Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Planning and Works Committee
Consolidated
Agenda
Tuesday, June 19, 2018
9:00 a.m.
Regional Council Chamber
150 Frederick Street, Kitchener, Ontario

* Denotes item(s) not part of original agenda

1. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest under the “Municipal Conflict Of Interest Act”

2. Delegations

2.1 Craig Robson re: PDL-CPL-18-28/COR-TRY-18-61, Brownfields Financial Incentives Program – Tax Increment Grant Application – 1011 Homer Watson Boulevard, City of Kitchener

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions regarding the property municipally known as 1011 Homer Watson Boulevard in the City of Kitchener, as described in Report PDL-CPL-18-28/COR-TRY-18-61 dated June 19, 2018:

a) Approve a joint Tax Increment Grant with the Regional amount not to exceed $5,321,422 net of any other future brownfield assistance, to be financed from the incremental tax revenue for the property following remediation, phased redevelopment and reassessment; and

Should you require an alternative format please contact the Regional Clerk at Tel.: 519-575-4400, TTY: 519-575-4605, or regionalclerk@regionofwaterloo.ca
b) Provide a Tax Increment Grant subject to the phased redevelopment of the property; and,

c) Authorize the Region’s Commissioner of Planning, Development and Legislative Services and Commissioner of Corporate Services/Chief Financial Officer to execute any associated agreements with the registered owner of 1011 Homer Watson Boulevard and the City of Kitchener, with the form and content of such agreement(s) to be satisfactory to both the Regional and City of Kitchener Solicitors.

2.2 TES-RTS-18-06, Stage 2 ION: LRT from Kitchener to Cambridge – Preferred Route (Staff Presentation)*

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo endorse the Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route (2018) as displayed in Attachment 1 as the preferred route for Stage 2 ION: LRT from Kitchener to Cambridge as shown in Report TES-RTS-18-06 dated June 19, 2018; and,

That the Region of Waterloo increase the contract with WSP Canada Group Limited by $967,243.71 plus applicable taxes for a revised total of $2,830,030.55 to cover the amended project scope requested.

i. Lee Ann Mitchell & Terry Mycyk

*ii. Jordan Menard

*2.3 PDL-CPL-18-30, Recommendation for Proposed Amendment to the Regional Official Plan (East Side Lands – Stage 2) (Staff presentation)

Recommendation

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains (December 2017) and Addendum to the Subwatershed Study (March 2018) (WSP) pursuant to Regional Official Plan policy 7.6.6 to the extent that it addresses matters of Regional interest; and

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo adopt the proposed amendment to the Regional Official Plan with respect to lands in the northern part of the City of Cambridge and the southern part of the Township of Woolwich, as set out in...
Attachment ‘4’; and

That Regional staff be directed to prepare the implementing by-law for the proposed amendment to the Regional Official Plan as set out in Attachment ‘4’

*i. Steve Omelia, Miller Thomson

*2.4 Dave Aston, MHBC Planning, re: TES-DCS-18-12, Class Environmental Assessment Study – Erb Street Improvements, Fischer-Hallman Road to Wilmot Line, City of Waterloo

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Class Environmental Assessment for Erb Street Improvements, from Fischer-Hallman Road to Wilmot Line, in the City of Waterloo:

a) Approve the Recommended Design Alternative for the proposed construction and widening of Erb Street from Fischer-Hallman Road to Wilmot Line as described in Report TES-DCS-18-12 dated June 19, 2018.

b) Direct staff to file a Notice of Completion as required by the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment and place the Environmental Study Report on the public record for review for a period of 30 days.

c) Amend Traffic and Parking By-law 16-023, as amended, upon completion of construction to add to Schedule 22, Reserved Cycling Lanes on the north side of Erb Street (Regional Road 9) from Fischer-Hallman Road to Ira Needles Boulevard in the City of Waterloo.

d) Amend Traffic and Parking By-law 16-023, as amended, upon completion of construction to add to Schedule 22, Reserved Cycling Lanes on the south side of Erb Street (Regional Road 9) from Fischer-Hallman Road to Ira Needles Boulevard in the City of Waterloo.

**Consent Agenda Items**

Items on the Consent Agenda can be approved in one motion of Committee to save time. Prior to the motion being voted on, any member of Committee may request that one or more of the items be removed from the Consent Agenda and voted on separately.

3. Request to Remove Items from Consent Agenda

4. Motion to Approve Items or Receive for Information
Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-law 16-023, as amended, upon completion of construction of the roundabout at the intersection of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) and Ament Line (Regional Road 17) to:

- a) Add to Schedule 10, Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover, Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) at Ament Line (Regional Road 17), on All Entry and Exits;

- b) Remove from Schedule 17, Maximum Speed of 80 km/h on Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) between Ament Line (Regional Road 17) and 450m North of Sunset Drive;

- c) Remove from Schedule 17, Maximum Speed of 80 km/h on Ament Line / Hawkesville Road (Regional Road 17) between 715 m East of Manser Road (Regional Road 5) and 450m West of Northside Drive (St. Jacobs);

- d) Add to Schedule 17, Maximum Speed of 80 km/h on Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) between 400m South of Ament Line to 450 m North of Sunset Drive;

- e) Add to Schedule 17, Maximum Speed of 60 km/h on Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) between Ament Line (Regional Road 17) to 400m South of Ament Line;

- f) Add to Schedule 17, Maximum Speed of 80 km/h on Ament Line / Hawkesville Road (Regional Road 17) between 715 m East of Manser Road (Regional Road 5) and 400m West of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10);

- g) Add to Schedule 17, Maximum Speed of 60 km/h on Ament Line / Hawkesville between 400 m West of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) and 400m East of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10); and

- h) Add to Schedule 17, Maximum Speed of 80 km/h on Ament Line / Hawkesville Road (Regional Road 17) 400m East of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) and 450m West of Northside Drive (St. Jacobs).
4.2 **TES-RTS-18-05**, Hespeler Road Grade Separation Reserved Bus Lane – Traffic and Parking By-law Amendments

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-law 16-023, as amended, to:

a) Remove from Schedule 4, No Stopping Anytime on both sides of Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) from Highway 401 to Avenue Road;

b) Add to Schedule 4, No Stopping Anytime on both sides of Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) from Highway 401 to Coronation Boulevard/Dundas Street (Regional Road 8);

c) Add to Schedule 15, Southbound Right-Turn Lane Designation on Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) at Jaffray Street, Buses Excepted;

d) Add to Schedule 15, Southbound Right-Turn Lane Designation on Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) at Coronation Boulevard (Regional Road 8), Buses Excepted; and,

e) Add to Schedule 24, Reserved Bus Lane, anytime, west side of Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) from Jaffray Street to 170m south of Jaffray Street;

In the City of Cambridge, as outlined in Report TES-RTS-18-05 dated June 19, 2018.

4.3 **TES-TRP-18-07**, Proposed Relocation of Intersection Pedestrian Signal (IPS) – Bridgeport Road (Regional Road 9), in the City of Waterloo

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo relocate the existing intersection pedestrian signal from the current location at the Bridgeport Road (Regional Road 9) Peppler Street intersection to a new location approximately 130 metres to the east on Bridgeport Road at the Laurel Creek Trail crossing, as outlined in Report TES-TRP-18-07 dated June 19, 2018.
4.4 **TES-TRP-18-08**, Proposed Level 2 Crossover on Cedar Street (Regional Road 97) at the Westgate Plaza Entrance, in the City of Cambridge, and on Nafziger Road (Regional Road 5) at Maple Leaf Street, in the Township of Wellesley

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend the Region’s Traffic and Parking By-law 16-023, as amended, to add the following to Schedule 10:

- A Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover on Cedar Street (Regional Road 97) at the east entrance to Westgate Plaza (east approach), in the City of Cambridge, and
- A Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover on Nafziger Road (Regional Road 5) at Maple Leaf Street (north approach), in the Township of Wellesley; as outlined in Report TES-TRP-18-08, dated June 19, 2018.

4.5 **TES-WAS-18-14**, Cambridge East Water Supply Class Environmental Assessment: Notice of Completion

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the “Cambridge Water Supply Class Environmental Assessment Project Report” summarized in this Report TES-WAS-18-14 dated June 19, 2018;

And that the Regional Municipality of Waterloo publish the Notice of Completion for the Project File Report and make the report available for public review and comment for a 30-day period, in accordance with the Municipal Engineers Association’s Class Environmental Assessment process.

4.6 **Bleams Road Improvements** Strasburg Road to Fischer-Hallman Road City of Kitchener Public Consultation Centre #1 Information Package (Information)
5.1 **TES-TRP-18-09.1**, Moving Forward (Transportation Master Plan Update) – Recommended Plan Additional Information

**Recommendation:**


5.2 **TES-TRS-18-17**, Pilot Transit Service Proposal in Elmira

**Recommendation:**

That the Region of Waterloo permit Kiwanis Transit and the Township of Woolwich to operate a community circulator transit service as a pilot project from September 4, 2018 to March 1, 2019, subject to sufficient funding being provided by Kiwanis Transit and the Township of Woolwich, as described in report TES-TRS-18-17 dated June 19, 2018.

