 15 metres vertical setback), subject to Section 3 of Railway Association of Canada (RAC) Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions – Lot Lines</td>
<td>As per Section 1</td>
<td>Establish the front, rear, side and exterior side lot lines (due to irregular shaped lot)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The existing and proposed zoning is shown on Figure 3 below.

![Figure 3 – Existing and Proposed Zoning](image)

**Holding Provision**

The Region requires a Holding Provision be added to the Zoning By-law Amendment for the Subject Lands for the following:
• The submission of a Record of Site Condition (RSC) and the Ministry’s Acknowledgement Letter be received to the satisfaction of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo.

• The submission of a detailed Stationary Noise Study assessing the impact of the building design regarding on-site and off-site sensitive uses be submitted to confirm that the development will comply with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MOECP) noise guidelines.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

• A planning application fee in the amount of $40,000 has been paid to the City of Cambridge to process the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment.

• Future planning application fees will be required as part of the submission of a complete Site Plan application for each phase of development.

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

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

PUBLIC VALUE:

A Statutory Public Meeting required under the Planning Act was held on September 5, 2023. Following the Public Meeting, any person that provided their contact information on the sign-in registry at the meeting or requested through other means to be kept informed about the application were notified through mailed correspondence of the Council Meeting and were provided with access to the Recommendation Report.

The full application submission was posted on the City’s “Current Development Applications” webpage for the public to view.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:

Not applicable

PUBLIC INPUT:

A Statutory Public Meeting was held on September 5, 2023. There were public delegations present at the public meeting and City staff received written submissions related to the proposal. During the public meeting, questions were raised by Council and members of the public. The themes of the comments can generally relate to land
use compatibility, building height, scale, density, the impact on traffic and parking, as well as shadow impacts, railway safety and affordability.

**Land Use Compatibility, Building Height, Scale**

The proposed towers sit on top of a 3 and 4 storey podium structure that will provide parking for the development. The proposed building design will transition in heights from 8 storeys along the Laurel Street frontage, which increases in height toward the CPR line. The two, 8 storey buildings along Laurel Street are designed to create a comfortable and engaging pedestrian-friendly environment through the provision of an attractive built form, that provides a transition between the existing residential properties and the proposed towers. To break up the massing and to enhance visual interest, building façades will largely consist of windows and vertical and horizontal elements and incorporate transitions between building materials.

The proposed residential towers provide an appropriate building transition between the development and the surrounding low density residential neighbourhood. Staff are satisfied that the proposed building heights, scale, massing will achieve a compatible transition from the surrounding neighbourhood. Furthermore, the building design incorporates various design elements to help create a visually appealing building mass. The proposal presents a height that would help achieve Provincial, Regional and City goals relating to housing.

**Parking & Traffic on Local Roads**

In support of the revised proposal, the applicant has submitted a Parking Justification Study prepared by Crozier, dated June 2023 and Parking Justification Study Comment Response memo dated January 2024 along with a Transportation Impact Study (TIS), prepared by Crozier Consulting, dated January 2024. The applicant seeks to implement similar parking ratios that apply across other municipalities. Such parking ratios encourage mixed-use and transit-oriented forms of development, which are considered appropriate for this regeneration area of the City. The TIS includes unbundling parking for residential units and demonstrates that there will be an adequate residential and visitor parking supply to meet the parking demand. Unbundled parking would provide a parking space option for future tenants, which would attract non-auto users.

This is further supported with the integration of dedicated bicycle parking and secure bicycle storage on-site for tenants, that encourages active transportation while reducing the reliance on vehicle ownership, decreasing the parking demand on-site. The studies demonstrate that there will be an adequate residential and visitor parking supply to meet the parking demand. The proposed development of the site will provide vehicle access from both Laurel Street and Dolph Street North, while pedestrian access to the development is also provided from both streets using sidewalks. Within the
development, walkways are provided to allow for movement between buildings, the streets, and outdoor areas. An internal roadway is provided within the development lands which will connect to Laurel Street and Dolph Street North.

Based on the findings of the TIS, the proposed development can be supported from a transportation operations and safety perspective. However, to improve operations at the intersection of Laurel Street at Duke Street, an all-way stop is recommended. Recommendations of the TIS will need to be implemented as part of the site development and future Site Plan application and the developer will be responsible for the cost of implementing the all-way stop.

Additionally, while there are challenges with the configuration of the intersection and the proximity of the rail crossing, City Transportation staff are working toward the implementation of an all-way stop at the intersection of Laurel Street at Lawrence Street to be implemented later this year.

**Shadow Impacts**

In support of the revised proposal, the applicant submitted a Shadow Study prepared by ABA Architects, together with supplemental information by MHBC in a letter dated March 22, 2024. Shadow impact guidelines require that in order to be considered acceptable, a Shadow Study must demonstrate, for potentially impacted residential properties, that at least 50% or more of the residential property should not be shaded for more than two interval times (a 4-hour period), or at least 50% of the residential property should be in full sun for at least two interval periods (a 4-hour equivalency).

During the spring and fall equinoxes, the adjacent properties will have partial shadowing caused by the development from late morning until noon during the spring and fall equinoxes. The massing of the proposed towers has been designed to adequately limit shadow impacts on adjacent properties, particularly during the spring and fall equinoxes. In consideration of the criteria used to evaluate shadow impacts, and due to the placement of the buildings and the significant setbacks, the shadow impacts achieve the criteria.

**Railway Safety**

Concerns were raised regarding railway safety as it relates to appropriate signage within the vicinity of the Subject Lands. Two locations were identified during the Public Meeting, including the railway crossings on Dolph Street North, in addition to the crossing within the intersection of Laurel Street and Lawrence Street. Overall railway noise and train whistling impacts on the existing residential properties were also identified.
The City completed a railway assessment for the noted at-grade crossings as per Transport Canada requirements in 2018 and necessary safety improvements were made. In 2023, further assessment was completed at the Dolph Street North CPR crossing to identify if the crossing is a potential candidate for whistle cessation. It was determined that with satisfactory safety mitigation in place, this location could be a candidate for whistle cessation. In addition, there is an existing whistle cessation order in place at the Laurel Street and Lawrance Street railway crossing. Furthermore, the Dolph Street North CN crossing was decommissioned in 2023 and is no longer in operation.

**Housing Affordability**

The owner acknowledges the request for the contribution to the City’s Affordable Housing Fund and is considering the request. In addition, the applicant has the ability to partner with a housing provider within the Region to provide units within the building to be used for affordable housing.

It is staff’s opinion that an additional statutory public meeting is not necessary. Written public submissions are included in Appendix E to this report and an excerpt of the public meeting minutes is included in Appendix F.

**INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:**

The applications have been circulated to the departments and commenting agencies listed in Appendix G.

Regional staff are supportive of the proposed redevelopment of the site. Although the subject lands are not located within a wellhead protection area, Regional staff requested the inclusion of the prohibition of geothermal wells within the site-specific zoning by-law.

**CONCLUSION:**

The City of Cambridge is expecting to accommodate significant population growth within the current Planning Horizon into the year 2051. With limited vacant residential land available within the City and an increase in housing costs, there is a growing need and demand for more dense housing options within the Built-Up Area of the City that can accommodate more people in smaller spaces. There is also a demand for rental housing due to the current low vacancy rate and more affordable housing options than traditional single detached dwellings.

The Region supports the provision of a range of housing options, including affordable housing. The development includes a wide range of unit sizes that will provide housing at a variety of rental rates. The proposed infill development represents an efficient use of existing municipal water and sanitary sewer services and provides more affordable options for market rate housing, supports the intensification objectives of the Provincial
Growth Plan and works towards the creation of a complete community or a 15-minute neighbourhood.

It is the opinion of planning staff that the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, conform with the policies of the Provincial Growth Plan, the Regional Official Plan, and the City of Cambridge Official Plan and meet the general intent and purpose of the City of Cambridge Zoning By-law 150-85. The proposal represents good planning and contributes to the creation of additional housing stock for the City. The proposal is a desirable built form that incorporates high standards of design. As such, Planning Staff recommends approval of the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments contained in Appendix C and D respectively.

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

APPROVALS:
This report has gone through the appropriate workflow and has been reviewed and or approved by the following as required:
Director
Deputy City Manager
Chief Financial Officer
City Solicitor
City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:
Appendix A – Proposed Concept Plan
Appendix B – Proposed Building Elevations and Renderings
Appendix C – Proposed By-law for Official Plan Amendment
Appendix D – Proposed By-law for Zoning By-law Amendment
Appendix E – Written Public Submissions
Appendix F – Public Meeting Minutes Excerpts
Appendix G – Internal/External Consultation and List of Supporting Studies
Appendix B – Proposed Building Elevations and Renderings
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

BY-LAW 24 - ____

Being a by-law of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge to adopt Amendment No. 79 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012), as amended with respect to land municipally known as 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street.

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. 79 to the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012) shall apply to lands legally described as Plan 716, Lot 216, Part of Lot 217, Plan 533, Part of Lot 3 to Part of Lot 6, RP58R9554, Parts 1 to 5, City of Cambridge, Regional Municipality of Waterloo; and shown on Schedules ‘A’, ‘B’ and ‘C’ attached hereto and forming part of the By-law (herein referred to as ‘the Lands’);

2. THAT Amendment No. 79 to the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012) as amended, consisting of the text and attached map, 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. 79 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 28th day of May, 2024.

__________________________________
MAYOR

__________________________________
CLERK
Purpose and Effect of Official Plan Amendment No. 79, By-law No 24 -

The purpose and effect of Official Plan Amendment No. 79 (OPA 79) to the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012), as amended, is to redesignate the lands municipally known as 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street in the City of Cambridge and Regional Municipality of Waterloo from 'Business Industrial' to 'High-Density Residential' with Site-Specific Policy 8.10.115 to permit a maximum of 1,215 residential units and a maximum building height of up to 19 storeys.
Amendment No. 79 to the City of Cambridge Official Plan

1. Chapter 14 Map 2 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan is hereby amended by redesignating the Lands from ‘Business Industrial’ to ‘High-Density Residential’ as shown on Schedule ‘A’ attached hereto;

2. Chapter 14 Map 2A of the City of Cambridge Official Plan is hereby amended by adding Site-Specific 115 as shown on Schedule ‘B’ attached hereto;

3. Chapter 16 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan is hereby amended by adding Figure 115 as shown on Schedule ‘C’ attached hereto;

4. Section 8.10 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan is hereby amended by adding the following subsection thereto:

8.10.115  777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street

1. Notwithstanding policy 2.8.3.3 of this plan, for the Lands shown on Figure 115 on Schedule C attached hereto, the following site-specific policies shall apply:

   a. The maximum building height shall be 19 storeys and the implementing zoning by-law shall include further restrictions on height and setbacks for buildings.

   b. A minimum and maximum Floor Space Index (FSI) shall not apply.

   c. A maximum of 1,215 residential units shall be permitted.

2. As part of future Site Plan application, the following will be required:

   a. The submission of an affidavit and a report from a Professional Engineer licensed to practice in the Province of Ontario that demonstrates that the proposed development has been designed in accordance with the Railway Association of Canada’s “Guideline for New Development in Proximity to Railway Operations” (Dialog & J.E. Coulter Associated Limited, May 2013), to the satisfaction of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and the City of Cambridge.

3. The implementing zoning by-law shall apply a holding (H) to the Lands to limit the development and/or site alteration until such time as:
a. A Record of Site Condition (RSC) in accordance with O. Reg. 153/04, as amended, has been filed with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks, and a Ministry Acknowledgement Letter has been provided to the satisfaction of the City of Cambridge and the Region of Waterloo.

b. Detailed transportation and stationary noise impact studies are completed to the satisfaction of the City of Cambridge and the Region of Waterloo.
Schedule A – Map 2

Schedule A to Official Plan Amendment 79
Amendment to Map 2 of City of Cambridge Official Plan

Legend:
- Site
- Galt City Centre; Preston Towne Centre; Hespeler Village
- Low / Medium Density Residential
- High Density Residential (Subject to Section 8.10.115)
- Business Industrial
Schedule B – Map 2A
Schedule B – Figure 115
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

By-law 24-XXX

Being a By-law to amend Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended with respect to land municipally known as 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street North.

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

WHEREAS this By-law conforms to the City of Cambridge Official Plan, as amended;

AND WHEREAS Council deems that adequate public notice of the public meeting was provided and adequate information regarding this Amendment was presented at the Public Meeting held September 5, 2023, and that a further public meeting is not considered necessary in order to proceed with this Amendment.

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

1. THAT this by-law shall apply to lands municipally addressed as 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street North and legally described as Plan 716, Lot 216, Part of Lot 217, Plan 533, Part of Lot 3 to Part of Lot 6, RP58R9554, Parts 1 to 5, City of Cambridge, Regional Municipality of Waterloo, as shown outlined in heavy black on Schedule ‘A’ attached hereto and forming part of this by-law;

2. THAT Schedule ‘A’ to the City of Cambridge By-law 150-85, as amended, is hereby amended by changing the zoning classification of the lands shown outlined in heavy black in the attached Schedule ‘A’ to this By-law from General Industrial - M3 to Multiple Residential – (H) RM3 s.4.1.477.

3. THAT the aforesaid City of Cambridge Zoning By-law no. 150-85, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding the following subsection under section 4.1 thereof:

“4.1.477 – 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street”

1. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 1.2.2.1, 2.2.3 and 3.1.2.4 of this by-law, the following regulations shall apply to the lands in that RM3 zone classification to which parenthetical reference “s.4.1.477” is made on Schedule ‘A’ attached and forming part of the by-law:

   a) The maximum density per net residential hectare shall be 385 units per hectare with a maximum of 1,215 residential units.

   b) A maximum building height of up to 7 storeys shall be permitted on the subject lands in accordance with the minimum front, rear, interior and exterior side yard setbacks permitted in the RM3 zone.

   c) A maximum building height of 8 storeys shall be permitted on the subject lands, provided a minimum setback of 10 metres from the front lot line abutting Laurel Street is provided.
d) A maximum building height of 9 to 15 storeys shall be permitted on the subject lands, provided a minimum setback of 10 metres from the exterior lot line abutting Dolph Street North is provided and a minimum setback of 30 metres from the front lot line abutting Laurel Street is provided.

e) A maximum building height of 16 to 19 storeys shall be permitted, provided a minimum setback of 30 metres from the exterior lot line abutting Dolph Street North is provided and a minimum setback of 36 metres from the front line abutting Laurel Street is provided.

f) A minimum 30 metre setback from the rear lot line abutting the Canadian Pacific Railway shall be provided, or a 15 metre horizontal and 15 metre vertical setback, subject to Section 3 of the Railway Association of Canada’s “Guideline for New Development in Proximity to Railway Operations” (Dialog & J.E. Coulter Associated Limited, May 2013).

g) The front lot line shall be all lot lines abutting Laurel Street.

h) The rear lot line shall be all lot lines abutting the Canadian Pacific Railway.

i) The exterior side lot line shall be the lot line abutting Dolph Street North.

j) All other lot lines shall be the interior side lot line.

k) A minimum required amenity area of 15 square metres per unit shall be provided, which shall include both private and common amenity area.

l) Parking shall be provided at a total minimum rate of 1.15 spaces per unit, which includes 1.0 parking spaces per residential unit, and 0.15 parking spaces per unit for visitors.

m) The minimum required width of a parking stall, not including barrier free stalls, shall be 2.75 metres.

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

2. Notwithstanding the (H) Prefix Zone holding provisions as outlined in S.2.1.4 of the aforesaid City of Cambridge Zoning By-law, as amended, the removal of the (H) Holding Provision for the entirety of the lands zoned (H)RM3 S.4.1.477 may only be lifted upon submission of the following:
a) Record of Site Condition (RSC) in accordance with O. Reg. 153/04, as amended, that has been filed with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks, and Ministry Acknowledgement Letter to the satisfaction of the City of Cambridge and the Region of Waterloo; and,

b) A detailed Transportation and Stationary Noise Study has been completed and mitigation measures addressed to the satisfaction of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo. The detailed stationary noise study shall review the potential impacts of noise (e.g. HVAC systems) on the sensitive points of reception and the impacts of the development on the adjacent noise sensitive uses.

4. **AND THAT** this By-law shall come into force and effect on the date it is enacted subject to Official Plan Amendment No. 79 coming into effect pursuant to Subsection 24(2) of the Planning Act, R.S.O., 1990, c. P. 13, as amended.

Enacted and Passed this 28th day of May, 2024.

________________________________________
MAYOR

________________________________________
CLERK
This is Schedule A attached to and forming part of By-law ________

Lands affected by the by-law

Zoning Classification

- OPEN SPACE
- LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
- INDUSTRIAL
- MEDIUM HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
- COMMERCIAL
Purpose and Effect

The purpose and effect of this By-law is to amend the zoning classification of the lands legally described and legally described as Plan 716, Lot 216, Part of Lot 217, Plan 533, Part of Lot 3 to Part of Lot 6, RP58R9554, Parts 1 to 5, City of Cambridge, Regional Municipality of Waterloo from General Industrial - M3 to the Multiple Residential - RM3 s.4.1.477 to facilitate a residential apartment development with site specific provisions for a maximum of 1,215 units.
November 3, 2023

Your worship Mayor Liggett, members of Cambridge City Council,

On behalf of the board of directors of Preston Towne Centre Business Improvement Area, we wanted to reach out regarding the proposed development of 777 Laurel Street, Cambridge.

The board of directors would like to confirm that we offer our support for the proposed development on this site.

This project will bring a great deal of pedestrian traffic to the Core area of Preston, Cambridge and add a considerable amount of new housing to the area.

This type of project adds sustainably to our core area. Currently the City of Cambridge and the Region of Waterloo offer great public transit in the proposed area. The proposed development is within easy walking distance of Preston Towne Centre and will further support all our local shops and services that Preston Towne Centre currently provides.

Preston Towne Centre maintains a small town feeling and is a great place to live, work and enjoy, so anything you can do to make this project move forward would be a great investment of our further growth.

Sincerely,

Kendra Brough
Chair, Preston Towne Centre BIA
From: [Name redacted]

Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2023 8:32 AM

To: Michael Campos <camposm@cambridge.ca>

Subject: [External] 6 tower proposal at Dolph and Laurel in Preston

No thank you to this.

When the city and developers address the following, perhaps a proposal such as this could be considered:

1. Where is additional green space going to be located with the addition of these 1000s of residents?

2. When are main and secondary roadways going to be enhanced to facilitate the transportation of 1000s of additional people?

3. What is the plan for additional public transportation...and not additional buses on already existing roadways...?

Preston is now congested almost all day long. The roadways are not equipped for the people we have, never mind such a massive development.

How is the city, and developers, proposing to address this. Please don't suggest additional buses because that is nonsense.

Where is our additional green space and trees as these new residents move to this city?

I am sure these are loads of other considerations to the infrastructure that needs to be addressed before such a development is considered but these are mine at this point.
Hi Councillor Kimpson & Clerk, I missed the deadline to submit correspondence to the public meeting tonight but I thought I’d reach out to you directly anyway. I’m not sure if you’ll recognize my name but I’m in your ward and I live on Laurel very near the proposed development area at 777 Laurel St.

I would love to see the property converted to residential. I think that it would be a great benefit to the community, though I do hope the shortage of parking the developer is proposing is taken into consideration.

My main concern though - rats! Please consider the current rat issues in Preston, and consider having the developer include some way to mitigate potential rat problems when the factory buildings are demolished (if approved, of course).

Preston has always had a strong 'not in my backyard' community, so I'm hoping my 'Yay for 777' isn't drowned out by that. It seems the development proposal addresses the key issues the naysayers are bringing up, such as increased traffic, street parking, job loss (those businesses can move!).

Yay for housing, development of downtown areas, and residential neighbourhoods.

Thank you,
MINUTES

Corporation of the City of Cambridge
Planning - Statutory Public Meeting

Date: September 5, 2023, 6:30 p.m.
Location: Council Chambers


Staff Members in Attendance: Hardy Bromberg, Deputy City Manager - Community Development; Bryan Boodhoo - City Solicitor; Michael Oliveri - Council Committee Services Coordinator; Maria Barrantes Barreto - Council Committee Services Coordinator

Others in Attendance: Jacqueline Hannemann - Senior Planner; Sylvia Rafalski-Misch - Manager of Development Planning; Rutvik Shah - Support Technician

1. Meeting Called to Order

2. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

None.

3. Public Meeting Notice

4. Presentations


4.2 Jacqueline Hannemann, Senior Planner re: 23-291-CD Public Meeting Report – Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment – 777 Laurel Street
5. Public Meetings

5.1 23-291-CD Public Meeting Report – Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment – 777 Laurel Street

Motion: 23-309

Moved by Councillor Kimpson
Seconded by Councillor Earnshaw

Alternate Motion

THAT Report 23-291-CD Public Meeting Report – Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment for 777 Laurel Street be received;

AND THAT application OR05/23 for 777 Laurel Street be referred back to staff for a subsequent report and staff recommendation.

AND FURTHER THAT staff be directed to schedule a meeting with the developer and residents to discuss concerns, obtain feedback and address resident concerns in the subsequent report and staff recommendation.

In Favour (8): Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

Carried (8 to 0)

6. Delegations


7. Correspondence

8. **Motion to Receive Correspondence and Presentations**

   Motion: 23-310

   Moved by Councillor Hamilton
   Seconded by Councillor Cooper

   THAT all presentations and correspondence from the September 5, 2023, Planning – Statutory Public Meeting Committee be received.

   In Favour (8): Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

   **Carried (8 to 0)**

9. **Adjournment**

   Motion: 23-311

   Moved by Councillor Devine
   Seconded by Councillor Roberts

   THAT the Planning – Statutory Public Meeting Committee does now adjourn at 8:20 p.m.

   In Favour (8): Councillor Devine, Councillor Kimpson, Councillor Earnshaw, Councillor Roberts, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Hamilton, Councillor Ermeta, and Mayor Liggett

   **Carried (8 to 0)**

   ____________________________________________
   Mayor

   ____________________________________________
   Clerk
This application has been circulated to the department and agencies listed below. Their comments will be included in a future staff report to Council for consideration.

- Regional Municipality of Waterloo
- GrandBridge Energy Inc. (Hydro)
- Grand River Conservation Authority
- Waterloo Regional District School Board
- Waterloo Catholic District School Board
- City of Cambridge Development Engineering Division
- City of Cambridge Senior Environmental Planner
- City of Cambridge Transportation Division
- City of Cambridge Economic Development
- City of Cambridge Fire Department
- City of Cambridge Building Department
- City of Cambridge Accessibility Coordinator
- City of Cambridge Sustainability Transportation
- City of Cambridge Planning Services
- Canadian National Rail
- Canadian Pacific Rail

List of Supporting Plans, Reports and Studies:

- Set of Architectural Plans (Incl. Shadow Analysis)
- Planning Justification Report
- Set of Site Plans
- Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report
- Traffic Impact Study
- Wind Study
- Noise Study and Vibration Analysis
- Parking Study
- Archeological Report
- Urban Design Brief
Report 24-078-CD was deferred by Council of May 28th, 2024. Appendix ‘H’ will provide a summary of the neighbourhood meeting held on June 13th, as directed by Council, and will be distributed on the June 25th Council addendum via the following link: June 25th Council Meeting.
To: COUNCIL  
Meeting Date: 6/25/2024  
Subject: 24-057-CD: Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study Final Report  
Submitted By: Joan Jylanne, Manager of Policy Planning  
Prepared By: Jeremy Parsons, Senior Planner – Heritage  
Report No.: 24-057-CD  
File No.: R01.02.05  
Wards Affected: Ward 1, Ward 2

RECOMMENDATION(S):  
THAT Report 24-057-CD: Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study Final Report be received;  
AND THAT Council endorse the recommended HCD boundaries, as outlined within Figure 1;  
AND FURTHER THAT Council approve the recommendations and conclusions of the HCD Study Report and approve the preparation of a Hespeler HCD Plan and Guidelines in accordance with Section 41 of the Ontario Heritage Act.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:  
Purpose  
The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a summary of the Hespeler Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Study process, recommendations on proposed HCD boundaries, and recommendations on the preparation of a district plan and guidelines.

Key Findings  
- This project includes both a Study Phase and a Plan Phase:  
  - The Study Phase is to evaluate and determine whether the Study Area should be designated as an HCD and to recommend district boundaries.
The Plan Phase involves preparing a plan with policies and guidelines to help manage change and guide development in the district.

- A Study Area was established comprising approximately 524 properties which were evaluated for cultural heritage value.
- The Study Area contains a total of 67 properties that are listed and 16 properties that are designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.
- Consultation took place through an Engage Cambridge project webpage, a project survey, a Public Information Centre (PIC), MHAC meetings, and community focus group meetings.
- Based on the analysis conducted within the Study, the Study Area contains sufficient cultural heritage value to be considered for Part V designation.
- The recommended HCD boundaries are smaller than the original Study Area, at 311 properties, and reflect the area where the greatest concentrations of cultural heritage resources are found within the Study Area.
- Council approval is required to proceed to the Plan Phase of the project, and to prepare an HCD Plan and Guidelines for Hespeler.

Financial Implications

The Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study and Plan project (A/00740-20) has an approved budget of $100,000 and is funded through the Capital Works Reserve Fund. The Study Phase comprises just over $55,000, and the Plan Phase would be funded with the remaining budget.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☒ Strategic Action

Objective(s): PLACEMAKING - Promote and create a wide range of destinations and activities that capitalize on the beauty of the rivers and heritage buildings

Strategic Action: Enhance opportunities to enjoy built and natural heritage

☐ Core Service

Program: Not Applicable

Core Service: Not Applicable

BACKGROUND:
In 2008, the City of Cambridge’s Heritage Master Plan recognized Hespeler Village as a “heritage character area” and recommended further evaluation. The Hespeler Streetscape Plan and Urban Design Guidelines also recognizes Hespeler Village as a special character area with heritage significance.

In 2020, Council directed staff to initiate the Hespeler HCD Study. The Hespeler HCD Study was subsequently included within the 2022 Approved Budget and Business Plan.

In January 2023, Heritage Planning staff issued a Request for Quotations (RFQ) and in February 2023 the project contract was awarded to TRACE Architectures Inc. The HCD Study began in April 2023.

After project initiation, during Spring and Summer 2023, Heritage Planning staff created project timelines and established an EngageCambridge project website. The consultant team began to conduct background research, initiated property surveys, and began to evaluate area character.

During Fall 2023, residents located within the Study Area were notified of the project through direct mail. An online public survey was also released to begin to collect community perspectives on the Study Area and on the concept of an HCD in Hespeler. Public comments and analysis of survey data are included in Section 4 of the Study Report, attached as Appendix A. On April 4, 2024, the consultant team provided a draft copy of the HCD Study Report to Heritage Planning staff who have reviewed and provided comments. On April 18, 2024, MHAC was consulted on the finalized HCD Study Report.

ANALYSIS:

The Hespeler HCD Study was undertaken using methodology outlined by the Ontario Heritage Act and the Ministry of Culture and Multiculturalism’s Toolkit. This methodology included four main areas of research:

- An area history based upon archival research outlining significant themes and events that have shaped Hespeler’s evolution;
- An on-the-ground survey to create a cultural heritage inventory in which individual properties were documented and the characteristics of buildings, landscapes, and streetscapes were noted;
- An analysis of existing City and Regional policies to identify if any changes are required to support a future HCD; and,
- Public consultation to determine levels of support for a potential HCD and to give members of the public an opportunity to identify what they value and would like to see conserved in a potential HCD.
The evaluated Study Area includes approximately 524 properties within downtown Hespeler and includes the commercial section of Queen Street, industrial lands, civic spaces, historic residential neighbourhoods, and natural corridors. The evaluated Study Area contains 67 non-designated properties that are currently listed on the Municipal Heritage Register and 16 properties that are designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

The HCD boundaries recommended, included as Figure 1, are smaller than the original Study Area and comprise a total of 311 individual properties, including 58 non-designated properties that are currently listed on the Municipal Heritage Register and 15 properties that are designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. In order to meet the threshold of an HCD, more than 25% of the properties must meet at least two criteria under Ontario Regulation 9/06. According to TRACE, 190 properties or 36% of the properties within the Study Area merit meeting at least two criteria under the regulation. The following is a breakdown of the classification of properties evaluated within the Study Area:

- Category 1: 16 Designated or Key Properties
- Category 2: 89 Strongly Contributing Properties
- Category 3: 199 Somewhat Contributing Properties
- Category 4: 220 Non-Contributing Properties

Further, TRACE has determined that 224 properties out of 311 (72%) of the properties within the recommended HCD boundaries meet at least two of the nine criteria under the regulation. The higher number of properties of identified value within the recommended HCD boundaries is reflective of further research during the evaluation process.

The consultant team proposed the recommended HCD boundaries because of the “concentration of heritage resources creating a compelling and unique sense of place that is distinct from other communities” and the “significant number of properties which reveal broad architectural, cultural, social, and economic patterns of the region’s history.” The recommendations further add, “there is a wealth of high-value heritage residential, industrial and institutional buildings, waterscapes and natural and man-made landscapes that are an integral part of the identity of Hespeler” (1.4.2. Recommended Boundary).
Figure 1: Map showing the HCD Study Area (red) and the recommended HCD boundaries (purple) (TRACE Architectures, 2024).

Figures 1 and 2 have both been amended from the mapping presented at MHAC to reflect the fact that the parcel of land at 171 Guelph Avenue (Forbes Estate) has been removed from the proposed boundaries given that it will be designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and protected with a heritage conservation easement agreement.
Heritage Planning staff support the recommended boundaries which appropriately cover significant areas of cultural heritage value within downtown Hespeler. These include areas with significant concentrations of historic building stock and areas which touch on themes related to the industrial, commercial, civic, residential, and natural history of Hespeler. The recommended HCD is anchored on the Speed River and includes a portion of Guelph Avenue, an industrial spine running north-south across the river; commercial areas along Queen Street, civic properties in the downtown; portions of mature residential neighbourhoods south of Queen Street; and naturalized spaces in the Mill Pond and Chilligo Conservation Area.

Heritage Planning staff also note that TRACE’s analysis has revealed a substantial number of key or contributing properties, 304 properties within a Study Area of approximately 524 properties. The size of the proposed HCD, at 311 properties, is relatively large in comparison to other HCDs across Ontario; however, it reflects an area
with a significant concentration of heritage resources and is noticeably condensed from the size of the original Study Area. Further, designating a large batch of listed properties (58) within the recommended boundaries would assist the City in its efforts to protect listed properties that will lose protection on January 1, 2027, due to changes implemented through Bill 23, the More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 and Bill 200, the Homeowner Protection Act, 2024.

The Study Phase of the project is now complete. The purpose of the Study Phase was first to evaluate the Study Area to determine if it contained sufficient heritage value to be designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. Secondly, the Study Phase is intended to make recommendations on the geographic boundaries of the area to be designated, on the objectives and contents of a future HCD Plan, and on any changes that will be required to the City’s Official Plan and municipal by-laws [Section 40(2)].

Should Council decide to move the project ahead, the Plan Phase will involve the development of policies, guidelines, and procedures to help guide future changes to the HCD so that the area’s character and heritage value is conserved.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

Ontario Heritage Act (R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18)

Area study

40 (1) The council of a municipality may undertake a study of any area of the municipality for the purpose of designating one or more heritage conservation districts. 2005, c. 6. s. 29.

Scope of study

(2) A study under subsection (1) shall,

(a) examine the character and appearance of the area that is the subject of the study, including buildings, structures and other property features of the area, to determine if the area should be preserved as a heritage conservation district;

(b) examine and make recommendations as to the geographic boundaries of the area to be designated;

(c) consider and make recommendations as to the objectives of the designation and the content of the heritage conservation district plan required under section 41.1;

(d) make recommendations as to any changes that will be required to the municipality’s official plan and to any municipal by-laws, including any zoning by-laws. 2005, c. 6. s. 29.
Consultation

(3) If the council of a municipality has established a municipal heritage committee under section 28, the council shall consult with the committee with respect to the study. 2005, c. 6. s. 29.

City of Cambridge Official Plan (consolidated 2018)

Chapter 4: Cultural Heritage Resources

4.2 Priorities for Cultural Heritage Resources

e) Pass by-laws under the Ontario Heritage Act to establish and regulate Heritage Conservation Districts designated in accordance with Section 4.7 of this Plan.

4.7 Designation of Heritage Conservation Districts

1. The City will regulate as fully as possible the demolition, removal or inappropriate alteration or erection of buildings, which, in the opinion of Council, constitute or impact on a cultural heritage resource within a Heritage Conservation District as shown on Schedules 1, 2 and 3.

2. Council, after having consulted with MHAC, may pass by-laws pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act to define one or more potential Heritage Conservation Districts to be examined for future designation as a Heritage Conservation District.

3. Council may, after consultation with the owners of properties included in a defined potential Heritage Conservation District, pass by-laws pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act to designate all or part of the defined potential Heritage Conservation District as a Heritage Conservation District and apply to the Ontario Municipal Board for the approval of such by-laws.

4. The provisions of Policies 4.7.1 to 4.7.3 shall apply in respect of any building or structure and the land that is situate within the area that has been designated as a Heritage Conservation District.

5. With consultation from the MHAC, Council may pass by-laws of intent for a maximum period of one year that defines one or more areas to be examined for future designation as a Heritage Conservation District. During this period, alteration works including erection, demolition or removal of heritage buildings or structures shall be prohibited or limited.

6. For the purposes of defining a potential Heritage Conservation District in accordance with Policy 4.7.2, a study will be prepared which identifies the following:

    a) the composition of the area;
b) the incidence of buildings or structures of cultural heritage value included on the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources referred to in Section 4.3;

c) the heritage significance, character and appearance of the selected study area, including buildings, structures, contextual elements, landscapes, vistas and other properties;

d) the possible geographic boundaries of the study area;

e) the structural soundness of buildings or structures; and

f) the feasibility of restoring, using or maintaining buildings or structures.

7. Where Council determines that the establishment of a Heritage Conservation District is appropriate and feasible, the study prepared pursuant to Policy 4.7.6 shall form the basis of the Heritage Conservation District Plan. The Heritage Conservation District Plan shall include:

a) a statement of objectives for the District;

b) a statement explaining the cultural heritage value or interest of the District;

c) description of properties in the District and of the heritage attributes of the District;

d) policy statements, guidelines, and procedures for achieving the stated objectives and for managing change in the District;

e) a description of the types of alterations that will require a City permit and a description of minor alterations that will be permitted without the need for a City permit;

f) a map identifying the boundaries of the District; and

g) a communication plan for dialogue with the public, particularly the residents and landowners in the proposed Heritage Conservation District, identifying the intent and scope of the District.

8. Where it is proposed to designate a Heritage Conservation District in which properties have already been designated pursuant to Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, the property may be included in an area designated as a Heritage Conservation District. A property that is included in an area designated as Heritage Conservation District may subsequently be designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

9. Pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act, Council may pass by-laws to designate all or part of the lands set out in Section 4.7 as a Heritage Conservation District. Such a
designation shall not require an amendment to this Plan. The designating by-law shall identify the extent of the area, contain procedures and timelines for alterations to and demolition of existing buildings and/or structures as well as the erection of new buildings and/or structures based on the criteria established in the Heritage Conservation District Plan, and outline the appeal process to the Ontario Municipal Board or other Provincial appeal body.

10. Prior to designating a Heritage Conservation District, Council will undertake a public consultation/information process.

11. Where a Heritage Conservation District is in effect, public works shall be carried out and by-laws passed only if they complement/enhance the objectives set out in the Heritage Conservation District Plan.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study and Plan project (A/00740-20) has an approved budget of $100,000 and is funded through the Capital Works Reserve Fund. The Study Phase comprises $55,535, or approximately half of the allocated project budget. A total of $38,339 has been issued for completed work so far. A total of $17,196 remains to be issued for work completed during the Study Phase. The total remaining cost for the Plan Phase is $30,520. Given that the current project is on time and on budget, no additional funds are anticipated to be requested to be allocated to this project.

PUBLIC VALUE:

The designation of properties of heritage significance protects and celebrates cultural heritage value for the benefit of the community. Conserving heritage properties supports the principle of sustainability (Five Public Value Principles).

Sustainability:

This project will support sustainability by employing policies to support the retention of existing structures and by supporting the conservation of culturally significant spaces valued by the community.

Transparency:

Council reports are posted publicly as part of the report process and Council meetings are open to the public.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:

Council is required under the Ontario Heritage Act to consult with the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) as part of the Study process. The following MHAC meeting dates were held to discuss the Hespeler HCD Study:
Feedback received during these sessions has informed the recommendations of the Study. MHAC voted to support the recommendations and conclusions of the HCD Study Report, including the proposed boundaries. Through Report 24-012 (MHAC), the Committee provided the following recommendations to Council:

THAT Report 24-012 (MHAC) Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study Report be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) accepts the Hespeler Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Study Report, its recommendations, and its conclusions outlined within Appendix B;

AND THAT the MHAC recommend that Council endorse the recommended HCD boundaries, as outlined within Appendix A;

AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC recommend that Council approve the recommendations and conclusions of the HCD Study Report and approve the preparation of a Hespeler HCD Plan and Guidelines in accordance with Section 41 of the Ontario Heritage Act.

PUBLIC INPUT:

In addition to the two MHAC meetings, which are open to the public, the following public consultations were held as part of the Hespeler HCD Study:

- October 30, 2023: Public Information Centre Open House
- January 10, 2024: Community Focus Group Meeting #1
- February 14, 2024: Community Focus Group Meeting #2
- March 13, 2024: Community Focus Group Meeting #3

Feedback received during these sessions has informed the recommendations of the Study.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:

Heritage Planning staff have notified the following community groups and agencies as part of the HCD Study consultation process:

- Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, Cambridge and North Dumfries Branch;
- Black Bridge Community Association;
- Canadian Pacific Railway;
Friends of Chilligo Conservation Area;
Garden Hespeler (Hespeler Horticultural Society);
Grand River Conservation Area (GRCA);
Grand Bridge Energy;
Hespeler Village Neighbourhood Association;
Hespeler Village Business Improvement Association;
Hespeler Heritage Centre;
Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation;
Ontario Ministry of Transportation;
Silverheights Neighbourhood Association;
Six Nations of the Grand River First Nation;
Waterloo Region;
Waterloo Region District School Board; and,
Waterloo Catholic District School Board.

Staff in the Community Planning Division at the Region of Waterloo reviewed the Study Report and indicated support for the Study but did not provide any other comments.