5.3 **TES-WAS-18-13**, Hidden Valley Intake Operating Protocol Redevelopment with Expert Panel

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a Consulting Services Agreement with C3 Water Inc. to provide consulting engineering services for undertaking the review and updating of the Hidden Valley Low Lift (HVLL) Intake Operating Protocol, at an upset limit of $242,058 plus applicable taxes.

6. Reports – Planning, Development and Legislative Services


**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions regarding the property municipally known as 181 King Street South in the City of Waterloo, as described in Report PDL-CPL-18-29/COR-TRY-18-62 dated June 19, 2018:

a) Approve a joint Tax Increment Grant with the Regional amount not to exceed 2751939
$1,064,487 net of any other future brownfield assistance, to be financed from the incremental tax revenue for the property following remediation, redevelopment and reassessment;

b) Provide a Tax Increment Grant subject to the redevelopment of the property;

and

c) Authorize the Region’s Commissioner of Planning, Development and Legislative Services and Commissioner, Corporate Services / Chief Financial Officer to execute any associated agreements with the registered owner of 181 King Street South and the City of Waterloo, with the form and content of such agreement(s) to be satisfactory to both the Regional and City of Waterloo Solicitors.

7. Information/Correspondence

7.1 Council Enquiries and Requests for Information – No Items Pending

8. Other Business

*8.1 Jon Arsenault re: Ontario Municipal Waste Association (MWA) Awards to the Region of Waterloo, Waste Management Division: Gold Award for Best Calendar and Gold Award for Best Campaign

9. Next Meeting – August 14, 2018

10. Adjourn
### Upcoming Public Consultation Event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, June 26, 2018</td>
<td>5:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Bleams Road Improvements Strasburg Road to Fischer-Hallman Road</td>
<td>Country Hills Community Centre, Room 2, 110 Rittenhouse Road, Kitchener, ON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

Date: June 19, 2018      File Code: F25-20

Subject: Brownfields Financial Incentives Program – Tax Increment Grant Application – 1011 Homer Watson Boulevard, City of Kitchener

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions regarding the property municipally known as 1011 Homer Watson Boulevard in the City of Kitchener, as described in Report PDL-CPL-18-28/COR-TRY-18-61 dated June 19, 2018:

a) Approve a joint Tax Increment Grant with the Regional amount not to exceed $5,321,422 net of any other future brownfield assistance, to be financed from the incremental tax revenue for the property following remediation, phased redevelopment and reassessment; and

b) Provide a Tax Increment Grant subject to the phased redevelopment of the property; and,

c) Authorize the Region’s Commissioner of Planning, Development and Legislative Services and Commissioner of Corporate Services/Chief Financial Officer to execute any associated agreements with the registered owner of 1011 Homer Watson Boulevard and the City of Kitchener, with the form and content of such agreement(s) to be satisfactory to both the Regional and City of Kitchener Solicitors.
Summary:

The Region of Waterloo has received a Tax Increment Grant (TIG) application for the remediation and redevelopment of 1011 Homer Watson Boulevard in Kitchener, the former Kitchener Frame site. Please see Attachment A for a reference map.

The remediation and redevelopment of the former Kitchener Frame site supports the Region’s intensification and environmental sustainability objectives. The Applicant is subdividing the property into eleven development blocks ranging in size from 1.3 hectares (3.2 acres) to 10 hectares (25 acres) for a total of 27 developable hectares (67.5 acres). The property is to be redeveloped with a mix of retail, office and industrial uses.

If approved, this TIG would represent the seventh successful joint TIG application in Kitchener with approved grants contributing to the development of approximately 1,549 residential units, over 55700 square metres (600,000 square feet) of office and retail space, and an estimated total current value assessment increase of $528,891,272.

Based on a detailed assessment of the remediation information and invoices provided, a total of $7,787,000 in direct remediation costs are considered eligible for this TIG. With a 10 per cent allowance for incidental costs afforded under the TIG ($778,700), the maximum potential TIG (before deductions for brownfield financial assistance) is $8,565,700. Remediation of the site is complete and no other brownfield financial assistance is pending for this application.

The TIG would be cost-shared between the Region and the City of Kitchener with grant proportions determined by each municipality’s share of the municipal taxes levied on the property in the year the application was submitted (2015). Property taxes in 2015 determine that approximately 62.1% (maximum of $5,321,422) of the TIG would be provided by the Region and the remaining 37.9% (maximum of $3,244,275) would be provided by the City of Kitchener. The Region’s portion of the joint TIG would be funded from the incremental tax revenue following the phased redevelopment of the property.

The Region’s total liability for making grant payments will be the lesser of the amount approved by Regional Council through this report, the final net eligible remediation costs incurred by the Applicant, or 10 years of the final annual tax increment, which is determined following MPAC’s reassessment of the property.

The Applicant has requested an eleven phase TIG, to accommodate the eleven development blocks within the subdivision. Annual payments are expected to last between two and seven years for each phase and payments for the first phase could start as early as 2021.

City of Kitchener Council approved the joint TIG application on May 7, 2018.
Background – Tax Increment Grant

The Regional Brownfield Financial Incentive Program (BFIP) has been operational for over 10 years. The BFIP program has consisted of three forms of financial assistance for the development community:

- Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Grant (now discontinued)
- Regional Development Charge (RDC) exemption
- Joint Tax Increment Grant (TIG) – The joint TIG program is offered in Area Municipalities where Community Improvement Plans (CIP) have been approved for the purposes of encouraging brownfield remediation and redevelopment (currently in the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener, and Waterloo).

The joint TIG program assists with the cost of remediating brownfield sites. Applicants must meet a number of eligibility criteria and the approved TIG is not paid until after remediation, redevelopment and reassessment of the property. The actual amount of the TIG is the lesser of:

- The Council approved maximum total potential TIG established when the application is approved;
- The final actual net remediation costs (final allowable costs net of all other brownfield assistance); or
- Ten years of tax increment payments (the final annual tax increment multiplied by 10)

1011 Homer Watson Boulevard Application

In May 2015, the Region of Waterloo received a Tax Increment Grant (TIG) application from 1869071 Ontario Inc. (the Applicant) for the remediation and redevelopment of 1011 Homer Watson Boulevard in Kitchener. This property is the former Kitchener Frame site (please see location map in Attachment A). The 27 hectare (67.5 acres) property is a former heavy industrial property that was used for automotive manufacturing.

Located on the south-east corner of the intersection of Bleams Road and Homer Watson Boulevard, the redevelopment of 1011 Homer Watson Boulevard supports the Region’s intensification and environmental sustainability objectives. A new subdivision development that will include a mix of retail (1 block of 10 hectares/ 25 acres), office (1 block of 1.5 hectares/ 3.7 acres) and industrial uses (9 blocks totaling 15.7 hectares/38.8 acres) are planned for this former brownfield site.
Environmental Remediation and Accepted Costs

Phase One and Phase Two Environmental Site Assessments confirmed the presence of several contaminants, including petroleum hydrocarbons, volatile organic compounds, metals, polychlorinated biphenyls and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in the soil and ground water at levels exceeding Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change standards. The site has been fully remediated and a Record of Site Condition has been filed.

City of Kitchener and Regional staff have conducted a detailed review of the Remedial Work Plan for the site, all subsequent soil testing and disposal work, as well as all submitted invoices. Based on this review, a total of $7,787,000 in direct remediation costs are accepted as eligible remediation costs for the site. This amount plus a 10 percent allowance for indirect costs afforded under the joint TIG program ($778,700), results in a net maximum eligible joint TIG of $8,565,700.

At the time of this report, the applicant has not submitted a Regional Development Charge (RDC) Exemption application under the Brownfield Financial Incentive Program, but the opportunity to apply for assistance under this program does exist. If the Region receives an RDC Exemption application, the amount of any exemption provided under that program is subtracted from the total amount of the TIG, on a block by block basis. The impact of a successful RDC Exemption will result in a lower maximum eligible TIG and ultimately, lower the TIG payments for both the City and Region. Region staff will advise if an RDC Exemption application is submitted and deemed acceptable and this amount will be deducted as other brownfield financial assistance.

No other brownfield financial assistance is pending for this application. Please see Attachment B for detailed illustration of the tax increment grant calculations and methodology, and Attachment C for a summary of the joint TIG review process.

Joint TIG Calculations and Payment Schedule

The estimated payment schedule for the joint TIG is based on the following information:

- The Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC) assessment value of the property before remediation and redevelopment;
- An MPAC estimate of the assessed value of the property after remediation and redevelopment;
  - The estimated increase in Regional and City taxes (tax increment) based on the difference between the ‘before’ and ‘after’ assessed value of the site; and
- An estimated total net eligible remediation costs (including a 10 per cent allowance for indirect remediation costs) less any other government financial assistance received.
The joint TIG is paid to the Applicant on an annual basis for a maximum of 10 years, or until the net eligible remediation costs have been recovered or the Council approved maximum has been paid, whichever comes first.

In the case of 1011 Homer Watson Boulevard, the final net eligible remediation costs are known and were used to calculate the proposed joint TIG and are included in the Recommendation. The joint TIG is cost-shared between the Region and the City of Kitchener, with grant proportions determined by each municipality’s share of the municipal taxes levied on the property in the year the application was submitted (2015).

Property taxes in 2015 determine that approximately 62.1% (maximum of $5,321,422) of the TIG would be provided by the Region and the remaining 37.9% (maximum of $3,244,275) would be provided by the City of Kitchener.

The Applicant has requested an eleven phase TIG, to accommodate the eleven development blocks within the subdivision. Depending on the final MPAC assessment of each phase, it is estimated that annual TIG payments would last between two and seven years per phase. TIG payments for the first phase could start as early as 2021.

The joint TIG program permits phasing plans of up to 10 years.

**Joint TIG Calculations**

Table 1 (below) shows how joint TIGs are calculated. It summarizes the estimated tax increment for 1011 Homer Watson Boulevard, as well as the eligible TIG amount based on the net remediation costs of this application. The lesser of these values ($3,244,278 for the City; $5,321,422 for the Region; and a total of $8,565,700 combined) is highlighted. These calculations indicate that, if approved, eligible remediation costs will be paid back in a relatively short amount of time, given the significant tax increment available.

**Table 1 – Joint TIG Calculations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Tax Increment</th>
<th>Eligible Remediation Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Total (10 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kitchener</td>
<td>$773,953</td>
<td>$7,739,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td>$1,269,471</td>
<td>$12,694,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total TIG</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,043,424</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,434,240</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estimated TIG Payment Schedule

Table 2 (below) provides an estimated payment schedule including all eleven redevelopment phases of 1011 Homer Watson Boulevard. The final payment schedule is not confirmed until each phase is complete and reassessed by MPAC. The Region's share of the TIG would be capped at capped at $5,321,422, as highlighted.

Table 2 – Estimated TIG Payment Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total TIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$773,953</td>
<td>$1,269,471</td>
<td>$2,043,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$697,985</td>
<td>$1,144,867</td>
<td>$1,842,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$645,809</td>
<td>$1,059,284</td>
<td>$1,705,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$494,825</td>
<td>$811,636</td>
<td>$1,306,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$308,168</td>
<td>$505,472</td>
<td>$813,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$308,168</td>
<td>$505,472</td>
<td>$813,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$15,370</td>
<td>$25,200</td>
<td>$40,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TIG</td>
<td>$3,244,278</td>
<td>$5,321,422</td>
<td>$8,565,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This TIG payment schedule assumes that redevelopment will occur in a single phase. Actual timing and amount of TIG payments may differ.

Impact of the Joint TIG Program in Kitchener

The infusion of private investment in the redevelopment of brownfield properties which is supported by the BFIP is helping to ensure the efficient use of existing infrastructure, as well as helping to achieve the Region’s broader economic development and land use planning objectives.

If approved, this TIG would represent the seventh successful joint TIG application in Kitchener with approved grants contributing to the development of approximately 1,549 residential units, over 600,000 square feet of office and retail space, and an estimated total current value assessment increase of $528,891,272.
Once 1011 Homer Watson Boulevard is complete, MPAC estimates it will have a total assessed value of $111,474,873 compared to $8,000,000 in 2015. Figure 1 (below) illustrates the projected changes to the Region’s share of the tax increment on 1011 Homer Watson Boulevard compared to projected Regional TIG payments.

Figure 1 – Comparison between Annual TIG Payments and Projected Annual Tax Increment for 1011 Homer Watson Boulevard

Next Step – Executing an Interim Tri-Partite Agreement

As a condition of approval under the joint TIG program, an interim Tri-Partite Remediation and Redevelopment Agreement (“Agreements”) for each phase of the development is required between the Applicant, the Region of Waterloo, and the City of Kitchener. These Agreements establish a number of conditions including, but not limited to, the following:

- The owner must pay all property taxes levied upon the property during remediation and redevelopment (failure to pay and keep in good standing all municipal property taxes will deem the owner in default);
- The owner must submit a Record of Site Condition, prepared by a Qualified Person to the Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change and have it be accepted and registered on title; and
- The owner must demonstrate that the remediation and redevelopment of the site has resulted in a minimum $100,000 increase in the assessed value of the property.
In the case of 1011 Homer Watson Boulevard, once the redevelopment and assessment of each phase is complete and verified, the executed interim Agreements for each phase will be finalized and have a new payment schedule inserted into them as "New Schedules". These New Schedules will include the final TIG payment schedules based on the actual remediation costs and the actual reassessment value of the redeveloped property as determined by MPAC.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

City of Kitchener and Regional staff have jointly reviewed the application and are satisfied that the application meets the eligibility and application requirements. City of Kitchener Council approved the joint TIG application on May 7, 2018. City staff also received a draft copy of this report on May 16, 2018 and they concur with its recommendations.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

The TIG recommended for the Homer Watson site is consistent with the 2015-2018 Corporate Strategic Focus, which directs the Region to: Improve environmental sustainability and livability in intensifying urban and rural settlement areas (Strategic Objective 3.6).

**Financial Implications:**

If approved, the Region’s share of the joint TIG for 1011 Homer Watson Boulevard is capped at $5,321,422. The final TIG payment schedule will be determined when the redevelopment phases are reassessed by MPAC.

Under the funding model for joint TIGs adopted by Regional Council in 2013, the annual TIG payments would be funded from the increased tax revenue on the property occurring in the same year. In other words, the tax revenue resulting from the increased assessment following the redevelopment of a brownfield property is used to fund the annual TIG payment. TIG payments for the first phase of development are expected to commence in 2021. It is expected that the remaining phases will be paid over a seven year period. Once the TIG is fully paid, the increased assessment resulting from the redevelopment would benefit the overall tax levy.

A listing of approved TIGs and the applicable funding sources, as approved in the 2018 capital budget and 2019 – 2027 capital forecast, is attached as Attachment D. Subject to Council’s approval, this TIG will be reflected in the Region’s 2019-2028 capital plan. The current TIG payment schedule is based on development occurring in one phase however, the actual timing and amount of TIG payments will depend on the phasing of development. The first TIG payment is not expected to impact the tax levy until 2021. Staff will be reviewing the timing of the TIG payments as part of the development of the 2019 and subsequent year’s budgets and will make any necessary adjustments.
Regional Council recently approved a TIG for 1 Adam Street in Kitchener (June 6, 2018). Approval for two additional TIGS, 1011 Homer Watson Blvd. and 181 King Street South (also included in the June 19th Planning and Works agenda) are pending. The following table shows the cumulative impact of these three tax levy funded tax increment grants.

Cumulative Impact of Recently Approved and Pending Tax Levy Funded TIGS ($ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024-2028</th>
<th>10 Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved 1 Adam St.</td>
<td>$0.379</td>
<td>$0.707</td>
<td>$0.420</td>
<td>$0.600</td>
<td>$0.379</td>
<td>$0.698</td>
<td>$3.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending 1011 Homer Watson*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.269</td>
<td>$1.145</td>
<td>$1.059</td>
<td>$1.848</td>
<td>$5.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending 181 King St. **</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0.379</td>
<td>$0.896</td>
<td>$1.689</td>
<td>$1.745</td>
<td>$1.438</td>
<td>$2.546</td>
<td>$8.693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* preliminary – final payment stream will depend on phasing
** assumes future brownfield assistance is paid

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from Planning, Finance, Economic Development and Legal Services was involved in the review of the joint TIG application and the preparation of this report, and are in support of the staff recommendation.

Attachments:

Attachment A – 1011 Homer Watson Boulevard Location Map
Attachment B – Detailed TIG Calculation Methodology - Illustration
Attachment C – Joint TIG Application Review Process
Attachment D – Listing of Approved TIGS and Funding Sources (2018 Capital Budget)

Prepared By: Carolyn Crozier, Principal Planner, Community Planning

Angela Hinchberger, Director, Treasury Services/Deputy Treasurer

Approved By: Rod Regier, Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services

Craig Dyer, Commissioner, Corporate Services/Chief Financial Officer
Attachment A – 1011 Homer Watson Location Map

Subject lands at 1011 Homer Watson Boulevard
Attachment B – Detailed Joint TIG Calculation Methodology - Illustration

This methodology is outlined as an illustration only and is not related to any specific application. The anticipated joint Tax Increment Grant payments and schedule are determined for each application based on the following steps:

The first step includes a calculation of the anticipated assessment increment. This is based on the pre-remediation MPAC assessment value(s) and the estimated post-remediation and redevelopment assessment value(s) for each phase of development as provided by the Applicant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Value “Pre”</th>
<th>Assessment Value “Post”*</th>
<th>Assessment Increment*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$942,750 (2013)</td>
<td>$62,900,000 (est.)</td>
<td>$61,957,250 (est.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These values are for illustration purposes and are based on estimates and will be confirmed by MPAC upon project completion.