Verbal comments were received from the GRCA and the Friends of Chilligo Conservation Area during a meeting held with municipal staff on April 10, 2024. Written comments were also received from the GRCA on April 29, 2024, indicating that a portion of the Study Area is regulated by the GRCA, in accordance with the Conservation Authorities Act, and that a portion of the Study Area is located in a floodplain policy area. Chilligo Conservation Area is considered a passive conservation area with limited services and no assigned GRCA staff members. Any future trails, signage, or additional public access within Chilligo Conservation Area would require further discussion and evaluation by GRCA staff. The scope of the HCD Study does not entail the construction of any new trails, signage, or additional public access into the Chilligo Conservation Area.

Formal comments were not received from any other community group or agency.

Internal consultation has also taken place with staff from Operations, Infrastructure Services, and Parks.

CONCLUSION:
For the reasons outlined in this report, Heritage Planning staff recommend that Council endorse the proposed HCD boundaries and approve the recommendations and conclusions provided within the HCD Study Report. Further, it is recommended that Council authorize the preparation of an HCD Plan and Guidelines for Hespeler in accordance with Section 41 of the Ontario Heritage Act.
REPORT IMPACTS:
Agreement: No
By-law: Yes
Budget Amendment: No
Policy: Yes

The contents of the Study Report will form the basis for the forthcoming HCD Plan and Guidelines and may influence the contents of other planning policy documents at the City of Cambridge.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction & Background

Urban sprawl and intensification have been advancing at increasing rates across Canada, particularly in Ontario. Urbanization, along with unchecked development, presents a challenge that frequently poses a threat to the integrity of the heritage character of small towns and villages, and often overlooks the delicate balance between growth and conservation. Architectural landmarks, historic streetscapes, and rich landscapes are vulnerable to expansion and are at risk of erasure of both built and natural heritage. The conservation of these areas is not rooted in the desire to “halt” progress or development, rather, it is about establishing a framework to guide development in a way that integrates well with existing heritage resources, as well as historic context. Formally recognizing and protecting these heritage assets is an important and powerful tool for maintaining and safeguarding the unique essence of our collective past, while also ensuring future enrichment of our communities.

In 2020, Council for the City of Cambridge directed staff to commence the preliminary work for the Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Study for Hespeler. This was done to determine suitability for a designated Heritage Conservation District. Staff identified a portion of downtown Hespeler as a draft Study Area and began the study process under the Ontario Heritage Act.

In 2023, the City of Cambridge retained TRACE architectures, to conduct the HCD Study of Hespeler and to assess a Study Area comprising of over 500 properties. Having completed three other HCDs within the municipality, including Blair Village, Dickson Hill, and Main Street, the City of Cambridge had already determined that the quantity and concentration of heritage resources in Hespeler was more than enough to proceed with an HCD Study. The Study Area, along with an initial list of properties situated within the Study Area, served as a guide for TRACE to proceed with property research and documentation.
1.2 Scope of the HCD Study

1.2.1 HCD Designation Process

**HCD Study**

An HCD Study marks the initial step in determining the cultural and historical significance within a community, neighbourhood, or district in Ontario. This phase focuses on the comprehensive assessment of what is important to a community in terms of heritage value. It involves detailed gathering and analysis of geographical features, historical data, and current cultural elements, aiming to understand the intrinsic heritage character that defines the area. This information is then analyzed holistically to gain an overall sense of the uniqueness the community possesses. By collecting this information, the study seeks to understand not only what exists, but also why it matters to the community.

This process is guided by a Study Area, which is sometimes determined at the onset of the HCD Study. However, in this case the Study Area was pre-determined by the City of Cambridge, to allow for sufficient time to focus on the extensive list of properties included within the pre-defined area. The HCD Study involves the development of a database to store a detailed property inventory, policy, and historical research (including archival documents), preparation of maps, as well as photos (historic, satellite, and from site visits), plans, and other documentation.

Once this information is gathered, and public consultation takes place, the Consultant Team proceeds to take the wide range of community input to analyze and determine the recommended boundaries of the given area and whether the given area warrants consideration for Heritage Designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. This includes assessing the eligibility of the proposed area, based on the new requirements of *O. Reg. 9/06: Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest* (updated as of 1 January 2023 via Bill 23).

**HCD Plan & Guidelines**

If, based on the results of the HCD Study, Council, with input from the community and stakeholders, determine that the area should be formally considered for designation, the next step in the process is the development of an HCD Plan & Guidelines. This phase involves even more detailed research in order to obtain a more in-depth and precise understanding of the historic place within a given boundary. This is also the point in the process where the values identified in the HCD Study are transformed into a structured set of guidelines and requirements designed to protect and manage these values effectively. The HCD Plan
articulates specific policies and practical measures for overseeing changes and developments within the district, ensuring they align with the heritage attributes identified.

An HCD Plan is created to address practical concerns relating to the implementation and enforcement of the HCD and is developed within the context of existing planning documentation, such as Official Plans, Community Improvement Plans, Urban Design Guidelines, as well as the Ontario Heritage Act.

The companion set of HCD Guidelines is developed by the heritage consultants to design and curate a set of practical guidelines for managing change within the HCD boundary, including changes to streetscapes, open spaces, development, and renovations to publicly visible building façades. The guidelines are designed to be flexible to allow for practical application, but also specific enough that they can be easily incorporated into municipal planning policy and zoning by-laws for the community, in a way that is useful and effective.

The HCD Plan not only outlines the physical management of changes but also serves as a policy tool that integrates heritage conservation into the local planning and regulatory framework. By doing so, it facilitates a sustainable approach to heritage conservation that respects and reinforces the community’s historical identity and cultural significance.

**HCD Designation**

Following completion and review of the HCD Plan & Guidelines, the municipality designates the district by passing a by-law. Provided there are no objections submitted during the appeal timeframe, the by-law is registered on property titles. The designation by-law is also submitted to the Ontario Heritage Trust for their database.

![Figure 1](Figure 1 Graphic showing timeline of HCD process, from the Study Phase to Plan & Guidelines to Designation.)
1.2.2 Scope of the HCD Study

This HCD Study is the first document in the HCD process. It analyzes whether the entirety or a portion of the defined Study Area under review warrants proceeding to the subsequent HCD Plan & Guidelines phase.

The scope of this Study is as follows:

**Historic and Physical Overview**
- Mapping & imagery;
- Research & reporting - origins, periods, themes of development; and
- History & analysis of built form, streetscape, open space, and natural areas.

**Statement of Heritage Character and Significance**
- Description and reasons for potential designation;
- Mapping of evaluation results and recommendations; and
- Development of proposed boundaries within the defined Study Area.

**Property Survey, Inventory, and Evaluations**
- Documentation of all individual properties within the Study Area;
- Documentation of all public spaces, landscapes, and natural features; and
- Development of a database to store and organize documentation.

**Public Engagement**
- Overall coordination and dissemination of info to community;
- Facilitation and management of community feedback;
- Stakeholder and Public meetings and consultations; and
- Presentation to Council to conclude HCD Study.

**Administration and Coordination**
- Meetings and coordination with City Council;
- Document review; and
- Preparation of presentations, reports, and database.
1.3 What is a Heritage Conservation District?

The *Ontario Heritage Act* (Subsection 41.1) enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs). A Heritage Conservation District is an area which contains a concentration of heritage resources, with special character and/or historical association that distinguishes the area from its surroundings. The designation of an HCD affords the municipality the ability to enforce the protection of the character of an area by designating character-defining elements, as well as the public realm, under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The municipality can then guide future changes and development within a carefully designed framework document called the HCD Plan & Guidelines. This protection is not meant to hinder or prevent change, but rather to manage change in ways that are positive for the district and for the wider community. Many people now consider an HCD to be one of the most effective tools, not only for historic conservation, but also for effective and sound urban design, planning, and development.

For additional details about the designation process specific to Hespeler please refer to:

[https://www.engagewr.ca/hespeler-heritage-conservation-district-study-and-plan](https://www.engagewr.ca/hespeler-heritage-conservation-district-study-and-plan)

For information on the existing Heritage Conservation Districts within the broader City of Cambridge, please refer to:


For more detailed information related to HCDs, please refer to the *Ontario Heritage Toolkit: Heritage Conservation Districts* which is available for download from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport:

[https://ero.ontario.ca/notice/019-2770](https://ero.ontario.ca/notice/019-2770)

Please note these websites may be updated throughout the ongoing Study Phase.
1.4 The Benefits of a Heritage Conservation District

Establishing a HCD in Ontario offers several benefits, both tangible and intangible, that contribute to preserving the cultural, historical, and architectural significance of a particular area. HCDs can help safeguard the unique character and identity of a community, by conserving historically significant buildings, landscapes, and streetscapes. Furthermore, an HCD Plan is a change management tool, assisting a place with planning tools that regulate alterations, demolitions, and new construction within the district. These measures help ensure that any changes are sensitive to the area’s heritage values and maintain its overall character that has been established through the extensive HCD Study Process.

As of March 2020, 134 HCDs are already in existence in Ontario, with the earliest designations dating back to 1980. In the Waterloo region alone, there are 10 HCDs, encompassing over 1300 individual properties. Three of those HCDs are within the City of Cambridge: Blair Village, Dickson Hill, and Main Street (Galt).

While more HCDs are being planned and proposed every year in Ontario, due to their success, there is also a movement toward pursuing HCD designations because of Bill 23. On November 28, 2022, Bill 23, the More Homes Built Faster Act 2022, received royal assent and proposed extensive changes to the various pieces of legislation, including the Ontario Heritage Act. On January 1, 2023, the amendments to the Act came into effect. While there are numerous impacts on the Act because of this Bill, one of the most significant is a two-year time limitation on the listing of non-designated heritage properties on Municipal Registers. All listed properties are subject to this new time limitation, whereby, if the council of the municipality does not give a notice of intention to designate the property under subsection 29 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act on or before the second anniversary of the day the property was included in the Register, Council must remove the property from the Register and cannot list it again for a period of five years. Therefore, municipalities are forced to designate listed properties ahead of the January 1, 2025 two-year time limit since the enactment of the Bill in 2023.

Despite new HCDs coming into force every year due to their success, it is also important to recognize the residual resistance to HCDs in some instances. Typically, concerns are centered around issues pertaining to a perceived loss of control over one’s property, impact on property values and insurance, and burdensome bureaucratic processes (The Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, 2009). HCDs may not necessarily be the right option for all historic places, however there are several myths about HCDs that have been disproven for years, with decades of proven track record in Ontario (University of Waterloo, 2009).

Some of the benefits of an HCD include:
• Sense of place and identity;
• Creation of a unique planning framework which protects and upholds the heritage values of the place;
• Supports sustainable, resilient communities;
• Provides stability and/or increased property values;
• Potential financial incentives for property owners;
• Bolsters community pride; and
• Tourism and economic development.
1.5 **The Study Area Boundary**

The goal of the Study is to assess the heritage characteristics of the Study Area and determine if the area, or any parts thereof, merit designation as a Heritage Conservation District(s), pursuant to the *Ontario* Heritage O. Reg. 9/06 (as amended by O. Reg. 569/22).

*Figure 2* Satellite view showing extents of the Region of Waterloo. *Google Maps.*
Figure 3 Satellite view showing extents of the City of Cambridge. Google Maps.
**Hespeler**

Hespeler is part of the City of Cambridge, which is located north of Hwy 401 and east of Hwy 24, within the broader Region of Waterloo. Hespeler is situated nine kilometres north of downtown Cambridge, 18km east of Kitchener, and 15km south of Guelph. Hespeler, located along the Speed River in the most northeasterly section of the City of Cambridge, is known for its early industrial base, primarily from woolen and textile mills, contributing to its historical development. Today, Hespeler’s landscape is marked by industrial heritage, natural heritage areas, a well-defined downtown core, and surrounded by residential areas. It is these key areas which served as the basis for determining the initial HCD Study Area shown in the map below.

**Region of Waterloo**

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo, known as Waterloo Region, is situated in Southern Ontario, Canada, and encompasses the cities of Cambridge, Kitchener, and Waterloo (collectively referred to as the Tri-Cities), along with the townships of North Dumfries, Wellesley, Wilmot, and Woolwich. Covering an area of 1,369 square kilometers, the region had a population of 587,165 according to the 2021 Canada census. Historically known as Waterloo County until 1973, the region's development was significantly influenced by early German-speaking settlers, leading to a rich cultural heritage that includes the famous Oktoberfest celebration. The Region features a blend of urban and rural landscapes, with the Grand and Speed Rivers flowing through it, enhancing the region's natural beauty. It has a varied topography, including farmlands, parks, and conservation areas, contributing to its scenic diversity.

**City of Cambridge**

Cambridge Ontario, located at the confluence of the Grand and Speed Rivers, was formed in 1973 from the amalgamation of Galt, Preston, Hespeler, Blair, and a portion of the surrounding townships. Cambridge is characterized by its historical development, with each former municipality having well-documented histories. The city’s geographic setting contributes to its scenic beauty and features a diverse landscape beyond its urban centres, that include historic sites and natural heritage areas.

**Purpose of Study Area**

The initial Study Area encompasses much of the downtown area of Hespeler. It includes the commercial precinct anchored on Queen Street, the industrial area located along the Speed River, and residential areas south of Queen Street. The initial Study Area boundaries are outlined on the map found below and contain approximately 524 properties. The generous size of initial Study Area is to ensure that a broad area is taken into consideration for potential inclusion within the future HCD.
The Study Area includes a unique community within the City of Cambridge, notable for its mix of commercial, industrial, and residential land uses, its important cultural and civic institutions, its distinctive architecture, and its relationship to the Speed River. The Study Area is characterized by a concentration of nineteenth and early twentieth-century structures, notably industrial buildings. The area is also defined by a several major civic properties designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, such as the former Hespeler Town Hall, the Forbes Textile Mill, and the former Hespeler Hotel.

![Aerial Photo of Hespeler. Study Area as defined by the City of Cambridge. TRACE architectures.](image)

**Figure 4** Aerial Photo of Hespeler. Study Area as defined by the City of Cambridge. *TRACE architectures.*
2 History and Evolution of the Study Area

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents key periods and themes identified as significant in Hespeler’s development, growth, and as part of its ultimate evolution into the City of Cambridge. This historical analysis is intended to provide context around the physical, cultural, and economic aspects of Hespeler, including the community’s relationship with the Speed River, its establishment as a settlement, as a Town, and the industrial past that has shaped the place. It also speaks to the significance of the social and cultural elements that have reinforced Hespeler’s sense of place over time.

2.2 Historic Overview

Hespeler is a community on the Speed River in southwest Ontario. The settlement of Bergeytown was founded in 1832 and was named after its earliest settler, Michael Bergey. The settlement was renamed New Hope in 1835 and was then incorporated as the Village of Hespeler in 1859, named after influential industrialist Jacob Hespeler, and subsequently as the Town of Hespeler in 1901. In 1973, along with Preston and Galt, Hespeler was amalgamated into the City of Cambridge.

Hespeler is located in the Speed River Valley, a river tributary of the Grand River. Hespeler was settled by Pennsylvanian Mennonites, beginning in the 1830s with Michael Bergey. Hespeler’s namesake, Jacob Hespeler, arrived in 1845 and established an industrial complex that would foster the growth of Hespeler into a prominent industrial centre. The arrival of the railway in 1859, and the growth of manufacturing, particularly textiles, would make Hespeler one of the leading industrial areas in the country.

Industry continued to thrive, adapt, and expand throughout the first half of the 20th century and during the First and Second World Wars. Notably, Hespeler textile mills would supply the uniforms for the Canadian military in both World Wars, in addition to producing other wartime supplies. The post war period, however, would see the decline in some industries, particularly textiles, while other manufacturing would remain stable and diversify.

In 1973, the amalgamation of Hespeler with Galt and Preston, as well as Blair and parts of the Townships of Waterloo and North Dumfries, created the City of Cambridge and the Regional Municipality of Waterloo. Many Hespeler residents felt, and continue to feel, tied to their former community, and as a result, still very much identify with Hespeler and its distinct history.
The history of Hespeler and the development of its built heritage and cultural landscapes can be understood by looking at the following historical themes.

2.2.1 Pre-Contact and Early Settlement

The history of Indigenous peoples in the area now known as Cambridge, Ontario, is deeply rooted and spans thousands of years. The region has been inhabited by various Indigenous groups long before European settlers arrived. These groups include Iroquoian people from Western New York and Pennsylvania, particularly the Huron (Wendats), Neutrals (Attiwandaronks) and the Anishinaabe (Ojibwe, Odawa, and Potawatomi). Archaeological excavations carried out in the vicinity of Cambridge, as well as surface finds, show that the Grand River valley has had a long history of Indigenous settlement, and camp sites and chipping stations have been excavated and documented, especially in the Hespeler and Preston area, which date from about 1,000 BCE (Bray, 2008). Since the Speed River provided an excellent environment for hunting and fishing, the concentration of find spots around Hespeler (and Preston) was significant (Brewster, Langan, 2001).

In 1784 a tract of land six miles wide on each side of the Grand River was granted to the Six Nations by the British Crown, and in 1798 Block 2 of the Six Nations Land Grant (over 90,000 acres) was deeded to Richard Beasley, James Wilson, and John Baptiste Rousseau. Beasley quickly bought out Wilson and Rousseau, and the future settlement of Hespeler would grow around lots 9 and 10 of Beasley's Second Concession.

While the area attracted settlers from a variety of areas, including England, Ireland and Scotland, the present-day Hespeler lands were attractive to Pennsylvania German Mennonite farmers. Settlers were looking for cheaper land, as well as guaranteed freedom to practice Mennonite worship and beliefs (Bray, 2008). In 1816, the German Company Tract became the Township of Waterloo, and language, cultural, and religious tolerance of the Mennonites served to attract other German speaking immigrants from Europe. As a result, a period of high immigration occurred between 1820 and 1870. In 1831, Michael Bergey and his wife Susanna, arrived from Pennsylvania, establishing a homestead on land deeded to Susanna by her brother. They purchased additional lots along the eastern side of the Speed River on what was known as the Indian Trail. The settlement would become ‘Bergeytown’. Industrialization started to take hold, and sawmills, foundries, and other manufacturing began to take shape.

As more immigrants started to populate the area, the settlement is renamed New Hope, and with growing industrialization, a modest commercial area started to emerge. New Hope would see its first general store erected on the corner of Adam and Queen Streets in 1840, and various religious organizations would establish congregations, and later schools. Jacob Hespeler (Born in 1810 in Wuertemberg, Germany, and first emigrated to the United States before reaching Preston in 1830’s, after working for the Hudson’s Bay Company as a fur buyer) arrived in present day Hespeler in 1845, and purchased a sawmill on the Speed River.
**Jacob Hespeler**

Jacob Hespeler came to Preston around 1835. He was born in 1809 in Württemberg, Germany, and immigrated to the United States at an early age. Early on, Hespeler was an entrepreneur and industrialist. In 1845, he purchased Abraham Clemens’ mill on the Speed River in New Hope, which would begin his influential involvement in the settlement’s industrial and social life.

Between 1845 and 1853, Jacob Hespeler made several land purchases, and had acquired 145 acres on the Speed River. In 1847 he erected the large stone dam on the Speed River at the former Clemens sawmill, as well as a stone grist mill and flouring mill. He later added a sawmill, a distillery, a woolen mill, and a cooperage to the large industrial complex. Hespeler was also involved in politics and served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Upper Canada. The settlement of New Hope was proclaimed in 1858 as the incorporated Village of Hespeler on January 1, 1859. Jacob Hespeler became the first Reeve.

After the incorporation of the Village of Hespeler in 1858, the town began to grow at a rapid pace. The advantages of an influx of skilled artisans and entrepreneurs from Pennsylvania, Great Britain, and central Europe, combined with improved transportation links to major markets, put Hespeler in the forefront of industrialization in Upper Canada in the 19th century. Various religious congregations also began to establish themselves in the settlement, including the Roman Catholics (1833), the Wanner Mennonite Church (1837), the Methodists (1837), and the Evangelical Association of Canada (1840). The Presbyterians would later arrive (1855), as well as the Lutheran congregation (1860).
Jacob Hespeler was central to the majority of the development taking place, and was the largest landholder in the area, and continued to broaden his business ventures. The commercial centre of New Hope continued to expand on Queen Street with the construction of new shops, the Hespeler Hotel was built in 1847, and the first post office, in Jacob Hespeler’s store on Queen and Chapel streets, in 1851. The arrival of various railway lines in the 1850s facilitated settlement and industrialization, specifically the Galt-Guelph Railway (1858) and subsequently, industry flourished.

Hespeler’s first bakery operated by George Ellis in the Orton Block, on the corner of Queen and Guelph Avenue opened (1858), the Germania Hotel is completed (later known as the Cambridge Archives).

Figure 5 Excerpt of Tremaine’s Map of the County of Waterloo, Canada West 1861. Note the volume of land owned by Jacob Hespeler at this time. *Image Courtesy of the City of Cambridge Archives.*
Smellie Block) in 1864, and Hespeler’s first drug store operated by George Wright is opened in the Glick Block (1870). The Hespeler Hotel was built in 1847 and the Queen’s Hotel at the northwest corner of the main intersection of town was built in 1891.

Figure 6 Hespeler Grand Trunk Railway Station. The original station was likely constructed in 1857-59 with the opening of the line by the Great Western Railway. No photos or other details have survived of that structure. In 1900, a replacement structure was built by the Grand Trunk Railway. *Ontario Railway Stations.*

The railway brought temporary workers to fill jobs in the growing number of mills along the river. It also allowed for a real boom in industry, and an industrial area grew in Hespeler around the tracks. Men, and later women, worked in the factories to produce lumber, knitwear, furniture, and other manufactured goods. In 1861, Jacob Hespeler built the stone housing block known as Riverside Terraces as housing for people that worked in his factories.
Figure 7 Queen Street looking east (south side of the street), with St. James Lutheran Church in background. Image date ca. late 1860s. *Hespeler, Canada: A Souvenir of The Factory Town* (1901).

Around 1869, Hespeler sold portions of his property and moved to California. Hespeler would return to the village just before his death in 1881 and was buried in Hespeler’s New Hope Cemetery.

**Commercial Core & Industrial Prosperity**

Jacob Hespeler bought Joseph Oberholtzer’s Saw Mill and Water Rights in 1863 (current municipal address 215 Queen St. West) for his son-in-law, Herbert M. Farr and Farr’s uncles, who founded and built the Randall Farr Company, manufacturing hosiery. The Randall, Farr and Company oversaw the business until 1874, when Randall and Farr deeded the buildings and land to the J. Schofield Company, which became a partnership between Jonathan Schofield and Robert Forbes. In 1880, Robert Forbes bought out his partner Jonathan Schofield, and continued his expansion of the business. The company became the R. Forbes and Co. Ltd.
In 1888, the company was incorporated, and Robert’s son, George “Duthie” Forbes took over as President. He was joined in running operations with his brother James. Under the management of James & George Forbes, the company grew and thrived. James Forbes unexpectedly died in February 1891, followed by his father Robert in 1895, leaving the company completely under the control of George D. Forbes (Dominion Woollens History, https://dominionwoollens.ca/mill-history/).

![George D. Forbes](image)

**Figure 8** George D. Forbes. Referred to as the “Chief”, presided over the industrial backbone of Hespeler, and what was at one time the largest textile mill in the British Empire. *Dominion Woollens History.*

Historically, the Forbes family played an important role within the history of Hespeler. When Hespeler was incorporated as a town in January 1901, George D. Forbes became Hespeler’s first mayor, while being the owner of the town’s large textile mill, and the single most important employer in Hespeler. In 1928, George Forbes sold the business, and the company would be merged to form Dominion Woollens and Worsted. This merger included mills in Hespeler, Milton, Orillia, Peterborough, and Toronto. The enterprise was one of the largest woollen mills in the British Empire and it was probably the largest in Canada producing a high-quality textile.
**Figure 9** Architectural aerial view of Forbes Factory Buildings. *Hespeler: A Good Place to Live* (1922).

**Figure 10** View of the Speed River looking west, Forbes Factory in distance and the Electric Street Car on the Hespeler-Preston Line. *Hespeler: A Good Place to Live* (1922).
Figure 11 Partial View of R. Forbes Company Plant, showing employees coming home from work. *Hespeler: A Good Place to Live* (1922).

Although the textile mill dominated the industrial sector of Hespeler, a variety of other operations capitalized on Hespeler’s location on the Speed River. The area North of the Speed River quickly industrialized, with various companies establishing themselves in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. This included the production of furniture, rubber goods, and agricultural implements. The diversity of industries helped to create a resilient economy and provided employment opportunities for the growing population. Hespeler’s industrial sector has embraced innovation and technological advancements throughout its history. Companies invested in new machinery and production methods to increase efficiency and output. The introduction of electric power in the late 19th century further fueled industrial growth, allowing factories to expand their operations.

An example of this is the founding of the Stamped and Enamelware Company in the old Canadian Woollen Mills building, formerly the Jacob Hespeler industrial complex. The Hespeler Furniture Company was founded in 1901 by C.A. Gruetzer.
Figure 12 The Hespeler Furniture Company. *Old Boys Reunion, Official Pamphlet (1906).*

A.B Jardine Co., which was originally established in 1870 by Andrew Bell Jardine, expanded and relocated to the stone plant on Avenue Street (now Guelph Avenue).
The Kribs family business also expanded during this time, diversifying with demand. The business, originally established as a sawmill and lumber yard around 1860 by Lewis Kribs, father of William Kribs, would expand and move from Forbes Street to Avenue Road (Guelph Avenue) in 1902, when a new plant was built. A lumber and sawmill business were established here until 1914 – supplied many local factories with materials.
Figure 14 Kribs Saw Mill 1901. Hespeler, Canada: A Souvenir of The Factory Town (1901).
As a result of the industry, increased work, and population, Hespeler would see a substantial growth in commercial and residential building during this period. Many of Hespeler’s larger estate homes were constructed over this period. First, the construction of 152 Guelph Avenue, overlooking the industrial core, built by Jacob Hespeler, as his residence. Charles Karch, of the Karch Foundry on Queen Street West built 120 Queen Street West, overlooking the family business, in 1870, and the Kribs house, owned by William Kribs lumber and sawmill owner was built in 1900 on Guelph Avenue.
**Figure 16** Residence of W. A. Kribs (ca. 1900) on George Street. *Hespeler, Canada: A Souvenir of The Factory Town* (1901).
Figure 17 Residence of J.A. Jardine. Hespeler, Canada: A Souvenir of The Factory Town (1901).

“Hustling Hespeler”

The Daily Telegraph, Waterloo County Edition printed an article in October 1911 entitled “Hustling Hespeler”. The article declared Hespeler as one of the most beautiful locations in the country due to its location on the Speed River, while also elaborating on the manufacturing industry in the Town. The article functioned more as an advertisement, highlighting the abundance of potential in Hespeler, including incentives the Town offered for new industry – sites, moderate taxes, cheap power, moderate rents to working people, and splendid railroad facilities. The article also states over two-hundred new homes had been built in a two-year period, between 1909-1911.
Figure 18 View east from the Forbes Company Plant Tower, looking northeast. Hespeler: A Good Place to Live (1922).

A new streetcar system, the Galt, Preston and Hespeler electric railway, later called the Grand River Railway Company, began to operate in 1894, connecting Preston and Galt. In 1898, the line reached Hespeler, which further accelerated growth possibilities.
Figure 19 Hespeler Streetcar Terminus, fishing on the River ca. 1910. Background is the Upper Mill/1901 Canadian Woolen Mill on Guelph Avenue. Digital Archive Ontario.
Figure 20 Bird’s Eye View from St. James’ Lutheran Church, looking westwards. Hespeler, Canada: A Souvenir of The Factory Town (1901).
During this time, prominent civic buildings began to get established and civic life became more organized. Town Hall construction began in 1914, which included Hespeler Fire Department, the town jail, the offices of the Mayor, Town Clerk, Chief of Police, assessor, and Tax Collectors, and the Board of Health and Welfare Office. This was designed by architect John Evans of the firms Evans and Fulford of Galt. The building was opened in November 1915. That same year, the Town Council also authorized an application to the Carnegie Foundation for the purpose of building a Carnegie Library.

As civic buildings were established, so were public greenspaces and parks. The Hespeler Board of Parks Commissioners was created by Council in 1907. All Hespeler’s parks originate after this period. In 1915, the same year the Town Hall officially opened, George D. Forbes donated land known as Victoria Park to the town of Hespeler for a “Public Park, Garden and Walk” – he would also donate land of Kribs Street, that would become Forbes Park.
Social organizations grew, as did religious establishments and churches. Hespeler Women’s Institute organized at Sunnyhill, the residence of David Rife in 1916. Old Boys’ Reunions had been taking place since 1906, including parades and presentations in the downtown Hespeler Minor Hockey Association first appeared in Ontario Minor Hockey Association competition, The Shamrocks, as early as the 1936-37.
The construction of Queen’s Theatre, which began in 1920, completed in 1921, as was the Post Office Building. As the local industry and factories continued to succeed, new residences were completed, and the community grew. Queen Street developed a fashionable commercial and civic centre at that time.
The War years

During the late 19th century, textile workers from Scotland were enticed to settle in Hespeler with the promise of steady employment at the mills, and new subdivisions were developed in order to provide housing for the mill workers during the 1920s. During both World Wars, Dominion Woollens produced much of the khaki for soldier’s uniforms and wool for socks. The wartime boost to the local labour market necessitated construction of workers’ housing, especially for the many young women who filled the factory jobs while the men were in the armed forces. Distinctive dormitories, such as Gordon Hall and Winston Hall, were designed and built with a full range of facilities, including comprehensive social and recreational programs (Bray, 2008). These residences were often used in Mill recruitment efforts, to advertise an exciting new lifestyle to possible recruits.

Workers from other parts of Canada, notably from Newfoundland and Labrador, were recruited to work in the mills during the labour shortage experienced throughout the war years in the 1940s. Dominion Woollens sent recruiters to Ontario and Newfoundland to attract young women to employment at the Mill, which operated 24 hours a day, six days a week, producing for clothing, household items, and Canadian military uniforms. While mill work was physically demanding, the factory advertised an extensive recreation and social program, including dances, picnics, sports teams, and others, as a means of enticing potential recruits, and entertaining the workers once they moved to Hespeler.
While some women returned to Newfoundland and Labrador after the war, many stayed in Hespeler and the Cambridge area. It is estimated that there are between 12,000 and 15,000 people in the Cambridge area whose families came from Newfoundland during the period between World War II and the 1960s. It is believed by the 1970s, one in every four residents in Cambridge was from Newfoundland (Barrett, 2021).

**Post War Hespeler**

Like many industrial towns, Hespeler faced challenges in the latter half of the 20th century due to economic shifts and changes in manufacturing practices. In 1958, the Dominion Woolens and Worsted went into receivership. The company was purchased by the Toronto based Silknit, and eventually closed in 1984. Consolidation of companies within the manufacturing sector, increased foreign competition, and globalization of both corporations and markets are influences common to most of the industrialized world, and shared with many other Canadian communities.
Other industry, however, was still successful and was able to adapt to changes in manufacturing. The population of Hespeler continued to grow throughout the 1960s and 70s and the Town remained known for its industries. As an example of this, in 1969, American Standard purchased the assets of the Stamped and Enameled Ware and began production of enameled steel bathtubs and sinks. W.A. Kribs, who at that time had shifted to making washing machines, changed their name to Simplicity Products Limited, after their popular and iconic brands of washers and dryers. Also, Hespeler Hockey Stick Company, which had existed in some form since 1905, would see a surge in popularity in its innovative and iconic hockey sticks, particularly as hockey flourished in Southern Ontario.

The brand was established by George Sleeman in Hespeler, Ontario, Canada, in the early 1900s. Sleeman, an entrepreneur and sports enthusiast, initially began producing hockey sticks in his basement before expanding operations into a full-fledged manufacturing facility. Hespeler hockey sticks gained popularity among players due to their quality craftsmanship and performance on the ice. The brand became known for producing durable sticks with innovative designs that appealed to players of all skill levels, from beginners to professionals. In the 1960s and it would be a challenge to find someone that did not use a Hespeler brand hockey stick made at the Sheffield Street plan in Hespeler. (HMHA History).
While Wayne Gretzky, born in nearby Brantford, had a long-standing history in Hespeler, including legendary moments in Hespeler Minor Hockey, he also was a significant brand ambassador for Hespeler Hockey Sticks and equipment throughout his career.
Figure 28 Wayne Gretzky playing at the Hespeler Minor Olympics, 1970-71. HMHA History.

In 1960, the MacDonald Cartier Freeway, or the 401, opened on November 17. While this was met with some excitement and necessity, the highway ultimately cut Hespeler off from Galt and Preston.

Figure 29 Map of Highway 401 Plan, ca. 1960. It Happened in Cambridge.
Figure 30 The cloverleaf interchange at Highway 401 and Hespeler Road opened in 1960. It was later revised to remove two of the leaves. Highway 401 runs from left to right across the picture. The town of Hespeler is in the top right corner. Guelph Mercury Tribune.

While Hespeler was successful in attracting new businesses in the latter half of the 20th century, it remained in the shadow of its larger neighbours, including Galt. Like many industrial towns, Hespeler faced challenges in the 20th century, including economic downturns, changes in consumer preferences, and increased competition. Some industries declined or closed, resulting in job losses and economic hardship for the community. For Hespeler, being so closely tied to several key industries, the loss of these enterprises, meant the loss of local identity. Demolition of the factory buildings removed visual evidence of this important past, and the rise of new forms of economic activity that had little to do with manufacturing, further strained connections with the city’s industrial origins.

When, in the late 1960s, the provincial government proposed the amalgamation of Hespeler with its larger neighbours Galt and Preston, to form a single city, the idea was not well accepted. However, in the end amalgamation could not be resisted and on January 1, 1973,
the Town of Hespeler disappeared as a separate political entity with its amalgamation with Galt and Preston to form the new City of Cambridge.

While traditional manufacturing industries faced difficulties, Hespeler began to see a transition towards new sectors. Service industries, technology, and retail became increasingly important parts of the local economy. Some former industrial sites were repurposed for commercial or residential use, contributing to the diversification of the local economy.

Figure 31 Hespeler Santa Claus Day Parade, date unknown. Hespeler Santa Claus Parade, Facebook Site, 2020.

In recent years, there have been efforts to revitalize the community, including the redevelopment of former industrial sites for commercial and residential purposes. The spirit of place in Hespeler remains strong however, and it is a vibrant community within the city of Cambridge. It has become known for its historic charm, civic pride, cultural events, and outdoor recreational opportunities. One of the most iconic events is the Hespeler Santa Clause Day Parade. Hespeler has maintained its tradition of hosting its own Parade, even after the amalgamation with Cambridge. This initiative was done within the community, and in a treasured tradition for those that live, as well as visit, Hespeler. While its industrial
heyday may be in the past, the legacy of its industrial pioneers still shapes its identity, and efforts to preserve its history and heritage continue.
3 Policy Framework

3.1 Legislation, Official Plan Policies, By-Laws

3.1.1 Provincial Policy Statement (2020)

The Provincial Policy Statement 2020 (PPS 2020) is a document issued by the provincial government that provides policy direct on land use planning and development. The statement is an important part of Ontario’s planning system, designed to guide municipal decision-making, development approvals, and planning activities across the province. The PPS is periodically revised to reflect changes in government policies, priorities, and societal needs. At time of this HCD Study, PPS 2020 remains the most current version, however an updated version is expected sometime later this year (2024). Please note that the new PPS is anticipated to be officially in place in 2024 (https://prod-environmental-registry.s3.amazonaws.com/2024-04/Proposed%20Provincial%20Planning%20Statement,%20April%2010,%202024%20-%20EN%202.pdf).

The PPS 2020 is built upon several focus areas to promote sustainable economic growth, protect the environment and resources, and encourage efficient land use and development patterns. Key principles and policy areas include:

1. **Building Strong Communities**: Encourages the development of healthy, livable, and safe communities that are accessible offer a mix of housing, are efficient in terms of land use and support public transit and active transportation.
2. **Wise Use and Management of Resources**: includes policy’s for the protection of agricultural resource is natural resource is and the conservation of water and energy resources.
3. **Protecting Public Health and Safety**: addresses risk management and mitigation related to natural heritage such as flooding and erosion.
4. **Integrated and Long-Term Planning**: encourages integrated planning approaches that take into account the interaction between multiple jurisdictions and accommodates the needs of current and future generations.
5. **Economic Development**: Supports a diverse and competitive economy by providing opportunities for development and investment in urban and rural areas.

The PPS provides a broad framework, requiring that all decisions related to land use planning “shall be consistent with” the provincial policy statement. Municipalities and decision makers must interpret and apply these policies within their local context, considering other provincial interests and policies, as well as local circumstances and priorities. The PPS is
intended to balance flexibility for local decision making with provincial interests, ensuring that the growth and development across Ontario occur in ways that are sustainable, resilient, and aligned with provincial goals.

**Natural Heritage Protection & the PPS**

The provincial policy statement provides comprehensive policy direction on the management of natural heritage systems and areas, emphasizing their protection for biodiversity, natural processes, and ecological functions. The PPS outlines policies for protecting natural heritage areas, especially in relation to managing development and land use changes to conserve the ecological integrity and heritage character of communities.

The PPS establishes a robust framework for safeguarding natural heritage areas, balancing ecological preservation with responsible development. It outlines several key elements to guide municipalities and developers in protecting biodiversity and ecosystem health, while maintaining community character.

The following are the essential aspects of the PPSS approach to natural heritage protection:

- The PPS mandates the identification and safeguarding of significant natural features such as wetlands and woodlands. Development is generally restricted to ensure the integrity of these features.
- Advocates for planning that respects ecological connections, aiming to sustain or enhance the health and diversity of natural systems.
- Encourages municipalities to map and protect interconnected natural spaces, thereby preserving ecological functions across landscapes.
- Supports the establishment of protective buffer zones around natural features to further protect these areas from the impacts of adjacent land uses and development.
- Development near natural heritage features is subject to detailed impact assessments, with a general prohibition unless no negative impacts are proven.
- Recognizes the intrinsic value that natural heritage features and landscapes contribute to the character and identity of communities.
- Promotes natural heritage conservation as means to mitigate and adapt to climate change, enhancing environmental resilience.