The anticipated assessment increment is then used to calculate the expected increase in municipal taxes (Region and City) that would be generated by the remediation and redevelopment for each phase, referred to as the ‘tax increment’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Municipal Taxes “Pre”*</th>
<th>Municipal Taxes “Post”*</th>
<th>Total Tax Increment*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>$7,210</td>
<td>$252,757</td>
<td>$245,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>$11,542</td>
<td>$404,650</td>
<td>$393,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$18,752</td>
<td>$657,407</td>
<td>$638,656</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tax amounts do not include the education portion of annual taxes levied and are rounded to the nearest dollar. For illustration purposes only.

The final step is to determine the estimated total eligible remediation costs for the joint TIG program which includes a 10% allowance for indirect remediation costs to be added to the eligible remediation cost estimates. This total is then reduced by an amount equal to any other government brownfield remediation financial assistance received for the project. At this time, no other assistance is applicable to this application.
Estimated Rem. Costs | Indirect Rem. Allowance (10%) | Less Other Assistance | Total Eligible Rem. Costs Through TIG*
---|---|---|---
$2,672,646 | $267,265 | N/A | $2,939,911

* Rounded to the nearest dollar.

These steps culminate in the maximum eligible joint TIG for this application which is then cost shared between the Region and City based on the proportion of each municipality’s share of the municipal taxes levied on the property. The following table summarizes the maximum joint TIG and estimates of the Regional and City financial commitments for this illustration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum TIG*</th>
<th>Maximum Regional Portion (61.6%)*</th>
<th>Maximum City Portion (38.4%)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,939,911</td>
<td>$1,809,588</td>
<td>$1,130,323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounded to the nearest dollar.

The City and Region’s total liability for making grant payments are capped by the lesser of the equivalent of ten (10) years of tax increment, which is determined following MPAC’s reassessment of the property, the total actual net eligible remediation costs incurred by the Applicant or the amount approved by Council.

Payments related to the development do not commence until at least one (1) year following the re-assessment of the development by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC).

The TIG is not an exemption from the property taxes levied, but a grant payable to the owner according to the payment schedule in accordance with an agreement between the parties. Therefore the Applicant is required to pay all applicable property taxes for the property at all times during and after remediation and redevelopment or until such time as ownership is transferred to the intended end-user (if applicable).

The joint TIG Program applies only to the municipal portion of the tax bill and does not include the education portion that is remitted to the Province.

The final amounts of the TIG payments will be determined by the actual MPAC assessment value and classification and the final net eligible remediation costs, thus the final schedule of payments is subject to change.
Attachment C – Joint TIG Application Review Process

As part of the application process, the TIG requires the Applicant to provide an estimated remediation cost at the time an application is submitted. This estimate is provided in a Remedial Work Plan prepared by a Qualified Person under Ontario Regulation 153/04 (as amended). Further, as a condition of final approval of eligible costs, invoices must be submitted by the Applicant and must be approved for eligibility by City of Kitchener and Regional staff.

As part of City and Regional staff’s review, the site and proposed redevelopment are evaluated based on the following standard eligibility criteria developed by the Region and Area Municipalities for the joint TIG program.

1. The site must be located within the designated Area Municipal Community Improvement Plan (CIP) Project Area where the CIP allows for implementation of the Regional Brownfield Financial Incentive Program.

2. The Applicant must be the registered owner of the site or an assignee of the owner.

3. The Applicant cannot be responsible for causing the on-site contamination that requires remediation.

4. The remediation and redevelopment undertaken must result in a minimum increase of $100,000 in the assessed value of the property.

5. A “Qualified Person” (as per Ontario Regulation 153/04) must complete the Environmental Site Assessments.

6. Redevelopment plans must meet all approved policy and should comply, where feasible and appropriate, with applicable design guidelines.

7. The site must not be in a position of tax arrears or have any outstanding municipal financial obligations.

8. Application for a TIG must be made prior to issuance of building permit(s) for the redevelopment.

City of Kitchener and Regional staff are satisfied that the site and redevelopment of Victoria Common meets the eligibility criteria of the joint TIG program.
## Economic Development

### Ten Year Capital Budget and Forecast (Thousands) 2018 - 2027

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99054 51 Breithaupt Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>953</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99056 170 Water (North 2) Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td>3,442</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99057 130 Water (South Parcel) Tax Increment G</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99058 36 Francis Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99059 750 Lawrence Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99060 355 Mooregates Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99061 Environmental Site Assessment Grants</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99062 Community Improvement Plans</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99063 19 Guelph Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99065 350 Dundas Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>2,716</td>
<td>4,779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99066 83 Elmsdale Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1,778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99067 445 King Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1,778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,066</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,138</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,071</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,494</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,792</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,792</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,288</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,277</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,565</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FUNDING & FINANCING

Property Taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3980020 General Tax Supported Capital Reserve</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td>3,442</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3980140 Brownfield Incentive Program Reserve Fund</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3980180 Water Capital Reserve</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3980460 Federal Gas Tax Reserve Fund</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Reserves</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>4,816</td>
<td>3,903</td>
<td>8,719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDING &amp; FINANCING</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,066</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,138</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,071</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,494</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,792</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,792</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,288</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,277</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,565</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Rapid Transit

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

Date: June 19, 2018  File Code: D10-40/TPAS2

Subject: Stage 2 ION: LRT from Kitchener to Cambridge – Preferred Route

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo endorse the Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route (2018) as displayed in Attachment 1 as the preferred route for Stage 2 ION: LRT from Kitchener to Cambridge as shown in Report TES-RTS-18-06 dated June 19, 2018; and,

That the Region of Waterloo increase the contract with WSP Canada Group Limited by $967,243.71 plus applicable taxes for a revised total of $2,830,030.55 to cover the amended project scope requested.

Summary:

In June 2011, the Stage 2 Light Rail Transit (from Kitchener to Cambridge) alignment/stop locations were endorsed by Council as part of the initial work done on Stage 1 Light Rail Transit (LRT). To proceed with Stage 2 LRT, an Environmental screening must be completed through the Transit Project Assessment (TPA) Process. The pre-planning activities for the TPA Process are underway. There have been four public consultation centres (PCC) with three nights per PCC.

The Project Team has reviewed all of the input received from PCCs No.1 through 4. Comments received at PCC No. 4 (May 2018) were generally consistent with and reflective of the route evaluation results. Unfortunately with major infrastructure projects there will always be some impacts. There continues to be much positive feedback and excitement related to the project to date. However, even with route changes, some residents continue to express concerns, in particular around three key topics. The three key topics are property impacts, traffic (during and after construction) and the need for...
LRT (in particular in the Preston area).

The Project Team has made enhancements and will continue to consider design refinements to minimize the project impact. Therefore, the Project Team recommends to move forward to endorse the Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route (2018) as the preferred route for Stage 2 ION: LRT from Kitchener to Cambridge.

On May 15, following PCC No. 4, City of Cambridge staff presented Report 18-079 (CD) to City Council recommending that Council generally support the Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route (2018). City of Cambridge Council accepted the route, except for the section along Shantz Hill, King Street and Eagle Street. Regional and City staff have been cooperating to build a “made in Cambridge” solution to Stage 2 LRT and will continue to collaborate, developing ideas to minimize and mitigate property and cultural heritage impacts.

Pending Regional Council endorsement of a preferred route, the project team will complete the preliminary design, identify the preliminary property impacts, and complete the business case, all of which will be presented to the public at PCC No. 5 in 2019. After PCC No. 5, the recommended preliminary design and the business case will be presented to Regional Council to conduct the Transit Project Assessment Process. Region staff will prepare and submit Provincial and Federal funding applications.

Report:

1. Background

The Province of Ontario has projected that Waterloo Region will experience significant population and employment growth over the next fifteen years – a growth of more than 185,000 residents and 90,000 jobs by 2031. Refer to Attachment 6 for maps showing the existing and forecasted density of residents and jobs.

To provide for the projected growth, the Region will have to either continue its pattern of outward growth or encourage greater intensification in existing developed areas. With little opportunity to add or expand the road networks in our core areas, and the expected increase in population, Regional Council (with much public support) has consistently identified rapid transit as the most sustainable transportation solution to meet our community’s future transportation needs. High-quality rapid transit has been identified as a crucial component in managing growth, facilitating intensification and minimizing/reducing future “urban sprawl”.