The PPS addresses the conservation of natural heritage areas through distinct policies focused on conserving ecological values of these areas while also integrating considerations for the broader context of community heritage character and sustainable development. This policy framework strategically facilitates a balance between development pressures and the need to protect Ontario’s valuable natural heritage resources.
Heritage Conservation Districts & the PPS

In addition to the focus areas noted above, the Provincial Policy Statement also provides policy guidance on the conservation of cultural heritage resources. When it comes to the designation of a Heritage Conservation District (HCD) under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, the PPS sets a broader policy framework that encourages the conservation of cultural heritage and built heritage resources as part of promoting sustainable and healthy communities.

The PPS supports the conservation of these heritage resources by:

- Encouraging the conservation, use, and management of resources in a manner that maintains their heritage, cultural, and archaeological value for present and future generations.
- Advising on integrated planning approaches that consider cultural heritage and archaeological resources as part of making decisions on land use planning.
- Encouraging adaptive reuse of heritage buildings and structures to maintain their heritage value while accommodating new functions, which can contribute to reducing urban sprawl and promoting more efficient land use.

While the PPS provides the policy framework, the actual designation, protection, and management of heritage conservation districts are more directly governed by the *Ontario Heritage Act*, which empowers municipalities to enact by-laws for the designation of these Districts. The PPS reinforces the importance of these districts within the broader context of provincial land use planning objectives, ensuring that their conservation is considered alongside other provincial interests such as economic development, environmental protection, and the efficient use of land and infrastructure.

3.1.2 Ontario Heritage Act (2023)

The *Ontario Heritage Act* (OHA) is a provincial statute that provides a framework for identifying, preserving, and protecting cultural heritage properties and archaeological sites. Enacted in 1975, the Act enables municipalities and the provincial government to designate properties of historical, architectural, archaeological, or cultural significance to ensure their conservation for future generations.

Key components of the *Ontario Heritage Act* include:

- **Designation of Heritage Properties (Part IV):** the Act allows for the designation of properties as being of cultural heritage value or interest. This can be done either individually or as part of a heritage conservation district. A designated property is subject to legal protections and restrictions to ensure its preservation.
- **Heritage Conservation Districts (Part V):** The Act enables the creation of heritage conservation districts within municipalities. These districts are areas with a
concentration of heritage properties that are protected and managed through district plans to maintain their historical integrity.

- **Heritage Permits**: For designated heritage properties or properties within heritage conservation districts, owners must obtain consent from the local municipal heritage committee or the municipality before making significant alterations, demolitions, or new constructions that might affect the properties heritage attributes.

- **Municipal Heritage Committees**: The Act encourages the establishment of municipal heritage committees, which advise local councils on heritage matters, including property designations, alterations to designated properties, and heritage conservation district plans.

- **Heritage Easements**: The Act allows for heritage easements, which are agreements between property owners and the Ontario Heritage Trust or municipalities to protect and preserve the heritage attributes of a property.

- **Ontario Heritage Trust**: The Act established the Ontario Heritage Trust, an agency of the provincial government with a mandate to identify, preserve, protect, and promote Ontario’s built, cultural, and natural heritage.

- **Archaeological Sites**: The act provides a framework for the conservation and protection of archaeological sites, requiring reporting and assessment of sites where archaeological resources are discovered or expected.

The *Ontario Heritage Act* represents an important tool for heritage conservation, empowering local communities and the provincial government to work together in preserving Ontario’s rich historical and cultural legacy.

### Part V: Heritage Conservation Districts

A Heritage Conservation District is a specific area within a municipality that is recognized for its special character and heritage value, which is protected and managed through policies and guidelines under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The Act allows municipalities to designate areas as heritage conservation districts to conserve and enhance the character of historic neighbourhoods, landscapes, or areas, including their built heritage, cultural heritage landscapes, and archaeological resources.

HCDs are geographically defined areas within a municipality recognized for their distinct heritage character. They can vary greatly in size and character, from single properties to large neighborhoods, and are designated under local bylaws to conserve their heritage attributes. These districts can include a mix of residential, commercial, institutional, and natural heritage features, each contributing to the overall heritage character of the area.
O. Reg. 9.06: Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

The Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (O. Reg. 9/06), amended by O. Reg. 569/22, part of the Ontario Heritage Act, sets standardized criteria for assessing cultural heritage value, which municipalities must apply when designating properties. It was introduced to bring consistency to the designation process, ensuring that properties meet a comprehensive set of heritage value criteria before being designated. This regulation along with O. Reg. 10/06, has significantly influenced heritage conservation practices in Ontario, guiding both municipal decisions and the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) evaluation of heritage properties.

For an HCD to be designated under the updated regulations, at least 25% of the properties within the district or defined area must satisfy 2 or more of a set criterion. These criteria assess various aspects of the properties, including their design or physical value, historical or associative value, and contextual value. This means that not all properties within an HCD need to meet the heritage criteria individually. However, a significant portion (i.e. 25%) must meet these standards to collectively uphold the district’s heritage value.

In order for a property to be considered as a contributor to heritage character of an area, it must meet 2 or more of the following criteria:

1. **Design Value or Physical Value**: Properties that are rare, unique, representative, or early examples of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method.
2. **Design Value or Physical Value for Craftsmanship**: Properties that display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.
3. **Design Value or Physical Value for Technical Achievement**: Properties that demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
4. **Historical Value or Associative Value for Direct Association**: Properties that have a direct association with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community.
5. **Historical Value or Associative Value for Potential to Yield Information**: Properties that yields, or have the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.
6. **Historical Value or Associative Value for Work or Ideas**: Properties that demonstrate or reflect the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community.
7. **Contextual Value for Character**: Properties that define, maintain, or support the character of the district.
8. **Contextual Value for Linkage**: Properties that are physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to each other.
9. **Contextual Value for Landmark Status:** Properties that are defined by, planned around, or are themselves a landmark.

**Ontario Heritage Toolkit**

The Ontario Heritage Toolkit is a collection of guides designed to assist municipalities, heritage professionals, and the public in understanding and implementing the provisions of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The Toolkit provides practical advice and detailed procedures for identifying, preserving, and managing cultural heritage resources in Ontario. It is particularly useful for those involved in heritage conservation at the local level, offering clear explanations of the legal and policy frameworks, as well as best practices. It should be noted that the Toolkit is currently being updated by the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) and the old version will be replaced.

The toolkit is divided into several volumes, each focusing on a different aspect of heritage conservation as outlined in the *Ontario Heritage Act*. These volumes cover topics such as:

- Designating properties under Part IV (Individual Designations) and Part V (Heritage Conservation Districts) of the Act
- Heritage property evaluation and inventory processes
- Legal and procedural aspects of heritage conservation
- Conservation strategies and best practices

**Volume on Heritage Conservation Districts**

The volume dedicated to heritage conservation districts under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* is an essential resource for understanding and implementing HCD's.

The volume covers:

- An overview of what Heritage Conservation Districts are, their purpose, and their importance in preserving the character and heritage of broader areas beyond individual buildings or sites.
- Detailed explanation of the legal basis for HCDs under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, including the roles and responsibilities of municipalities, property owners, and other stakeholders in the designation and management process.
- Step by step guidance on how to establish an HCD, from initial study and research, through public consultation and engagement, to the adoption of the bylaw that formally designates the area as an HCD.
- Insights into creating an effective district plan, which is a critical component of an HCD. This includes guidelines for permitted alterations, new constructions, and other interventions within the district to ensure they maintain or enhance its heritage value.
• Best practices for the ongoing management, conservation, and enhancement of heritage conservation districts, including advice on maintenance, funding, and heritage impact assessments.
• Real world examples and case studies that illustrate the successful implementation of HCD’s, providing practical insights and lessons learned.
• Additional resource is, such as templates, checklists, and reference materials, to assist municipalities and stakeholders in effectively managing HCDs.

This volume is an invaluable tool for municipalities considering the designation of HCDs, providing a comprehensive framework for the protection and management of areas with significant heritage value. It emphasizes a collaborative approach, involving community stakeholders in the preservation of their heritage, and provides a road map for balancing heritage conservation with sustainable development and change.

3.1.3 Region of Waterloo Official Plan (2015)

The Region of Waterloo Official Plan is an extensive planning framework intended to guide growth and development within the Region of Waterloo up to the year 2031. The plan replaces the previous Regional Official Policies Plan approved in 1995 and addresses growth management, environmental protection, infrastructure development, and land use in response to anticipated population growth and changing social, economic, and environmental conditions.

Key highlights of the plan include:

• **Growth Management:** The plan outlines a strategy for managing anticipated population growth, with Waterloo Region's population expected to reach approximately 729,000 by 2031. This represents an increase of around 38 percent from the 2009 population, necessitating careful planning to accommodate this growth sustainably.

• **Planned Community Structure:** The plan emphasizes a balanced approach to growth, directing a significant portion of new development towards existing built-up areas to optimize the use of land and existing infrastructure. This approach aims to create more compact, vibrant, and complete communities that support a mix of employment, housing, shopping, and services.

• **Urban and Township Growth:** The plan distinguishes between the Urban Area, which includes the primary urban areas of the cities of Cambridge, Kitchener, and Waterloo, and Township Urban Areas, which are the main urban areas within the townships of North Dumfries, Wellesley, Wilmot, and Woolwich. Both areas are intended to accommodate the majority of the region’s growth, with policies in place to ensure developments contribute to complete communities and are supported by adequate infrastructure.

• **Environmental Protection and Sustainability:** The plan incorporates policies aimed at protecting the natural environment and promoting sustainability. This includes managing...
water resources, conserving energy, and enhancing the region's natural and cultural heritage.

- **Infrastructure Development**: The plan addresses the need for strategic investment in physical and community infrastructure to support growth. This includes transportation systems planning, wastewater treatment, water supply management, and waste management, ensuring that infrastructure development is financially and environmentally sustainable.

- **Consultation and Implementation**: The plan underscores the importance of public consultation and collaboration with various stakeholders, including area municipalities, to achieve its goals. It also highlights the use of planning tools and resources for effective implementation.

**OP Sections Relevant to Hespeler HCD Study**

**Chapter 2: Shaping Waterloo Region’s Urban Communities**

- **Planned Community Structure**: Emphasizes the main urban zones in Cambridge, Kitchener, Waterloo, and parts of Woolwich Township, targeting these areas for significant regional growth. The infrastructure includes municipal water, wastewater systems, and transit services. Hespeler, identified as a Built-Up and Greenfield Area on Map 3a, is designated for development, contributing to complete communities with mixed land uses and minimum density targets.

- **Re-Urbanization Target**: Mandates that at least 45% of new residential developments annually should occur within the Built-Up Area from 2015 onwards, promoting efficient land use and infrastructure reuse. Hespeler is part of this target area.

- **Urban Designated Greenfield Areas**: Designates new development areas within the Urban Area but outside the built boundary, targeting a mix of land uses to create complete communities with emphasis on walking, cycling, and transit use.

- **Special Policies for Urban Areas**: Tailored policies for unique areas like the Stockyards Industrial/Commercial Area, allowing specific developments such as Power Centres under certain conditions while ensuring compatibility with broader urban design objectives.

**Chapter 3: Liveability in Waterloo Region**

- **Range and Mix of Housing**: Focuses on providing a diverse range of housing options in terms of form, density, and affordability, including intensification in residential neighborhoods and incentives for affordable housing.

- **Cultural Heritage**: Utilizes legislation for conservation, maintains municipal registers for cultural heritage resources, and promotes the conservation and compatibility of cultural heritage with new developments. This section of the OP details the utilization of existing legislation for conservation, regional implementation guidelines, municipal registers for cultural heritage resources, region-wide heritage inventory maintenance, conservation of
cultural heritage landscapes, development and implementation of an Archaeology Master Plan, development application assessments near cultural heritage resources, the establishment of a heritage planning advisory committee, cultural heritage impact assessments, conservation promotion and research, as well as assistance in heritage resource documentation.

Chapter 7: The Greenlands Network

- **Greenlands Network**: Includes a comprehensive network of environmental features aiming to enhance the region’s ecological integrity. Hespeler is part of a Significant Valley, contributing to the scenic and recreational value of the area.
- **Landscape Level Systems**: Identifies and conserves significant valleys and environmentally sensitive landscapes, with policies aimed at enhancing the character and cultural heritage of these areas.
- **Core Environmental Features**: Protects significant environmental assets, with strict guidelines limiting development and requiring Environmental Impact Statements for any allowed alterations.
- **Supporting Environmental Features and Stewardship**: Emphasizes the conservation of non-core features that contribute to ecological functions and biodiversity, integrating them into development planning to preserve ecological connectivity.

Official Plan Maps

The Region of Waterloo OP maps that are relevant to Hespeler include:

- Map 3A: Urban Area
- Map 4: Greenlands Network
- Map 5A: Regional Transit Network
- Map 5C: Regional Cycling Routes

3.1.4 City of Cambridge Official Plan (2018)

The City of Cambridge's 2018 Consolidated Official Plan is a strategic policy document that directs general land use within the city. It aims to support long-term growth and development, addressing community needs while conforming to the Region of Waterloo Official Plan and the Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. The plan covers various areas including housing, commercial, industrial, cultural heritage, natural heritage, agricultural, parks and open space, and transportation and infrastructure. It's a legal document periodically reviewed to meet the city’s evolving needs and to align with higher-level policies. Public input is sought before any changes are finalized, with the amendment process outlined in the Ontario Planning Act.
Additionally, the City of Cambridge has adopted several master plans since 2008, focusing on areas such as arts and culture, cycling, communications, core areas, corporate sustainability, technology, and economic development. Each plan contains specific goals, strategies, and actions tailored to improve different facets of city life, from enhancing cultural life to guiding investments in cycling infrastructure, promoting sustainable practices, and fostering economic growth.

**OP Sections Relevant to Hespeler HCD Study**

**Chapter 4: Cultural Heritage Resources**

- **Section 4.1: Objectives:** These objectives support the conservation of the city's built heritage, coordinate heritage interests with various stakeholders, and promote heritage as a component of tourism and quality of life.

- **Section 4.2: Priorities for Cultural Heritage Resources:** This section prioritizes the conservation of cultural heritage resources, promoting the integration of these resources into new developments in a way that preserves their heritage value.

- **Section 4.7: Designation of Heritage Conservation Districts:** This section outlines the process for designating areas as Heritage Conservation Districts, including the preparation of a study to identify the character, significance, and boundaries of the area. It also describes the contents of a Heritage Conservation District Plan, which includes objectives, heritage value statements, descriptions of properties, policy statements for managing change, and procedures for alterations and demolitions within the district.

- **Section 4.8: Cultural Heritage Landscapes:** Although this section primarily addresses larger landscapes, it's relevant to Heritage Conservation Districts as it involves the identification, conservation, and designation of significant landscapes, which may include or overlap with Heritage Conservation Districts.

- **Section 4.9: Heritage Character Areas:** This section introduces the concept of Heritage Character Areas as geographical areas of heritage significance. It mentions that policies for recognizing these areas will be developed and incorporated into the Plan.

- **Section 4.10: Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment:** This section requires a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment for developments that could affect designated properties, cultural heritage landscapes, or non-designated resources of cultural heritage value.

**Official Plan maps**

The City of Cambridge OP maps that are most relevant to Hespeler include:

- Map 5: Hespeler Village
- Map 6: Regeneration Areas
- Map 7A: Major Transportation Facilities and Hydro Corridors
- Map 7B: Regional Transit Network
- Map 8: Provincially Identified Former Waste Disposal Sites
3.1.5 **City of Cambridge Zoning By-Law (2012)**

The City of Cambridge Zoning By-Law outlines the comprehensive zoning regulations within the City of Cambridge, including definitions, classifications, and general and specific zoning rules that govern land use and development. It is structured into various sections and appendices, each addressing different aspects of zoning and planning within the city. The document is designed to guide developers, property owners, and city planners in understanding and complying with the zoning requirements to ensure orderly and sustainable urban development.

**Zoning Maps**

The zoning by-law maps that are relevant to Hespeler include:

- Map Z6: Special Regulations in the Hespeler Village
- Map Z9: Regeneration and Transition Areas

3.1.6 **City of Cambridge Property Standards By-Law No. 181-04 (2004)**

By-law No. 181-04, enacted by the Corporation of the City of Cambridge, serves as a comprehensive framework for the maintenance, safety, and occupancy standards of properties within Cambridge, replacing the previous By-law 38-04. It aligns with the city's Official Plan and adheres to the Building Code Act, S.O. 1992, c.23, to ensure properties meet specific standards for human habitation and use.

This by-law is an important regulatory document for the City of Cambridge, aiming to enhance the quality of life, safety, and aesthetic appeal of the community by ensuring properties are well-maintained, safe, and suitable for occupancy.
3.2 Master Plans, Conservation Plans and Strategic Plans

3.2.1 City of Cambridge: Core Areas Community Improvement Plan (2022)

The Core Areas Community Improvement Plan (CIP) presents a comprehensive strategy for revitalizing the core areas of Cambridge. The document outlines the rationale, legal framework, and historical context for the current CIP, building upon past initiatives and lessons learned to foster community improvement and sustainable development.

Legislative Framework

This section details the legal foundations for the CIP, anchored in the Municipal Act and the Planning Act, which enable the city to undertake such planning and development efforts.

Previous Plans, Programs, and Initiatives

A review of past strategies highlights what has been effective and what hasn't, setting a context for the new plan. It notes the evolution of CIPs since the 1980s and various financial incentives aimed at stimulating private investment, such as the Design Guide Program and Building Revitalization Program.

Supporting Policies

The CIP aligns with provincial, regional, and local policies to ensure a cohesive approach to community improvement, touching on land development regulations, growth management, and the city's strategic objectives towards "People, Place, and Prosperity."

Community Improvement Project Areas

Focusing on Cambridge's three core areas (Hespeler Village, Preston Towne Centre, Galt City Centre), this section delineates the designated zones for the CIP, emphasizing mixed-use development, accessibility, and the promotion of cultural and tourist activities.

Goals and Objectives

The document sets forth ambitious goals, such as creating safe and vibrant areas, supporting local businesses, preserving cultural heritage, and promoting affordable housing. The objectives include enhancing residential and commercial spaces, facilitating redevelopment, improving infrastructure and aesthetics, and offering financial incentives for private investment.
Programs
Detailed provisions for grants and loans are outlined to support eligible projects that contribute to the CIP's goals, such as developing new residential or commercial units, renovating existing spaces, and preserving heritage properties.

Other Strategies
Additional supportive measures include relief from fees and charges, partnerships with the private sector, capital improvements for public spaces, promotion of arts and culture, and strategic property acquisition and disposition to bolster redevelopment efforts.

3.2.2 Cambridge Connected Strategic Plan (2024-2026)

Introduction
The City of Cambridge’s Strategic Plan for 2024-2026, titled "Cambridge Connected," outlines a comprehensive framework for guiding the city's development and ensuring it remains a vibrant, inclusive, and prosperous community. The plan emphasizes sustainability, leadership, collaboration, transparency, and engagement across all strategic actions.

Key Updates
The City of Cambridge Strategic Plan for 2024-2026 reflects significant updates from its 2016-2019 version. The newer plan emphasizes sustainability, collaboration, transparency, and engagement more robustly, highlighted through the newly added public value statement. The vision has expanded to articulate a unified, inclusive community with a stronger focus on safety and accessibility. Strategic goals are refined under themes of People, Place, and Prosperity, with a clearer emphasis on community belonging, economic resilience, and proactive climate action. Notably, the plan introduces detailed strategic actions and a performance measurement framework to better track progress and ensure accountability, showing a deeper commitment to aligning city initiatives with the community’s needs and feedback.

Vision & Public Value Statement
The vision for Cambridge is to celebrate the uniqueness of its founding communities while being a unified city. The plan envisions a community where residents and visitors enjoy safe, clean, caring, sustainable, inclusive, and accessible neighborhoods. Cambridge aims to provide a wide variety of lifestyle and housing options, access to social supports, transportation options, and ample cultural and recreational opportunities.
The plan stresses a commitment to principles of sustainability, engagement, leadership, collaboration, and transparency, ensuring service excellence and promoting pride of place.

**Strategic Goals**

The strategic goals are categorized under three main themes:

1. **People**
   - Foster a community with heart, ensuring that everyone feels they belong and are cared for equitably.
   - Enhance equity and inclusion efforts to accommodate all community members and address their needs effectively.

2. **Place**
   - Focus on placemaking, creating inviting destinations that capitalize on the city's natural and built heritage.
   - Prioritize planning for growth to accommodate a changing and diverse population while preserving green spaces.

3. **Prosperity**
   - Build economic resilience by creating strong cores in downtown areas and supporting local businesses.
   - Improve transportation options and infrastructure to facilitate connectivity and active transportation choices.

**Strategic Actions**

The plan outlines specific actions to achieve the objectives, including:

- Activating community spaces and hubs.
- Enhancing accessibility and inclusivity in service delivery.
- Supporting small businesses and economic initiatives.
- Addressing climate change and preparing for emergencies through proactive and innovative strategies.

**Measuring Our Progress**

A new component focuses on monitoring and evaluating the plan's effectiveness through ongoing business plan development, application of performance metrics, and transparent reporting on priorities.
The Cambridge Heritage Master Plan serves as both a visionary and policy framework aimed at conserving and celebrating Cambridge’s heritage resources. It articulates the community's shared values as manifested in buildings, landscapes, and cultural practices, set against the historical backdrop of the Grand River's pivotal role in shaping the area's settlement and industrial growth.

Key aspects of the plan include:

- **Diverse Heritage Resources**: The plan emphasizes the significance of built heritage, cultural heritage landscapes, and archaeological sites, proposing strategies for their preservation and integration into the city's future.
- **Strategic Initiatives**: Recommendations focus on building community support, providing heritage "products," establishing an implementation framework, and fostering cooperation among stakeholders.
- **Principles and Priorities**: The plan sets forth principles such as focusing on character areas and promoting heritage-friendly development. Priority actions include enhancing the heritage resource inventory and incorporating the plan's recommendations into official policies.

**Hespeler & the Heritage Master Plan**

Specifically, in Hespeler, the plan highlights:

- **Industrial Heritage**: Hespeler’s growth was significantly influenced by its industrial roots, with key industrialists adopting a “paternalistic” approach towards the community, which is reflected in the preservation of many important buildings.
- **Community Fabric**: The strong sense of local pride among Hespeler residents is attributed to the shared history of industrial employment, notably at Dominion Woollens and Worsteds, which shaped the community’s cohesion.
- **Socio-Cultural Evolution**: The integration of newcomers, particularly during and after WWII, contributed to the development of modern-day Cambridge, with the Newfoundland Club being a testament to this enduring influence.
- **Architectural and Urban Character**: Hespeler’s heritage character is marked by a mix of land uses reflecting its industrial past and the community's evolution, with the downtown core showcasing a modest collection of mid-late 19th-century buildings.

The Cambridge Heritage Master Plan envisions a future where the city reclaims its natural and rural landscapes, embraces its historical narratives, and enhances the quality of life through vibrant downtown cores and integrated new developments. Hespeler, with its...
rich industrial heritage and strong community fabric, exemplifies the unique character and potential for heritage conservation within Cambridge.

3.2.4 The Grand Strategy for Managing the Grand River as a Canadian Heritage River (1994)

Developed in 1994, the Grand River Management Strategy outlines a visionary management philosophy that underscores the river's value and outlines goals and guidelines for sustainable heritage and recreational resource management, emphasizing shared responsibility and community engagement.

The strategy is built on the belief in the enduring value of the Grand River watershed's resources, highlighting the river's role as a barometer of civilization's impact on the natural environment. It identifies critical challenges such as improving water quality and fostering greater appreciation and protection of heritage and recreational resources. The governance model stresses stakeholder participation, clear communication, and effective conflict resolution.

The strategy sets forth goals to enhance knowledge, stewardship, and enjoyment of the watershed's resources, underpinned by values such as integrity and accountability. Actions include strengthening partnerships, encouraging community involvement, and enhancing the watershed's well-being through shared responsibility.

Canadian Heritage Rivers System: Grand River Nomination

The Grand River's nomination as a Canadian Heritage River underscores its significant natural, human heritage, and recreational values, illustrating the river's integral role in the cultural and ecological landscape of Southern Ontario. Key points include:

- **Purpose and Criteria:** The nomination aims to recognize the Grand River's outstanding contributions to Canada's natural and cultural heritage, ensuring its preservation and enjoyment for future generations. A river must exhibit significant natural, cultural, or recreational values to qualify for this designation.

- **Human Heritage and Recreational Values:** The Grand River, spanning 290 kilometers, is noted for its rich mosaic of cultural heritage, including its significance to Indigenous peoples, its 19th-century industrial architecture, and its association with prominent Canadian figures. The river offers extensive recreational opportunities, from water sports to trails and heritage appreciation, facilitated by a comprehensive protective framework led by the Grand River Conservation Authority.

- **Role in the Canadian Heritage Rivers System (CHRS):** The river's inclusion in the CHRS highlights its exceptional qualities within developed areas, its representation of Great
Lakes Lowlands ecology, its historical and current adaptive management of river flows, and its contributions to Canada’s industrial and cultural development. Additionally, the nomination aims to enhance public awareness of the Indigenous peoples’ historical and ongoing relationship with the river.

In the context of Hespeler Village and the current HCD Study, it is important to note that the Speed River is a tributary and is therefore an integral part of the overall Grand River System.


This report assesses the developments and initiatives from 2004 to 2014 aimed at preserving and enhancing the Grand River's status as a Canadian Heritage River, focusing on heritage conservation, recreational opportunities, and environmental stewardship. The report includes:

- **Management and Recreational Activities:** The report covers the managed system of dams and reservoirs operated by the Grand River Conservation Authority, highlighting the watershed's role in supporting a diverse range of recreational activities. It emphasizes the rich cultural heritage and the various opportunities for community engagement and education about the river's significance.

- **Heritage River Surveys:** Conducted in 2012 and 2014, these surveys aimed to assess changes in the river's human heritage and recreational features. Feedback from a wide array of stakeholders informed the ongoing management and preservation efforts.

- **Grand River Water Management Plan Update:** Initiated in 2008, this update focuses on sustainable water management, enhancing river health, and supporting the watershed's recreational and cultural uses in alignment with its heritage status. The plan sets water quality and flow targets to support recreational activities and the ecological and cultural integrity of the river.
3.3 Guidelines

3.3.1 Standards & Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places In Canada (2011)

The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada (SGCHPC) serve as the first Canadian benchmark for heritage conservation practices. They provide comprehensive guidance from making informed decisions regarding the planning, intervention, and utilization of historic places, aiming to establish a consistent set of principles and guidelines across Canada. This document is especially important for ensuring sound conservation practices and is widely adopted by various levels of government for assessing conservation interventions on historic places.

The document underwent revisions for its second edition, which was issued by Parks Canada in 2011. These revisions aimed to address feedback in order to clarify the relationship between the standards and guidelines and statements of significance, enhance the explanation of the conservation decision-making process, provide a clearer interpretation of the 14 standards, add guidance for sustainability related interventions, and address new topics such as cultural landscapes and the conservation of modern materials. The guidelines also expanded to offer more comprehensive advice for archaeological sites and engineering works, among other areas.

The Standards and Guidelines emphasize a three-phase conservation decision making process: understanding the historic place through research and investigation, planning for its conservation while considering all factors affecting its future, and intervening in a manner that respects and protects the site’s heritage value. The document outlines specific standards for general conservation practices, rehabilitation, and restoration, ensuring that any physical changes to Character-Defining Elements are minimized and compatible with the historic places overall character.

The Standards & HCDS

The Standards and Guidelines significantly support and reinforce the establishment of heritage conservation districts by providing a detailed framework for the conservation of cultural landscapes, including heritage districts. This document helps in understanding, planning, and intervening in historic places to maintain their heritage value, which is imperative for the conservation of HCDs. The guidelines offer practical advice and a consistent set of principles that can be applied to the diverse character and requirements of each CDs, whether they're residential, commercial, institutional, or a mix of these, often incorporating natural heritage features such as green spaces and waterways.
Municipalities across Ontario use the Standards and Guidelines as a reference point when reviewing heritage permit applications for alterations, demolitions, or new construction within HCDs. The document ensures that any changes respect the heritage values and character-defining elements of the district, maintaining the district’s overall heritage integrity. This approach is visible in the detailed processes and requirements set out for permit applications within HCDs, which include providing comprehensive plans, drawings, and specifications that clearly show how the proposed changes align with heritage character of the area.

The Standards and Guidelines provide a foundational framework that supports the establishment, management, and conservation of heritage conservation districts, ensuring that the heritage and character of these districts are preserved for future generations.

### 3.3.2 Hespeler Village Streetscape Plan & Urban Design Guidelines (2013)

The Streetscape Plan and Urban Design Guidelines are tailored for Hespeler Village within Cambridge, anticipating significant demographic changes by 2031. This comprehensive approach integrates the area’s rich industrial heritage with contemporary needs, aiming to enhance both the pedestrian experience and economic vitality.

#### Study Area Inventory & Analysis

The analysis highlights Cambridge’s projected population growth, emphasizing its impact on the Hespeler Study Area. The area boasts a diverse mix of industrial history alongside modern retail, residential, and leisure activities.

#### Character Areas

The plan delineates three key character areas within Hespeler Village:

1. **Village Core Area**: This area stands as the compact heart of Hespeler, showcasing a blend of retail, commercial, and residential spaces along Queen Street East and is distinguished by historic facades that lend a unique identity.
2. **Milling Road Adaptive Reuse Area**: Milling Road reflects the industrial past, spotlighting opportunities for repurposing historic mill buildings along the Speed River.
3. **Queen Street West**: This area presents a less dense development pattern with varied uses, yet it lacks the cohesive character of the village core.

#### Nodes & Gateways

Active hubs like Forbes Park and Old Towne Hall Parkette are central to community events and need to be seamlessly integrated into the streetscape. The plan underscores the
importance of cohesive wayfinding and establishing defined gateways to highlight culturally significant areas.

**Architectural Façade and Heritage Assets**

The guidelines emphasize the preservation of Hespeler's Character-Defining Elements, including heritage buildings, public spaces, and natural assets like the Speed River. Specific historical buildings are acknowledged, alongside the need for a facade improvement program to enhance the village’s aesthetic appeal.

**Lighting Considerations**

The plan identifies issues related to the height of light standards and fixture types, which contribute to light pollution. Recommendations include retrofitting existing fixtures with energy-efficient options to reduce costs and environmental impact.

**Policy Review**

The Streetscape Plan aligns with various policy frameworks, advocating for sustainable land use, growth within designated areas, and the promotion of mixed-use development. This involves a detailed review of Provincial, Regional, and Municipal policies, including the City of Cambridge Official Plan and Zoning By-Law.

**“Complete Streets” Philosophy**

The concept of "Complete Streets" is promoted, emphasizing the need for streets to accommodate all users safely and effectively. This includes considerations for pedestrians, cyclists, motorists, and transit riders, ensuring equitable access for all.

**“SWOT” Analysis**

The analysis reveals:

- **Strengths**: The natural beauty of Forbes Park and the compact development conducive to a pedestrian-friendly environment.
- **Weaknesses**: Challenges related to the constrained right of way on Queen Street and the maintenance of public infrastructure.
- **Opportunities**: Enhancing the area's cultural and heritage appeal and improving connectivity.
- **Threats**: Traffic congestion and the lack of a unified streetscape character.

**Streetscape Concept**

The concept outlines strategies for enhancing connectivity, developing a cohesive streetscape, and preserving the area's heritage. Recommendations extend to material
selection, pedestrian safety enhancements, and the incorporation of cultural and recreational opportunities.

**Traffic & Pedestrian Circulation**

The plan proposes maintaining efficient traffic flow along Queen Street while significantly improving pedestrian access and safety. This includes better connections from surrounding neighborhoods to the urban core.

**Redevelopment Opportunities**

Opportunities for redevelopment are discussed in the context of mixed-use development, heritage preservation, and public space enhancement. This encompasses areas within the Urban Core, along Queen Street, and the Milling Road/River Front.

**Design Guidelines**

Detailed guidelines are provided for managing heritage properties and facade improvements, with specific attention to the Milling Road area. The aim is to maintain the industrial character while allowing for modern architectural elements that complement the historic context.

**Implementation Phasing**

The plan’s implementation is phased, beginning with Queen Street and expanding to include Adam Street, Guelph Avenue, and other key areas. It also outlines options for developing public squares and revitalizing Milling Road to enhance public engagement and activity.

### 3.3.3 Milling Road Streetscape Plan & Urban Design Guidelines (2021)

This document outlines a comprehensive approach for the redevelopment of Milling Road in Hespeler Village. Initiated in January 2020, the plan builds upon the 2013 Hespeler Streetscape Plan & Urban Design Guidelines, focusing on creating a unique and pedestrian-friendly destination while enhancing the historical character of the area.

The location of Milling Road along the Speed River and its proximity to various residential, commercial, and industrial properties offer a unique opportunity to create a distinctive sense of place, drawing inspiration from successful models such as Toronto’s Distillery District.

The document provides an inventory and analysis of the current conditions, including the architectural and landscape character, land use, and existing amenities. Key features such as Jacob’s Landing Park, Mill Run Trail, and the industrial heritage of the area are highlighted. The analysis also addresses challenges related to pedestrian and vehicular circulation, parking, and the condition of the city-owned building at 30 Milling Rd.
The guidelines emphasize streetscape improvements on city-owned land and potential partnership opportunities for development on adjacent parcels. Specific design guidelines are divided into built form, streetscape design, park design, and phasing and costing. Key recommendations include:

- Future developments should complement the traditional industrial facade of the area, with renovations encouraging public use and flexibility. Preservation and adaptive reuse of existing structures are emphasized, particularly the city owned building at 30 Milling Rd.
- The plan suggests modifications to traffic circulation to prioritize pedestrian movement and enhance the streetscape with planting, seating, lighting, and other amenities.
- Enhancements to Jacob’s Landing and connections to the Mill Run Trail are proposed to increase utilization and accessibility of green spaces.
- The document outlines a phased approach for implementation, considering practical and financial feasibility.

### 3.3.4 Hespeler Village River Activation Master Plan Phase III (2003)

The River Activation Master Plan was a comprehensive initiative aimed at revitalizing the Hespeler Village Core Area centered around the Hespeler Mill Pond and Speed River. The master plan seeks to transform the Hespeler Mill Pond and Speed River into a focal point for community revitalization, emphasizing the protection and enhancement of the area's historical significance.

However, it should be noted that the Plan never became formalized and the committee in charge of its oversight dissolved many years ago. For this reason, and for the purpose of this HCD Study, the Plan is used as a guiding document only and is understood to not be an official policy document.

#### Master Plan Concepts

Two primary concepts were proposed:

- **Concept A**: Focuses on environmental enhancements such as dredging the Mill Pond, creating wildlife habitats, improving trail connections, and establishing recreational areas.
- **Concept B**: Combines economic development with environmental improvements, including the adaptive reuse of industrial buildings, public open spaces, and extensive trail/boardwalk systems.
The final plan integrates aspects from both concepts, aiming to strengthen the downtown core, provide public open spaces, and enhance the urban landscape through mixed-use developments and environmental conservation efforts.

**Project Phasing Strategy**

The implementation strategy outlines a phased approach over a ten-year period, emphasizing linkages with other initiatives, the retention of the Mill Pond dam, and the enhancement of public spaces and infrastructure. Noting, as mentioned above, that the Plan unfortunately never became formalized, thus the 10-year plan was only partially executed.
“New Urban Identity” Implementation

This strategy envisions transforming the industrial lands west of Guelph Ave into a vibrant urban area, expanding the Hespeler Village Core Area, and making it eligible for financial incentives under the City of Cambridge’s revitalization program. Concerns were raised about preserving the historical industrial buildings in the southern portion of the area.

Factors for Further Study

The Plan highlights the need for a proactive landscape development strategy focusing on environmental rehabilitation, including the creation of new wetland habitats and the improvement of water quality in the Mill Pond.

3.3.5 Galt Core Area – Building Height Guidelines (2022)

The Building Height Guidelines for the Galt Core Area, provide a detailed framework aimed at guiding future developments in Cambridge's downtown. The guidelines are designed to balance the need for urban intensification with the preservation of the area’s unique heritage and character. The guidelines cover various aspects of urban development, including building heights, design principles, public realm contributions, and the impact on the city's skyline.

The guidelines were developed in response to the anticipated growth and the need for intensified development within the Galt Core Area, particularly with the proposed extension of the LRT line and provincially mandated intensification targets. The study emphasizes the importance of enhancing the pedestrian-focused public realm, revitalizing heritage structures, and ensuring a vibrant downtown through the strategic placement of taller buildings and the careful consideration of building massing, height, and siting.

Urban Design Principles

A set of urban design principles underpins the guidelines, focusing on the compatibility of new developments with the existing urban context, the protection of view corridors, the enhancement of the public realm, and the sensitivity towards heritage structures. Key principles include:

- **Compatibility with Urban Context**: Ensuring new developments harmonize with adjacent buildings in terms of massing and height.
- **Protection of View Corridors**: Buildings along Main Street should maintain a consistent scale, with taller elements set back to preserve east-west views.
- **Enhancement of the Public Realm**: The base of buildings should contribute positively to the pedestrian experience, with considerations for setbacks and ground-floor uses.
• **Minimization of Visual Impact**: Taller buildings should be positioned to reduce their visual impact on existing neighborhoods and contribute aesthetically to the city's skyline.

**Building Heights and Guidelines**

The guidelines propose a conceptual height plan that restricts taller buildings along Main Street and its immediate adjacencies, promoting increased building heights further from the street to preserve the character of the riverfront and heritage areas. The plan acknowledges the trend towards taller developments and aims to integrate these within the urban fabric without compromising the area's heritage assets.

The guidelines were grouped into the following three categories:

- **Mid-Rise Buildings**: The guidelines recommend a base portion of 2 to 3 stories, consistent with adjacent structures, with upper portions stepped back to maintain a clear relationship with neighboring massings. Ground-floor setbacks are advised for commercial activity or landscaped transitional spaces, enhancing the streetscape and pedestrian comfort.

- **Tall Buildings**: Tall buildings should feature a set back tower from the base to ensure a slender profile and minimize wind and shadow impacts. The design of the building base is crucial, with an emphasis on high-quality materials, transparency, and active ground-floor uses to enhance the pedestrian realm.

- **Parking Structures**: Parking integrated into the upper floors of buildings should be attractively screened and contribute to the overall building appearance. Stand-alone parking structures, if necessary, must also be of high quality and visually engaging.
3.4 Other Planning Studies

3.4.1 Environmental Assessment for Hespeler Pedestrian Bridge (2023)

As part of the City of Cambridge’s Cycling Master Plan established in 2020, an Environmental Assessment (EA) was conducted for the proposed construction of a pedestrian bridge and associated trail across the Speed River in Hespeler. The bridge aims to connect the existing Mill Run Trail on the north side of the river with a new trail proposed along Queen St W on the south side, enhancing access to Hessler’s core and linking to future public facilities.

The EA, completed under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act, aimed to confirm the projects need, identify and evaluate the best location and design for the pedestrian bridge and trail, and assess potential environmental impacts along with mitigation measures. Key aspects covered in the EA include technical considerations such as trail connection length, structural requirements, implementation, and utilities. Other considerations include social and economic factors such as public safety, accessibility, economic development, cultural environment assessments including archaeological and heritage resources, as well as natural environment concerns focusing on flooding hazards and climate change factors.

Notable issues raised include unauthorized use of a nearby railroad bridge, safety concerns, and considerations regarding local heritage properties, indigenous cultural significance, and environmental sensitivities. The proposed trail alignment and bridge location involve A3 metre wide trail starting from queen St. West and Winston Blvd. designed to minimize environmental disturbance, including plans for boardwalk sections and tree preservation.

Public consultations demonstrated overall support for the bridge, with survey results indicating strong favourability towards the proposed location and design, primarily for hiking in cycling uses. The document also highlights ongoing considerations for integrating the project within the broader context of regional transportation and Environmental Conservation efforts.

It should also be noted, however, that during the Community Stakeholder Group meetings for this HCD Study phase that community members were not in agreement with this determination and felt that the location of the bridge was not conducive to the realities of how people in the community wish to connect to and access both sides of the river. Particularly that the proposed location was too far west of the downtown core and would not prevent people from using the rail bridge as an alternative crossing.
3.4.2 City of Cambridge Growth & Intensification Study (2017)

The City of Cambridge's Growth & Intensification Study, as presented in a stakeholder session on June 26th, 2017, was conducted by a collaborative effort from Dillon Consulting Limited, Watson & Associates Economists, Curtis Planning Inc., and Tim Welch Consulting Inc. The study focuses on the Hespeler Village and Queen Street West Node, covering a broad spectrum of planning contexts, issues, opportunities, and a forward-looking vision for the area.

Planning Context

The Study Area encompasses 3 primary components:

- **Hespeler Village Community Core Area**: Identified as the historic centre of the area, it plays a significant role in the overall character and cultural heritage of the community.
- **Queen St. West Community Node**: This is a commercial zone situated adjacent to the highway, offering a different character and utility compared to the community core area.
- **Regeneration Area**: Spanning 146 hectares (360 acres), this area serves as a connective link to community nodes with the core, holding significant potential for redevelopment and growth.

A notable part of the planning context is the inclusion of certain areas within the regulated floodplain by the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA), which adds a layer of complexity to any development considerations.

Issues and Opportunities

Hustler Village presents a historically rich community with an appealing pedestrian realm, cultural assets, and a public space conducive to community events and activities. The Main Street, characterized by 3-4 storey mixed-use buildings, and its proximity to the Speed River, highlight the area's attractiveness and the budding interest in development, especially near the riverfront.

However, the presence of extensive industrial uses along the riverfront, covering nearly 30% of the Study Area, poses challenges to public accessibility and may necessitate environmental cleanup for redevelopment.

On the other hand, the Queen Street West Node, offers a contrasting setting with its highway commercial “big-box” layout with the area being recognized for its potential for intensification, being adjacent to Highway 401.
Vision

The vision for Hespeler Village and the Queen Street West Node is based on 4 key priorities:

- **Preservation of Historic Character**: Maintaining the historical essence of the hustler village community core ensuring that development respects and integrates the area's rich heritage.

- **Leveraging Community Assets and Natural Features**: the plan aims to capitalize on the unique assets and natural beauty of the area, enhancing its appeal and livability.

- **Strategic Intensification and Redevelopment**: Focus is placed on directing growth towards underutilized sites, particularly those near the Speed River and the highway, to optimize land use and foster economic vitality.

- **Enhanced Access to the Riverfront**: A key objective is to improve public access to the riverfront, making it an integral part of the community's recreational and aesthetic landscape.

3.4.3 Growth Management Strategy Land Inventory and Capacity Analysis (2009)

The document outlines a comprehensive approach to managing growth within the city. This strategy involves assessing the city's land inventory, identifying opportunities for intensification within the existing urban boundary, examining residential greenfield areas, evaluating employment lands, and offering conclusions and recommendations.

Hespeler Core

The following structured approach aims to provide a clearer understanding of the potential and challenges for intensification within this key area of Cambridge:

- **Location and Composition**: The Hespeler Core is strategically located around the intersection of Guelph Avenue and Queen Street West, extending along the Queen Street corridor. This area predominantly features commercial uses with some industrial uses to the west of Guelph Avenue, surrounded by residential zones primarily consisting of single-family detached houses.

- **Intensification Opportunities**: The analysis identifies nineteen sites covering approximately 14 hectares within the Hespeler Core that hold significant potential for intensification. These include:
  - **Riverfront Sites**: A large concentration of potential development sites exists along the Queen Street corridor, particularly on the north side of Queen Street, fronting the river.
- **Other Potential Sites:** Additional opportunities for intensification are identified in areas currently underutilized or serving as surface parking lots.

- **Environmental Concerns:** Flood plain restrictions and the presence of potential brownfield sites among the industrial areas could limit development opportunities.

- **Compatibility with Existing Built Form:** The existing built environment within the core area necessitates that any new development be compatible in scale and massing, which may constrain opportunities for high-density development.

- **Suitable Built Forms:** Given the area's characteristics and challenges, the most appropriate forms of development include townhouses, stacked townhouses, and possibly some apartments.
4 Public Engagement

4.1 Introduction

Public engagement plays a crucial role in the establishment and successful conservation of heritage districts. Involving the community in decision-making processes fosters a sense of ownership and ensures that the conservation efforts align with local values and aspirations. This collaborative approach is instrumental in ensuring that the strategies and measures put in place for conservation resonate deeply with the local community’s values, history, and plans, thereby enhancing the likelihood of their success and sustainability. Successful implementation of a district will ultimately depend on wide-spread public support for district designation based on a clear understanding of the objectives for designation and appreciation of the proposed HCD plan, policies, and guidelines.

During the Study Phase, the Consultant Team and the City implemented a diverse array of consultation and engagement strategies to maximize opportunities for inclusive and diverse community participation. This component was critical, and the comprehensive insights and inputs from various stakeholders within the community was a critical factor in the evaluation of the HCD Study Area.

A range of consultation sessions and activities have been held throughout the study and are the public engagement opportunities are summarized in the following sections.
4.2 Public Engagement Centre

4.2.1 Community Consultation #1 – 30 October 2023

Location: Hespeler Legion Branch 272

The first Public Consultation Centre (PIC 1) for the Hespeler Conservation District Study was held on Monday, October 30, 2023, from 7:00 PM to 9:30 PM at the Hespeler Legion located at 26 Schofield St. The event saw a commendable turnout of approximately 50 community members, alongside municipal representatives and the Consultant Team from TRACE architectures. The City of Cambridge was represented by two Planners, Jeremy Parsons, Senior Planner for Heritage, and Joan Jylanne, Manager of Policy Planning. Additionally, three City Councillors from Wards 2, 5, and 8 were in attendance, underscoring the importance of this initiative.

Presentation Overview & Highlights

The evening included various interactive and informative materials:

- Four poster boards showcasing the Study Area, with a preliminary analysis of the Core and Expanded Boundaries.
- An opportunity for attendees to leave comments on the poster boards using Post-it notes.
- A comprehensive PowerPoint presentation delivered by TRACE architectures.
- Facilities for attendee feedback, including a Comment Box, a Sign-in Sheet, and a Sign-up Sheet for the HCD Study Community Focus Group.

The presentation covered topics such as:

- The fundamentals of heritage legislation in Ontario.
- The capabilities and limitations of Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs).
- The proven benefits of HCDs for homeowners, business owners, and the community.
- The current phase of the Study, expected to conclude in 2024, followed by Council decisions on developing a full HCD Plan & Guidelines and the potential designation under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act.

Adjusted Agenda

To accommodate the extensive inquiries, the meeting agenda was slightly modified. It featured a presentation by the Consultant Team, a robust Q&A session, and an informal period for personal interactions with the Consultants and municipal representatives. This setup allowed for in-depth discussions, viewing of map boards, submission of comments, and Community Focus Group sign-ups.
Community Feedback

Discussions and individual conversations yielded valuable insights, notably:

- Concerns over the impact of Provincial density targets on established neighborhoods.
- Calls for stricter recommendations within Heritage Conservation Districts.
- Alarming loss of heritage buildings in Hespeler, exacerbated by large-scale developments.
- Advocacy for broader HCD study boundaries to include more areas.
- Suggestions to integrate the Hespeler Village River Activation Master Plan (circa 2005) into current considerations.
- Strong opposition to specific developments and the loss of significant properties and facilities.
- Queries about HCD Plans' role in protecting heritage buildings from natural and developmental threats.
- Recommendations to draw lessons from successful HCD implementations for compatible development.
- Traffic concerns linked to inadequate road infrastructure to support increased development.

Cultural and Community Engagement

The unique culture and traditions of the community were also celebrated, with mentions of:

- Lary Turner’s Tales.
- Themed Weekend Tours.
- The iconic “Hespeler Girls” Calendar.
- Vibrant community initiatives and annual events.

Mapping Exercise

With the assistance from the City, the Consultant Team presented three enlarged versions of the Study Area, illustrating sample zones of interest, intended to foster conversation. These areas presented the overall Study Area, a Core Area, and an Extended Area. Participants were invited to add notes and comments to the maps.
Figure 32 Satellite image with Hespeler with Study Area denoted in salmon and core zone denoted in blue. TRACE architectures.
Figure 33 Satellite image with Hespeler with Study Area denoted in salmon and core zone denoted in yellow. TRACE architectures.
4.3 Community Focus Group

As part of the HCD Study, the City of Cambridge assembled a Community Focus Group (Community Focus Group) as part of the requirements outlined in the Hespeler Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Project RFQ. Committee membership was eligible to Hespeler residents on a volunteer basis, with Council members being permitted to attend but encouraged to avoid direct participation in order to ensure more resident involvement. The intent of the Committee was to act as a voice for the local community, without formal voting procedures. The Focus Group met three times during the Study Phase. Should Council decide that the project move into the second Plan & Guidelines Phase, these meetings will recommence in Summer 2024. (For more information, please refer to the Terms of Reference for the Focus Group on the project website: https://www.engagewr.ca/hespeler-heritage-conservation-district-study-and-plan)

A Community Focus Group in the context of a Heritage Conservation District (HCD) study serves several key purposes aimed at guiding, overseeing, and facilitating the successful completion of the study. Functions included:

- **Guidance and Consultation**: The Community Focus Group provides leadership and sets the direction for the HCD study, ensuring that it aligns with broader conservation goals, community interests, and legislative requirements.

- **Stakeholder Representation**: The committee often includes representatives from various stakeholder groups, including local government officials, community members, heritage experts, and sometimes property owners within the proposed district. This diverse membership ensures that multiple perspectives are considered, promoting a holistic approach to heritage conservation.

- **Decision-Making and Problem Solving**: Community Focus Groups help inform key decisions throughout the study, from initial planning stages to final recommendations for district designation. This includes decisions on the boundaries of the proposed district, criteria for heritage designation, conservation strategies, and guidelines for future development within the district. Challenges and conflicts are common in the planning and execution of HCD studies, especially when balancing heritage conservation with development interests. The Community Focus Group plays an important role in addressing these challenges and finding solutions that respect heritage values while accommodating growth and change.

- **Coordination and Communication**: The committee facilitates coordination between different parties involved in the study, including consultants, local experts, and municipal staff. They also ensure effective communication among stakeholders, keeping the community informed and engaged throughout the process.
Advocacy and Support: Members of the Community Focus Group often act as advocates for the HCD, promoting its benefits to the community and garnering support for its implementation.

### 4.3.1 Meeting #1 – 10 January 2024

**Presentation Overview**

**Meeting Agenda**

The agenda for the January 10, 2024, meeting includes a brief introduction, presentation of Study Area and survey results, discussion on the downtown Queen Street core, breakout groups focusing on 3 case studies, summary, and next steps.

**Study Area**

The initial Study Area covers much of downtown Hespeler, encompassing commercial, industrial, and residential areas, with approximately 542 properties considered for potential inclusion in the future Heritage Conservation District (HCD).

**Heritage Conservation District Study – Phase 1**

This phase involves examining the character and appearance of the area, recommending boundaries, objectives, and changes to the Official Plan and municipal bylaws. It focuses on areas with cohesive, harmonious streetscapes and significant historical associations.

The study process includes historical research, field studies, public participation, evaluation of cultural heritage resources, and delineation of HCD boundaries, with findings and recommendations presented to the Council.

**Public Participation and Survey Results**

The presentation details the public engagement process, including a presentation to the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee, a Public Information Centre, an online survey, and community focus group meetings. The survey, completed by both residents and non-residents, provided insights into the community's views on areas of cultural heritage value.

Selected answers and comments from the survey are shared, indicating strong feelings about various locations within Hespeler and emphasizing the significance of the downtown core. See Section 4.4 Online Engagement / Survey for an overview of the survey results.

**Key Buildings and Spaces**

Specific buildings and spaces noted in the survey include Queen Street's commercial and residential areas, the Fashion History Museum, churches, row housing on Spring Street, the former American Standard Building, and several other significant locations.
Character of the Downtown Core

One of the goals of this presentation was to identify the key elements that comprised the character of Hespeler’s downtown core. These were sorted into Intangible and Built Heritage examples, including:

- Intangible heritage examples include local traditions and events such as Lary Turner’s Tales, weekend tours by individuals dressed as Jacob Hespeler, the "Hespeler Girls" calendar, the Old Boys Reunion, Hespeler’s reputation as a "Beehive of Activity," the close-knit community dubbed "Company of Neighbours," and holiday celebrations like Christmas treats for kids at the Old Town Hall and the local Santa Claus Parade.

- Built heritage examples focus on the small yet well-preserved commercial center, especially the Queen Street block between Tannery and Cooper streets. Also noted are repurposed industrial buildings such as the original Hespeler Mill, the American Standard Building, the Hespeler Furniture Co., the Jardine Enamelware, and the Karch Foundry. The presentation observes that beyond the core commercial area, the streetscape transitions to residential use, particularly after the Cooper Street Node to the east and Adam Street to the west.

These examples were derived from community feedback, particularly from discussions at a Public Information Centre held on October 30th. The slide also prompts discussion on the downtown core’s perceived boundaries, the coexistence of industrial, commercial, and residential zones, and how these elements contribute to the character and perception of downtown Hespeler.

Another goal of this discussion was to determine what the community felt were the “extents” of the downtown core, with discussion focused on Queen Street East (Commercial and Residential) versus Queen Street West (Commercial, Residential, and Industrial).

Case Studies

The presentation discussed three case studies involving key properties in the area, focusing on aspects like scale, materials, and the modern response to heritage buildings. The presentation encouraged discussion on the positives and negatives of recent developments, their impact on the downtown core, and the potential role of an HCD in addressing concerns related to these developments.

The three case studies were:

- Hespeler Library / Idea Exchange (5 Tannery St E)
- American Standard / Riverbank Lofts (19 Guelph Ave & 49 Queen St E)
- Queen Street Apartments (2-10 Queen St W)
Committee feedback

River Activation Plan and Development Projects

- The 20-year-old River Activation Plan's concepts were generally seen as positive, with the group acknowledging that the goals have mostly stood up over time.
- There was a discussion around the failure to purchase land for recreational spaces, which has now been sold to possible developers, affecting the Parks Master Plan and the envisioned wildlife sanctuary.
- The concept of intensification in the core area was supported, with the need for new developments to bring vitality without compromising heritage character.

Heritage Conservation and Adaptive Reuse

- Opinions varied on heritage conservation, with some attendees emphasizing that "heritage has to be beautiful" and questioning the role of added height in protecting heritage.
- Adaptive reuse was preferred over the demolition of heritage buildings, but there were concerns about new constructions not respecting the heritage character.

Case Studies

- **Library**: The redevelopment concept was critiqued for obscuring the original building with glass that wasn't as translucent as expected, suggesting alternative approaches like building on top of the existing structure could have been explored.
- **Riverbank Lofts**: Few complaints were directed at the building itself, but there were remarks about the lack of walkability and the excessive allocation for parking over public or amenity space.
- **New Build on Queen**: Mixed feelings were expressed about the approved height, with some desiring a taller structure. There were doubts about the feasibility of reusing the existing building and comments on the attractiveness of the wood and stone in the renders. Concerns were raised about the gardens being smaller than depicted in the renderings.

Downtown and HCD Boundary & Zones

- The current Official Plan (OP) boundary for the downtown core area was seen as acceptable, with distinctions made between Queen St E (more residential with natural heritage) and Queen St W (commercial/residential mix).
- There was a question about whether HCD zones need to be physically contiguous and whether the river itself should be included in the boundary, highlighting the river's central role in Hespeler’s heritage and community identity.
Presentation Overview

Meeting Agenda
The February meeting focused on three main topics:

- Natural Landscapes
- Village Gateways
- Heritage Conservation Districts

Landscapes and Public Open Spaces
Emphasis was placed on the importance of including public spaces like sidewalks, roads, parks, rivers, and shorelines in heritage conservation efforts. These spaces not only provide contexts for buildings but are also intrinsic to the community's original planning.

Hespeler’s Natural Landscapes and Value
The natural landscapes of Hespeler, are integral to the area's character and heritage. Notable features include the Speed River, Little Riverside Park, the Railroad Bridge over Speed, Jacob’s Landing, Forbes Park, and the Mill Pond. These landscapes are not only historically significant but also offer recreational opportunities and aesthetic value to the community. The discussion raised concerns about the future value of these landscapes as the town faces potential development pressures, pointing to the importance of maintaining these areas for recreational and communal use. The intertwining of natural heritage with the urban environment was noted as a unique opportunity, offering residents a blend of historical and natural beauty.

Mill Pond
The Mill Pond was highlighted as a significant natural feature within Hespeler, noted for its strategic opening to the Speed River, which provides a substantial advantage for the community. This aspect emphasizes the pond's role not just as a water body but as a vital part of the area's recreational and aesthetic landscape, enhancing the connection between the town's residents and its natural heritage.

Chilligo Conservation Area
Managed by the Grand River Conservation Authority, this area is noted for its deciduous forests, meadows, marshlands, and Ellis Creek, demonstrating the significance of natural heritage in the heart of Hespeler.
The Speed River
Discussion on the river’s historical industrial use and its present potential as a recreational and leisure asset, underscoring opportunities for improving quality of life and attracting new residents.

Village Gateways
Examination of Hespeler's gateways from historical and contemporary perspectives, focusing on physical features that define the district’s boundaries and offer significant vistas. Insights into Queen Street East, Cooper Street, Queen Street West, and Guelph Avenue as part of the district’s gateways, providing specific viewpoints and historical contexts.

Committee Feedback
Community Responsibility for Safeguarding Landscape Value
- Attendees universally agreed on the community’s pivotal role in determining the value of natural landscapes, asserting that while consultants could provide expertise, the final valuation should reflect community sentiment.
- There was a consensus that landscapes should be appreciated for their current value rather than speculative future worth, acknowledging their dynamic nature, including changes due to seasonality and natural progression.

Conservation vs Densification
- The conversation revealed a tension between accommodating growth and preserving Hespeler’s natural beauty. Participants stressed the need for strategies to manage densification without compromising the area’s core values.
- The challenge of densification while preserving Hespeler’s character extended to discussions on gateways. Stakeholders stressed the importance of maintaining the town’s core values and natural beauty in the face of growth, emphasizing strategic management to avoid compromising the area’s heritage.

River Access, Public Access, and Protected Views
- Public access to the river and protecting views were highlighted as critical issues. The discussion pointed towards a shared desire to ensure that development does not obstruct public vistas or access to natural amenities, especially around the heart of the town and significant areas like the Mill Pond and Speed River.
- The importance of maintaining public access and protecting views, especially near gateways, resonated with participants. There was a collective push to ensure that new developments around entry points into Hespeler do not hinder access to natural spaces or obstruct key views, particularly those of the river and Mill Pond.
Mill Pond and Speed River

- The Mill Pond's enhancement of local paths was praised, with some suggesting collaboration with the Grand River Conservation Authority to safeguard its surroundings. Others highlighted the calming effect of natural riverbanks and advocated for protective measures against development encroachment.
- A few participants voiced concerns about increasing density along the waterfront, fearing it could diminish residents' enjoyment and views, particularly behind certain properties. The idea of height restrictions and careful density planning in these areas was suggested to preserve the scenic and recreational value.

Ecological Considerations and Historical Studies

- Queries were raised about the ecological impact of potential development, with a strong call to consider previous studies like the Hespeler Village Activation Plan, which contains pertinent recommendations on Open Space Management.
- The lack of enforcement and the relevance of past plans were points of contention. Some participants felt previous studies had been overlooked, suggesting that key recommendations, particularly those related to ecology and environment, be integrated into current discussions.

Views on Natural Spaces

- Discussions around the Mill Pond emphasized not just the visual aspects but the full sensory experience it offers, including the sounds and smells of nature, which many felt were integral to the community's character. There was a shared interest in maintaining public access and the natural ambiance that attracts families and outdoor enthusiasts.
- The debate extended to the broader Speed River area, where participants expressed a desire to see derelict industrial buildings repurposed or integrated into the natural landscape, balancing heritage conservation with ecological restoration.

Specific Feedback on Village Gateways

- Participants pointed out specific gateway areas needing attention, such as Guelph Ave and the approach from the 401, highlighting the opportunity to enhance these entry points to reflect Hespeler's unique character.
- Concerns were voiced about traffic and safety near gateways, especially where heavy traffic might deter comfortable access to key intersections and entry points into the town, thus affecting the pedestrian experience.
- The potential for gateway features in site plan approvals for developments was discussed, with a focus on integrating these features to enhance the sense of arrival in Hespeler and to contribute positively to the town's aesthetic and heritage value.
- The idea of enhancing natural and extended green spaces within and around gateway areas was suggested, including the enhancement of existing laneways and paths that could serve as green links between streets and natural areas.
• While there was a general consensus on the need to enhance village gateways, views on how to achieve this varied. Some participants focused on historical preservation and the enhancement of natural elements, while others suggested modern interventions could be integrated sensitively to mark entry points into Hespeler.
• The concept of a pedestrian bridge and other infrastructure improvements was floated as a means to improve connectivity and the overall aesthetic of gateway areas, with inquiries about the status of environmental assessments and potential implementations.

4.3.3 Meeting #3 – 13 March 2024

Presentation Overview

Meeting Agenda

• The agenda includes discussions on the Hespeler River Activation Master Plan, Conservation Area/Pedestrian Bridge Environmental Assessment (EA), SW/SE Study Area, and Heritage Conservation Districts, focusing on their significance, uniqueness, and history.

Hespeler River Activation Master Plan

• Central to the master plan is the Hespeler Mill Pond and Speed River, aiming to enhance the village core’s social, environmental, and economic aspects while preserving its existing attributes. The plan incorporates feedback from numerous committee meetings and emphasizes improving water quality in the Mill Pond.
• The draft master plan concept aims to strengthen the downtown core, introduce urban aesthetic improvements, revitalize existing buildings, and create a wildlife sanctuary along with an interpretive boardwalk system.
• The goal is to expand the core area, offer financial incentives for development, and establish a "New Urban Identity" through redevelopment and new uses, balancing historical preservation with modern needs.
• Refer to Section 3: Policy Framework for a more detailed overview of this document.

Pedestrian Bridge and Trail Projects

• A new pedestrian bridge and trail system identified in the City’s Cycling Master Plan aims to improve connectivity and encourage recreational activities, with considerations for environmental, social, economic, and cultural impacts.
• The Hespeler Bridge EA has been completed and the City is hoping to move into the Bridge design starting in 2024 and carry into next year.
• The City is currently addressing constraining issues that, once resolved, the City would be looking to have the 60% design completed and then continue in the process with a Public Consultation and final design submission.
Heritage Conservation Districts

- The discussion emphasized identifying the most cohesive collection of heritage resources that tell Hespeler's story and contribute to its character. The focus was on preserving architectural details, landscapes, and historical buildings that reflect the village's industrial history and community spirit.
- Notable highlights of Hespeler's heritage resources include:
  - Hespeler's well-preserved street layouts, lotting patterns, and architectural diversity.
  - The role of the Speed River as a natural feature pivotal to the village's development and quality of life.
  - The industrial heritage, particularly the Dominion Woollens/Silknit/Forbes textile building, is noted for its significant impact on the village's identity and cultural history.
  - The community's pride in their heritage and the collective spirit.

Committee Feedback

River Activation Plan

- Recognition that the environment has naturally evolved to what was once a visionary idea of a wildlife sanctuary, indicating a correct direction in past planning.
- There is a consensus on the necessity for the downtown core’s intensification, highlighted by the positive reception of new spaces like apartments and coffee shops that bring vibrancy while being mindful of heritage preservation.

Pedestrian Bridge Concerns

- Doubts were raised about the pedestrian bridge's effectiveness in enhancing the downtown core due to its perceived distant location.
- The bridge's potential to divert traffic from the historically used railroad bridge was questioned, with suggestions that its placement should consider practical routes for residents, especially students.

Heritage Preservation and Adaptive Reuse

- There's a tension between preserving Hespeler's heritage through adaptive reuse and accommodating new developments.
- The community stresses the importance of retaining the character and architectural integrity in any new construction, with adaptive reuse being favored over demolishing historic structures.
- Concerns were voiced over specific developments perceived as undermining heritage preservation efforts.

Conservation and Natural Heritage

- The community values the natural heritage areas, expressing a desire for remedial work and enhanced accessibility for recreational use.
• The richness in biodiversity, evidenced by bird watching reports, underscores the importance of these areas.
• Suggestions for interpretive elements to enrich visitors' understanding of Hespeler's natural and historical landscape were well-received.

**Character and Identity of Hespeler**

• The community cherishes Hespeler's historical and visual identity, emphasizing the need to maintain its small-town ambiance amidst development pressures.
• The river's centrality to Hespeler's identity and development was highlighted, with calls to focus on enhancing riverfront access and for residents and visitors.
• The conversation also touched on allowing food-based commercial ventures to enhance Hespeler's appeal as a destination while preserving open spaces and low-rise building profiles to protect the village's character.

**Development Concerns**

• There are significant concerns about potential overdevelopment, particularly in sensitive areas like Chilligo and along the riverfront, where there's fear of natural heritage being compromised.
• The community is sensitive to development activities that may not align with the Heritage Conservation District's objectives, advocating for a careful review of new projects to ensure they harmonize with Hespeler's heritage and natural setting.
4.4 Online Engagement / Survey

4.4.1 Overview

The City of Cambridge created a project website for the Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study via the Engage Cambridge website:

https://www.engagewr.ca/hespeler-heritage-conservation-district-study-and-plan

241 respondents took part in the City of Cambridge’s Hespeler HCD Survey which ran to 1 February 2024.

4.4.2 Results

Residency

Living in Hespeler

- Residents: Out of the total respondents, a significant majority (205) confirmed living in Hespeler, indicating a strong local engagement in the survey.
- Non-residents: A smaller segment (36) indicated they do not live in Hespeler, suggesting some interest or stake in the area from those outside the community.

Living in the HCD Study Area

- Inside HCD: 77 respondents live within the designated HCD Study Area, highlighting a direct interest in the heritage conservation discussions.
- Outside HCD: 161 respondents live outside the HCD Study Area, reflecting wider community interest and potential impacts of the HCD designation beyond its immediate boundaries.

Awareness of HCD & Implications

Funding for Property Alterations

- Only 73 respondents are aware of the potential for funding eligibility for external property alterations, suggesting a gap in communication or awareness regarding the benefits of the HCD designation.
- A larger group (168) is unaware of these funding opportunities, indicating a need for targeted outreach to ensure property owners understand the financial support available for heritage conservation efforts.
Heritage Permit Requirements

- 173 respondents are aware that major external alterations in an HCD may require heritage permit approval, indicating a fair level of understanding of the regulatory implications of the HCD designation.
- 68 respondents indicated they were not aware of the permit requirements, underscoring the importance of educational initiatives to ensure compliance and conservation goals are met.

Cultural Heritage Value & Important Features

Key Areas of Cultural Heritage Value

- Forbes Park and Queen Street: These areas are most frequently recognized for their cultural heritage value, highlighting their significance within the community.
- Library, Churches, and Guelph Avenue: Other areas like the Library, Churches, and Guelph Avenue also hold considerable heritage value for the respondents, pointing to a diverse appreciation of Hespeler's historical landscape.

Important Features of Downtown Hespeler

- Natural Heritage Features: The Speed River and Hespeler Mill Pond are overwhelmingly valued, with 224 mentions, emphasizing the community's connection to its natural heritage.
- Historic Buildings and Commercial Core: The former Town Hall building, Library, commercial core, Forbes Park, and the former Post Office are also highly valued, indicating a strong appreciation for Hespeler's historic architecture and public spaces.

Community Engagement and Education

Information Dissemination and Outreach

- Unaware of Funding: 146 respondents are not aware of funding opportunities for property alterations, suggesting a gap in communication. This indicates a crucial need for targeted outreach programs to inform property owners about available support.

Opportunities for Public Involvement

- Feedback Provided: 83 respondents provided additional comments or feedback, demonstrating a vested interest in the heritage conservation process and a potential pool of engaged citizens for future initiatives.
Heritage Conservation Priorities & Challenges

Emphasis on Natural vs Built Environment

- **Natural Features Valued**: The Speed River and Hespeler Mill Pond were highlighted by 191 respondents, showing a strong community preference for preserving natural heritage alongside 164 mentions for the commercial core and historic buildings.

Strategic Conservation Planning

- **Areas of Cultural Heritage Value**: Forbes Park and Queen Street each received 17 mentions as key areas of cultural heritage value, suggesting these as focal points for preservation efforts.

Regulatory Awareness and Compliance

- **Awareness of Permit Requirements**: 173 of respondents are aware of the heritage permit requirements, indicating a foundational understanding within the community but also highlighting the need for further education to reach the 63 respondents who are unaware.

Balancing Development and Conservation

- Feedback on this aspect can be derived from the general comments section, where respondents may express concerns or views on development versus conservation, providing a qualitative dataset for analysis.

Future Visions & Aspirations

Community Vision for Hespeler’s Heritage

- The 83 pieces of feedback provided can be analyzed for common themes, revealing the community’s collective vision for Hespeler’s heritage conservation and development.

Enhancing Heritage Tourism and Education

- The value placed on natural and historic features suggests potential for heritage tourism. The high appreciation for areas like Forbes Park and historic buildings could serve as anchors for developing educational and tourism-related initiatives.

Additional Comments & Feedback

- **General Feedback**: 83 respondents took the opportunity to provide additional comments or feedback, indicating a proactive engagement and interest in shaping the future of Hespeler’s heritage conservation efforts.
4.5 Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC)

The following meetings took place virtually with the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) for the City of Cambridge.

4.5.1 Meeting #1 – 19 October 2023

Presentation Overview

The consultant team gave a presentation that introduced the Consultant Team and updated the MHAC on the work completed to date. The presentation also included information about Heritage Conservation Districts and objectives and benefits of the Study.

The Consultant Team presented the methodology and overview of the results of the Study Area Field Study, which included an initial site visit in June 2023, and a three-day comprehensive Field Survey in August 2023. The Survey included a full documentation of the Study Area boundary, photography and property detailing of over 500 properties. The survey also included context photography and landscape survey. Examine the character and appearance of the area that is the subject of the study, including buildings, structures and other property features of the area, including landscapes, landmarks, and significant views that define the Study Area to determine if the area should be conserved as a heritage conservation district. Property information and photographs have been compiled into a database.

During this presentation, the Consultant Team also presented the MHAC with a series of initial area maps, drawn from the preliminary results of the Field Survey. These maps explored various configurations of boundaries and areas of heritage concentration.

Due to the nature of the meeting, MHAC did not provide the consultant team with feedback immediately after the presentation. Limited feedback was provided, however the Consultant Team was made aware that the Committee was satisfied with the Field Survey and the volume of properties surveyed, in addition to supporting the work done thus far.

4.5.2 Meeting #2 – 18 April 2024

Below is a summary of the questions and answers from the second Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee meeting held on 18 April 2024:
Number of Properties Meeting Heritage Criteria

- Q: How many of the 211 contributing properties meet at least two of the outlined heritage criteria?
- A: Approximately 175 properties meet the minimum criteria. These numbers may be subject to adjustment.

Clarification on the Heritage Criteria

- Q: What are the criteria for these properties?
- A: The criteria are adopted directly from the Ontario Heritage Act.

Listing Status of Properties

- Q: How many of the 175 properties are listed?
- A: 67 properties are listed within the study area. It was noted that Category 2 consists of both Listed and Significantly contributing properties, while Category 3 contains “Somewhat” contributing properties.

Concerns About Incomplete Documentation

- Q: Concerns were raised about missing appendices and maps lacking street names. The specific address 1695 Franklin Blvd is not shown; what is its status?
- A: The property at 1695 Franklin Blvd is just outside of the study area. Part IV designations, which give properties a base level of protection, extend beyond the study boundary.

Property in the Context Of Apartment Buildings

- Q: When considering apartment buildings, is each unit counted as one property or is the entire building considered one property?
- A: The classification is based on the legal definition or property parcel.

Additionally, the Committee voted unanimously to recommend that the Council endorse the proposed Heritage Conservation District (HCD) boundary and the conclusions of the HCD Study Report, praising the comprehensiveness of the study. City staff also expressed positive feedback on the proceedings.
4.6 **Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA)**

The discussion during the GRCA meeting on the Hespeler HCD Study which took place on 10 April 2024, focused primarily on the conservation and regulatory management of the Chilligo Conservation Area. Key topics included maintaining the area as a passive conservation space, which is characterized by minimal active human intervention and lacks staff for regular patrolling. The area falls under strict regulatory protection, encompassing wetlands, creeks, floodplains, and the Speed River, all of which require adherence to specific legislative protections like a 15-meter buffer around protected zones under the Conservation Authorities Act. Any potential developments or changes within the conservation area would necessitate extensive permitting processes, thorough hazard analyses, and compliance with a two-zone flood policy, emphasizing the meeting's overarching theme of careful environmental stewardship. Key takeaways from the meeting are as follows:

### Chilligo Conservation Area Regulations and Protections
- The area is largely unstaffed and categorized under passive conservation, meaning minimal active human intervention.
- It is regulated under the Conservation Authorities Act, with specific protections, such as a 15-meter buffer around protected areas.
- Current maps need updating to include missing right-of-way and there are no plans to introduce new trails, to avoid further environmental impact and liability risks.

### Infrastructure and Maintenance Concerns
- The city of Cambridge owns part of the property and a major sanitary line runs under one of the trails, with plans to decommission one of the paths to consolidate maintenance.
- There is an interest in maintaining certain informal trails and possibly upgrading others to better facilitate access and maintenance.

### Friends of Chilligo
- Friends of Chilligo, established in 2007 due to damage from offroad vehicle use, are primarily interested in protecting existing historic and natural trails.
- They generally oppose new trail constructions but are open to discussing expansions if these would respect the conservation area’s integrity.

### Future Plans and Agreements
- There is a maintenance agreement between the City and GRCA expiring next year (2025), which will be revisited, including terms related to trails and bridges.
• Any new infrastructure, like bridges or the proposed new bridge near the dam, requires permits and careful consideration of environmental impact.

**Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Considerations**

• The HCD Study is not limited to built heritage alone; it encompasses both built and natural heritage. This comprehensive approach ensures that the conservation and enhancement efforts address all aspects of the area’s historical and ecological significance.

• Suggestions were made during the meeting about possible modifications within the HCD, such as removing existing structures like workshops and parking lots to better align with heritage conservation goals.

• There was a specific caution raised about the potential impact of new trails on the HCD. Encouraging new trails could be problematic, necessitating careful policy considerations to avoid unintended consequences on the natural and historical aspects of the area.
5 Heritage Character Analysis

5.1 Context

Hespeler is located on the Speed River, tributary of the Grand River, in southwestern Ontario. The small-town character of Hespeler is seen through its lower-scale buildings, extensive greenspace, mature trees, parks, natural areas, and views to the Speed River. A unique element of Hespeler’s visual quality is the presence of institutional, industrial, residential, and natural landscape, all within the central core Study Area.

Architecturally, Vernacular, Georgian, Edwardian, and Victorian-era architecture are the predominant styles in Hespeler, often as interpreted by the builder. Hespeler has by far the greatest concentration of older intact industrial buildings in the greater municipality of Cambridge, including a few that are still in industrial use. As Hespeler was once home to several textile mills and factories, remnants of this industrial heritage can still be seen in the form of old mill buildings and warehouses. These structures often feature sturdy brick construction with large windows and heavy timber framing.

Like many southern Ontario towns, Hespeler has an historic downtown core characterized by Victorian and Edwardian commercial architecture. These buildings were constructed primarily in the late 19th and early 20th centuries during the town’s industrial boom. The civic centre of Hespeler on Tannery Street East has a collection of institutional and public buildings, including the Hespeler Public Library, the historic Fire Hall, and Old Town Hall (Hespeler Heritage Centre). The former Post Office/Fashion History Museum, as well as architecturally significant places of worship on Cooper Street and Queen Street East, contribute significantly to the Hespeler streetscape and skyline.

The residential architecture in Hespeler ranges from historic Vernacular, Georgian, neo-Gothic, Victorian, and Edwardian homes, to more modern styles. In the older parts of town, one will find charming single-family homes with features like gabled roofs, bay windows, dormers, and front porches, reflecting the village's history of growth and development over time. Some early residential homes remain on Queen Street West, including the Bergey Log Cabin, ca.1830.

Due to the steep slopes of the river valley at that location, Hespeler’s core developed in a very compact fashion, with residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial land uses crowded together on the hillsides and in the narrow valley. The hills and topography result in many interesting views and vistas along the streets, particularly from the higher residential areas north and south of the Speed River ‘valley.’

While the original Village has remained relatively intact, Hespeler has seen some modern development in recent years, predominantly on the outskirts of the central core area. There
have also been significant changes in the downtown area. This includes contemporary residential subdivisions, high-rise apartments, retrofit of heritage buildings, commercial developments, and institutional buildings constructed in a variety of architectural styles. Presently, Hespeler is a mixed-use destination, combining a strong industrial past with parks, trail connections, retail, institutional, residential, and leisure activities found within its boundaries.