In 2003, Regional Council approved the Regional Growth Management Strategy (RGMS), a long-term strategic framework that identifies where, when and how future residents and jobs should be located to focus growth in a sustainable manner. The RGMS is anchored by a rapid transit system located within the linear urban corridor formed by the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener, and Waterloo. The RGMS seeks to
address the housing, transportation, source water and environmental protection challenges that the Region faces through the promotion of a different urban form that allows some greenfield development and directs growth to already developed areas. This results in a more efficient use of infrastructure investments by the Cities and the Region and a more efficient use of land resources.

Rapid transit is also a significant part of the Province’s Places to Grow Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2006). Rapid Transit in the Central Transit Corridor is identified in the Plan, which recommends that priority funding be given to infrastructure projects that support an integrated regional transportation network for the movement of people and goods throughout the Greater Golden Horseshoe. Investment in LRT in Waterloo Region is a key part of a broader strategy to encourage compact and transit-supportive communities, and provide greater transportation choice for Regional residents.

In 2006, Regional Council approved rapid transit as the preferred transportation strategy for Waterloo Region as part of Phase 1 of the Rapid Transit Environmental Assessment. Rapid transit was embedded in the 2009 Regional Official Plan (ROP), providing a legal framework that required a transportation solution to manage growth (New ROP approved in early 2015). In June 2011, Regional Council endorsed an alignment of LRT from north Waterloo to downtown Cambridge to be implemented in two stages.

2. Why Light Rail Transit?

A high-quality rapid transit system is vital for the Region to evolve into a more compact urban form, helping to limit sprawl and protect sensitive environmental landscapes and high quality farmlands from urban encroachment. LRT in the Region has the multiple goals of providing transportation choice, meeting future transportation needs, and building a viable, vibrant and sustainable community.

Based on the Environmental Assessment work to date and experience in other municipalities, LRT would result in wide-ranging economic, social, and environmental benefits, including reduced congestion, increased transit ridership, re-urbanization and intensification, improved mobility, environmental benefits, urban revitalization and enhanced public safety and health. According to the Central Transit Corridor monitoring report (2017), the value of building permits within the CTC totalled $2.1 billion from 2011 to 2016.

LRT as a centrepiece of an expanded transit network solution can help shift a substantial amount of future auto travel to transit. It can also encourage re-urbanization, with resulting intensification that can in turn promote a much higher percentage of trips by walking, cycling and transit. Achieving higher transit ridership targets will not eliminate the need for road improvements, but it can reduce the amount of road construction required and reduce road expansion costs.
Improved transit service in the central transit corridor and throughout the Region would result in a significant modal shift to transit. Rapid transit can improve travel conditions through reduced travel times, higher frequencies, improved journey quality, and improved reliability. The net effect is a change in patterns of accessibility, extending the distances that people will be prepared to travel by transit, reducing the costs of existing travel, and easing the movement of people and goods in the Region.

Rapid transit, as a strategic street-level system along the central transit corridor, can be a significant catalyst for achieving re-urbanization and economic and demographic intensification. Intensification and redevelopment resulting from rapid transit is expected to shape urban form in a more efficient manner and thereby avoid, delay or minimize the expansion of urban areas into the Region’s valuable agricultural, environmental and rural areas. This in turn would protect our community’s food and water supply and diverse economy.

Phase 1 of the EA determined that rapid transit is the preferred transportation strategy for Waterloo Region as compared to expanding the road network or improving conventional transit. Using multiple criteria based on the goals and objectives of RGMS, the evaluation concluded that rapid transit:

- best achieves the goals of the RGMS;
- is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and conforms with the Provincial Places to Grow Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe;
- supports reurbanization objectives, downtown revitalization and innovative urban design;
- increases transportation choice and transit ridership;
- is the least expensive form of motorized transportation when considering personal transportation costs;
- contributes to the Region’s countryside protection goal by facilitating reurbanization and reducing the pressure to expand urban boundaries;
- provides a safe mode of transportation and promotes an active and healthier lifestyle; and
- utilizes the least amount of land and minimizes the impact on air quality and greenhouse gas emissions.

The Objectives of light rail transit are to:

- Provide efficient infrastructure - Move more people in less space.
- Enhance the Region’s character and place-making - Introduce a strong sense of identity along the LRT corridor to attract residents, businesses and visitors alike.
- Promote transit-oriented development - Support communities that contain a full range of development densities and land uses, including those that are compact,
mixed use and pedestrian-friendly.

- Serve as an investment in the Region’s future - Ensure the Region’s economic competitiveness by investing in more sustainable and efficient modes of transportation.
- Preserve natural environments - Minimize impacts to the natural environment as much as possible and protect outlying areas from urban sprawl.
- Increase transit accessibility and mobility - Provide accessible transit service to residents including those with low incomes, physical challenges, the elderly and others who do not drive.
- Provide convenient and accessible rapid transit stations - Develop transit stations as activity centres, incorporating safety, comfort, aesthetics and convenience.
- Engage the community - Work with the community to minimize any negative effects on residents and businesses.

3. **Stage 2 LRT – Kitchener to Cambridge Study Process and Structure**

A technical team is guiding the project with oversight by the established Rapid Transit Steering Committee which includes Region Chair Ken Seiling, and Councillors Tom Galloway, Sean Strickland, Geoff Lorentz and Karl Kiefer. The technical team is being assisted by WSP and is comprised of staff from the Region of Waterloo, City of Cambridge, City of Kitchener, Grand River Conservation Authority and the Ministry of Transportation.

To progress with Stage 2 LRT, an Environmental Assessment study must be completed, as was done for Stage 1 LRT. The Stage 2 LRT study is following the Transit Project Assessment (TPA) process, a special, streamlined process for transit projects approved by the Province under the Environmental Assessments Act. The TPA process is part of the provincial approvals required to implement Stage 2 LRT. The process is intended to ensure that any impacts of “provincial significance” are properly managed, and includes opportunities for public involvement and input.

The TPA process incorporates all of the planning, engineering, and technical studies and analyses which have already been completed or are currently on-going. The formal TPA can start once a selected transit project has been endorsed by Regional Council.

The TPA regulation provides a framework for focused consultation and objection processes. The Minister of Environment and Climate Change may give notice allowing a proponent to proceed with its transit project, but can only take action if there is a potential for a negative impact on a matter of provincial importance that relates to the natural environment or has cultural heritage value of interest, or on a constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty right.
4. Evaluation Process and Results

The project team started with the 2011 Council endorsed route and station locations. A number of alternative routes were added and presented to the public at PCC No. 1 in November 2015. Following a review of the comments received the routes were screened for feasibility based on physical constraints and engineering considerations. The project team compared the remaining routes using the evaluation criteria in Attachment 2 to identify the Preliminary Potential Route (2017), which was presented to the public at PCC No. 2 in February and March of 2017.

At PCC No. 2, many comments were received about the Preliminary Potential Route (2017), including both support and concerns. In response, the project team added several route alternatives for further investigation. An additional round of public consultation, PCC No. 3, was held in November 2017 and January 2018 to review these and gather more route ideas from the public and from stakeholders. Refined route alternatives were presented in three areas:

- In the **Kitchener** segment, between the approved River Road Extension and the Highway 8/King Street interchange.

- In the **North Cambridge** segment, between Highway 401 and Eagle Street near Hespeler Road. In this area, considerable input has been received from local residents and the public, which was collected and considered. A screening process was applied to focus on refinements and additional routes that:
  - Minimized travel time by providing a direct connection between the Sportsworld and Pinebush stations
  - Traveled through Preston with a station in the vicinity of King and Eagle
  - Reduced property and environmental impacts compared to the 2017 Preliminary Potential Route.

- In the **South Cambridge** segment, between Dundas Street and Downtown Cambridge, including alternative locations for the terminal LRT station.

An additional alternative, called Alternative “J”, was brought forward that was based, in part, on a route submitted by a group of residents. This alternative was modified by the project team to reduce impacts on the Hydro One transmission corridor, to remove impacts to the Parklawn and Hagey Mennonite cemeteries adjacent to Fountain Street and CP Rail corridor, and to provide a station in Preston.

Following PCC No. 3, the project team screened the routes presented, along with additional routes brought forward by the public, for engineering considerations and environmental constraints that pose obstacles to construction or implementation of the
final system. Based on the screening process several route alternatives were eliminated from further consideration. A final group of route alternatives were evaluated and compared using the project evaluation criteria. The route alternatives were evaluated in separate and distinct segments with the exception of Alternative “J”, which spans both the Kitchener and North Cambridge segments. Alternative “J” was evaluated against the alternative from each of these two segments that performed the best. The evaluation Maps showing the alternatives evaluated in each segment, including Alternative “J”, are shown in Attachment 3.