**Figure 34** The Map above presents an aerial image of Hespeler and identifies several key historic areas within the Study Area, which is delineated in red. TRACE architectures.
5.2 Landscape and Public Open Areas

Landscapes often play heritage value roles as important as those of buildings and provide settings for the built heritage. These spaces are often features of the original plan or survey of a settled community, and may include a combination of natural features, built structures, and intangible elements, that together contribute to their cultural value.

The greater Cambridge area hosts a rich diversity of natural heritage features, due to its location at the intersection of several major environmental systems integral to the Cultural Heritage of the place. Hespeler has a significant natural environment that is the focus and geographic centre upon which the Hespeler community has been established (please refer to the River Activation Plan).

The Hespeler Core Area is uniquely situated adjacent to natural areas and the Speed River. Its proximity to the River, the numerous connections to parks (Forbes Park, Little Riverside Park, and Mill Pond), and trail connections, provide the opportunity to promote active transportation. Residents and visitors alike avail themselves of Hespeler’s trails, parks, and access to the River for leisure and recreation.
Figure 35 Map of Hespeler with the greenspaces identified in green. These are both natural green spaces and park space. The Speed River in denoted in blue and the rail line in yellow. 

**TRACE architectures.**

**Speed River & Mill Pond**

The Speed River, a major tributary of the Grand River, transects the Study Area. Historically, the Grand River basin was of critical importance to Indigenous Nations and was the focus for traditional land use activities, such as fishing and hunting. It was also used as a travel and trade route. The River played a significant role in the development of Hespeler, providing waterpower for mills and factories during the industrial era. Today, the Speed River area is popular for recreational activities such as walking, cycling, kayaking, and fishing. The Hespeler section of the Speed River is particularly scenic, with tree-lined banks and picturesque views.
Figure 36 Mill Pond on the Speed River looking north from Little Riverside Park. TRACE architectures.
**Jacob’s Landing**

Jacob’s Landing is a 2.7-hectare Park divided by Guelph Avenue. The portion of park included in the Study Area is situated west of Guelph Avenue and on the south side of Milling Road. With riverfront access, Jacob’s Landing features a canoe/boat launch, fishing opportunities, and views across the river.

*Figure 37* Jacob’s Landing Park, looking eastward. *TRACE architectures.*
**Little Riverside Park**

A small quiet park with benches, accessible via Queen Street East and Spring Street. There is a canoe/kayak/board launch. This park has excellent views of the Mill Pond, Queen Street East, and along the River eastward.

![Little Riverside Park](image)

**Figure 38** Little Riverside Park, looking west. *TRACE architectures.*
**Ellacott Lookout**

In this natural area in Cambridge, you can find the Ellacott Lookout, which provides a view of the Mill Pond. A gazebo provides a lookout, and a stone staircase takes you down to river level.

**Figure 39** Benches at Ellacott Lookout. *TRACE architectures.*
Forbes Park

This 1.4-hectare park is located in the core of Hespeler’s downtown area. The Park was created following the donation of land by George Duthie Forbes in 1915. The existing bandstand structure was constructed ca.1924, when the Women’s Institute commissioned its construction to honour Hespeler soldiers who died in the First World War. The bandstand was originally built in Little Riverside Park in 1919, but after it was destroyed by fire, new plans moved it to Forbes Park.

Figure 40 Forbes Park. TRACE architectures.

Historically, Forbes Park has been a space of public gathering, and is presently home to the annual Hespeler Village Music Festival, which takes place each July. Forbes Park is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.
The Chilligo Conservation Area

The Chilligo Conservation Area is located next to the Speed River in Cambridge. The area includes forest, meadows, and marshlands. The Mill Run Trail runs through Chilligo Conservation Area and ends in Riverside Park.

Figure 41 Chilligo Conservation Area Trail. TRACE architectures.

Figure 42 View of former Forbes/Dominion Woolens/Silk Knit Textile Mill and National Historic Site and Silk Knit Dam from Chilligo Conservation Area. TRACE architectures.
Mill Run Trail

The Mill Run Trail is a 6.5 km woodland natural stone dust trail connecting Hespeler and Preston. It runs along the Speed River, crossing through the Chilligo Conservation Area, and terminates at Riverside Park. Much of the trail sits on the original 1895 rail bed of the “Galt, Preston, and Hespeler Street Electric Railway”.

Figure 43 Mill Run Trail (accessed via Sheffield, looking west). TRACE architectures.
5.3 **Village Structure**

Hespeler, located within the amalgamated City of Cambridge, has a distinct structure influenced by its historical and industrial development, which is reflected in its urban planning. Mills and church steeples define the skyline, and the prevailing three storey height of the commercial and industrial buildings lining Queen Street, creates a narrow street-like effect. At the heart of Hespeler is its downtown core, which developed around the intersection of Queen Street West (Regional Road 46) and Guelph Avenue (Regional Road 24). This area serves as the commercial and central hub of the village.

The downtown area of Hespeler is characterized by its historic buildings, many of which date back to the 19th and early 20th centuries. These buildings feature a variety of architectural styles, with stone and brick construction, and distinctive storefronts. Some of these historic buildings have been preserved and repurposed, while others still serve their original functions.

Perhaps the key feature of Hespeler is the Speed River. The riverfront area offers scenic views and recreational opportunities, with parks, trails, and green spaces lining the water's edge. Additionally, Hespeler is surrounded by natural and park landscapes. The community boasts several riverside parks and open spaces that contribute to Hespeler’s livability and sense of community. These areas are outlined in the previous section.

5.3.1 **Streetscape Character In Hespeler**

Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs) conserve areas of interest such as residential, commercial, combination of residential/commercial, institutional, rural, and “main street,” and they often incorporate natural heritage features such as green open space, trees, parkland, and waterways. Whole neighbourhoods, streetscapes, or areas, may be significant. These areas are noteworthy not only because of the buildings, but also because of the streetscape features – trees, open spaces, patterns of historical development, vistas, and even typography – collectively forming a distinct and integrated character that can be conserved through heritage conservation district designation.

Hespeler’s streetscape character is varied and tells the story of its evolution from settlement to industrial hub, commercial core, civic buildings, and residential neighbourhoods. The following streetscapes provide examples of the varied landscape in Hespeler. Queen Street East and West form the main axis of the town running east-west and run parallel to the Speed River. There are a number of access points to Hespeler Village from Hespeler Road and other adjacent areas, namely: Queen Street from the west, Guelph Avenue from the north, Queen Street from the east, and Cooper Street from the southwest. One unique challenge for Hespeler Village is that Highway 401 separates this area from the rest of Cambridge and the...
core area has been by-passed by Hespeler Road. This challenge could be a positive feature, as it feels more like an “isolated historic village” and could perhaps be better preserved, yet still functional for contemporary uses, because of this fact.

**Queen Street Corridor**

The Queen Street Corridor in the Study Area is a mixed industrial, commercial, and residential area, anchored in the West by Hespeler’s largest, and longest serving Textile Mill, and in the East by the residential area around the Ellacott Lookout. The area features a combination of architectural styles, including a wide range of house types.

This mixed variety of building style and type is very pronounced on Queen Street West, with early residential mixed with industrial, and several modern commercial additions. Most of the early commercial and residential properties were built in the two decades between 1840 and 1910, and reflect the dominant architectural styles of those periods - High Victorian Gothic, Queen Anne, and Edwardian Classicism – as interpreted by the working-class owners. Moving eastward on Queen Street West, the street remains residential, with some notable modern changes such as gas stations and banks. Numerous significant properties line the street, such as “The Castle,” Charles Karch house, at 120 Queen Street West, as well as 39 Queen Street West (c.1840) Samuel Bergey House, and 41 Queen Street West (early 1830s) log home built by Michael Bergey, likely Hespeler’s first residence.

The street leads into the Commercial Core of Hespeler, predominantly traditional vernacular commercial, including the striking red brick of the former Queen’s Hotel (1891), presently Ernie’s Roadhouse. The street also has an assortment of other contemporary structures, including a large new apartment complex on the corner of Adam Street. This intersection divides Hespeler east and west.
Figure 44 Intersection at Adam and Guelph, looking eastward. This intersection divides Hespeler east and west. TRACE architectures.

Hespeler’s compact commercial core has a variety of retail, restaurants, and other commercial uses located near each other. This means that it is easy and convenient to walk to many different types of destinations within a relatively short period of time.

Figure 45 48 Queen Street East. TRACE architectures.
Figure 46 Queen Street East streetscape, looking west. TRACE architectures.

Figure 47 7 Queen Street East. TRACE architectures.
Figure 48 Queen Street East streetscape looking east toward Cooper Street intersection. Riverbank Loft apartment complex is on the left. **TRACE architectures.**

The spectrum of residential housing off Queen Street East is large. The historic worker’s housing built by Jacob Hespeler ca.1862, known as the Riverside Terrace on Spring Street, is tucked behind the Anglican Church and the recent apartment dwelling included as part of the Riverbank Loft development. The connection to the River and the parkland remains through a path to Little Riverside Park.
Figure 49 Spring Street (off Queen Street East). Looking west toward the Riverside Terrace homes and the Riverbank Loft apartment complex. *TRACE architectures.*

Figure 50 Riverside Park, looking west, along the backyards of the residential properties along Queen Street East. *TRACE architectures*
Heading east, the predominantly religious and civic buildings serve as iconic markers of Hespeler’s streetscape, particularly at the corner of Queen East and Cooper Street. The three church steeples of St. Andrews’s, St Mary’s, and the former St. James Lutheran Church, now the Dayalbagh Radhasoami Satsang gur, are historic and visible markers when entering the Town of Hespeler from all directions, and at various viewpoints along the Speed River.

**Figure 51** Streetscape view westward from 111 Queen Street East. TRACE architectures.

**Figure 52** 179 Queen Street East (near Panabaker). Views to the River between houses from Queen Street East are common on the north side of the street. TRACE architectures.
**Figure 53** 212 Queen Street East. Limestone Italianate 2-storey house structure built for veterinarian and Hespeler Councillor, John C. Green. 1865-1875. *TRACE architectures.*

**Figure 54** Queen Street East, at Panakaber. Looking west. *TRACE architectures.*
Figure 55 Queen Street East at Renwick Street, view from Ellacott Lookout. TRACE architectures.
Institutional Core

Figure 56 View of Old Town Hall, Tannery Street East. TRACE architectures.

Figure 57 View of Cenotaph and Old Town Hall (now the Heritage House Museum) from Queen Street East walkway. TRACE architectures.
Figure 58 View of Cenotaph. TRACE architectures.

Figure 59 Forbes Park gateway off Tannery Street East. TRACE architectures.
Figure 60 View of Library (Idea Exchange) from Franklin Avenue. Old Town Hall visible in the background, to the right. The historic building is enclosed by the new glass facade. TRACE architectures.
Guelph Avenue

Guelph Avenue is a mixed residential and former industrial neighbourhood developed in the late 19th and early 20th centuries primarily to house the prosperous middle class and, in several cases, the owners of the major local industries. The overall neighbourhood has a wide variety of housing ages and styles, from the mid-19th century to the mid-late 20th century, and a variety of materials, including limestone rubblestone, plaster, clapboard, and brick. It is characterized by large houses on large lots. The north end of the Study Area, on Guelph Avenue, is characterized by large residential properties and developments, and a heavy tree canopy. Much of the land east of Guelph Avenue was owned by the Forbes family, owners of the largest mill in Hespeler. This land is now part of a residential subdivision on the lands of the former Forbes Estate. The Forbes Estate is protected by a separate heritage designation under Part IV of the OHA.

Figure 61 Former Forbes Estate, 171 Guelph Avenue. Built in 1912, Beaux-Arts, 2½-storeys, yellow brick with stone details, Ionic columns on full-width 2-storey porch, flared hipped roof with dormers, and porte-cochere. TRACE architectures.
Figure 62 Former Jacob Hespeler House and Coombs Orphanage, 152 Guelph Avenue, built 1858. TRACE architectures.

Figure 63 151 Guelph Avenue. Kribs-Barber House, red glazed brick, bowed verandah, and 2-storey balcony. TRACE architectures.
Moving south down Guelph Avenue, the area quickly becomes a combination of mixed industrial and greenspace. The east side of the street maintains a strong tree canopy, with mixed former industrial, such as the Four Fathers Brewery. The western side of Guelph Avenue is industrial, particularly as it crosses Sheffield and the train tracks.

**Figure 64** Four Fathers Brew Pub, 125 Guelph Avenue. *TRACE architectures.*

**Figure 65** Guelph Avenue looking east on train tracks. *TRACE architectures.*
Figure 66 Guelph Avenue looking south. TRACE architectures.

The approach to the Speed River/Mill Pond presents a natural gateway to Hespeler, with the bridge over the river, the properties on the east and west riverfront, and access points to the Mill Run Trail and Jacob’s Landing park space. On the eastern flank at 5 and 19 Guelph Ave, Jacob Hespeler’s Grist and Cotton Mills/Stamped and Enamelled Ware Ltd./American Standard (1847-61, 1870, 1881), is the oldest industrial building standing, although re-purposed as an apartment complex, the Riverbank Lofts. The western view, the former industrial with Milling Road complexes in the background.
**Figure 67** Looking south Guelph Avenue. Sparrow Brewing & Roasting Co. located on west side of the street. *TRACE architectures.*

**Figure 68** Mill Pond and the Riverbank Lofts. Sections of this complex are the Jacob Hespeler’s Grist and Cotton Mills, which would later become Stamped and Enamelled Ware Ltd./American Standard. *TRACE architectures.*
Figure 69 Bridge on Guelph Avenue, looking south toward the Queen Street East and West intersection. Former Hespeler Mill (now Riverbank Lofts) on left. TRACE architectures.

Figure 70 Looking west from Guelph Avenue Bridge at Speed River with a view of former industrial buildings along the river’s edge. TRACE architectures.
Milling Road

The Milling Road Area comprises industrial buildings owned by both private ownership and by the City of Cambridge. Historically, it is Hespeler’s industrial centre, containing many of the factories that drove the economy of Hespeler, and is concentrated south of the residential sections of Guelph Avenue. Milling Road is not a long street and contains relatively few buildings; however, most are of pre-WWII vintage. These industrial buildings are set close to the road, with limited curb and sidewalk, typical of industrial spaces that also often had loading docks. Sections along the southern side of the street have been landscaped and lead to the eastern side of Jacob’s Landing park space.

![Milling Road Area](image)

**Figure 71** View along north side of Milling Road and the former Hespeler Furniture Company red brick factory. *TRACE architectures.*
Across Milling Road and sitting on the bank of the Speed River is an industrial building currently owned by the City of Cambridge. It is utilized for storage for maintenance vehicles and replacement parts for City infrastructure.

**Residential Neighbourhoods in Hespeler**

Residential neighbourhoods in Hespeler include a wide range of house types and streetscapes. These areas grew both organically, or as planned housing projects, such as neighbourhoods where mill owners encouraged workers financially to build their own homes. As a result, neighbourhoods in Hespeler often include homes of varied architectural styles, as well as different construction dates. The older residential homes in Hespeler were built as early as the 1830s, such as the Bergey Log Home.

**Figure 72** North side of Milling Road. *TRACE architectures.*
Figure 73 41 Queen Street West. Log home built by Michael Bergey (ca. 1830), likely Hespeler's first residence. (Now covered with board and half-timbers). TRACE architectures.

Between the 1860s and 1900s, residential neighbourhoods started to take shape, such as Cooper Street, where residents built heavily mortared rubblestone homes with Georgian and Victorian influences. Earlier versions such as 66 Cooper Street (1870) are more Georgian in style, whereas later versions such as 60 Cooper (1890) street incorporate Victorian elements, such as wood porches and verandahs with ‘gingerbread’ trim details.
Figure 74 66 Cooper Street ca. 1870s. TRACE architectures.

Figure 75 60 Cooper Street ca. 1890s. TRACE architectures.
Several of Hespeler’s Industrial leaders established estate-like properties as the community’s industrialization started to take shape during this time period.

The older properties are often interspersed residential homes built between 1890 and 1915. and reflect the dominant architectural styles of that period, High Victorian Gothic, Edwardian Classicism, and Italianate influences. These included properties like arched windows, as well as the use of yellow or buff brick such as 22 Harvey Street (1890s). Later styles would incorporate a variety of other design influence, red brick and picturesque vernacular style such as the “Big Cottage” residence at 132 Walker (see image 86).

In addition to stately brick homes, there are a variety of late 19th and early 20th century homes built in a range of architectural styles and exterior building materials local materials, such as wood, that range between 1.5 and 2-storeys. While some of these residences have been re clad with modern materials, such as vinyl siding, and additions added, they contribute to the varied and eclectic landscape of most residential streets in Hespeler. Both vernacular and contemporary residences typically have gable roofs and siding.

Figure 76 22 Harvey Street ca. 1890. TRACE architectures.
**Figure 77** 1 Forbes Street. *TRACE architectures.*

**Figure 78** 40 Keffer Street. *TRACE architectures.*
Figure 79 35 Cooper Street. TRACE architectures.

The incremental growth of Hespeler is evidenced by a range of architectural styles in the residential areas, from the early stone construction to 1960s bungalows, and many in between.

The overall skewed street grid, caused by the steep hillside topography, provides interesting views toward the Speed River, the downtown, and the Industrial core.
Figure 80 Franklin Avenue and Shamrock intersection. TRACE architectures.

Figure 81 Intersection at Courtney and Harvey, looking north downhill toward Queen Street West. TRACE architectures.
**Figure 82** St. Matthew's Cathedral, Ecclesiastical Gothic Revival style, yellow brick, originally St. James Anglican, Harvey Street. *TRACE architectures.*

**Figure 83** Intersection at Shamrock and Keffer Street. *TRACE architectures.*
**Figure 84** 55 Keffer Street. TRACE architectures.

**Figure 85** Tannery Street West. TRACE architectures.
Walker Street

Walker Street contains several turn-of-the-century urban residential developments as well as a variety of fine architectural styles. There are deeper setbacks on many properties, larger lots, and mature tree canopy and sidewalks on both sides.

Figure 86 Brick residence on Walker Street with deep hill setback, ca. 1914. TRACE architectures.

Figure 87 167 Walker Street Residence. TRACE architectures.
**Cooper Street**

As one of the original entranceways or gateways to Hespeler, Cooper Street contains numerous traditional homes on large properties, some of which back onto Forbes Park. Arriving from the south and proceeding north, Cooper Street bends slightly at the top of the hill, providing an excellent perspective of the downtown. The incremental growth of the town is evidenced by a range of architectural styles, from the mid 1800s to modern bungalows. Architecturally, there is a mix of High Victorian, Gothic, and Georgian influences. There are many notable heritage properties on Cooper Street and a significant number built between 1850 and 1870.

Homes are set back from the road and demonstrate a mix of limestone, brick, and siding, with gable and hipped roofs. Sidewalks line both sides of the street through the Study Area. Most of Cooper Street is lined with mature trees. While there is less tree canopy as Cooper Street approaches Queen Street East, there is significant greenery on the eastern side of the street, where homes are set further back.

![Figure 88](Cooper Street, looking north toward Queen Street East. Photo taken from west side of the street. TRACE architectures.)
Figure 89 Cooper Street, looking north toward Queen Street East. Photo taken from east side of the street. TRACE architectures.

Cambridge has little remaining farmland and very few agricultural buildings left within its municipal boundaries. What few agricultural buildings remain include former farmhouses and mills, now incorporated into the urban fabric. The large trees in the southern portion of Cooper Street provide a reminder of previous farm paths and laneways. This is also evident in the larger farmhouse-style properties.
Figure 90 125 Cooper Street. Italianate-Georgian house, 2-storey, granite rubblestone, Welsh arches over windows, built in 1884. TRACE architectures.

As Cooper Street winds closer to Queen Street East, the Forbes Park entrance is a significant landmark on the western side of the street. This park was named in honour of the Forbes family, who donated the land for public use. Finally, the street culminates into one of the most iconic streetscapes in Hespeler, at the intersection of Queen Street West and the three iconic church and civic buildings, particularly St. Andrews, St. Mary’s, and the Old Post Office/Fashion History Museum.
Figure 91 Looking north toward Queen Street East from Cooper. St. Mary’s Church on the left, steeple from St. Andrew’s in background, with the Old Post Office on the right, or east side. *TRACE* architectures.

It is important to note that starting in 2025 the city is looking to completely reconstruct a 1.1 km stretch of Cooper Street, after replacing underground infrastructure. This segment includes Cooper Street, Phin Avenue, Queen Street East, and Chapel Street, all the way to the storm water outlet at the Speed River.

A painted bicycle lane will also be incorporated into this project between Richmond and Hammet Street as part of the proposed Bike-way network outlined in the 2020 City’s Cycling Master Plan.
5.4 Periods of Construction/Development

Author’s Note: This section briefly covers periods of construction, as reflected in the increase of built fabric in the Town of Hespeler. These historical periods are also addressed in Section 2 of this document.

5.4.1 Early to mid 19th Century: Colonial Settlement and Early Industrialisation

Early bankside trails that became formalized into roadways and road improvements figure prominently in the early development of the region. The land on which the town of Hespeler grew was part of the Six Nations Land Grant, deeded by the British Government in 1784. This original tract of Six Nations lands was purchased by land speculator Richard Beasley, and subsequently, this area came to the attention of a group of Pennsylvania Mennonites wishing to establish a new agricultural community.

By the 1830s, this group had built the community named Bergeytown, flanking the Speed River. By 1835, the settlement had grown, at which time the name was changed to New Hope. The first general store in New Hope was established in 1840 by John Gingerich at the corner of Adam and Queen Streets. This small settlement grew to become the core of Hespeler, largely due to the efforts of industrialist and businessman Jacob Hespeler, who purchased 145 acres along the banks of the Speed River in 1845. Records from 1846 indicate a population of only one hundred inhabitants, a grist and a sawmill, a tannery, a tavern, one store, one pail factory, two blacksmiths, two tailors, and two shoemakers.
The town grew quickly with the industrial development, augmented by the introduction of the Great Western Railway Line into the village in 1859. This period saw the construction of key industrial buildings and worker housing to accommodate the growing workforce. In 1869, the population had multiplied to 1200 and the community contained several large manufacturers, including a knitting mill and a woolens factory.

5.4.2 Late 19th Century to Early 20th: Expansion and Urban Growth

Spurred on by the arrival of the railway and the industrial push, Hespeler continued to grow rapidly, in both population and geographic coverage. A vibrant commercial core developed at the intersection of Queen Street and Guelph Avenue, and the town had grown in all directions from its concentrated hub around the original core. Construction activities included the development of residential neighborhoods, commercial buildings, schools, churches, and civic amenities to support the growing population and industrial workforce. The distinctive architecture of many heritage buildings in Hespeler reflects the construction styles prevalent during this period. Continued growth allowed Hespeler to be incorporated as a town in
January 1901. A wide variety of vernacular worker’s buildings were punctuated by the few large houses of the mill owners and managers.

**Figure 93** The Expansive Size of the R. Forbes Woolen Mills on the western Edge of Hespeler. *Fire Insurance Maps (1910).*

Hespeler’s industrial base expanded significantly over the following years. In addition to the expansive Forbes Mill, this included the growth of an Industrial Sector north of the Speed River, and the establishment of the Hall, Zryd Foundry Limited, the Hespeler Machinery Company, The Universal Lighting Rod Company, and the Hespeler Hockey Stick Company, to name a few. By 1911 the electric railway system between Preston and Galt had reached Hespeler as well as Berlin (later called Kitchener) and Waterloo.
Figure 94 Exterior view of plant. A.B. Jardine + Co. Ltd., Hespeler (1914-1918). Industries off Guelph Avenue. LAC ID 3371084.
Figure 95 Development of an Industrial and Manufacturing Sector north of the Speed River. Arrow indicates location of the Jardine + Co. Plant in the image above. Fire Insurance Maps (1910).
Figure 96 A composite of the Fire Insurance Maps from 1910 superimposed on the present satellite image of Hespeler. The Study Area is defined in red. This map indicates the growth patterns of Hespeler. It also indicates that the Town Plan has remained relatively unchanged in the core. TRACE architectures.

Wartime/Mill Recruitment

The War years represented an interesting period in Hespeler, as Dominion Woollens & Worsted Co. Ltd, who had purchased the Forbes Mill in 1928, was awarded large contracts from the Department of Supply & Services to manufacture cloth for military uniforms. At this time, despite the growth over the last one hundred years, housing in Hespeler was in very short supply during the period when the Second World War began.

The solution for the company, was to purchase housing for their employees. Dominion Woollens & Worsted Co. Ltd. first purchased the former Lester Weaver house, across Queen St. West, which was renamed “Gordon Hall” and renovated to house 70 young women, who were employed on the night shift. The Company finally purchased three additional residences to house workers. At this time, the textile mills in Hespeler were among the largest in the word.
Demographically, a major shift was also happening, as companies were looking to immigration to fulfill the demand. They actively recruited labourers from further afield, initially from Scotland and, during WWII, from Newfoundland and Labrador. Women from northern Ontario were also brought in to replace men taken for the war effort, and many of these women were provided lodging in specially built company dormitories. In this way, the mills provided a social setting that extended beyond working hours and helped the newcomers blend with the existing population.
5.4.3 Post–World War II Era (1940s to 1960s)

As in other parts of southern Ontario, Hespeler witnessed post-World War II suburbanization and residential development. Construction during this period focused on the expansion of suburban neighborhoods, the construction of single-family homes, and the development of amenities such as schools, parks, and shopping centres, to accommodate returning veterans and their families. During the 1920s, Highway 8 was illuminated and properly paved. Somewhat later during the 1950s and 1960s, Highways 24 and 401 were constructed and paved, fostering greater suburban growth and industrial activity in the vicinity of Preston and Hespeler.
The textile industry still pursued housing development during the war years, including the creation of new housing subdivisions to sell to employees. Dominion Woolens housing developments were constructed on Woodsdale, Cedar, Oak, Weaver, Millvue, Walnut, Edward, and Beech Streets. Between 1949 and December 1955, the company was faced with stiff competition from imported textiles and their workforce shrank considerably.

**Figure 99** Edward Street Housing Development. *Hespeler Heritage Centre.*
On November 17, 1960, the four-lane Highway 401 to Highway 8 at Preston was officially opened, connecting what was then Waterloo County with Toronto. One unique challenge for Hespeler Village is that Highway 401 separates this area from the rest of Cambridge, as the core area was by-passed by Hespeler Road. This has aided in historic preservation.
Figure 101 Aerial photo of Hespeler (1945), with Study Area and Hespeler Road location outlined in red. TRACE architectures.

Figure 102 Aerial photo of Hespeler (1955), with Study Area and Hespeler Road location outlined in red. TRACE architectures.
Figure 103 Aerial Photo of Hespeler (1966), showing escalating suburban growth (original image is cut-off to the west). Study Area outlined in red. TRACE architectures.

5.4.4 Industrial Decline and Redevelopment (1970s to Present)

Hespeler, along with other manufacturing towns in the region, and across the province, faced challenges due to industrial decline in the latter half of the 20th century. Many industrial facilities closed or relocated, leading to economic restructuring and shifts in land use. Construction efforts during this period included adaptive reuse of former industrial buildings, brownfield redevelopment, and efforts to diversify the local economy through commercial and residential projects. During World War II, Hespeler mills supplied Canada with most of its wool for uniforms. Other textile companies also opened in the early 1900s and continued to be successful until the late 1940s, when they began to decline. Dominion Woolens, for example, was facing bankruptcy by 1959 and was sold to Silknit, which eventually closed the plant in 1984. Other industry was still quite successful, and by 1969, Hespeler's population had grown to 6,000.

After the peak of local employment was reached in the mid-20th century, local industries declined, and the village is now sustained largely as a bedroom community for regional urban

**Figure** 104 2006 aerial photo of Hespeler. Major suburbanization, but relatively little change in the core. Study Area outlined in red. *TRACE architectures.*
5.5 Architectural Styles

A range of architectural styles are present in the Study Area, reflecting the various periods of construction. A concentration of Georgian, Renaissance Revival, and Edwardian Classical style buildings are located within the commercial area in the centre of the Study Area, which corresponds with the 19th century dates of construction in that area. Several of the buildings in the Study Area have been documented as designed and/or built by notable residents, foundational in the history of Hespeler, such as Micheal Bergey, Jacob Hespeler, Charles Karch, and George Duthie Forbes, to name a few.

5.5.1 Hespeler Vernacular Architecture

Ontario vernacular architecture refers to the variety of building styles and construction methods that emerged over time in the province’s rural and small-town communities. It embodies the practical responses of settlers and later generations to the local climate, available materials, cultural influences, and functional needs. Across the province, vernacular architectural styles tend to reflect the unique characteristics of a region. In Hespeler, this is typically a compact form, 1 ½ or 2-storeys high with a rectangular or ‘L’-shaped floor plan, gable roof, and often a porch, and can be seen in single-family homes, churches, and commercial buildings.

Figure 105 127 Queen Street West. TRACE architectures.
Vernacular Architecture also borrows from a variety of other styles and can have significant ornamentation and unique features. However, vernacular structures often exhibit simple, functional designs adapted to local needs and environmental conditions.

**Figure 106** 7 Shamrock Street. *TRACE architectures.*

Efforts to preserve and interpret Ontario's vernacular architecture have grown in recent decades, driven by a recognition of its cultural significance and historic value. Heritage conservation initiatives seek to protect vernacular buildings from demolition and degradation, while also promoting an appreciation of their architectural and cultural heritage.
Figure 107 88 Cooper Street. TRACE architectures.

5.5.2 Georgian (1784–1860)

This period coincides with the time when Upper Canada was being settled by British immigrants, and Georgian architecture was popular in Britain during this era. Georgian architecture in Upper Canada reflected the architectural tastes and styles brought over by British settlers. Key characteristics of Georgian architecture include symmetry; brick construction; classical influences such as columns, pediments, and pilasters; multi-pane windows, arranged in a grid pattern and symmetrical floorplans.
In Hespeler, Pennsylvanian Mennonite influences are embedded in some residential buildings. After the American Revolution, many Mennonites left southern Pennsylvania for inexpensive land in southwestern Ontario. The influence of the German farmhouse style is evident in the hilly landscape of Hespeler, where many properties follow the Georgian form; however, do not follow all the British characteristics. Mennonite architecture in Pennsylvania and surrounding areas is characterized by simplicity, functionality, and adherence to traditional building methods. Mennonite homes typically feature modest designs with practical layouts, often constructed using locally available materials such as stone, brick, or timber. The architecture tends to reflect the Mennonite values of simplicity and humility, with minimal ornamentation and decoration.

Row, or terrace houses, were introduced into Ontario in anticipation of fulfilling the need for higher density housing with of the growth of industry. One of the best examples of this is Jacob Hespeler’s Workers Row Houses on Spring Street, built ca.1862. These houses were built by Jacob Hespeler and are named the Riverside Terrace. They housed workers who worked in his Mill, located next to the homes. They are made of heavily mortared limestone rubblestone and are influenced by Georgian style. Hespeler’s first Town Hall stands at the top of this row of houses in section 61-63. This section of the row is built of tooled ashlar limestone.
Figure 109 Section of 61-79 Spring Street - Workers Row Houses on Spring Street ca.1862. These houses were built by Jacob Hespeler and are named the Riverside Terrace. TRACE architectures.

5.5.3 Gothic Revival (1750 – 1900)

Since a great many of the early settlers in Ontario were from the United Kingdom, it is not surprising that their buildings often contain details found in English Gothic and neo-medieval architecture. Many elements of stone buildings in England are translated into wood on cottages and smaller residences in Ontario Gothic Revival buildings. The overall effect is eclectic and usually ornate. This style, characterized by its pointed arched windows, steeply pitched roofs, and ornate decorative elements, was popularized during the Victorian Era and reflected a romanticized interest in medieval architecture. Gothic Revival architecture played a significant role in shaping the built environment of southwestern Ontario. While the neo-Gothic Cottage is probably the most pervasive Ontario residential style prior to 1950, Gothic Revival Architecture found a strong foothold in ecclesiastical buildings and institutional buildings, such as schools, libraries, and public buildings.
Figure 110 97 Queen Street East. Smiley House, stone, formerly blacksmith’s shop. Limestone-rubblestone vernacular Gothic Revival Home. TRACE architectures.

The three gable Gothic style was prevalent throughout southern Ontario. The yellow brick produced in western Ontario gives the towns a distinctive style. Red and orange brick was shipped in from the east.

Figure 111 120 Queen Street West. This Victorian Gothic building is known as “The Castle”, and was built by Charles Karch, owner of the Old Karch Foundry, ca.1870. TRACE architectures.
5.5.4 Victorian (1840–1900)

In Ontario, a Victorian style building can be seen as any building built between 1840 and 1900 that does not fit into any of the aforementioned categories. It encompasses a large group of buildings constructed of brick, stone, and timber, using an eclectic mixture of Classical and Gothic motifs. 19th century urban centres are packed with lovely residences and small commercial buildings made with bay windows, stained glass, ornamental string courses, and elegant entrances. Victorian homes are prevalent throughout southwestern Ontario, especially in cities and towns that experienced significant growth during the 19th century. Victorian architecture encompasses a range of styles that were popular during the reign of Queen Victoria (1837-1901) in Britain, and these styles were often adapted and interpreted by architects and builders in Ontario.

**Figure 112** 150 Walker Street has Victorian and Queen Anne influences. *TRACE architectures.*

Victorian homes in southwestern Ontario can be found in various architectural styles, including Italianate, Second Empire, Queen Anne, Gothic Revival, and others. Each style has its own distinctive features, such as ornate detailing, asymmetrical façades, steeply pitched roofs, and decorative elements like bay windows, brackets, and intricate woodwork. These homes were typically constructed using locally available materials, including brick, stone, and wood. Brick was a common choice for urban homes, while stone was more prevalent in rural areas. Wood was often used for decorative elements such as trim, gingerbread detailing, and ornate porch columns.
Figure 113 122 Walker Street. TRACE architectures.
5.5.5 Second Empire

Second Empire architecture had a notable presence in Ontario during the 19th century, particularly from the 1860s to the 1880s. This style, characterized by its mansard roof, dormer windows, and ornate detailing, influences many residential and commercial buildings in Ontario from this period. Commercial buildings often featured tall, narrow façades with decorative elements such as pilasters, cornices, and arched windows.

Figure 114 18-22 Queen Street W. Known as Och’s Block, constructed of limestone and yellow brick. TRACE architectures.

Second Empire elements were sometimes combined with other architectural styles such as Italianate or neo-Gothic; or adapted to suit local preferences and climates. This produced a more North American version of the style.
5.5.6 Beaux-Arts

The Beaux-Arts architectural style had a notable presence in Ontario, particularly during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. This style, originating in France, was characterized by grandiosity, classical symmetry, and ornate detailing. It became popular in North America during the late 19th century and was often associated with public buildings, institutions, and monuments. Beaux-Arts architecture found expression in government buildings, particularly those associated with civic pride and authority.
Figure 116 The Old Town Hall Building, 11 Tannery Street East. Officially the second Town Hall in Hespeler (the original was on Spring Street). Like the nearby Library and Fire Station, the Old Town Hall expresses the Beaux-Arts style and has a commanding presence. TRACE architectures.

Another example is the Forbes Estate, one of the most impressive homes in Hespeler. The house was built with yellow brick in the Beaux-Arts style with a flat-topped ornate portico. A two-storey porch with classical detailing, such as ionic-composite double-height columns, displays the family’s social standing.
Art Deco architecture made its mark in southwestern Ontario during the early to mid-20th century and is characterized by its geometric shapes, streamlined forms, and decorative motifs, which became popular during the interwar period, particularly in downtown cores. Art Deco influenced the design of public buildings and civic structures in southwestern Ontario, including libraries, courthouses, and municipal buildings. These buildings often feature streamlined forms, decorative friezes, and stylized motifs that convey a sense of modernity and progress.
Figure 118 74 Queen Street East, the former Post Office, presently the Fashion History Museum, built in 1928. This building is the most prominent feature looking eastward down Queen Street. Although not an Art Deco building, it has some early Art Deco influence. TRACE architectures.

5.5.8 Industrial/Functional (1840s–1960s)

While not a specific architectural style per-se, it is important to note that the industrial and functional buildings in Hespeler are an important part of the historic architectural fabric. The region of Hespeler has a significant number of original industrial buildings, some of which still serve an industrial purpose. Architecturally, these buildings are an example of purpose-built architecture. Industrial buildings with heritage character in Ontario reflect the province's rich industrial history, encompassing a wide range of structures that played vital roles in various sectors such as manufacturing, transportation, and resource extraction. In addition to traditional building types, the most outstanding examples of "new purpose" buildings were the industrial and railway facilities and their related hotels and out-buildings.
They often feature sturdy brick or stone construction, expansive open floor plans, and large windows for natural light. These buildings also include warehouses, characterized by their utilitarian design, with large open spaces, loading docks, and tall ceilings. Excellent examples of this are seen in former textile mills, such as those in Hespeler.

Figure 119 211 Queen Street West. Lens Mills/Dominion Woollens and Worsted Ltd. ca.1864. TRACE architectures.
Figure 120 25 Milling Road. Hespeler Furniture Co. Founded in 1901, the Hespeler Furniture Factory was operational until the 1970s. This famous location was one of the largest of its kind. TRACE architectures.
5.6 **Materials**

The dominant cladding materials used in the traditional architecture of the Town of Hespeler are yellow brick and limestone, likely sourced in the region, as well as plaster and wood siding. There is the use of aluminum and vinyl siding as well, particularly in more recent residential areas. Painted metal and asphalt shingles are the most common roofing materials, although there are a number of houses which have pressed metal or tile roofs. Porches, “gingerbread” trim, balustrades, and other features and detailing are typically constructed of wood. The post-war buildings use more contemporary materials including hard-fired brick, stone veneer, vinyl and metal siding, and exterior insulated stucco. reddish brick from other areas of Ontario is also fairly common.

**Locally Manufactured Building Materials Include:**

**Yellow Brick**

In southwest Ontario, particularly in regions such as Windsor, London, and the surrounding areas, yellow brick, also called buff brick, is commonly used in construction. These bricks share many characteristics with those found in other parts of southern Ontario, including their yellowish hue and durability. The colouration of the brick can vary from light to dark, depending on the mineral content of the clay, and the temperature at which the bricks are fired. Historically, the denser clay of yellow bricks has been favored for its ability to better withstand harsh weather conditions, including frost and moisture, making the bricks suitable for use in the Canadian climate.