The project team completed the evaluation of the route alternatives and identified the Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route (2018). A summary of the evaluation results by segment is in Attachment 4. A map showing the 2017 and 2018 routes is in Attachment 5. The Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route (2018) improves upon the Preliminary Potential Route (2017) in several ways:

- Three minutes faster
- 60 fewer properties impacted
- 70 fewer full property buyouts
- 33 fewer Built Heritage and Cultural Landscape Resources affected
- Reduces traffic and property impacts on King Street from River Road to Highway 8 underpass
- Reduces traffic and property impacts on Eagle Street east of Preston to Hespeler Road
- Reduces impact on properties along Beverley Street

5. Results – Public Consultation Centre No. 4

The fourth round of Public Consultation Centres was held on May 8, 9, and 10, 2018 with over 380 attendees. The public was presented with the Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route and asked to provide feedback. Over 220 responses were received, including comment sheets, emails, and online survey responses. Overall, there was much more positive feedback about the Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route (2018) as compared to the feedback on the 2017 route. Many comments were received acknowledging and appreciating the Region’s consideration of alternatives to reduce property impacts in particular. The PCC No.4 Summary Report has been posted online, which includes an Appendix of all comments received.

The following summarizes aspects of the project and/or Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route (2018) that respondents support:

- Light Rail Transit as the Region’s rapid transit strategy
- The overall Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route (2018) alignment and stop locations linking major urban centres and providing good coverage and
connectivity throughout the region, supporting growth and development, and minimizing property impacts

- Reduces property impacts compared to the 2017 Preliminary Potential Route, particularly along King Street
- Reduces potential congestion and traffic impacts compared to the 2017 Preliminary Potential Route, particularly by avoiding King Street between Fairway Road and the Highway 8 interchange
- Shorter travel time
- Allows for good integration of LRT with bus routes
- Provides a more direct route from Fairway to Sportsworld
- Has less risk of traffic incidents impacting LRT service, as LRT is on a fully separate right-of-way
- Avoids potential construction impact on existing roadways and traffic
- Largely in support of an LRT stop in Preston as it provides access to rapid transit for local residents, supports existing businesses and encourages economic growth, and provides opportunities for redevelopment. Although some concern remained within the community of Preston, many of the comments received at PCC No. 4 were in agreement that the best alternative through the Preston area is the Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route (2018).
- The use of the abandoned railway spur on the north side of Preston minimizes impact to the community by avoiding Eagle Street and Riverside Park
- Support for the LRT station in the King/Eagle area to be off-street in order to further reduce traffic and property impacts
- Many residents who were previously concerned about the idea of an elevated structure at Shantz Hill were at ease after seeing the photographic rendering.
- Feedback was strongly in support of the Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route (2018) through South Cambridge including running along Mill Creek and the terminal station location at Bruce Street and Water Street.

The following summarizes aspects of the project and/or Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route (2018) that concern respondents:

- Need for LRT and the ridership potential
- The choice of LRT over buses for a transit strategy
- Delaying a decision on the route is causing delay to development, within the City of Cambridge in particular
- Need for more transit and parking infrastructure
- Property requirements and lack of details at this time
- Impacts on traffic operations after opening and during construction
- Potential negative business impacts due to lack of access during construction
- Need for the Highway 401 west connection with Highway 8 and a GO connection for Cambridge
• Impacts on properties in Preston, including concerns about the established community, heritage buildings, noise and vibration
• Potential impacts on river corridors in Preston and downtown Cambridge
Some residents continue to remain strongly in favour of using Maple Grove Road and Speedsville Road and reaching destinations like the airport, Conestoga College, Hespeler Village, Cambridge Memorial Hospital, King Street/Coronation Boulevard and Water Street

6. Area Municipal Feedback

On May 15, 2018 City of Cambridge staff presented Report 18-079 (CD) to City Council recommending:

“THAT Cambridge Council generally supports the portion of the Preliminary Proposed Route in Cambridge as identified in Report 18-079 (CD) subject to having a future opportunity to consider specific property impacts and cultural heritage impacts prior to finalization of this Environmental Assessment process.”

City of Cambridge Council amended, and passed, the resolution as follows:

“THAT the Preliminary Proposed Route be accepted as presented, except the portion that travels on Shantz Hill Road, King Street, and Eagle Street.”

City of Cambridge Council questions and concerns included:

• What are the property and heritage impacts at the King/Eagle block with the new project team proposed route?
• Why is King/Eagle better for a station as opposed to further east on Eagle?
• The aesthetics of the Shantz Hill bridge is a concern. Is there another way to bring LRT into Cambridge?

City of Cambridge Council did not provide a suggested alternative to the route section in question. Regional and City staff have been cooperating to build a “made in Cambridge” solution to Stage 2 LRT and will continue to collaborate, developing ideas to minimize and mitigate property and cultural heritage impacts.

City of Kitchener staff are part of the project’s Technical Advisory Committee. They are supportive of the Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route (2018), pending the next steps regarding property impacts.

7. Key Concerns and Responses

The Project Team has reviewed all of the input received from PCC No.1 to 4. There continues to be much positive feedback and excitement related to the project to date. However, even with route changes, some residents continue to express concerns, in
particular around three key topics: Property impacts, traffic (during and after construction) and the need for LRT (in particular in the Preston area).

**Property Impacts:** The potential for property impacts was a key criterion in the evaluation process. The assessment of property impacts was approached very conservatively, capturing the greatest area of potential property impacts, direct or indirect, required to implement the project. As the project is still in the route planning stage and at a conceptual level of design, refinements are still being incorporated and thus property impacts are subject to change. Once the recommended route has been endorsed by Regional Council, the Project Team will proceed to the preliminary design stage which will include a more detailed engineering study to identify the impacts to individual properties.

**Traffic (during and after construction):** In most cases, LRT is added in existing roadway corridors by widening the road and creating new lanes for LRT in the middle of the roadway, without eliminating vehicular lanes. The exception is along Hespeler Road where the road will be reduced from six lanes to four lanes but turning lanes will be preserved and pedestrian and cycling features will be added. This road reduction is being planned for as part of the transportation strategy within the Transportation Master Plan for the Region that is currently underway. The Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route (2018) uses dedicated LRT rapidway throughout and does not share any traffic lanes with automobiles. At signalized intersections, coordination will be maximized with LRT using existing green time where possible. In the Deer Ridge Drive area, for example, King Street will remain two lanes in each direction and traffic operations will be minimally impacted as the LRT will move during the green time for the major flow of traffic along King Street. More detailed traffic studies will be performed, but a preferred route is required to be selected in order to develop specific solutions.

Automobile and pedestrian access to residences and businesses will be maintained during construction. However, the nature of construction will require some closures, detours and service interruptions. The key will be to continue open communication with all those involved and give as much notice to the travelling public as possible.

**The Need for LRT (in particular in Preston):** LRT has been selected by the Region as the best way to efficiently move people, to manage growth by encouraging development and growth in existing urban areas, limiting urban sprawl and protecting the environment. The idea of a rapid transit corridor in Waterloo Region is deep-rooted and was first presented in 1976, when it was highlighted in the Regional Official Policies Plan. Planning for ION began in 2000, and is embedded in the Regional Official Plan. In 2011, Council’s decision to implement LRT in two stages was made following six years of technical studies and an extensive, unprecedented public consultation process.
In the Regional Official Plan, Major Transit Station Areas (lands within 600-800 metres of an ION stop) are to be planned to support rapid transit with increased densities and a mix of land uses such as residential, office, institutional and retail (ROP policy 2.D.6). The proposed ION stop at the intersection of King Street and Eagle Street (and the surrounding lands), are identified in the Cambridge Official Plan as part of the Preston Towne Centre, Community Core Area as well as a Regeneration Area.

The Preston Towne Centre is one of the historic business centres of Cambridge, which is planned to maintain its historical role as a community focal point with a concentration of diverse land uses and density (COP policies 2.6.3.2 and 2.6.3.2). It currently has a range of housing types including high-rise and mid-rise apartments, townhouses and single detached houses, as well as a wide variety of land uses such as specialized commercial uses, offices, and community facilities. As a Community Core Area, the City's objective is to continue encouraging higher residential densities and mix of land uses in the Preston Towne Centre, promoting things such as infrastructure renewal, enhanced transportation opportunities for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users, as well as development supportive of transit such as sensitive infill, intensification and mixed use buildings (COP policies 2.2.g and 2.6.3.2). To encourage intensification within walking distance of the Preston Towne Centre, the Cambridge Official Plan has identified a Regeneration Area which is planned to transition from one use such as industrial, to another such as commercial and multi-unit residential by 2031. Regeneration Areas are planned to transition to a higher density, transit supportive uses.