In addition to their durability, yellow bricks are prized for their aesthetic appeal, lending a warm, lighter, and more inviting look to buildings. There are a significant number of built heritage resources in Hespeler that showcase the use of yellow brick.

**Limestone**

The use of limestone in southwest Ontario dates back centuries and has played a crucial role in shaping the region's architectural heritage, infrastructure, and economy.

Limestone was one of the primary building materials used by early settlers in southwest Ontario. This was thanks to the region's abundant limestone that provided a durable material for constructing homes, barns, churches, and other structures. Also, immigration from places such as Scotland, brought many masons familiar with the material.

Historic buildings, such as churches, courthouses, and government buildings, often highlight intricate limestone detailing, including carvings, columns, and façades. These structures reflect the craftsmanship and architectural styles of their respective periods and serve as cultural and historical landmarks in the region.
Wood

The most common building material in early use in the region was wood, due to its availability, its use for both structure and cladding, and the abilities in carpentry that were reasonably common. Opportunity to paint it a range of different colours also appealed to early homeowners. Wood was also the dominant material for decorative elements such as cornices, brackets, dormers, and porches.
6 Evaluation, Boundary, and Statement of Significance

6.1 Evaluation of Significance and Determination of Cultural Heritage Value

The initial Study Area for the HCD Study, as directed by the City of Cambridge, encompasses much of the downtown area of Hespeler, including approximately 524 properties. It includes the commercial precinct anchored on Queen Street, the industrial area located along the Speed River, and residential areas south and north of Queen Street. While the City expected that this area would be scoped further by the consultants, the generous size of the initial Study Area provided the consultant team with a broad territory to consider for potential inclusion within a future HCD, if proposed.

The Study Area encompasses a unique community, notable for its mix of commercial, industrial, and residential land uses, its important cultural and civic institutions, its distinctive architecture, and its relationship to the Speed River and Mill Pond. The Study Area is characterized by a concentration of 19th and early 20th century structures, notably large industrial buildings. The area is also defined by a number of major civic and residential properties designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Of the 524 properties reviewed, 67 are Listed under Section 27, Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* on the City of Cambridge Municipal Heritage Register and 16 have been designated under Section 29, Part IV of the OHA. The former Forbes Textile Mill is also a National Historic Site of Canada under the Historic Sites and Monuments Act. The inventory and historical research conducted for this HCD Study have shown that there are additional properties that may also have individual cultural heritage value or interest.

The significance of an HCD often extends beyond its built heritage, structures, streets, landscape, and other physical and spatial elements, to include important vistas and views between and towards buildings and spaces in the district.

The quality and interest of a district may also depend on the diversity of the lifestyle and the traditions of the people who live and work there. (*Ontario Heritage Toolkit*, 2006)
Defining Heritage Character

Evaluation of cultural heritage value of a prospective Heritage Conservation District (HCD) is guided primarily by O.Reg. 9/06 (as amended by O.Reg. 569/22) as well as the Ontario Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) of 2020. It is also supported by the guidelines included in the Ontario Heritage Toolkit’s Heritage Conservation Districts: A Guide to District Designation Under the Ontario Heritage Act (2006). The evaluation of heritage attributes for an HCD will usually involve an aggregate of buildings, streets, and open spaces that, as a group, form a collective asset for the community. The purpose of a HCD Study is to assess the significance of the whole ensemble of buildings and landscapes – of place - not just individual properties. HCDs aim to maintain the unique character and ambiance of a particular neighborhood, district, or community. This includes conserving the architectural style, streetscapes, and overall visual identity that contribute to its historical or cultural value or interest. By conserving heritage resources, HCDs help foster a sense of place and identity within communities. They contribute to local pride and serve as reminders of the area's history and evolution over time. The evaluation is not an arbitrary process.

In the Ontario Provincial Policy Statement of 2020, heritage resources are defined within the broader context of cultural heritage. Heritage resources include, but are not limited to, cultural heritage landscapes, archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage resources identified under the Ontario Heritage Act. Built heritage resources may include buildings, structures, monuments, engineering works, gardens, and cemeteries. Heritage attributes of a resource may include materials, forms, location, spatial configurations, uses, cultural associations, meanings, and traditions, and may be tangible or intangible.

This definition encompasses various aspects of cultural heritage that are considered significant and worthy of preservation within the planning and development framework of Ontario. It recognizes not only physical structures and landscapes but also intangible aspects such as cultural associations and traditions.

**Built Heritage Resources** are generally located on property that may be designated under Parts IV (individual property) or V (district) of the Ontario Heritage Act, or that may be included on local, provincial, federal, and/or international registers.

**Cultural Heritage Landscapes** are defined as geographical areas that may have been modified by human activity and identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Indigenous community. The area may involve features such as buildings, structures, spaces, views, archaeological sites, or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning, or association. Cultural heritage landscapes may be properties that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest under the Ontario Heritage Act or have been included on federal and/or international registers, and/or protected through official plan, zoning by-law, or other land use planning mechanisms.
As described in the *Ontario Heritage Tool Kit (2006)*, general character of Heritage Conservation Districts may include the following four characteristics, each of which is found in the subject Hespeler Study Area as a whole:

- A concentration of heritage buildings, sites, structures, designed landscapes, and natural landscapes that are linked by aesthetic, historical, and socio-cultural contexts or use;
- A framework of structured elements including major natural features such as topography, landform, landscapes, water courses, and built form such as pathways and street patterns, landmarks, nodes or intersections, approaches, and edges;
- A sense of visual coherence through the use of such elements as building scale, mass, height, material, proportion, colour, etc. that convey a distinct sense of time or place; and
- A distinctiveness which enables districts to be recognized and distinguishable from their surroundings or from neighbouring areas.
6.2 Property Inventory

Ultimately, the integrity of the District depends on the management of all the individual parts of which it is comprised. Therefore, each property within the Study Area is individually evaluated for its potential significance and contribution to the values of the Study Area.

Properties are evaluated based on the following criteria described in the Ontario Heritage Toolkit:

**Design or Physical Values:**
- Is a representative, unique or early example of architectural style, type, expression, material, or construction method; or
- Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit; or
- Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.

**Associative or Historical Values:**
- Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community; or
- Yields or has potential to yield important information about the community or culture; or
- Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to the community.

**Contextual or Environmental Values:**
- Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area; or
- Is physically, functionally visually, or historically linked to its surroundings; or
- Is a landmark or well-known site. Properties displaying a high degree of integrity score higher than those which have been heavily altered.

**Bill 23 Changes to Prescribed Criteria to Designate Heritage Conservation Districts**

Ontario Bill 23 (in effect since January 1, 2023) prescribed additional criteria that a municipality must meet in order to designate an area as a Heritage Conservation District.

These changes require criteria in O. Reg. 9/06 under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act to be used in the heritage evaluation of an HCD to determine if an HCD Study Area merits designation. At least 25% of the properties within this HCD Study Area must satisfy two or more of the nine criteria. This change is reflected in the updated Ontario Heritage Act, Section 41(1). The nine criteria are:
i. The properties have design value or physical value because they are rare, unique, representative or early examples of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method;

ii. The properties have design value or physical value because they display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit;

iii. The properties have design value or physical value because they demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement;

iv. The properties have historical value or associative value because they have a direct association with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community;

v. The properties have historical value or associative value because they yield, or have the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture;

vi. The properties have historical value or associative value because they demonstrate or reflect the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community;

vii. The properties have contextual value because they define, maintain, or support the character of the district;

viii. The properties have contextual value because they are physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to each other; and

ix. The properties have contextual value because they are defined by, planned around, or are themselves a landmark.

To measure the 25% threshold, steps were required in the evaluation process, the following process was completed during the Field Study (Section 6.3):

- The consultant team completed individual property heritage evaluations of the 524 properties within the Study Area using the criteria for determining the cultural heritage value or interest of individual properties of O. Reg. 9/06 (section 1) under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act;
- Each individual property evaluation was entered into a database in order to provide an analytical platform. This was used to calculate percentages; and
- A proposed boundary was established based on contributing properties in the Study Area, as well as natural and landscape features, public space or other unique features. In order to measure the 25% threshold in the proposed HCD boundary, the percentage of contributing properties was measured, and presented in map form.
6.3 Field Survey & Evaluation

As required by Section 40(a) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, the Hespeler HCD Study included the completion of a built form and landscape survey of the Study Area. The survey serves as an evaluative record used to collect information about the historical and physical characteristics of the Study Area. The field survey in a HCD study involves a systematic approach to documenting and evaluating the historic fabric of the district. Built form and landscape survey activities were conducted in the Summer of 2023. An initial site visit was conducted in June 2023, involving a walk-through of the Study Area, photography, and visits to the Hespeler Heritage Centre and the City of Cambridge Archives.

This was followed by a three-day Field Survey Visit conducted in August 2023 and included a full survey of the Study Area boundary, photography, and property detailing of over 500 properties. The survey also included context photography and landscape survey.

This was followed by a return site visit in October, 2023.

The overall objective of the Field Surveys was to:

- Examine the character and appearance of the area that is the subject of the study, including buildings, structures, and other features of the area, including landscapes, landmarks, and significant views that define the Study Area, to help determine if the area should be conserved as a heritage conservation district; and
- Property information and photographs have been compiled into a database, to facilitate the evaluation of over 500 individual properties.

Due to the geographic size of the Study Area, and volume of properties, the Consultant Team established five survey zones, to better understand the development patterns and architectural characteristics of each. The Consultant Team labelled these as Character Areas; however, they do not represent independent sections of the potential HCD; rather, they represented an initial organization method of a significant volume of properties.
6.3.1 Evaluation Results

For the Field Study Evaluation, the consultant team considered the criteria under 41(1) of the Act and used this to determine four possible levels of contribution to the overall heritage value of the Study Area:

**Category 1: Designated Property**
These properties are critical to maintaining the values of the place and require the highest level of protection.

**Category 2: Listed or Strongly Contributing Property**
These properties significantly contribute to values of the place.

**Category 3: Somewhat Contributing Property**
These properties make a minor contribution to the values of the place. All properties which back onto the Speed River or which have mature trees score a minimum of Category 3, regardless of their architectural contributions.

**Category 4: Non-Contributing Property**
These properties do not contribute to the values of the place.

These criteria are evolving, and were re-evaluated throughout the Study Phase, especially as more information was received. Presently, in the Study Area, the breakdown is as follows:

**Category 1:** 16 Designated Properties

**Category 2:** 89 Listed or Strongly Contributing Properties

**Category 3:** 199 Somewhat Contributing Properties

**Category 4:** 220 Non-Contributing Properties

190, or 36%, of properties in the Study Area meet at least two of the nine criteria according to the updated requirements under O. Reg. 9/06 affecting Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. Therefore, the Study Area overall merits a potential designation.
6.4 Recommended Heritage Conservation District Boundary and Analysis

6.4.1 Determining the Boundary

Boundary delineation is a critical task during the HCD Study Phase; some Study Areas have obvious character and a clear set of boundaries; others are more difficult to define. Determining the appropriate boundary for the proposed HCD requires careful consideration of the heritage character as well as the extent of cultural heritage resources within different parts of the Study Area. The Ontario Heritage Tool Kit outlines criteria for determining a boundary. They include:

- Historic factors;
- Visual factors;
- Physical features; and
- Legal or planning factors.

Boundaries should be drawn to include not only buildings and structures of interest but also the entire property on which they are located. Vacant land, infill sites, public open space, and contemporary buildings may also be included within the district to ensure that their future development is in keeping with the character of the area. Buildings and structures of less obvious historical or architectural merit, but that also contribute to the scale or scenic amenity of the area, may also be included (Ontario Heritage Toolkit, 2006).

6.4.2 Recommended Boundary

Hespeler has a long history which pre-dates colonial settler-contact with Indigenous peoples, who had a long-term migratory relationship with this region and within this river basin. The growth of the settlement along the river allowed for a significant industrial boost and the development of a thriving commercial centre and diverse residential neighbourhoods. The Study Area contains a significant number of properties which reveal broad architectural, cultural, social, and economic patterns of the region’s history. The concentration of heritage resources creates a compelling and unique sense of place that is distinct from other communities, including those within greater Cambridge. There is a wealth of high-value heritage residential, industrial, commercial and institutional buildings, waterscapes, and natural and man-made landscapes, that are an integral part of the identity of Hespeler.

Based on this analysis of Hespeler, its surroundings, historic development, physical attributes, social and cultural character, and the inventory and evaluations of individual
properties, this Study identifies a large portion of the Study Area which merits designation as a Heritage Conservation District. The proposed HCD comprises 309 individual properties and the Chilligo Conservation Area. As of the current evaluation, 250 individual properties and the Chilligo Conservation Area contribute to the heritage character of the area as per the requirements of the OHA and the 9 criteria listed above in Section 6.2. Of these contributing properties:

224 properties in the recommended boundary meet 2 or more criteria.

41 properties meet at least 1 criterion.

44 properties do not meet at least 1 criterion.

A list of property addresses is included in the Appendix.

224, or 72%, of properties in the Recommended HCD Boundary meet at least two of the nine criteria according to the updated requirements under O. Reg. 9/06 affecting Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. Therefore, the Study Area overall merits a potential designation

Please note that this boundary, the properties included, and their degree of contribution will continue to be evaluated over the course of the possible next step (Plan & Guidelines) Phase, and this list is subject to minor modification.

Based upon the findings of this HCD Study, the authors recommend that the City of Cambridge proceed to the next stage in the process for the potential designation of the Hespeler Heritage Conservation District under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. The community meetings and questionnaire revealed that residents have a strong connection to the place and strongly value the ambiance and character of the place. This is particularly seen in the town’s relationship with the Speed River and its natural landscape. Specific buildings, historic features, historic sites, and the Commercial Core are also valued by residents. A recurring message heard throughout the public engagement process is that “as large of an area as possible” should be included within the HCD.

**Full Size Maps are available in the Appendix. A list of property addresses included in this suggested boundary is also included in the Appendix.**
**Figure 121** Recommended HCD Boundary. *TRACE architectures.*

**Figure 122** Recommended HCD Boundary contrasted with the original Study Area. *TRACE architectures.*
Figure 123 Recommended HCD Boundary noted in pink, including property parcels. The Speed River is noted in blue, and the train tracks are noted in yellow. A larger version of this map is included in the Appendix. TRACE architectures.

The proposed district boundary is centred on the river and surrounding historic natural, commercial, industrial, institutional, and residential cores of Hespeler. While this is a substantial area, the intent of protecting key views, streetscapes, and first impressions when entering Hespeler, and protecting the existing sense of place that is predominant, and rooted in the relationship to the River, are the key determinants.

This recommended boundary contains the area with the greatest concentration of heritage resources and where substantial future development pressure can be anticipated. Through careful management of change, the heritage value can be conserved while incorporating sensitive new development and/or reusing/repurposing existing properties, based upon the Plan & Guidelines to follow.
6.4.3 Recommended Boundary Rationale

The HCD Study has determined where the greatest concentrations of cultural heritage resources are found within Hespeler and has focused the inventory and evaluation process on those areas. While the Consultant Team has included a significant geographic area in the proposed HCD boundary, that is the opportunity to provide optimal protection for, and management of, the physical and historical context for the historic district. It includes commercial, institutional, industrial, and residential areas that are important in Hespeler’s evolution. It also focused extensively on highlighting the historic significance of the Speed River waterfront.

The rationale for recommended designation can be summarized as follows:

- The recommended Hespeler Heritage Conservation District has a significant heritage character as found in its built heritage resources, cultural landscapes, natural land and waterscapes, and associations with important people and events in the history of the area;
- The recommended district area contains the critical varied elements that Hespeler still possesses, to maintain the “small town by the river” sense of place;
- If these elements are not safe-guarded in some way, Hespeler will no doubt lose that sense of place due to development pressures over time;
- The area has potential for intensification and redevelopment that could affect the cultural heritage resources; the HCD Plan will help the community guide appropriate development that is compatible with the heritage values of the HCD;
- The property inventory and evaluation of the study area have shown that these heritage resources merit conservation, while meeting updated designation criteria in O. Reg. 9/06 under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act, and over 25% of the properties within this HCD Study Area satisfy two or more of the nine criteria under the Act;
- The area displays evidence of the major stages of Hespeler’s evolution;
- There appears to be public support for HCD designation, based on the community engagement process undertaken; and
- District designation has proven to be one of the best policy tools available to Ontario municipalities for meeting many conservation goals and objectives.

This recommended area includes significant sections of Queen Street East, Queen Street West, Cooper Street, Guelph Avenue, Milling Road, as well as some sections of Tannery Street West, Keffer Street, Harvey Road, Shamrock Street, Franklin Avenue, Forbes Street, and Kribs Street. The area includes all of the institutional properties on Tannery Street East and in Forbes Park. This area also includes portions of the Speed River, its shoreline, and the Chilligo Conservation Area.
Figure 124 This Map presents the proposed HCD boundary and identifies contributing properties. This map will be updated throughout the HCD Plan Phase, as appropriate.

TRACE architectures.

While there are a number of properties within the recommended area that do not appear to contribute to the heritage character of the rest of the streetscapes and village, their general scale and character often do in fact help set a visual continuity for the place. Any properties of heritage value within these areas can also be conserved through individual designation, as well as being included in a District.

The recommended boundary of an HCD still allows the municipality scope for extending the District in a later phase, if desired. In the meantime, it should be kept in mind that properties abutting an HCD District boundary have some degree of municipal regulation. This regulatory power is granted under the umbrella planning policies set by the Province in the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). Section 2.6 of the PPS deals with cultural heritage resources and requires adjacent properties to be developed in ways that are compatible with the heritage character of the properties next to it, within the HCD.
It is also recommended that the City of Cambridge expedite designation of recognized properties on the register that fall outside this suggested boundary, in advance of January 1, 2025, due to the changes to the OHA under Bill 23.
6.5 Preliminary Statement of District Significance

6.5.1 Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value

The draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value summarizes the heritage value/interest and attributes of the recommended HCD Area. The Statement also played a key role in determining the boundary for the potential HCD and is the basis for the evaluation of the level of contribution of individual properties found within the Study Area. Upon acceptance of the HCD Study, this Statement may need to be refined in the next phase as part of developing the Heritage Conservation District Plan & Guidelines.

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest Under OHA Part IV

Description of Hespeler Ontario

Hespeler is located on the Speed River, within the City of Cambridge, in the Region of Waterloo. Downtown Hespeler contains the commercial and industrial heart of the village, which was established when the area was settled as a mill village in the mid 1800s. This gave life here to the early industrial development, and subsequently, a truly mixed village of multiple industries, residential enclaves, a commercial High Street (Queen Street), as well as significant institutional and recreational attributes. This organic development pattern is clearly defined and supports an inspiring and unique mixed village character. It derives its charm from:

- the interesting topography, the river and views to it, and

- the small-scale vitality of early North American villages that have survived the spectre of modern zoning and exponential growth, with its demolitions and siloed separation of uses.

The District includes commercial, residential, industrial, and institutional buildings located on the north and south sides of the Speed River. The street grid is also skewed by Hespeler’s hilly topography, resulting in many interesting views and vistas throughout the elevated residential areas. The commercial core that developed on the south side of the Speed River is dominated by Queen Street (divided east and west by Adam Street and Guelph Avenue) and runs parallel to the Speed River. The small commercial core is a modest collection of retail and residential buildings from a range of periods, punctuated by more architecturally expressive institutional buildings such as churches, the former Post Office, the former Town Hall, and the Library. Spring Street includes workers’ housing, built in the mid 19th century, for those who worked in the mills. Queen Street West is marked by early commercial buildings, such as the Queen’s Hotel and the larger commercial blocks on the south side,
transitioning quickly to historic, vernacular residential properties. The former Forbes Textile Mill, a National Historic Site, anchors the suggested district’s western boundary.

Residential streets offshoot from the main core – including many named after the industrial founders of Hespeler. The skewed street grid on the western side of Hespeler is marked by the steep hillside topography. As a result, the orientation of the streets offers views toward the Speed River ‘valley’, with mixed architectural styles and several early stone and wood homes built in the late 19th century. Eastern residential areas such as Cooper Street, present a southern gateway into the village, with larger stone homes and farmhouses, mixed with modest and modern housing, large lots, and a slope culminating in iconic religious and institutional buildings at the corner of Cooper and Queen Street East. Walker Street is another residential neighbourhood, with architecturally significant homes that once belonged to prominent members of the local community, such as merchants, executives, and artists.

North of the Speed River, up Guelph Avenue, includes the bulk of impressive surviving mills and factories, with the historic residential neighbourhoods set north of the industrial sector. Hespeler has by far the greatest concentration per capita of older industrial buildings in the Cambridge area, with many buildings still intact, and several still in industrial use. This industrial area is characterized by the factories that made Hespeler a prosperous centre.

Uphill from the industrial core, the residential section of Guelph Avenue contains the former homes of historically significant members of Hespeler’s industrial elite, such as the Forbes Estate, Kribs-Barber House, and the original home of Jacob Hespeler. Set on a hill, overlooking the industrial area, these stately homes are built of ashlar limestone, red and yellow brick, and their grandeur displayed these families’ influence and prominence in Hespeler.

The Speed River

Hespeler developed over time on both sides of the Speed River. The river runs through the center of town, and is characterized by two engineered dam structures, including the Speed River Dam, built by Jacob Hespeler in the mid 19th century, immediately to the east of Guelph Avenue, as well as the Silknit Dam, (adjacent to the former Forbes Textile Mill), built in 1906. The Mill Run trail follows along the northern shoreline, approximately 6.5 km along the Speed River, crosses through the Chilligo Conservation Area, and terminates at Riverside Park. The river features both natural and cultural elements and is divided east and west by the bridge on Guelph Avenue. The riverbanks on the east are mostly characterized by their natural appearance. The riverbed includes natural ledges, park space, substantial waterfront vegetation, and boat launches for watersports. The western section of river has a layering of industrial installations, including some stone and concrete retaining walls, former industrial buildings, a railroad bridge, in addition to some naturalized vegetation.
Cultural Heritage Value

The history of Indigenous peoples in the area now known as Cambridge, Ontario, is deeply rooted and spans thousands of years. The region had been inhabited by various Indigenous groups long before European settlers arrived. These groups include the Anishinaabe (Ojibwe, Odawa, and Potawatomi), Haudenosaunee (Iroquois), and Neutral peoples. Colonial settlement in Hespeler began along the shores of the Speed River in the mid 19th century. Today, the natural appearance of the river, in combination with its cultural edges and surviving industrial, commercial, institutional, and residential architecture, creates a compelling and unique sense of place.

The cultural heritage value of downtown Hespeler lies in its historical significance as an example of a 19th century mill town on the Speed River, its scale and strong sense of place, its association with community well-being, its aesthetic value as a picturesque townscape, and its river-based cultural landscape. These elements express a unique and distinct small-town character.

Hespeler’s origins are directly linked to the river, beginning with the natural topography of a small-scale narrow river valley. This was then layered with construction of the first mills, the continued growth of the industrial sector, and the arrival of the railway in 1859, which expanded its market reach and resulted in prosperity of the textile and other industries. The prosperity brought the commercial, residential and institutional buildings, artifacts and customs to the village. Throughout its growth, Hespeler has maintained its small-town atmosphere, in part the result of a tightly composed urban form consisting of a commercial/industrial core surrounded by elevated residential areas.

The cultural heritage value is also reflected in the industrial buildings, bridges, and pathways oriented around the river, as well as in its public green spaces, including significant greenspace around the riverbed, and natural and man-made park space throughout the District. The open spaces of the river and the unique urban configuration, captured by the hilly topography of the town, afford significant views and vistas of key heritage attributes. Combined, these elements and their associated intangible activities, make it a healthy, vibrant, and liveable community. The river is an important cultural landscape corridor that offers a recreational setting and a backdrop to the adaptive reuse of industrial sites for residential, commercial, and recreational use.

Description of Heritage Attributes

- The geography of the river, which allowed for the siting of many industrial buildings to take advantage of the natural flow of the river, harness waterpower, and establish prosperous factories along the Speed River and supporting settlement and growth;
- The collection of 19th and early-20th century commercial architecture along Queen Street East and West, in stone, brick and wood-frame construction, and a small-scale rhythm of
individual storefronts with independent entrances, that reflects the commercial
development of these streets during the late 19th century;

- Limited setbacks and sections of continuity along Queen Street West and East
  commercial buildings, characterized by the typical placement of commercial buildings at
  the lot-lines and the sidewalk frontage, of two- or three-storey heights, with flat, shed, and
  mansard roofs;

- Unique architecture of Queen Street East and West residential, featuring vernacular
  construction, mixed materials, projecting balconies, gothic style windows, limited
  setbacks, river access on the north side of the street, and large lots providing access to
  the river via rear yards, especially on Queen Street East;

- Landmark buildings in late-19th and early 20th century architectural styles in the
  commercial area, that reflect key civic and religious buildings;

- The collection of residential buildings built during the key periods of Hespeler’s
  development between 1830 and 1930, reflecting its growth and prosperity, including
  examples of worker’s cottages, Ontario Vernacular, Gothic-Revival, and Edwardian
  styles, as well as fine stone and yellow brick construction;

- Significant views of key heritage attributes from a distance, including views of the town’s
  rooflines, steeples, and smoke stacks from streets descending into the District;

- The presence of open and green landscape spaces that permit public enjoyment of
  heritage resources and commemorations, including a network of pedestrian paths,
  riverfront parks, linear parks, and bridges oriented around the river;

- Residential neighbourhoods on Cooper and Walker Streets with mature tree canopy and a
  variety of architectural styles, deeper setbacks, larger lots, and large homes, gently
  sloping towards the commercial core downtown;

- Its hilly site precluded the laying out of extensive public open spaces in the downtown
  core, but over time, the natural setting, as well as former industrial sites, became venues
  for informal recreation;

- The presence of industrial infrastructure in the river, including the vehicle and railroad
  bridges, the dams, and the Mill Pond;

- Large-scale industrial buildings along the River’s edge and surrounding area that serve as
  a tangible reminder of the origins of Hespeler’s industrial foundations and prosperity; and

- A variety of social and cultural activities hosted in downtown Hespeler, which are
  facilitated by the commercial core and central gathering spaces of Forbes Park, that have
  served community-based initiatives, ceremonial and parade routes, as well as
  commemorative devices that integrate Hespeler’s historical events with the everyday
  experience of place. Examples include the Santa Claus Parade and the Bee Hives on lamp
  posts, (the beehive came to represent the busyness of the Hespeler community).
7 Implementation

The City of Cambridge has identified that central Hespeler, as a part of the municipality, merits consideration for designation as a Heritage Conservation District (HCD). The purpose of the Hespeler HCD Study was to provide an overall understanding of the area’s history and heritage character, and to determine if an HCD would be an appropriate heritage planning tool for the area.

This Study is the first step in describing the area’s heritage character and identifying the various heritage resources that comprise it. If Council approves the Study recommendations, the next step is to prepare a Heritage Conservation District Plan and Guidelines document containing the policies and guidelines required to properly manage conservation and development.

Through the Study Phase, which included professional evaluation of cultural heritage attributes, public consultation, and delineation of a boundary, the Consultant Team confirms:

A Hespeler HCD, under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act, is the most appropriate way for the municipality to conserve the area’s cultural heritage resources, and we recommend Council should authorize staff to proceed with preparation of a Heritage Conservation District Plan & Guidelines.

This study also concludes that areas outside of the recommended boundary contain individual properties of known or potential cultural heritage value, including several listed on the City of Cambridge Heritage Register. These should be protected through an alternative recognition, such as designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.
7.1 Draft Statement of HCD Plan Goals and Objectives

HCDs provide for the conservation of cultural heritage resources policies and guidelines that will assist in the protection and enhancement of the cultural heritage value of a district. District designation enables City Council to manage and guide future change in the area. HCDs take many different forms and variations, depending on the location and its history. However, they form an integral part of Ontario’s cultural heritage and contribute to an understanding and appreciation of the cultural identity of the place, and as a collection, the province.

In accordance with Subsection 40 (2) of the Ontario Heritage Act, the HCD Study considers the objectives around the recommended designation and the content of the future HCD Plan, should Council move forward with the adoption of an HCD. Therefore, the following objectives should be re-confirmed for continued relevance throughout the Plan Phase. This includes additional consultation with the public, completion of the landscape analysis and heritage evaluation, a formal statement of significance, and an updated boundary property inventory.

Based on the results of this HCD Study, the prospective HCD Plan for Hespeler should consider addressing the following objectives:

- **Overall Heritage**: Conserve and enhance the cultural heritage value and character-defining elements of the HCD, including built forms, street and landscape elements, and landmarks that contribute to Hespeler’s sense of place;
- **Natural Heritage**: Maintain and enhance the natural landscape and public realm of Hespeler that contribute to the HCD, including, but not limited to, the Speed River, retention of park spaces, open green spaces, and public River access;
- **Natural Heritage**: Protect the existing natural features of the watercourses and encourage the creation of new trails or other amenities to promote accessible, public access and enjoyment of these natural resources;
- **Built Heritage**: Encourage the conservation, rehabilitation, adaptive reuse, and maintenance of contributing existing buildings that express the heritage character of the HCD, while providing guidelines on appropriate change to the buildings;
- **Built Heritage**: Develop alteration, infill, and new development guidelines with the primary goal of promoting compatible development on fallow or non-contributing properties, that appropriately manages and preserves the cultural heritage value of the area’s history;
• Built Heritage: Ensure that new construction and development on vacant, underdeveloped lots and on large parcels responds to the character of contributing properties through their retention and the compatible design of new structures;

• Natural/Built Heritage: Encourage the revitalization of vacant and underdeveloped lots such as, but no limited to, former industrial properties along the waterfront, in an effort to safeguard the natural landscape and its associated cultural heritage value;

• Natural/Built Heritage: Reinforce and conserve the District’s significant built forms, streetscapes, materiality, and character that reflect its historic commercial, civic, institutional, and industrial uses and cultural heritage values by:
  o Developing appropriate setbacks and step backs for new development;
  o Maintaining and establishing architectural details and consistent street walls where appropriate and which support accessible, vibrant, and walkable pedestrian environments;
  o Maintain, conserve, and enhance the historic residential character of the streets and neighbourhoods adjacent to the commercial core, particularly as exemplified in its intact historic streetscapes, through the use of harmonious materials, height limits, architectural details or other design measures, enhanced and protected tree canopy, and views to the river or park space;
  o Encourage the enhancement and conservation of natural “gateways” to downtown Hespeler, including the Guelph Avenue Bridge entry, the Queen Street West entry, Cooper Street entry, and Queen Street East entry; and
  o Promote the enhancement of the public realm, through the commemoration and interpretation programmes of historical themes, including, but not limited to the industries that have shaped Hespeler, such as the textile industry.

• Incorporate the policies and guidelines of the HCD Plan into the regulatory framework of the City of Cambridge, and other studies and programs to encourage the conservation and enhancement of the HCD;

• Establish a Heritage Permitting process to assist property owners with conservation, maintenance, and alteration efforts, as well as provide guidance for appropriate restoration, repair, and on-going maintenance of all buildings within the District; and

• Encourage active participation from residents, property owners, and businesses, in the promotion and implementation of the HCD, including development of a streamlined and proactive heritage permitting process with the City to ensure that requirements of property owners are understood early in the process and revisions to project plans are mitigated and reduced.
7.2 Proposed Content of the HCD Plan and Guidelines

The HCD Plan should provide information for those seeking to understand the cultural heritage value of the HCD as well as provide policies and guidelines to achieve the stated objectives. The general layout of the Plan is as follows:

- Introduction (results of the HCD Study, public engagement summary for the Plan);
- Legislative and policy framework that will support the HCD and outline the cultural heritage values, attributes and the statement of objectives of the Plan;
- Statement of District Significance and Heritage Attributes (Character-defining Elements);
- Statement of Objectives (each of the objectives should be linked to policies, and subsequently the guidelines);
- Confirmed District Boundary;
- Policies and Guidelines (Contributing and Non-Contributing Properties, Public Realm, Natural and Built Heritage areas);
- The policies and guidelines direct both the conservation and alteration of existing resources, the public realm and new construction;
- Implementation: an overview of how the Plan is intended to be implemented through the heritage permit process and when a heritage permit is required; and
- Recommendations for financial incentives.
7.3 **Additional Recommendations**

Ontario’s provincial policy documents support the conservation of built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes, and archaeological resources, and enable planning authorities to implement plans to protect these resources.

The City of Cambridge’s municipal policy documents conform to provincial and regional plans, contain policies which prioritize heritage conservation, and authorize the municipality to establish new HCDs, following a study/plan process prior to designation. However, several modifications to City of Cambridge policy documents or municipal by-laws are required should Council approve the initiation of a Hespeler HCD Plan. For example, the Cambridge Official Plan (OP) will require another schedule for the Hespeler HCD. Other sections of the Official Plan that reference the Cambridge Heritage Conservation Districts, such as Section 4.1 (e), will also require update.

Additionally, there is a potential future need to consolidate by-laws and ongoing planning projects within the future HCD to ensure appropriate harmonization and implementation. While this can occur during or after the Plan phase, a preliminary analysis was completed as part of this HCD Study. The following by-laws and plans (and potentially others, to be determined) may require updates or amendments, depending upon the contents of the prospective HCD Plan:

- Development Charges By-law;
- Zoning By-laws;
- Property Standards By-law;
- Blackbridge Cultural Heritage Landscape; and
- Hespeler Building Height Guidelines.

While the proposed boundary has captured a wide range of properties, there remain properties and landscapes of local interest that were identified outside the proposed HCD boundary, such as the Forbes Estate, for example.

Therefore, it is also recommended that the City of Cambridge consider assessing properties inside the Study Area and its environs, that are not in the proposed HCD boundary, particularly those on the City of Cambridge Heritage Register, for possible Part IV designation as soon as possible.
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Ontario Bill 23 (in effect since January 1, 2023) prescribed additional criteria that a municipality must meet in order to designate an area as a Heritage Conservation District. These changes require criteria in O. Reg. 9/06 under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act to be used in the heritage evaluation of an HCD to determine if an HCD Study Area merits designation. At least 25% of the properties within this HCD Study Area must satisfy two or more of the nine criteria. This change is reflected in the updated Ontario Heritage Act, Section 41(1). The nine criteria are:

1. The properties have design value or physical value because they are rare, unique, representative or early examples of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method;
2. The properties have design value or physical value because they display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit;
3. The properties have design value or physical value because they demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement;
4. The properties have historical value or associative value because they have a direct association with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community;
5. The properties have historical value or associative value because they yield, or have the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture;
6. The properties have historical value or associative value because they demonstrate or reflect the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community;
7. The properties have contextual value because they define, maintain, or support the character of the district;
8. The properties have contextual value because they are physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to each other; and
9. The properties have contextual value because they are defined by, planned around, or are themselves a landmark.

* Please note Categorization and Criteria are updated as further research and analysis is conducted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>CIVIC NO.</th>
<th>STREET NAME</th>
<th>Criteria Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Adam St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Adam St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Adam St</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Adam St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Adam St</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Adam St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adam St</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property Number</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Criteria Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>96-98</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>Meets at least 2 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Cooper St</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Eagle Hill</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Eagle Hill</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Eagle Hill</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Eagle Hill</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Eagle Hill</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Eagle Hill</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Eagle Hill</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Eagle Hill</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Forbes St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Forbes St</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Forbes St</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Forbes St</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Forbes St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Forbes St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Forbes St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Forbes St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>Franklin Blvd</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>Franklin Blvd</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>Franklin Blvd</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Guelph Ave</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Guelph Ave</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Guelph Ave</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Guelph Ave</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Guelph Ave</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Guelph Ave</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Guelph Ave</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Guelph Ave</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Guelph Ave</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Guelph Ave</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Guelph Ave</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Guelph Ave</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Harvey St</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>11-13</td>
<td>Harvey St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Harvey St</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Harvey St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Harvey St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Harvey St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Harvey St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>27-29</td>
<td>Harvey St</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Harvey St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Harvey St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hungerford Rd</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hungerford Rd</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungerford Rd</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungerford Rd</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungerford Rd</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungerford Rd</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungerford Rd</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungerford Rd</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keffer St</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keffer St</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keffer St</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keffer St</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keffer St</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keffer St</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keffer St</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kribs St</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kribs St</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kribs St</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Kribs St</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Kribs St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lewis St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lewis St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lewis St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lewis St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lewis St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Milling Rd</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Milling Rd</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Panabaker St</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Panabaker St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Patrick Pl</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Patrick Pl</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>9-13</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>14-20</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>17-19</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>27-29</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>33-37</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>39-43</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Block</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Meets Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>137-139</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>165-167</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Queen St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>27-29</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>43-45</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>63-65 Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>66 Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>67 Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>69 Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>70 Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>73 Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>77 Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>78 Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>81 Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>82-84 Queen St W</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>83 Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>85 Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>88 Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>91 Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>93 Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>94 Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Street Name</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>98-100</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>112-114</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>113-115</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>211-215</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>Queen St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Shamrock St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Shamrock St</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sheffield St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Sheffield St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>61-63</td>
<td>Spring St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>65-79</td>
<td>Spring St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Spring St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tannery St E</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tannery St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Tannery St E</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tannery St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tannery St E</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tannery St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Tannery St E</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Tannery St E</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tannery St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tannery St W</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tannery St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tannery St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Tannery St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Tannery St W</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Tannery St W</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Tannery St W</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Walker St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Walker St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Walker St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Walker St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Walker St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Walker St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Walker St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Walker St</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Walker St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>143 Walker St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>144 Walker St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>147 Walker St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>150 Walker St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>151 Walker St</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>157 Walker St</td>
<td>Meets at least 1 criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>158 Walker St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>163 Walker St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>164 Walker St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>167 Walker St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>168 Walker St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>172-174 Walker St</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>173 Walker St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>180 Walker St</td>
<td>Meets 2 or more criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 29, 2024

Via email

GRCA File: Hespeler Heritage District Study

Jeremy Parsons
Senior Planner-Heritage
City of Cambridge
50 Dickson Street, P.O. Box 669
Cambridge, ON N1R 5W8

Dear Jeremy Parsons,

Re: Review of Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study
City of Cambridge

Further to our meeting on April 10, 2024, it is our understanding that the City of Cambridge initiated the Hespeler Heritage Conservation District (HCD) study to evaluate and make recommendations on the conservation of heritage of properties and neighbourhoods within Hespeler. The Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) further notes that a draft report has been prepared for this study (Trace Architectural, April 2024).

As such, the GRCA provides the following advisory comments for your review and consideration.

Resource Issues and Natural Hazards

Information currently available in our office indicates that the study area is traversed by the Speed River, Forbes Creek, Ellis-Chilligo Creek and their associated Regional Storm floodplains, other smaller tributaries of the Speed River, and steep valley and erosion hazard slopes. In addition, the study area contains portions of the Provincially Significant Speed River Wetland Complex and their regulated allowances (refer to the enclosed map). Consequently, a large portion of the study area is regulated by the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) in accordance with the Conservation Authorities Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.27, as amended and Ontario Regulation 41/24 (Prohibited Activities, Exemptions and Permits Regulation).

Further, portions of the Speed River floodplain within the study area are located within the Hespeler Two-Zone floodplain policy area, as identified in the City of Cambridge’s Official Plan. Two-zone floodplain policy areas include the floodway (the inner portion of the floodplain, where flood depths and velocities pose a potential threat to life and/or property) and the flood fringe (the outer portion of the floodplain where depths and velocities are less severe than in the floodway). Portions of the study area contains both floodway and flood fringe areas.
GRCA Property

As you are aware, the study area contains the Chilligo Conservation Area, which is owned by the GRCA. A portion of the Mill Run Trail traverses this conservation area and the City of Cambridge has an agreement with the GRCA to operate and maintain the trail. As opposed to Shades Mills Conservation Area in Cambridge, Chilligo Conservation Area is considered a passive conservation area that has been established for passive uses with limited services and no GRCA staff members on the property.

General Comments on the Draft Report

While specific development activities have not been identified in the draft report, we note that the HCD Study Goals and Objectives under Natural Heritage refers to the creation of new trails or other amenities to promote accessible, public access and enjoyment of these natural resources. Please note that the establishment of additional trails beyond the existing Mill Run Trail at the Chilligo Conservation Area would have to be discussed further and evaluated by GRCA property staff. The creation of additional trails should not be construed as a future reality given the significant natural hazards and features located and the passive use status of this GRCA property. In addition, any new development activity related to trail creation or any other development activity within Chilligo Conservation Area or other areas may be subject to GRCA permit approval under Ontario Regulation 41/24.

Thank you for providing this opportunity to comment on this study. We further trust that the above is of assistance on this matter. If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at ext. 2233 or jbrum@grandriver.ca.

Yours truly,

John Brum
Resource Planner
Grand River Conservation Authority

Enclosure: GRCA Map

Copy: Emily Guy, Trace Architecture (via email)
      Michael Hauser & Kathy Padgett, City of Cambridge (via email)
      Samantha Lawson, GRCA (via email)
Hespeler HCD Study
Survey

SURVEY RESPONSE REPORT
15 August 2018 - 12 February 2024

PROJECT NAME:
Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study
Q1 | Do you live in Hespeler?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question options</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mandatory Question (239 response(s))
Question type: Checkbox Question
Q2 | Do you live in the Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study Area?

Optional question (236 response(s), 3 skipped)  
Question type: Checkbox Question
Q3 What areas within downtown Hespeler do you consider to have cultural heritage value?

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:10 PM
Queen Street East. The river. Tannery St east.

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:11 PM
None

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:12 PM
Downtown Queen St along the river and Forbes Park area

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:12 PM
None of it.

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:15 PM
Historic buildings

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:16 PM
Areas along the river, library, churches parks

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:18 PM
Downtown and surrounding areas as defined on map above

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:19 PM
The Mill, the river and pond

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:20 PM
The Library, until they messed it up with glass. St. Andrew's Hespeler Presbyterian Church, Hespeler old City Hall, Dominion Woolens, Stamps &amp; Enamel, old bldgs. on Queen St., that haven's been changed.

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:21 PM
River, shops, mill pond, churches, town hall

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:22 PM
Queen street from cooper to Betchel

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:22 PM
The whole area you have highlighted, however I'd add the Forbes estate but that's been sold and buildings on that land are going to be torn down
Anonymous  
10/19/2023 02:23 PM  
I agree that the entire study area is important.

Anonymous  
10/19/2023 02:23 PM  
Queen street and part of Guelph Ave

Anonymous  
10/19/2023 02:24 PM  
Forbes Park, Fashion Museum, old City Hall,

Anonymous  
10/19/2023 02:28 PM  
Furniture factory

AdR  
10/19/2023 02:29 PM  
Queen street from Winston to Cooper, Jacob's Landing, old Len's Mill building, Forbes Park, Firehall/old town hall, IdeaExchange, the fashion history museum

Anonymous  
10/19/2023 02:30 PM  
Queen St. W/E, (Downtown), Jacobs Landing area

Anonymous  
10/19/2023 02:30 PM  

Anonymous  
10/19/2023 02:31 PM  
the views in and out of the speed river. Remaining industrial property. Height guidelines are critical to protect views and vistas

Anonymous  
10/19/2023 02:35 PM  
Queen street from Cyprianna's pizza to st Andrew's Presbyterian church. Forbes park. The brick building on milling road.

Anonymous  
10/19/2023 02:36 PM  
Downtown. Espically the little park by the fire station. The river dam as well.

Anonymous  
10/19/2023 02:39 PM  
Basiclly all areas marked in green except copper street.

Anonymous  
10/19/2023 02:41 PM  
| Anonymous | All of it! |
| Anonymous | St. Andrews Hespeler Presbyterian Church, Queen Street, Forbes Park Area |
| Anonymous | Queen street, foundry, lens mills |
| Anonymous | Old City Hall, a few of the churches |
| Anonymous | xxx |
| Anonymous | The mill and downtown areas |
| Anonymous | Churches, old city hall and areas along the speed river but not residential housing. |
| Anonymous | Storefronts on Queen Street. Preservation of natural areas on the banks of the river |
| Anonymous | The Village, Queen and Winston, Milling Rd |
| Anonymous | The old furniture factory, fire hall, library, chiuun kitchen |
| Anonymous | Forbes park, library, old town hall, store fronts along queen street, park and trail along river/pond |
| AJ88 | The entire area around Queen St. and Guelph Avenue intersection. |
Downtown, Mill buildings

town hall, library, queen st commercial buildings, churches, post office, furniture factory, dominion woollens, forbes estate, forbes park bandstand

Queen st, Cooper to Ellis, Guelph Ave, Milling rd - Sheffield st - Adam & Tannery

the library, cenotaph, old post office

None

Queen St W, Tannery St and Parts of Adam St. Guelph Ave near River and Perhaps Sheffield St

All

na

All those listed below as well as Forbes Estate and The Coombe, formerly Jacob Hesprier' house.

generally as shown on the map provided but not necessarily including the conservation area west of the Speed River

Old town hall (fire station), post office (fashion museum) and warehouses along speed river

The area highlighted has many cultural heritage value sites. I think areas along Queen St and Guelph Ave have cultural significance including Forbes Park.
Maybe the fire station and Queen st
from Adam Dstreet to the post office
the downtown and the queen and the immediate area surrounding said street and the river road
the three churches, the old post office, the library, the former city hall, the old Hespeler Hotel, several of the store fronts on Queen Street
Forbes Park
Downtown Queen St, churches, the outlined area above seems accurate.
Library and Fire Hall. Mill Race Park, Forbes Park
Old ones with cultural significance.
Guelph Avenue
Mainly Queen street from Hungerford to Guelph Ave. Tannery St., Forbes Park
Downtown, river, library
Downtown hespeler
Queen St at Ellicott lookout to Guelph/Adam St area
| Anonymous | Downtown core (old post office, old townhall), Queen St shops, old mills/Factories queen St. / Guelph ave. / Sheffield St |
| Anonymous | Those of historic significance |
| Anonymous | walker st, and the houses on queen street, the cafe in the green building, Choun's, Ernie's |
| Anonymous | Queen street |
| Anonymous | Mill Run trail, Guelph Ave bridge & trail, Downtown strip. |
| Anonymous | Mill pond, Textile buildings, Queen street downtown, Fashion history Museum, Forbes park, Idea Exchange |
| Anonymous | Jacobs Landing area, the shopping section of Queen Street, up to and including the library and fire hall buildings. |
| Anonymous | Queen Street between Adam & Cooper, only. |
| Anonymous | The downtown on Queen St. |
| Anonymous | The former industrial buildings, mills, etc hold a lot of value that is currently unused and mostly ignored, it would be great to see those buildings preserved and used in a way that brings more people to visit/enjoy the local sites/commercial core |
| Anonymous | Queen street |
| Anonymous | Both sides along the river, down Queen Street, and Guelph, by the Mill Trail |
| Anonymous | Forbes Park, Hespeler Library and Hespeler Fire Station. |
Anonymous
10/20/2023 08:53 PM
City hall, cenataph

Anonymous
10/21/2023 03:34 AM
Downtown steepled buildings; "Tenement" housing on river behind the Church, little "cottage" & it's garden@ park east of same "tenements"

Anonymous
10/21/2023 10:02 AM
Commercial core on Queen St. E., Industrial buildings off of Guelph Ave

Anonymous
10/21/2023 03:22 PM
All areas

Anonymous
10/21/2023 03:32 PM
All of downtown.

Anonymous
10/21/2023 03:32 PM
All the buildings and churches in downtown area and many old house in the immediate area especially those on Guelph Ave

Anonymous
10/21/2023 05:26 PM
Queen st, Cooper st, Harvey St and others

Anonymous
10/21/2023 05:33 PM
Queen St. & Lower Guelph Ave. & Sheffield St. (Hespeler hockey sticks!)

Anonymous
10/21/2023 06:31 PM
Certainly the downtown and the factories on Guelph Ave. More should have been done to preserve the Forbes estate. I wonder if the production of the miniseries 11/22/63 would have been filmed in Hespeler after the recent development.

Anonymous
10/21/2023 06:37 PM
None

Anonymous
10/21/2023 06:51 PM
Any area that has pre-world war 1 buildings, especially buildings that were well well built (well designed and constructed with quality), or those that are well kept and still have a good portion of their original features.
Anonymous 10/21/2023 08:24 PM
Down town Hespeler Village, Speed River and mill pond, Hespeler Heritage Centre, industrial areas in village, churches, schools, sport facilities, early municipal buildings, area for farmers’ market

Anonymous 10/21/2023 08:25 PM
The churches, the legion Along the River and Queen street

Anonymous 10/21/2023 09:00 PM
Downtown area

Anonymous 10/21/2023 10:46 PM
The old brick houses and buildings in the town centre

Anonymous 10/21/2023 11:01 PM
the village buildings that have old architecture

Anonymous 10/22/2023 02:40 AM
Library, Old lens mill location

Anonymous 10/22/2023 04:37 AM
Queen st between Winston and river road. Tannery st between Adam and queen.

Anonymous 10/22/2023 07:20 AM
The business block on Queen st.

Anonymous 10/22/2023 10:14 AM
Cambridge

Anonymous 10/22/2023 10:29 AM
Queen st from Cooper until Harvey, Tannery, Jacobs Landing, Guelph Ave from Queen until Fischer Mills.

Anonymous 10/22/2023 11:07 AM
No buildings. Tear down and replace with modern buildings.

Anonymous 10/22/2023 11:17 AM
The downtown core the train track station has been ripped apart otherwise it would have cultural heritage

Anonymous 10/22/2023 11:24 AM
The whole block, which development is ruining.
every area highlighted here with additions of Maple street and surrounding streets with old homes.

Natural conservation areas, historical buildings, parks.

The area indicated plus the two large heritage homes on Guelph Ave opposite Fisher Mills. I believe one is the Forbes house.

Smaller shops down the main street to the post office. Forbes park. Library and firehall.

Not sure

Only very few structures and areas that are both old and significant in their architectural design or historical importance.

Of heritage value: churches, individual houses, river/pond uses, some of the commercial buildings, the old townhall and the "new" library

fire station

None.

Queen st downtown, millpond

Fashion Museum and the churches near it, blackbridge

The current draft looks good

Queen St, Mill St, Jacobs Landing
Anonymous
10/23/2023 11:30 AM
The main street minus the two ugly new buildings.

Anonymous
10/23/2023 11:44 AM
The facades of the original stores on Queen street between Adam and Tannery, the now redone factory along the river, the churches, and some houses sprinkled about near the downtown.

Anonymous
10/23/2023 11:51 AM
all the old buildings around the bridge. too bad the rr station is no more.

Anonymous
10/23/2023 11:55 AM
Queen street, Forbes park and surrounding streets, the three churches at Queen and cooper intersection, speed river and mill pond trails, old textile mill

Anonymous
10/23/2023 11:58 AM
The woollen mills, Carnegie Library, the old hotel, churches, post office and American Standards building plus the dam.

Anonymous
10/23/2023 12:05 PM
Queen st

Anonymous
10/23/2023 12:16 PM
All areas and buildings

Anonymous
10/23/2023 12:27 PM
Downtown queen, the street lamps, Ernies, the shops. The library. The firehouse. Forbes park. Jacob's landing.

Anonymous
10/23/2023 12:29 PM
Forbes Estate

Anonymous
10/23/2023 12:30 PM
The main core area and up queen st including river road Down Guelph avenue all the older buildings

Anonymous
10/23/2023 12:32 PM
Our core and old buildings that give us small town character.

Anonymous
10/23/2023 12:49 PM
All of the buildings except the condos being built.

Anonymous
Queen Street East from Ellacot Lookout to the old textile mill on
Queen Street East, and Guelph Ave and Franklin to just past Four Father’s

Core down area, particularly queens street around the library.

Downtown core and Sheffield/Guelph Ave. Old Lens Mill

Churches and small shops.

All of the Queen st stores that are of archectural.

Queen street,

Library, old city hall, the buildings on queen street.

The core on Queen St, Forbes Park, the area around the Cenetaph/Firestation

Village retail facades, Idea Exchange library, Forbes Park and Bandstand, former Lens Mill property, Grand River and scenic lookouts including Jacobs Landing

Waterfall, costume museum, River bank loft building

Forbes Park, Library, Old Town Hall, the mill, Dominion Wollens building, Ernie's Roadhouse building, Jacob's Landing, Forbes Estate,

Downtown core
Anonymous 10/23/2023 07:00 PM
Queen Street building

Anonymous 10/23/2023 07:11 PM
Forbes Mansion, Dominion Woolens, Mill Street, American Std. Bldg., the band stand inside Forbes Park, Blackbridge.

Anonymous 10/23/2023 07:18 PM
River landing, Main Street, fire department, library, Forbes Park, pavilion in park and sitting area where the market sets up.

Anonymous 10/23/2023 07:42 PM
Most of Hespeler does. With the textile mills, Blackbridge and the downtown core area

Anonymous 10/23/2023 08:13 PM
Churches, Fashion History Museum, Lens Mill building, several homes.

Anonymous 10/23/2023 08:23 PM
Library, fire hall, old post office, church, Forbes park, downtown strip of buildings, city utility building by the water, old factories and warehouses

Anonymous 10/23/2023 09:47 PM
Forbes lane

Anonymous 10/24/2023 05:56 AM
Queen Street, Forbes park, tannery Street

Anonymous 10/24/2023 07:35 AM
The downtown core, the cenotaph, town hall building, old post office, library, fire house, Forbes Park, Millpond and trail along the river, Silknit plant and surrounding area.

Anonymous 10/24/2023 08:43 AM
Main drag and stuff near the river.

Anonymous 10/24/2023 09:53 AM
All areas

Anonymous 10/24/2023 11:16 AM
The main business section on Queen St. E. The area surrounding Forbes Park.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
<th>Exactly where you put it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Queen Street and surrounding areas, Historic buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Basically the entire downtown area. The part where they have torn down and built ugly buildings that don't fit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>The fashion museum, church, speed river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Everything there in green as well as The Forbes estate and a few other homes up Guelph Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Buildings that flank the river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Riverbanks waterfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Queen street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Queen st area, some houses on south of Guelph ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>From the old Post Office to the lights at Guelph Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>None of the area is culturally significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Downtown Hespeler and nearby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Commercial and religious Queen st and textile mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anonymous 10/25/2023 01:59 PM  all historical buildings, parks, river

Anonymous 10/25/2023 03:48 PM  The commercial downtown Queen St Hespeler

Anonymous 10/25/2023 04:09 PM  The main core

Anonymous 10/25/2023 04:09 PM  Most of the commercial buildings and parks

Anonymous 10/25/2023 07:25 PM  St Andrew's church

Anonymous 10/25/2023 08:20 PM  Fashion museum corner

Anonymous 10/25/2023 10:32 PM  Not sure

Anonymous 10/25/2023 11:04 PM  The 3 churches of Hespeler, as well as the housing behind St. Andrew's. Including housing along Queen st.

Anonymous 10/26/2023 10:15 AM  downtown core and surrounding area, including residential

Anonymous 10/26/2023 03:40 PM  The Fire Hall, St. Andrews Church, Forbes Estates

Anonymous 10/26/2023 03:55 PM  Buildings/areas directly adjacent to the river and mill pond.

Anonymous 10/26/2023 06:22 PM  The areas along Queen/River and Guelph Ave.

Anonymous 10/26/2023 10:50 PM  Everything riverside
Anonymous
10/26/2023 11:04 PM
The older buildings

Anonymous
10/27/2023 06:50 AM
Buildings, green space by the water fall & trail

Anonymous
10/27/2023 07:41 AM
Any areas or buildings that have a connection to the beginnings of Hespeler.

Anonymous
10/27/2023 02:34 PM
Elite wrestling building, Four Fathers, any of the buildings really

Anonymous
10/27/2023 05:11 PM
Old post office. Downtown churches. American standard apartments,

Anonymous
10/28/2023 01:16 PM
historic churches, Queen St. retail buildings, including Ernie's, historic row housing on Spring Street, Victorian and Edwardian houses, housing that was built to house textile workers

Anonymous
10/29/2023 08:27 AM
Areas of pre-1950s buildings, parks, woodlots. Buildings should include historic households, particularly those not designated as having historic importance in the past. Too many historic homes have been "modernized" without regard to their history.

Anonymous
10/30/2023 08:02 AM
very few

Anonymous
10/30/2023 12:05 PM
The bridge and churches

Anonymous
10/30/2023 12:27 PM
The river the wildlife that is being pushed out because of all the houses being built. Downtown that's already being destroyed from the awful new buildings being built.

Anonymous
10/30/2023 01:03 PM
Commercial store fronts and homes associated with the Mill

Anonymous
10/30/2023 01:22 PM
Queen and Quelph area Forbes Area Four Fathers.
The Mill area, Speed River, BlackBridge, Chilligo, Presbyterian Church, Smellie Block, Ernie's and old Queens hotel

Queen street, along the river and across the river

The addition of highrise apartment and new building at corner of Guelph and queen charm has been lost

The entire downtown collection of original buildings

See below

Queen Street, east of Hungerford and west of Harvey. As well as the residential neoghbourhood that sits to the south and southeast of Queen/Adam, mostly branching off Adam (Berney, Forbes).

About 10 buildings in all directions from the stop lights at queen and guelph avenue.

Museum

Queen Street to River Road, Queen Street to Edward Street, Adam Street, Guelph Avenue to Fischer Mills,

Queen street (east of Guelph Ave), Jacob's Landing

The area of Queen Street (and south of it) and Guelph Ave. I wouldn't include Sheffield.

Queen Street from the mill to the old post office

Queen street and surrounding area
Anonymous
  11/03/2023 09:16 AM
Down own core

jeffa
  11/05/2023 06:12 PM
Older houses with stone and yellow brick construction, mill pond area, silk-knit dam area, Chilligo conservation area

Anonymous
  11/09/2023 10:38 AM
Queen, Coooper, the river, all the way to Les Mills, Guelph ave, Walker, other side of the river

Anonymous
  11/10/2023 05:36 AM
Old post office to Ernies

Anonymous
  11/15/2023 10:54 AM
The older buildings along the river (older stone), buildings around the Library (Adam St. Area) and the natural areas along the shore lines; older stone homes with distinct architectural characteristics would be included and important.

Anonymous
  11/15/2023 10:55 AM
Forbes Park, Queen St, Textile Mills, Town Hall, Museum, Library,

Anonymous
  11/15/2023 08:04 PM
Feel all of the downtown core has heritage value. It is what makes the core so special.

Anonymous
  11/16/2023 02:49 PM
Fashion History Museum

Cammski
  11/20/2023 09:44 AM
None, let's allow redevelopment and renovations.

Anonymous
  11/24/2023 07:32 PM
Most of the downtown core area

Anonymous
  11/29/2023 11:19 AM
The old industrial buildings, the city hall and library, and some of the buildings along the Queen st downtown core.

Anonymous
  11/29/2023 11:29 AM
Queen Street between Adam and Cooper, old Town hall
Anonymous  
11/29/2023 12:13 PM  
The whole area for 2 to 3 blocks on either side of Guelph Ave.

Anonymous  
11/29/2023 01:48 PM  
downtown

Anonymous  
11/29/2023 02:23 PM  
downtown core, churches, the buildings converted to condos beside the river, the whole area on either side of the river

Anonymous  
11/29/2023 04:33 PM  
Old post office, spring st, fire station, old lens mill

Anonymous  
11/29/2023 07:28 PM  
All Historical Sites

Anonymous  
11/29/2023 09:06 PM  
Queen Street, Guelph Ave, Cooper St, River Rd

Anonymous  
11/29/2023 09:42 PM  
Queen Street. Leave the other streets alone. It's fascinating how you let the ugly building be built at Adam and Queen...and then start this process. Tearing down heritage buildings to do it. They had value.

Anonymous  
12/02/2023 07:25 AM  
Buildings

Anonymous  
12/02/2023 08:00 AM  
Not sure

Anonymous  
12/03/2023 08:40 PM  
Town clock and museum building.

Anonymous  
12/05/2023 03:35 AM  
I'm not sure what to answer. I don't have a clue. I'm happy that Hespeler is getting more homes to live, but I think that there should be low income housing.

Hespeler Participant  
12/05/2023 10:23 AM  
The heritage theme is good/ however many of the buildings should be updated.

Hespeler Participant  
12/05/2023 10:25 AM  
The Speed River
Quinton
12/15/2023 05:52 PM
Forbes Park, the bridge, the old-style apartments next to the bridge.

Anonymous
12/22/2023 07:11 PM
I am concerned about the queen st. and surrounding area as very important to our heritage. (guelf ave., cooper st. other smaller street with very old building's)

Anonymous
1/03/2024 09:51 AM
Jacob's Landing, Mill Pond Trial, Hespeler Village

Anonymous
1/08/2024 01:48 PM
The listed properties index needs to be updated as many of the buildings in the proposed HCD are not even listed

Anonymous
1/09/2024 09:07 AM
Town hall, library, Forbes Park, blocks of Buildings in downtown core

Anonymous
1/09/2024 06:49 PM
Queen street houses and buildings, the river and Forbes estate

Anonymous
1/10/2024 04:52 PM
I would consider most of the area defined on the map to have cultural heritage value. Downtown area is hard to define as zoning changes and residential can house certain businesses and many commercial buildings include residential floors.

Anonymous
1/10/2024 05:01 PM
All of it

Anonymous
1/14/2024 11:00 PM
The town hall, library, churches, Fashion Museum, houses, old manufacturing buildings, off of Guelph Ave.

Anonymous
1/16/2024 01:23 PM
Old Post Office/Presbyterian Church/centotaph library area

Anonymous
1/16/2024 04:24 PM
Main shopping street (Queen), places of worship, Forbes park, textile industry buildings, forbes house

Anonymous
1/16/2024 08:45 PM
Queen st
Anonymous
1/17/2024 08:44 AM

Queen St - Townline Road to Rooshill and one or 2 streets back.
Milling Road &amp; Sheffield Street - Guelph Ave. Forbes Park

Mandatory Question (239 response(s))

Question type: Single Line Question
Q4  What features of downtown Hespeler are important to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial core centred on Queen Street East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former industrial buildings extending from Guelph Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural heritage features such as the Speed River and the Hespeler Mill Pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbes Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Forbes Textile Mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Town Hall building and Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Post Office (now Fashion History Museum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mandatory Question (239 response(s))
Question type: Checkbox Question
Q5 Are you aware that external alterations to your property may be eligible for funding from the City of Cambridge if the Hespeler HCD is approved?

Question options
- Yes
- No

Mandatory Question (239 response(s))
Question type: Checkbox Question
Q6  Are you aware that major external alterations to properties in an HCD may require heritage permit approval?

Question options

- Yes: 173
- No: 68

Mandatory Question (239 response(s))
Question type: Checkbox Question
Q7  How would you like to hear about more information on the Hespeler HCD Study?

Question options
- Social media
- City mailings
- Public Information Centre Open House hosted October 30, 2023
- Other

Mandatory Question (239 response(s))
Question type: Dropdown Question
Q8 Please provide us with any additional comments or feedback that you may have about the Study Area, the project, or about Hespeler.

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:10 PM
Please include plans to better incorporate the river with Hespeler.

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:16 PM
Hespeler is a wonderful area to live in. It would be lovely to maintain its natural beauty and heritage throughout.

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:19 PM
Way too much sentiment is given to buildings. If it’s an eyesore and unoccupied, it can go.

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:21 PM
Redevelopment of speed river footpaths from local papers and internet - lovely idea. Redevelopment of old textile mill to houses and apartments I have concerns with infrastructure like roads, extra traffic, schools, daycare.

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:22 PM
How will this affect any current or on going developments?

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:23 PM
I think the building such as the one torn down on the corner of Queen and Guleph and soon to be torn down on Tanner St E should never have been allowed to happen. How could that even happen? Pathetic and there is no parking. Poor planning. This is a shit show and sending a survey after the fact is useless.

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:28 PM
Dont spend citizens money unless taxes go down or freeze Fix roads first Stop never used bike lanes Stop traffic calming Enforce parking on guelph ave by school where every day is a risk just to drive there

AdR 10/19/2023 02:29 PM
I think the area might be a bit small still. While it focuses on the main core of the downtown, there are many older style houses going down Rife and along Maple that could be added for the preservation of the impression and atmosphere of the area.

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:31 PM
Height guides need to be included.

Anonymous 10/19/2023 02:31 PM
I think it is important to preserve heritage areas within the community,
but we also have to encourage community members and building owners to keep the buildings in good working order. Many of the older buildings in Hespeler have been left in disarray with nobody taking accountability and then they have to be torn down.

Anonymous
10/19/2023 03:06 PM
I think designating residential properties as Heritage properties only hurts residents. The fact that these properties need special permission for work to be done on them makes it a hassle and decreases property value. I know of some residents close to retirement/retired who would essentially lose massive amounts in their planned retirement if this were to go through.

Anonymous
10/19/2023 03:14 PM
xxx

Anonymous
10/19/2023 03:18 PM
I am against having residential housing included in this. Leave our house as they are.

Anonymous
10/19/2023 03:23 PM
I am opposed to giving heritage designations to residential neighbourhoods. It is simply a form of privileged ‘nimby-ism’ and it exacerbates the housing crisis.

Anonymous
10/19/2023 03:25 PM
You have already ruined the village by allowing that huge monolith on the southwest corner to be built.

Anonymous
10/19/2023 03:40 PM
It would be great to see some of those old industrial factories and buildings around Guelph Ave, Sheffield Street and Milling Road repurposed into something new. Keeping the integrity of the heritage but updating them to make that area by the railway tracks more inviting and less of an eye sore.

Anonymous
10/19/2023 04:02 PM
River area should be protected

Anonymous
10/19/2023 04:39 PM
Hespeler played a key role in early 20th century development of Canada industrialization, war time, early immigrant settlement, innovation ... maintaining a reasonable portion of the heritage is the identity

Anonymous
Don't think it is appropriate to build high (+4 stories?) buildings
fronting directly on Queen St or Guelph Ave. They may be necessary to increase densification but they can be built outside of the Study Area and achieve the same goals.

Anonymous 10/19/2023 06:39 PM
I worry that river road will become just another subdivision. It is a nice rural road. That needs some maintenance work. The houses are all different. Some are very old. I would hate to see everything torn down for a subdivision. This is Hespeler of old. It should be saved from developers. They have already damaged the feel with all those town houses and there many cars.

Anonymous 10/19/2023 08:40 PM
Heritage should not be a hurdle for modernizing our cities. The Heritage in Hespeler is not widely known outside of it and should not hinder growth.

Anonymous 10/19/2023 11:33 PM
I think it is essential in this development-driven economy to respect our history and provide protections to buildings of architectural significance, to open dialogue around adaptive reuse and conservation.

Anonymous 10/20/2023 12:11 AM
It would be nice for more bridges across the pond near the fashion history museum, a direct path to the Mill ponds walkway, putting a little cafe/tea room on the water with the concrete stairs to the water and twinkly lights (across from the factory with the smokestack), also a used bookstore.

Anonymous 10/20/2023 10:01 AM
The area around Queen Street/Guelph Ave intersection is under serious problems of traffic. The traffic going to Adam St from Guelph Avenue or its reverse direction cause major congestion in peak hours around Hespeler Idea exchange, specially when the downtown road is closed for weekends in summers, which has its own charm and value add to the community, specially for seniors and kids. But alternative road options needs to be explored, its a high time for that based on growing population in Hespeler. I have more concerns and suggestions to discuss.

Anonymous 10/20/2023 10:26 AM
Defining a neighbourhood as Heritage can be damaging to property values. Our investment in our home should not be at risk because of someone's new "desire" to change its definition. That will be challenged in court.
Heritage buildings must be preserved and never torn down.

In addition Gardens/green space with the Heritage site NEED be preserved and/or revitalized WITH their properties!

Would like to maintain the small town features the area offers.

I don't live in Hespeler, but I worked there in the past and I came to appreciate the heritage buildings. All of Cambridge's historic areas are currently in peril.

Please allow the on-going uplift and modernization of the downtown core to continue without the red tape of a HCD.

I am very excited, firstly that the Ontario government has created legislation around protecting historical areas, and secondly that Cambridge is pursuing the possibility of Hespeler being designated as one. I have previously lived in Europe in a UNESCO World Heritage City, and so I am very familiar with there being details regulations for both new builds and altering or even maintaining existing historically listed building of any use or type. I am strongly in favour of exploring this for Hespeler. I have been very disappointed to see some of the largest new building projects in Hespeler not save or restoring existing historical buildings, but demolish them and build modern buildings of a mediocre design quality at best. The old building are forever lost and the new buildings significantly degrade the streetscape. I know there are lots of other cities or towns in southern Ontario that can claim more historical significance or a better preserved and more beautiful historical district then Hespeler, but I don’t think that is reason to overlook the preserving Hespeler’s historically valuable areas and work towards making Hespeler an integral incredibly well designed and well preserved town. In the future I would like to see the HCD extended to include a few more residential historical streets that have noticeable character and maturity. Such as, the Bella &amp; Henderson area, Bella &amp; Rife area, the Trillium &amp; Shaw area and especially the Guelph Ave &amp; Shaw area.

Years ago there was a plan to revitalize the area along the Speed River and Hespeler Mill Pond. Money put in city budget was for improvements in the Hespeler area. The Mayor of the day and council
decided to pull out money from Hespeler and use it for municipal development in Galt (one was a parking lot!!!). Certainly not the original intention of the committee that made recommendations and that received original council support. That type of shifting of local funds without consulting local communities needs to be avoided if the city is truly interested in seeing heritage maintained in Hespeler area (one of the original four municipalities brought together as Cambridge in 1973.

Anonymous
10/21/2023 10:46 PM
Making this area a bunch of heritage homes will prevent diversity in this area, as it comes with inherent costs with having to get permits for improvements, which will increase the white factor in the area... Unless that's the goal.

Anonymous
10/21/2023 11:01 PM
I see no particular area or block that holds significant heritage, other then perhaps the old Town hall, library and forbes park. Designating the wider area as heritage does nothing more than ensure that property is unattainable to the majority of society. Hespeler has old buildings, that does not mean they are heritage, it means they are old.

Anonymous
10/22/2023 04:37 AM
Stop multi floor buildings that look very out of place in the downtown core. Infrastructure can't handle it. Traffic can't handle it. Destroys the look and feel of hespeler

Anonymous
10/22/2023 10:29 AM
I think the park and and sitting area across from it should be redone. I feel as though there is so much missed potential with that entire area and if the city was willing to invest into redoing the sitting area by the river and into lightly renovating both parks along both sides. Maybe adding a walking trail on the other side of the river if that area can be used for anything. I also think the industrial buildings behind there and along Guelph Ave have potential to be something that can draw more of the community to the area it redeveloped in a decent way. I think the architectural heritage of the area should be kept and a lot of new development should follow existing design cues. I also believe that downtown hespeler should be more pedestrian friendly and that the summertime closure of Queen st should be extended full time and the restaurants with proper permits be allowed to offer outdoor seating. An updating of the path and structures in Forbes park would be nice as well.

Anonymous
10/22/2023 11:07 AM
This heratage designation is crap, no one really cares. Tear down old buildings and replace with new and modern.
Anonymous  
10/22/2023 11:17 AM  
Any work you guys are doing please hire someone good last time me and my neighbors had several things broken when you fix the street (Windows etc) shaking are very old heritage homes for hours at a time But we want to repair these things the city did not do anything to help even though they were the culprits and breaking it

Anonymous  
10/22/2023 12:03 PM  
Where the industrial building burnt a few years back... that needs to be remediated.

Anonymous  
10/22/2023 12:09 PM  
I understand infill development is extremely important for housing and environmental needs. It is important I believe to try and ensure that designs are in keeping with the heritage feeling of the surrounding area. I agree the heritage designation is a sound way to achieve all goals.

Anonymous  
10/22/2023 08:46 PM  
Why is there a metal fabrication shop on prime river-front real estate? Why is there an unused storage unit on the other side of the river? Can we develop the downtown real estate to attract more people and businesses to Hespeler? Can we fix the downtown intersection to improve traffic?

Anonymous  
10/23/2023 07:38 AM  
Don't overreach. We NEED development in Hespeler both commercial and residential especially along Queen Street. The industrial buildings north of the river and west of Guelph Ave should have been redeveloped already. We need new multi story residential and commercial in that area that should not be impacted/deterred by Heritage designation. Best to leave this area out entirely.

Anonymous  
10/23/2023 09:00 AM  
Commerce requires more EASILY VISIBLE parking and slower-moving traffic. A food store north of the river would be a (future) convenience. Reclamation of the riverine areas west of Guelph Ave would desirable.

Anonymous  
10/23/2023 10:00 AM  
the core of Hespeler has significant potential. A strong community of families who want to engage as a community and be a part of the core and its activities. elements of "heritage" are important to anchor the community; however the majority of Queen street has become outdated and run down. It is important to me that heritage does not impact the ability for the Hespeler core to be rejuvenated or slow rejuvenation down. We need progress to help the core flourish.
Anonymous 10/23/2023 11:16 AM
That new builds happening near the Mill Pond preserve all surrounding trees

Anonymous 10/23/2023 11:20 AM
Make the language easier to understand. Not too formal.

Anonymous 10/23/2023 11:44 AM
The boundaries for this area are interesting... and surprising.

Anonymous 10/23/2023 11:58 AM
Get it done while there are still properties and cultural heritage features...unlike what happened in Preston!

Anonymous 10/23/2023 12:30 PM
Please protect the downtown core area

Anonymous 10/23/2023 12:32 PM
Protection of buildings and heritage, destruction of our small town character. Concerned that developers will come in and build high rise buildings where the textile mill is along the Grand and not preserve our beautiful community.

Anonymous 10/23/2023 01:46 PM
Just do not spoil the great architecture.

Anonymous 10/23/2023 06:13 PM
Hespeler needs parking that is amenable to business owners! The lot on copper is not well maintained and neither is the sidewalk!! It’s very dangerous walking in winter when snow and ice are not removed from the sidewalk. Makes it hard to get to work.

Anonymous 10/23/2023 07:11 PM
Time is of the essence. Introduce a more cohesive heritage front/facade with any new development construction. Give Hespeler heritage a heritage look with new construction. Talk to Guelph, old is old,new looks old. Beautiful green space protected too. Thx.

Anonymous 10/23/2023 07:42 PM
Lived here all my life and don’t like what is happening in the core area. Large apartment buildings in a commercial district is just wrong

Anonymous 10/23/2023 08:13 PM
Hespeler is a beautiful village and has a quaint feel to it. There are areas that certainly need tidied up and roadside summer maintenance appears non existent and that should not be. Grass
along Queen Street is unkept and bodes poorly on the drive in from Hespeler Road it could be maintained much better!

Anonymous  
10/24/2023 05:56 AM  
I think it's important to preserve historical landmarks, rather than tear down and rebuild more modern buildings. There older buildings have far more character and contribute to the uniqueness of our village!

Anonymous  
10/24/2023 08:43 AM  
I don't find a lot of “cultural heritage” in a lot of the residential streets highlighted. Lots of buildings from the 1970s.

Anonymous  
10/24/2023 09:53 AM  
Hespeler is unique and should not lose its character; it is too bad this Hespeler HCD Study and proposal was not done before the construction of the eyesore on the corner of Queen Street and Adam Street, which is taking far too long and is disrupting traffic daily!

Anonymous  
10/24/2023 07:56 PM  
That a full environmental study of natural wildlife and the species of migratory birds that come through Hespeler and the 10 miles around it be done thoroughly. All waterways and existing woods and meadows need preserving.

Anonymous  
10/24/2023 10:07 PM  
This is a great much needed project to help preserve the heritage of Hespeler. There is too many of our historical buildings already destroyed, but I am thankful for the ones that have been saved like the stamped enamel. Can only hope this preservation will continue . The Forbes homestead and property should never be developed and preserved as a museum. We should work on rebuilding the former train station and developing a market/ businesses down in that area not condos!!

Anonymous  
10/25/2023 07:22 AM  
Private property maintenance standards. Street cleaning frequency to be updated per growing usage

Anonymous  
10/25/2023 08:43 AM  
I am one street over and I would like to know how that would affect our home. It would fall under HCD if it gets widened one street.

Anonymous  
10/25/2023 09:48 AM  
Other than the river a few churches and 2 or 3 homes there is nothing of cultural significance in the designated area.

Anonymous  
10/25/2023 07:22 AM  
I do have a passion for history and built heritage in Hespeler would
like to be involved.

Anonymous
10/25/2023 07:25 PM

Im

Anonymous
10/26/2023 10:15 AM

There really are some outstanding historically significant homes and buildings in the downtown core, they should be protected.

Anonymous
10/26/2023 11:04 PM

The downtown core is losing its heritage appearance value. The newer buildings have greatly reduced the heritage appearance of our community.

Anonymous
10/27/2023 06:50 AM

Na

Anonymous
10/27/2023 07:41 AM

While change is a part of any growing community, I think area residents should be a part of the decision making for those changes. We live in these areas and see how change impacts the community first hand, too much and we lose the small town feel we all love.