To help achieve the goals of the Preston Towne Centre Community Core Area and Regeneration Area, the proposed Major Transit Station Area will be subject to further studies. However, the existing land uses and planning framework make it an ideal location for rapid transit.

Following the comments received at PCC No. 2 and PCC No. 3 regarding impacts to properties and heritage buildings in Preston, the Project Team developed and sought suggestions from the public on refinements to the route. Refinements met the project objective of bringing LRT to the core of Preston and sought to reduce the number of impacts. The Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route (2018) greatly reduces impacts to the established residential neighbourhood and heritage homes, specifically along Moore and Eagle streets. Design refinements will be explored to further reduce these impacts during preliminary design.

**Recommendation**

Comments received were generally consistent with and reflective of the route evaluation results, recognizing that as with most major infrastructure projects there will be impacts. The Project Team has made changes and will continue to consider design ideas to minimize the impact of the key issues raised in the previous section. Therefore, the
Project Team recommends to move forward to endorse the Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route (2018) as the preferred route for Stage 2 ION: LRT from Kitchener to Cambridge.

Without Council endorsement some Regional projects will be delayed, the public will not have the property impact information they are demanding and some developments will be deemed premature impacting economic development.

8. Next Steps

Should Council endorse the preferred route, the next steps would include the following:

- Complete the preliminary design and the identification of the preliminary property requirements
- Finalize station locations/names
- Identify potential locations for traction power substations (TPSSs)
- Determine the location of the maintenance and storage facility (MSF)

Prepare the business case for the project

9. Future Steps

- In 2019, hold PCC No. 5 to present the preliminary design and preliminary property requirements
- After PCC No. 5, present recommended route (including the business case) to Regional Council for final authority to initiate the formal Transit Project Assessment Process (Late 2019)
- Address any comments submitted during public consultation or Minister of Environment and Climate Change’s review periods
- File the Environmental Project Report (EPR) for public review and complete the Transit Project Assessment Process
- Submit Provincial and Federal funding applications

Corporate Strategic Plan:

Stage 2 ION: LRT Kitchener to Cambridge supports the Council Strategic Area:

Sustainable Transportation: 2.1 Create a public transportation network that is integrated, accessible, affordable and sustainable.

Corporate Strategic Action 2.1.3 Complete the Environmental Assessment for ION Stage 2 and pursue funding from the Federal and Provincial governments.
Financial Implications:

The Region of Waterloo will require an increase to the WSP contract of $967,243.71 plus applicable taxes for a revised total of $2,830,030.55 to cover the increased/amended project scope that has been requested. The original scope assumed a 2011 Council approved preferred route. Since that time, the entire route has been reconfigured except for a small segment along Hespeler Road. With so many areas of the route needing to be analysed again for alternative options, additional costs have been and may continue to be incurred. These costs include: additional field investigations, new data collection, staff time for compressed project timelines, project management and administration time, agency meetings, technical meetings, redesign and new design time, evaluation, analysis and increased public consultation (seven extra public consultation centre events).

The Region’s approved 2018-2027 Rapid Transit Capital Program includes a budget of $1,874,800 in 2018 for Stage 2 ION Light Rail Transit TPA Process Study (Project #68024) to be funded from the RTMP Reserve (86%, $1,610,700) and the Transit Regional Development Charges Reserve Fund (14%, $264,100). The requested change can be accommodated within the 2018 budget.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Regional staff from Planning, Development and Legislative Services, Transportation and Environmental Services (Transportation and Design and Construction) has been consulted along with staff from the Cities of Cambridge and Kitchener, Grand River Conservation Authority and the Ministry of Transportation.
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Attachment 1: Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route Map (2018)

Legend
- Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route (2018)
- LRT Station
- Rail Corridor
- Potential Property Impacts
- Potential GO Station Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties Impacted*</th>
<th>Potential Full Buyout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>180-220</td>
<td>45-60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total, including partial and full buyout
## Attachment 2: Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Ability to serve multi-modal nodes</td>
<td>Are there good opportunities for connections between LRT, Grand River Transit (GRT), and GO services, as well as Park and Ride lots?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Impact on traffic operations</td>
<td>How many new signalized intersections are required? How many existing intersections have capacity issues and would be further impacted by LRT?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Engineering challenges</td>
<td>How many freight rail, MTO interchange or highway crossings are there? How compatible or constrained are they?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Potential ridership</td>
<td>How many local transit riders use existing bus stations within 800 metres of proposed LRT stations? What is the estimated travel time for the segment based on length, geometry, crossings, stations, and traffic signals along the route?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/cultural environment</td>
<td>Destinations served</td>
<td>Are there major commercial, industrial, office, or leisure destinations within 800 metres of proposed LRT stations? How many hospitals, schools or other institutional uses are there within 800 m of the stations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/cultural environment</td>
<td>Properties impacted</td>
<td>How many residential, commercial, industrial or institutional properties are impacted and how many of those could potentially require full buyout?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/cultural environment</td>
<td>Transit and pedestrian supportive land use policy</td>
<td>Does the route fit with existing planning policy, such as the Provincial Growth Plan, Official Plan, Transportation Master Plan or Zoning By-Laws?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/cultural environment</td>
<td>Cultural heritage impacts</td>
<td>How many heritage properties and buildings are there along the route?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural environment</td>
<td>Impact on floodplains</td>
<td>What area of floodplain does the route cross?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural environment</td>
<td>Impact to significant natural features</td>
<td>Does the route cross or impact any significant natural features such as wetlands, forests, watercourses or habitat for endangered/at risk species?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 3: Maps of Alternatives Evaluated

Map 1: Alternatives - Kitchener (F+K)
Map 2: Alternatives - North Cambridge (N3)
Map 3: Alternatives – North Cambridge (E)
Map 4: Alternatives – Kitchener to Cambridge (J)

Legend
- Alignment J – as proposed by local resident group
- Alignment J – refined to reduce major impacts
- Route proposed based on evaluations (Refer to Maps 1, 2 and 3)
- LRT Station proposed based on evaluations (Refer to Maps 1, 2 and 3)
- LRT Station – for Alternative J alignment
- Rail Corridor
- Potential Property Impacts

[Map Image]
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Map 5: Alternatives – South Cambridge (S)

Legend:
- Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route (2018)
- LRT Station
- Rail Corridor
- Potential Property Impacts

Legend:
- Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route (2018)
- LRT Station
- Rail Corridor
- Potential Property Impacts
## Attachment 4: Detailed Evaluation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kitchener (F-K) Evaluation results (*preliminary proposed)</th>
<th>F2a-K2</th>
<th>F2b-K3b*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and mobility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Ability to serve multimodal nodes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Impact on traffic operations</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Engineering challenges</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Ridership</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social/cultural environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Destinations served</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 Property requirements</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 Transit and pedestrian supportive land use planning policy</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 Cultural heritage impacts</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0 Impact on floodplains</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 Impact to significant natural features</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0 Ability to serve concentrations of employment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0 Opportunities for revitalization/intensification</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0 Cost</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very good at meeting the objective  
Very poor at meeting the objective
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Cambridge (N) Evaluation results (*preliminary proposed)</th>
<th>N3</th>
<th>N3a</th>
<th>N3b</th>
<th>N3c</th>
<th>N3d</th>
<th>N3e*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and mobility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Ability to serve multimodal nodes</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Impact on traffic operations</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Engineering challenges</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Ridership</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social/cultural environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Destinations served</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 Property requirements</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 Transit and pedestrian supportive land use planning policy</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 Cultural heritage impacts</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0 Impact on floodplains</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 Impact to significant natural features</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0 Ability to serve concentrations of employment</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0 Opportunities for revitalization/intensification</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0 Cost</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ● Very good at meeting the objective
- ○ Very poor at meeting the objective
### Kitchener to Cambridge (J)
**Evaluation results** (*preliminary proposed*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>F2b-K3b-N-N3e*</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and mobility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Ability to serve multimodal nodes</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Impact on traffic operations</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Engineering challenges</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Ridership</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social/cultural environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Destinations served</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 Property requirements</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 Transit and pedestrian supportive land use planning policy</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 Cultural heritage impacts</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0 Impact on floodplains</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 Impact to significant natural features</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0 Ability to serve concentrations of employment</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0 Opportunities for revitalization/intensification</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0 Cost</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very good at meeting the objective