Anonymous
10/27/2023 02:34 PM

I am worried about the condos going up on Sheffield and specifically the impact this might have on the Elite wrestling building as this is an excellent program for children and adults in the area like no other. I hope that the wrestling building will not have to be removed or cause the owner higher rent due to the changes.

Anonymous
10/28/2023 01:16 PM

Historic designation would be a boost to local tourism spending, and enhance the natural attraction of the river and dam.

Anonymous
10/29/2023 08:27 AM

I'm not sure if I'll be able to attend the Oct. 30th meeting because of childcare, but I am definitely interested in more information related to the outcomes of the meeting and the Study Area. Most of all, I want to know what the designation of HCD would mean for current residents, particularly those in historic homes that were previously "modernized" without regard for any cultural heritage. I'm also concerned that there is zero incentive for protection of heritage buildings here in Hespeler, among other things. My husband and I found this out after buying our first home here in summer 2021. Our Hespeler home dates to 1880, and no one cares about its heritage or could provide us with more info on its history, despite my inquiring with the Archives. We've watched signs and walls become graffitied...
over the past 1.5 years, and blatant disregard for neighbours’ comfort (sound and air pollution) and neighbourhood property. The lack of bylaws doesn't help; enforcement seems like a joke. On a positive note, I'm glad that the HCD is being considered, but more information needs to be shared with the public, and more public input needs to be obtained and respected. I generally lack time for community meetings, which regularly fall during work hours or commute times, or now during child bed times while on parental leave. I feel there is not the space for busy individuals to voice their dissatisfaction in the state of the community, despite our caring. Hoping that this will change in the future!

Anonymous
10/30/2023 08:02 AM
Having been personally involved with the Heritage advisory committee, I found that there was an excessive abuse of power and taxpayers' money.

Anonymous
10/30/2023 12:05 PM
The greed being showed by the city with all these new condos being built and the increase in property taxes is ridiculous considering no roads are being expanded and traffic is getting worse and worse in the city. Hespeler to be so much better but now it's all about getting as many people as you can in here and collecting their taxes.

Anonymous
10/30/2023 12:27 PM
Stop building more houses taking up every single inch of forest and farm land before we have nothing left. Schools don't even have enough room for all the kids being brought in now.

Anonymous
10/30/2023 01:03 PM
Nothing. I hope that our beautiful heritage district is identified and preserved. Thanks.

Anonymous
10/30/2023 04:22 PM
Under no circumstances do I want my property to be deemed heritage. Hespeler has already lost most of its historical appeal with the addition of new buildings and previous renovations. I do not want limitations on what I can do with my property.

Anonymous
10/31/2023 07:31 AM
Propose an enlargement of the study area. Open spillways and allow the Speed River to actually flow, clean up silt and vegetation issues. Address flood plain restrictions.

Anonymous
10/31/2023 10:43 AM
I think the scope/area of the hypothetical HCD is too large. The old industrial area has massive redevelopment potential, and the introduction of an HCD will give the privileged, anti-housing groups
the fuel they need to hurt projects that could provide more affordable options in the community to those of us who weren't alive to buy a house in the 1990s (myself included).

Anonymous
10/31/2023 04:41 PM

Hespeler has no heritage per se beyond the old arena where the Shamrocks played.

Anonymous
11/01/2023 10:47 AM

I feel that the area on the map above is too large. I feel Sheffield is culturally insignificant. I believe an HCD is great in theory (as I love heritage areas) but question whether they work. A lot of money is spent on the study and when it comes down to it, the City does what it wants anyhow...prime example is the Amazon warehouse in Blair's HCD. The "small guy" is penalized by having to spent huge money to try to adhere to the plan/guidelines, while the "big companies" get away with doing what they want.

Anonymous
11/01/2023 08:55 PM

Promoting and protecting architectural details

jeffa
11/05/2023 06:12 PM

I had learned from the project presentation on October 30, 2023 that the study was looking for older yellow-brick houses with stone construction. Unfortunately, the initial study area missed some of the historic heritage houses along Fisher Mills Road and Guelph Ave on the north side of the river (across from and around Jacob Hespeler's house) which is currently marked just past the study area cut-off.

Here are the areas of homes I would like to see considered part of the HCD, with mostly older construction: * Yellow-brick, fieldstone foundation construction - Add area: 7 Fisher Mills Road to 27 Fisher Mills Road - 7 Fisher Mills Road (b. 1946) - 11 Fisher Mills Road (b. 1903) * - Home to Huether family - 15 Fisher Mills Road (b. 1903) * - Home to Havey family (1903-1960) - 19 Fisher Mills Road (b. 1903) * - Home to King/Wildman family (1920-2003) - 23 Fisher Mills Road (b. 1890) - 27 Fisher Mills Road (b. 1895) - Add area: 170 Guelph Ave to 210 Guelph Ave. - 170 Guelph Ave. (b. 1875) - 174 Guelph Ave. (b. 1998) - 178 Guelph Ave. (b. 1900) - 190 Guelph Ave. (b. 1890) - 192 Guelph Ave. (b. 1890) - 196 Guelph Ave. (b. 1899) - 200 Guelph Ave. (b. 1890) - 204 Guelph Ave. (b. 1968) - 210 Guelph Ave. (b. 1900) I would also like to see these four currently historical listed houses to be moved to a designated status underneath the HCD: - 170 Guelph Ave. (b. 1875) – Stone house - 184-186 Guelph Ave. (b. 1895) – O'Keefe house - 46 Fisher Mills Road (b. 1870) – last example of this type of Regency Cottage house construction in area - 3 Shaw E. (b. 1890) – last example of “Sears kit home” with turret Victoria Park (66 Fisher Mills Road) donated by George Forbes and named after George Forbes’ wife, and established at a similar time to Forbes
Anonymous 11/09/2023 10:38 AM

It's all about Queen so why is Cambridge so sloppy when it comes to Hespeler. If we want to protect and Heritage the area let's start by respecting and cleaning up said area. People walk a lot but traffic too fast and I got hit on Sidewalk by a very young cyclist. It's a free for all and does not encourage cultural nor leisure tourism. Let's access view of river, where possible as it's all about the river. Cambridge could help by providing minimal basic services in order to make this area a fantastic cultural and attractive area and promote this beautiful place to live and learn. The history is so interesting.

Anonymous 11/15/2023 10:54 AM

It would be important to understand what the vision for the downtown core is before making it a HCD. Would this attract businesses or create a financial barrier? Much of the downtown is small business. Would homes be affordable to maintain for those moving into the area, or will they simply be sold to landlords and become rooming houses?

Camski 11/20/2023 09:44 AM

I support heritage areas and landmarks. Not all buildings should be deemed heritage simply due to age. Why don't we protect natural resources and allow buildings to change, be rebuilt and upgraded so they don't crumble into a state of disrepair.

Anonymous 11/24/2023 07:32 PM

None

Anonymous 11/29/2023 11:29 AM

I think this should only be for commercial buildings and government buildings. The horse already left the stable with the massive apartment buildings in the last decade. It's not fair to punish home owners when developers get to build brand new looking buildings next door.

Anonymous 11/29/2023 12:13 PM

Hespeler is going down the road to be only cute shops and eateries. Not much downtown is useful to my family.

Anonymous 11/29/2023 09:42 PM

Designate buildings, not a swath of land. Take more care. Instead of allowing a new build which included tearing down heritage buildings make builders address vacant property first. If a homeowner wants the designation let them have it. If they don't, they should be able to opt out.
Anonymous  
12/02/2023 08:00 AM  
N/a

Anonymous  
12/03/2023 08:40 PM  
Important points are - decreased noise, traffic management. Eliminate unattractive buildings and graffiti.

Anonymous  
12/05/2023 03:35 AM  
I used to live in Hespeler. I like everything about it. It's a nice town for anyone.

Hespeler Participant  
12/05/2023 10:23 AM  
Speed River needs to be dredged in the Hespeler area

Hespeler Participant  
12/05/2023 10:25 AM  
The Speed River should be dredged in the Hespeler area

Quinton  
12/15/2023 05:52 PM  
I'd love to hear more about fundings and changes. You have our email addresses, it should be easy to have an opt-in for information over email about things like this.

Anonymous  
1/03/2024 09:51 AM  
Hespeler needs a skate park.

Anonymous  
1/08/2024 01:48 PM  
Please make sure you include both sides of Edward St as there are many old houses on that road

Anonymous  
1/09/2024 06:49 PM  
Too many new builds are ruining the charm and heritage of Hespeler. It is also affecting wildlife.

Anonymous  
1/10/2024 04:52 PM  
I would include an area that has all of commercial, residential and natural aspects in the HDC. With the province pushing infill, it will help the region and the city build with preservation in mind. Many facades should be mandated to remain and unique architecture added for growth.

Anonymous  
1/10/2024 05:01 PM  
I think that where parkland and natural lands are concerned, we must maintain or expand. However, I don't see them as "heritage".

Anonymous  
Consider demolition by neglect and getting storefronts to have
To: COUNCIL
Meeting Date: 6/25/2024
Subject: 24-085-CD - Fence Variance Application Fee Waiver Request
Submitted By: Sylvia Rafalski-Misch, MCIP, RPP, Manager of Development Planning
Prepared By: Angelica Rabe, Planning Technician
Report No.: 24-085-CD
File No.: F2/24
Wards Affected: Ward 3

RECOMMENDATION(S):
THAT Report 24-085-CD - Fence Variance Application Fee Waiver Request be received;
AND FURTHER THAT Council approve the request to waive the fee for the Fence Variance Application due to hardship for the property at 1930 Briarwood Drive.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose
To provide Council with a recommendation on the Applicant’s request to have the Fence Variance Application fee waived.

Key Findings

- A by-law complaint was first filed in the summer of 2022 regarding a fence that was constructed in the front yard higher than the maximum 0.9m as permitted in the Fence By-law.
- In accordance with the City’s Municipal Fees and Charges for 2024 (By-law 24-013), an application fee of $426 is required for the processing of a Fence Variance Application.
- As per Corporate Policy D&I-180.120 Collection, Refund and Waiver of Planning Application Fees, the filing fee for an application in a hardship case for the Applicant may be waived by Council.
Financial Implications

If Council waives the required Fence Variance Application fee of $426, the cost for the processing of this application will be absorbed by the Clerks Division operating budget as revenue from fees and charges related to Fence Variance Applications sit within the Clerks Division operating budget.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action

  Objective(s): Not Applicable

  Strategic Action: Not Applicable

OR

☒ Core Service

  Program: Community Development

  Core Service: Planning

BACKGROUND:

The subject property is located at 1930 Briarwood Drive, southeast of Briarwood Road and backs on to the Gulf Mill Creek and a Commercial property. The subject property is shown below in figure 1.

Figure 1
ANALYSIS:

The subject property on Briarwood Drive in Cambridge, Ontario is zoned as Low Density Residential – R5 under the current Zoning By-law 150-85, as amended. The owner of the property has constructed a fence in the front yard ranging in height from 1.9m (6.2 ft) to 2.18m (7.15 ft), whereas the City’s Fence By-law permits a maximum of 0.9m (3ft) if located between the building line and the front lot line. As such, a Fence Variance application is required.

To address the non-compliance, the property owner submitted a Fence Variance Application to the Planning Services and subsequently requested waiving of the application fee.

The owner has identified that the reason for the fence and the height was due to family health matters and a requirement to use the front of the property. In an effort to minimize public concern and to ensure the safety of the property owners’ family member, the fence was constructed. Further, the owner has identified that due to financial constraints and health matters, the owner is unable to pay the required application fee of $426 and the application cannot be processed.

Corporate policy D&I-180.120 Collection, Refund and Waiver of Planning Application Fees, approved by Council in 1996, states that the required filing fees shall be collected by the Department, subject to the following exceptions:

- (a) The filing fee on an application for an amendment made by or on behalf of a resident or business to correct an error or legal status may be waived by Council or Committee of Adjustment.

- (b) The filing fee for an application in a hardship case for the applicant may be waived by Council or Committee of Adjustment.

- (c) The filing fee for an application that provides benefits to the general public may be waived by Council or Committee of Adjustment.

As per the above Policy, the filing fee for an application in a hardship case for the applicant may only be waived by Council.

The staff recommendation is that Council waive the fee for the Fence Variance Application as a result of the unique circumstance of this property owner.
EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):
City of Cambridge Official Plan 2012 (as amended)
The subject property is designated as Low/Medium Density Residential in the City’s Official Plan.

City of Cambridge Zoning By-law 150-85 (as amended)
The subject property is zoned Low Density Residential – R5 in the City’s Zoning By-law 150-85.

City of Cambridge Fence By-law 92-5 (as amended)
The Fence By-law permits a maximum fence height of 0.9m if located between the building line and the front lot line.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
If Council waives the required Fence Variance Application fee of $426, the cost for the processing of this application will be absorbed by the Clerks Division operating budget as revenue from fees and charges related to Fence Variance Applications sit within the Clerks Division Operating budget.

PUBLIC VALUE:
Not applicable.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:
Advisory Committees Consulted:
Not applicable.

PUBLIC INPUT:
If Council waives the application fee, the Fence Variance Application will be processed and circulated to residents within 60m of the subject property for comments as per standard procedure.

INTERNAL/EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:
There was no internal/external consultation undertaken with respect to the Owner’s request to waive the fee.

CONCLUSION:
The erected fence in the front yard of the subject property does not conform with the current regulations in the City’s Fence By-law and a Fence Variance Application is required subject to a fee of $426 per the City’s Municipal Fees and Charges By-law (By-
As per Corporate Policy, when a request is received, Council may waive the application fee in a hardship case for the applicant. Planning Staff recommend that the fee be waived, and that Staff process the Fence Variance Application.

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

APPROVALS:
This report has gone through the appropriate workflow and has been reviewed and or approved by the following as required:
Director
Deputy City Manager
Chief Financial Officer
City Solicitor
City Manager

ATTACHMENTS: (N/A)
To: COUNCIL
Meeting Date: 6/25/2024
Subject: Hamilton Street Watermain Extension
Submitted By: Leah Walter, Director of Engineering
Prepared By: Jamie Croft, Manager of Infrastructure Engineering
Report No.: 24-083-CD
File No.: A/01546-40
Wards Affected: Ward 3

RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 24-083-CD Hamilton Street Watermain Extension be received;
AND FURTHER THAT Council approves a new Capital Project A/01546-40 with funding in the amount of $510,000 from the Water Capital Reserve Fund to allow for the installation of new watermain on Hamilton Street between Chestnut Street South and Bishop Street South.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

Staff are seeking Council approval of a new capital project to allow for the installation of a new watermain on Hamilton Street.

Key Findings

Through recent capital project works, it has been identified that a water supply increase in the area of Hamilton Street at Bishop Street South is required to ensure sufficient fire flows are available for the area including to the new Preston Auditorium expansion.

Financial Implications

The watermain extension will require a new capital project A/01546-40 with funding in the amount of $510,000 from the Water Capital Reserve Fund.
STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action

Objective(s): Choose an Objective

Strategic Action: Choose a Strategic Action

OR

☒ Core Service

Program: Water

Core Service: Water Distribution System Maintenance

The report recommendation supports the City’s core service of water distribution maintenance, as the City is required to provide appropriate fire flow through its distribution system.

BACKGROUND:

As part of the site servicing review for the Preston Auditorium capital project, and associated fire flow testing, it was noted that insufficient fire flow exists in the Hamilton Street/ Bishop Street area. Modelling was undertaken for the water distribution system and the watermain looping extension on Hamilton Street was confirmed to be the preferred solution.

ANALYSIS:

The watermain looping and extension is required to provide sufficient fire flow to both the Preston Auditorium and surrounding areas. The small looping extension provides sufficient fire flow and supports the City’s core services of water distribution maintenance.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

There is no existing policy/by-law.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The watermain extension will require a new Capital Project A/01546-40 with funding in the amount of $510,000 from the Water Capital Reserve Fund. This is a new capital project, which is not in the current capital budget.

PUBLIC VALUE:
Sustainability:

This project will support sustainability by ensuring that the City continues to deliver on service levels for fire flow protection from the water distribution system.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:
Not Applicable

PUBLIC INPUT:
Posted publicly as part of the report process.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:
The Engineering team has been working closely with the Preston Auditorium Expansion project team and the City’s Environmental Services operation team. The City’s Finance team has also been consulted.

CONCLUSION:
Staff are seeking Council approval of a new Capital project to allow for the installation of a new watermain on Hamilton Street. This new watermain looping between Bishop Street South and Chestnut Street South will ensure appropriate fire flow is available.

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:

Not Applicable
To: COUNCIL
Meeting Date: 6/25/2024
Subject: 19 Cambridge Street - Arts & Culture Hub
Submitted By: Lesley Head, Director of Recreation & Culture
Prepared By: Rachel Fraser, Manager of Recreation, Culture & Sport
Report No.: 24-102-CD
File No.: C11
Wards Affected: All Wards

RECOMMENDATION(S):
THAT Report 24-102-CD 19 Cambridge Street - Arts & Culture Hub be received;
AND THAT staff be directed to discontinue advertising the 19 Cambridge Street property for lease;
AND FURTHER THAT staff be directed to provide a business case for the use of 19 Cambridge Street as an Arts & Culture Hub as part of the 2025 budget process.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Purpose
The purpose of this report is to request that Council direct staff to complete a business case with detailed costing as part of the 2025 budget process for use of 19 Cambridge Street as an Arts & Culture Hub.

Key Findings
- The use of 19 Cambridge Street for the purpose of an Arts & Culture Hub will fulfill the obligations from the purchase of the property through the Core Area Transformation Fund (CATF).
- Lack of affordable art studio space and cultural connectivity was a key concern voiced during the Arts and Culture Action Plan engagement.
- An Arts & Culture Hub would activate several recommendations from the 2024 Arts and Culture Action Plan that was recently approved by Council.
Financial Implications

Operating and capital impacts will be provided for Council consideration in the business case and reviewed as part of the 2025 budget process. It is currently estimated that $75,000-$100,000 would be required for start-up costs. Coverage of this cost will be requested through the Municipal Accommodation Tax (MAT) fund given the potential impact on tourism and alignment with funding criteria. These costs will primarily cover flooring, security, accessibility upgrades, mechanical review and repair. Further capital impacts yet to be determined will be identified and included in the business case.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☒ Strategic Action

Objective(s): STRONG CORES - Create an inviting downtown that connects and complements core areas and neighbourhoods where people want to live and visit

Strategic Action: Establish our core areas as attractive destinations

OR

☐ Core Service

Program: Not Applicable

Core Service: Not Applicable

BACKGROUND:

The City acquired 19 Cambridge Street, October 12, 2022 contemplating the expansion of the city hall envelope, among other things, with funding from the Core Area Transformation Fund (CATF).

Since listing the property, Arts and Culture staff and members of the public have expressed interest in having 19 Cambridge Street for use by the Arts & Culture community.

The CATF recognizes that vibrant, healthy core areas are a fundamental building block of great cities. The framework for CATF was approved by Council in June of 2020. Its purpose is to:

- help stimulate growth,
- offer opportunities for partnerships with private sector companies, non-profits and public institutions in terms of long-term and legacy projects that will be catalysts for economic and residential growth, and
• increase diversification, talent attraction and increase employment promoting urban vitality in our core areas.

It is recognized to achieve this; key strategic investments are required to both directly fund projects and create the overall environment for people to invest. Utilizing 19 Cambridge Street as an Arts & Culture Hub supports each CATF objective.

On May 28, 2024 the Arts and Culture Action Plan (2023-2033) was approved by Council. This Plan will lead the City’s efforts in supporting arts and culture for the next ten years. The goal of the plan is to make Cambridge a thriving center of creative and cultural development. This will be completed by making it a destination for artists and creatives, developing new and leveraging existing partnership structures to grow the local cultural network, and enhancing how local cultural spaces are used.

The following were identified within the Arts and Culture Action Plan that will be addressed through the utilization of 19 Cambridge Street as an Arts & Culture Hub:

• Lack of affordable studio space and cultural connectivity was a key concern voiced during the Arts and Culture Action Plan engagement
• Further investment in youth cultural programming is required
• Career advancement for local talent should be supported
• Connections amount the arts and culture community should be increased
• A lending inventory of staple event supplies should be provided

44 Gaukel Creative Workspace is an example of innovative space-sharing practice in Waterloo Region. Endorsed by Kitchener City Council in 2016, 44 Gaukel Creative Workspace endeavors to expand, support and connect local artists, cultural practitioners, and creative entrepreneurs. Both shared and independent studio space is available; providing a unique opportunity for artists and creative organizations to come together to foster cross-sectoral partnerships.

Utilizing the 44 Gaukel Creative Workspace as a model, a creative community partnership is being proposed for further review regarding the operation of an Arts & Culture Hub at 19 Cambridge Street. Arts-Build Ontario (a provincial arts service organization dedicated to realizing long-term solutions for arts and creative spaces) works in partnership with the City of Kitchener and acts as an anchor tenant.

Arts-Build Ontario is interested in expanding to a Cambridge location. It is recommended a non-profit or other service organization such as Arts-build Ontario be considered as part of the business case.
ANALYSIS:

The Arts and Culture Action Plan promotes the expansion of City-led programming for all ages, abilities and backgrounds. Currently there are space limitations at the Cambridge Centre for the Arts which would not allow for further expansion in this area. Detailed in the Arts and Culture Action Plan are recommendations on expansion of current programs and offerings. The addition of 19 Cambridge Street would allow for opportunities such as a youth arts hub, special events lending and storage space, and up to twelve unique at-cost rental spaces available to artists and cultural practitioners without displacing existing program offerings. The building design and existence of a customer service desk further supports the above applications and the introduction of a Print Studio space.

Given the recent release of the Budget and Business Plan Timeline for 2025, this is an opportune time to submit the proposal for an Arts & Culture Hub at 19 Cambridge Street.

City staff had previously solicited requests for proposals from the public for use of the site. Staff received one substantive proposal, but it would entail leasing the property for at least 10 years, which would not allow for an Arts & Culture Hub and would limit the ability of the future expansion of the City Hall campus. As such, it was not recommended. However, Council could direct staff to bring forward that proposal as an alternative.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

There is no existing policy/by-law.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Cultural activities attract tourists and spur the creation of ancillary facilities such as restaurants, hotels, and the services needed to support them. Thriving tourism and cultural destinations are growing across the country contributing to economic sustainability. Cultural facilities and events enhance property values, tax resources and overall profitability for communities.

Helping to remove financial barriers by offering creative workspaces at cost will support business incubation, offers the potential to create mentorship opportunities and is expected to expand Cambridge’s culture of innovation and contribute to a dynamic and increasingly diversified downtown.

By partnering with the cultural sector, the municipality can invest in talent development, boost entrepreneurship, combine business incentives and the arts to revitalize our downtown core.
Operating and capital impacts will be provided for Council consideration in the business case and reviewed as part of the 2025 budget process. It is currently estimated that $75,000-$100,000 would be required for start-up costs. Coverage of this cost will be requested through the Municipal Accommodation Tax (MAT) fund given the potential impact on tourism and alignment with funding criteria. These costs will primarily cover flooring, security, accessibility upgrades, mechanical review and repair. Further capital impacts yet to be determined will be identified and included in the business case.

PUBLIC VALUE:

Collaboration:

Collaboration will involve working in partnership with the creative sector, a non-profit arts service organization such as Arts-Build Ontario and our Business Improvement Area (BIA) as we develop this project.

Leadership

Investing in artist spaces and cultural hubs demonstrates the City’s support for artists and cultural practitioners. It aids in developing vibrant cores ensuring that creativity continues to thrive in Cambridge.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT:

Should the direction be approved, staff will engage with the Arts and Culture Advisory Committee, Youth Advisory Committee, Accessibility Advisory Committee and other Committees as suggested by space utilization and programming initiatives.

PUBLIC INPUT:

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:

There was no internal/external consultation undertaken.

CONCLUSION:

19 Cambridge Street offers an ideal location to initiate an Arts & Culture Hub. The existing design of the building lends itself to unique, affordable rental spaces with basic office amenities that can be made available at affordable costs to artists and cultural practitioners. The existing customer service desk provides additional programming opportunities including opportunity for a special event lending and storage space, youth arts hub and print making studio. This multi-disciplinary professional arts and culture
space will hold programs, provide space for artist studios and galleries and will support a vital, vibrant community art and culture hub.

**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:**

N/A
June 11, 2024

City of Cambridge Council
50 Dickson Street
Cambridge, ON N1R 5W8

Re: Proposed development at 777 Laurel Street

Dear Cambridge City Council,

I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed development at 777 Laurel St. This development will bring significant benefits to our community and is a well-conceived project that adheres to both provincial and municipal development requirements.

The developers have presented their plans, responded to community feedback, and have agreed to provide funds to the City’s housing reserve in lieu of affordable units. They have made adjustments to address the concerns of local residents as well as council members, including considerations for parking management, traffic studies, and affordable housing. This proposal will significantly enhance Preston community character and will bring additional foot traffic to local Preston shops. The developers’ willingness to engage with the public and make necessary modifications is commendable.

Their proposal aligns with provincial regulations, ensuring that the development supports sustainable and responsible growth and meets the guidelines outlined in the City of Cambridge’s Official Plan, which promotes efficient land use and the creation of vibrant, livable neighborhoods.

It is important that Council recognizes that while some loud voices have expressed opposition, many of us in the community support this project and see its potential to enhance our area. The proposed development will bring much-needed housing, boost local businesses, and contribute to the overall growth and prosperity of Cambridge.

Please consider the outcome should this development not be approved. The current factory building is aging and is surrounded by unused, rusting industrial equipment, which is a haven for rats and generally provides a poor environment for the surrounding residential neighbourhoods.

Thank you for considering the voices of those who support this development. I appreciate your efforts to balance various perspectives and make decisions that are in the best interest of our community’s future.

Sincerely,

Eowyn Spencer
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

BY-LAW 24-058

Being a by-law to adopt Amendment No. 79 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012), as amended with respect to land municipally known as 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street

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. 79 to the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012) shall apply to lands legally described as Plan 716, Lot 216, Part of Lot 217, Plan 533, Part of Lot 3 to Part of Lot 6, RP58R9554, Parts 1 to 5, City of Cambridge, Regional Municipality of Waterloo; and shown on Schedules ‘A’, ‘B’ and ‘C’ attached hereto and forming part of the By-law (herein referred to as ‘the Lands’);

2. THAT Amendment No. 79 to the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012) as amended, consisting of the text and attached map, 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. 79 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 25th day of June 2024

_________________________________
MAYOR

________________________________
CLERK
The purpose and effect of Official Plan Amendment No. 79 (OPA 79) to the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012), as amended, is to redesignate the lands municipally known as 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street in the City of Cambridge and Regional Municipality of Waterloo from from 'Business Industrial' to 'High-Density Residential' with Site-Specific Policy 8.10.115 to permit a maximum of 1,215 residential units and a maximum building height of up to 19 storeys.
Amendment No. 79 to the City of Cambridge Official Plan

1. Chapter 14 Map 2 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan is hereby amended by redesignating the Lands from 'Business Industrial' to 'High-Density Residential' as shown on Schedule 'A' attached hereto;

2. Chapter 14 Map 2A of the City of Cambridge Official Plan is hereby amended by adding Site-Specific 115 as shown on Schedule 'B' attached hereto;

3. Chapter 16 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan is hereby amended by adding Figure 115 as shown on Schedule 'C' attached hereto;

4. Section 8.10 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan is hereby amended by adding the following subsection thereto:

8.10.115  777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street

1. Notwithstanding policy 2.8.3.3 of this plan, for the Lands shown on Figure 115 on Schedule C attached hereto, the following site-specific policies shall apply:

   a. The maximum building height shall be 19 storeys and the implementing zoning by-law shall include further restrictions on height and setbacks for buildings.

   b. A minimum and maximum Floor Space Index (FSI) shall not apply.

   c. A maximum of 1,215 residential units shall be permitted.

2. As part of future Site Plan application, the following will be required:

   a. The submission of an affidavit and a report from a Professional Engineer licensed to practice in the Province of Ontario that demonstrates that the proposed development has been designed in accordance with the Railway Association of Canada’s “Guideline for New Development in Proximity to Railway Operations” (Dialog & J.E. Coulter Associated Limited, May 2013), to the satisfaction of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and the City of Cambridge.

3. The implementing zoning by-law shall apply a holding (H) to the Lands to limit the development and/or site alteration until such time as:
a. A Record of Site Condition (RSC) in accordance with O. Reg. 153/04, as amended, has been filed with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks, and a Ministry Acknowledgement Letter has been provided to the satisfaction of the City of Cambridge and the Region of Waterloo.

b. Detailed transportation and stationary noise impact studies are completed to the satisfaction of the City of Cambridge and the Region of Waterloo.
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

BY-LAW 24-059

Being a By-law to amend Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended with respect to land municipally known as 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street North

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

WHEREAS this by-law conforms to the City of Cambridge Official Plan, as amended;

AND WHEREAS Council deems that adequate public notice of the public meeting was provided and adequate information regarding this amendment was presented at the Public Meeting held September 5, 2023, and that a further public meeting is not considered necessary in order to proceed with this Amendment.

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

1. **THAT** this by-law shall apply to lands municipally addressed as 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street North and legally described as Plan 716, Lot 216, Part of Lot 217, Plan 533, Part of Lot 3 to Part of Lot 6, RP58R9554, Parts 1 to 5, City of Cambridge, Regional Municipality of Waterloo, as shown outlined in heavy black on Schedule ‘A’ attached hereto and forming part of this by-law;

2. **THAT** Schedule ‘A’ to the City of Cambridge By-law 150-85, as amended, is hereby amended by changing the zoning classification of the lands shown outlined in heavy black in the attached Schedule ‘A’ to this by-law from General Industrial - M3 to Multiple Residential – (H) RM3 s.4.1.477;

3. **THAT** the aforesaid City of Cambridge Zoning By-law No. 150-85, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding the following subsection under section 4.1 thereof: “4.1.477 – 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street"

   1. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 1.2.2.1, 2.2.3 and 3.1.2.4 of this by-law, the following regulations shall apply to the lands in that RM3 zone classification to which parenthetical reference “s.4.1.477” is made on Schedule ‘A’ attached and forming part of the by-law:

      a) The maximum density per net residential hectare shall be 385 units per hectare with a maximum of 1,215 residential units.
      b) A maximum building height of up to 7 storeys shall be permitted on the subject lands in accordance with the minimum front, rear, interior and exterior side yard setbacks permitted in the RM3 zone.
      c) A maximum building height of 8 storeys shall be permitted on the subject lands, provided a minimum setback of 10 metres from the front lot line abutting Laurel Street is provided.
d) A maximum building height of 9 to 15 storeys shall be permitted on the subject lands, provided a minimum setback of 10 metres from the exterior lot line abutting Dolph Street North is provided and a minimum setback of 30 metres from the front lot line abutting Laurel Street is provided.

e) A maximum building height of 16 to 19 storeys shall be permitted, provided a minimum setback of 30 metres from the exterior lot line abutting Dolph Street North is provided and a minimum setback of 36 metres from the front line abutting Laurel Street is provided.

f) A minimum 30 metre setback from the rear lot line abutting the Canadian Pacific Railway shall be provided, or a 15 metre horizontal and 15 metre vertical setback, subject to Section 3 of the Railway Association of Canada’s “Guideline for New Development in Proximity to Railway Operations” (Dialog & J.E. Coulter Associated Limited, May 2013).

g) The front lot line shall be all lot lines abutting Laurel Street.

h) The rear lot line shall be all lot lines abutting the Canadian Pacific Railway.

i) The exterior side lot line shall be the lot line abutting Dolph Street North.

j) All other lot lines shall be the interior side lot line.

k) A minimum required amenity area of 15 square metres per unit shall be provided, which shall include both private and common amenity area.

l) Parking shall be provided at a total minimum rate of 1.15 spaces per unit, which includes 1.0 parking spaces per residential unit, and 0.15 parking spaces per unit for visitors.

m) The minimum required width of a parking stall, not including barrier-free stalls, shall be 2.75 metres.

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

2. Notwithstanding the (H) Prefix Zone holding provisions as outlined in S.2.1.4 of the aforesaid City of Cambridge Zoning By-law, as amended, the removal of the (H) Holding Provision for the entirety of the lands zoned (H)RM3 S.4.1.477 may only be lifted upon submission of the following:
a) Record of Site Condition (RSC) in accordance with O. Reg. 153/04, as amended, that has been filed with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks, and Ministry Acknowledgement Letter to the satisfaction of the City of Cambridge and the Region of Waterloo; and,

b) A detailed Transportation and Stationary Noise Study has been completed and mitigation measures addressed to the satisfaction of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo. The detailed stationary noise study shall review the potential impacts of noise (e.g. HVAC systems) on the sensitive points of reception and the impacts of the development on the adjacent noise sensitive uses.

4. AND THAT this by-law shall come into force and effect on the date it is enacted subject to Official Plan Amendment No. 79 coming into effect pursuant to Subsection 24(2) of the Planning Act, R.S.O., 1990, c. P. 13, as amended.

ENACTED AND PASSED this 25th day of June 2024

________________________________
MAYOR

________________________________
CLERK
Schedule ‘A’

This is Schedule A attached to and forming part of By-law 24-059
Purpose and Effect of By-law No. 24-059

The purpose and effect of this by-law is to amend the zoning classification of the lands legally described and legally described as Plan 716, Lot 216, Part of Lot 217, Plan 533, Part of Lot 3 to Part of Lot 6, RP58R9554, Parts 1 to 5, City of Cambridge, Regional Municipality of Waterloo from General Industrial - M3 to the Multiple Residential - RM3 s.4.1.477 to facilitate a residential apartment development with site specific provisions for a maximum of 1,215 units.
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

BY-LAW 24-064

Being a by-law to amend By-law 21-065a, respecting the authorization of issuance of debentures for the rehabilitation of existing assets and construction of new assets contained in the Capital Funding Program (N. Cambridge Railway Grade Separation, Preston Auditorium Construction, Fountain Street Soccer Facility and East Side NS Collector Road Design)

WHEREAS the Corporation of the City of Cambridge (the "City") enacted By-law 21-065a amended by By-law 22-039 for the rehabilitation of existing assets and the construction of new assets for the City as identified in the City's capital program for the capital projects of: North Cambridge Railway Grade Separation, Preston Auditorium Construction, Fountain Street Soccer Facility Construction, East Side NS Collector Road Design (Allendale to Middle Block), and debenture monies to pay for the costs thereof at an amended estimated cost of $46,483,095;

AND WHEREAS the cost estimate of the aforementioned projects has further increased;

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

1. THAT By-law 21-065a is hereby amended as follows:
   a. Delete and replace the estimated cost of $46,483,095 in section 1, section 3, and in subsection 3.a. with a revised estimated cost of $47,937,115;

2. AND THAT this by-law shall come into force and effect on the day it is passed.

ENACTED AND PASSED this 25th day of June 2024

________________________________
MAYOR

________________________________
CLERK
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THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

BY-LAW 24-065

Being a by-law to designate the stone building on the property located
at 201 Water Street South as a property of cultural heritage value

WHEREAS the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990 Chapter O.18 authorizes the Council of a
municipality to enact by-laws to designate real property including all buildings and structures thereon,
to be of cultural value or interest;

AND WHEREAS the Notice of Intention to Designate the stone building at 201 Water Street South,
Cambridge, Ontario, has been duly published and served,

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

1. THAT the lands described in Schedule “A”, municipally known as 201 Water Street South,
Cambridge, Ontario be designated (the “Property”) to be of cultural heritage value. The
reasons for designation are as set out in Schedule “B”;

2. THAT the City of Cambridge is hereby authorized to serve a copy of this by-law to the owner of
the Property and the Ontario Heritage Trust and to cause notice of this by-law to be published
in a newspaper having general circulation in the City of Cambridge.

3. AND THAT it is Acknowledged and Directed that the City Solicitor, or their designate, be
authorized to register electronically any and all documents in connection with this transaction.

ENACTED AND PASSED this 25th day of June 2024

________________________________
MAYOR

________________________________
CLERK
BY-LAW 24-065

of the

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Being comprised of the stone building at 201 Water Street South described as
PT SUBDIVISION LT 2 CON 10 EGR NORTH DUMFRIES PT 1, 67R2799; CAMBRIDGE
The stone building on the subject property, 201 Water Street South, is designated because of its cultural heritage value.

Description of Historic Place

The stone building is located on the subject property at 201 Water Street South, Cambridge, Ontario. The legal description of the stone building is Part of Subdivision Lot 2, Concession 10 East of the Grand River, former Geographic Township of North Dumfries; City of Cambridge. The property is east of the Grand River and the City of Kitchener.

Summary of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

The stone building at 201 Water Street South was built by Scottish immigrants Jared Swan (1796-1877) and his wife Jean Griev (1793-1882) who arrived in Galt in 1832 with their two grown daughters and one son in law. The Swans bought the land at 201 Water Street South from William Dickson and lived in a log cabin on site while they constructed their home. The stone building consists of two separate sections that were built in two stages over a span of about 30 years. The storey and a half addition at the rear is believed to have been the first structure built by the Swans in approximately 1835. Between 1860 and 1865 it is believed that the two storey, Italianate four square, stone addition was built onto the original stone structure. This Italianate structure became the main part of the house, where the front entrance currently is.

The couple farmed the property until Jared’s death in 1877. Jean then sold the property to George Hay in 1879 and passed away in 1882. Jared and Jean are buried together at Mountview Cemetery beside lifelong friends who they grew up with in Scotland and with whom they emigrated to Galt.

Description of Heritage Attributes

Key heritage attributes that embody the architectural value of Soper Park include:

- Both bay windows with copper roofs on the front façade of the Italianate portion of the residence;
- The front façade portico;
- The central gable on the front façade of the Italianate addition;
- The l’oeil de boeuf, or ox eye, window on the front façade central gable peak;
- All cornices and deep eves on the front façade;
- All return eves on all elevations;
- All roof pitches on each elevation of the stone portions;
- All symmetrical façades;
- The rubblestone foundations;
- The stone construction materials including quoins;
- The stained-glass side lights and a transom; around the front façade entrance including the name “Carol Bank” plus the depictions of birds;
- All window openings on the stone portions of the stone residence; and
- All voussoirs, lintels and sills of the stone residence.

The property’s heritage designation does not extend to any interior features and is not intended to prevent the careful adaptive reuse of the building.
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 25th day of June 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 25th day of June 2024

_________________________________  
MAYOR

_________________________________  
CLERK