Very poor at meeting the objective
## North Cambridge (E)
### Evaluation results (*preliminary proposed*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N3-C1a</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E2*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and mobility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Ability to serve multimodal nodes</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Impact on traffic operations</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Engineering challenges</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Ridership</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social/cultural environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Destinations served</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 Property requirements</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 Transit and pedestrian supportive land use planning policy</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 Cultural heritage impacts</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0 Impact on floodplains</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 Impact to significant natural features</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0 Ability to serve concentrations of employment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0 Opportunities for revitalization/intensification</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0 Cost</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- • Very good at meeting the objective
- ○ Satisfactory
- ○○ Good
- ○○○ Excellent
- ○○○○ Very poor at meeting the objective
### South Cambridge (S) Evaluation results (*preliminary proposed*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>S3a</th>
<th>S3b</th>
<th>S3c</th>
<th>S3d*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and mobility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Ability to serve multimodal nodes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Impact on traffic operations</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Engineering challenges</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Ridership</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social/cultural environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Destinations served</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 Property requirements</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 Transit and pedestrian supportive land use planning policy</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 Cultural heritage impacts</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0 Impact on floodplains</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 Impact to significant natural features</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0 Ability to serve concentrations of employment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0 Opportunities for revitalization/intensification</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0 Cost</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Very good at meeting the objective*  
*Very poor at meeting the objective*
### South Cambridge (T)
**Evaluation results** (*preliminary proposed*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>T1a</th>
<th>T1b</th>
<th>T2*</th>
<th>T3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Ability to serve multimodal nodes</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Impact on traffic operations</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Engineering challenges</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Ridership</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/cultural environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Destinations served</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 Property requirements</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 Transit and pedestrian supportive land use planning policy</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 Cultural heritage impacts</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0 Impact on floodplains</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 Impact to significant natural features</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0 Ability to serve concentrations of employment</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0 Opportunities for revitalization/intensification</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0 Cost</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local transit integration (applies only to Terminal (T) Options)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.0 Integration with local transit service</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Very good at meeting the objective
- Poor at meeting the objective
- Very poor at meeting the objective
Attachment 5: Map of 2017 and 2018 Stage 2 LRT Routes
Attachment 6: Map of Existing and Forecasted Density (Residents and Jobs)

Existing Density Map
Future Density Map
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services

Design and Construction

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

Date: June 19, 2018

File Code: 07327.E

Subject: Class Environmental Assessment Study – Erb Street Improvements, Fischer-Hallman Road to Wilmot Line, City of Waterloo

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Class Environmental Assessment for Erb Street Improvements, from Fischer-Hallman Road to Wilmot Line, in the City of Waterloo:

a) Approve the Recommended Design Alternative for the proposed construction and widening of Erb Street from Fischer-Hallman Road to Wilmot Line as described in Report TES-DCS-18-12 dated June 19, 2018.

b) Direct staff to file a Notice of Completion as required by the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment and place the Environmental Study Report on the public record for review for a period of 30 days.

c) Amend Traffic and Parking By-law 16-023, as amended, upon completion of construction to add to Schedule 22, Reserved Cycling Lanes on the north side of Erb Street (Regional Road 9) from Fischer-Hallman Road to Ira Needles Boulevard in the City of Waterloo.

d) Amend Traffic and Parking By-law 16-023, as amended, upon completion of construction to add to Schedule 22, Reserved Cycling Lanes on the south side of Erb Street (Regional Road 9) from Fischer-Hallman Road to Ira Needles Boulevard in the City of Waterloo.

Summary:

The Region of Waterloo is currently undertaking a Class Environmental Assessment

2730923
(Class EA) Study to consider needed pavement reconstruction and road improvements for traffic growth, as well as transportation system improvements for transit, pedestrians and cyclists on Erb Street from Fischer-Hallman Road to Wilmot Line in the City of Waterloo. Please refer to Appendix ‘A’ for a Key Plan of the Study Area.

Five alternative design concepts were developed by the Project Team and evaluated with respect to their ability to meet the traffic and transportation needs on Erb Street, as well as their potential for impact on the project environment in relation to: traffic capacity, operations, safety, natural environment, social environment and costs. These alternatives were:

- Do-Nothing;
- Alt. 1 - Urbanize the Existing Road and retain the current number of travelled lanes with the exception of Widening to 4-lanes west of Ira Needles to the roundabout at the Waterloo Waste Management Centre/Costco Entrance and Adding Active Transportation Facilities;
- Alt. 2A - Widen the Road to 4-lanes, Urbanize and Add Active Transportation Facilities for Sidewalks and On-Road Bike Lanes;
- Alt. 2B - Widen the Road to 4-lanes, Urbanize and Add Active Transportation Facilities for Multi-Use Trails; and
- Alt. 2C - Widen the Road to 4-lanes, Urbanize and Add Active Transportation Facilities for Sidewalks, Multi-use Trail and Cycle Tracks.

Please refer to Appendix ‘B’ for typical cross-sections of the Design Alternatives. The design alternatives and their preliminary evaluations were presented to the public along with identification of the Project Team’s preferred design alternative, Alternative 2C (Modified), to Widen the Road to Four Lanes, Urbanize and Add Active Transportation Facilities for Sidewalks, Multi-use Trail and On-Road Cycle Tracks. Comments received from the public are supportive of the need for traffic, pedestrian and cyclist improvements along this section of Erb Street, however, concerns were expressed regarding the increase in traffic and associated noise.

In consideration of the technical information gathered for this project, as well as a review of all public and agency comments received, the Project Team is recommending a modified version of Alternative 2C as the Preferred alternative: Alternative 2C (Modified) - Widen the Road to 4-lanes, Urbanize and Add Active Transportation Facilities for Sidewalks, Multi-use Trail and Cycle Tracks. This Preferred alternative includes:

- Urbanizing and Widening Erb Street to four lanes from Fischer-Hallman Road to the roundabout at Gate 2 of the Region’s Waste Management Centre (east of Wilmot Line);
- Construction of an eastbound left-turn lane on Erb Street at Beechwood Place.
and extension of existing turn lanes at intersections;

- Removing the right-turn lane to the Bilingual School entrance at the north east corner of Erb Street and Erbsville Court;
- Completing the sidewalk on the south side of Erb Street between Gateview Drive and Erbsville Court, and on the south side of Erb Street from the commercial plaza entrance west of Ira Needles Boulevard to the traffic signals at the Westside Marketplace entrance;
- Constructing a Multi-use trail on the north side of Erb Street from the Westside Marketplace entrance west of Ira Needles Boulevard to the roundabouts at the Region Waste Management Centre/West Waterloo Commercial (Costco) site entrance and maintaining existing on-road bike lanes on both sides of Erb Street between Erbsville Court and Wilmot Line;
- Constructing cycle tracks on both sides of Erb Street from Fischer-Hallman Road to Erbsville Court; and
- Constructing noise walls abutting residential properties along the north side of Erb Street from Beechwood Drive westerly for approximately 170 m, and south side of Erb Street from Gateview Drive westerly for approximately 340 m.

The Recommended Design Alternative provides the required capacity for long-term traffic needs on this section of Erb Street, improves traffic operations and provides enhanced active transportation facilities as recommended in the Region’s Active Transportation Master Plan.

The estimated cost of the Recommended Design Alternative for the design and construction of the road improvements on Erb Street from Fischer-Hallman Road to Wilmot Line is $8.5 million to $10.5 million, including estimated costs of $2.0 million to $4.0 million for utility relocations such as Hydro One towers west of Ira Needles Boulevard that are required for all road widening alternatives. Funding for the improvements on Erb Street is currently provided in 2019 to 2020 in the Region’s 2018 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program pending approvals and completion of advance utility relocations. The timing of construction will be reviewed and revised as necessary during preparation of the recommended 2019 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program.

Pending Regional Council approval of the Recommended Design Alternative, a Notice of Study Completion for this Class Environmental Study will be filed by means of advertisements in local newspapers and mailings to adjacent property owners, tenants and agencies, with the Environmental Study Report placed on public record for a thirty (30) day review period.

In order to facilitate the improvements above, amendments to the Region’s Traffic and Parking By-law must be approved to allow implementation of the new cycling lanes.
1.0 Background

The Region of Waterloo is currently undertaking a Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) Study to consider road improvements on Erb Street from Fischer-Hallman Road to Wilmot Line in the City of Waterloo. Please refer to Appendix ‘A’ for a Key Plan of the Study Area.

The 2010 Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) identifies the need to widen sections of Erb Street between Gateview Drive westerly to Erbsville Court, and Ira Needles Boulevard westerly to Wilmot Line, to four lanes in the five to ten year horizon (approximately 2015 to 2020) to meet increased traffic demands associated with development in the area. Increased traffic volumes with the completion of the Costco site development in 2016 have accelerated the need for road improvements along Erb Street.

The section of Erb Street west of Fischer-Hallman Road to Gateview Drive is exhibiting poor pavement conditions and has been identified as needing major reconstruction. In addition, sections of Erb Street from Fischer-Hallman Road to Erbsville Court, and west of Ira Needles Boulevard to Wilmot Line, are lacking sidewalks and or cycling facilities and thus do not provide pedestrians and cyclists’ access throughout the entire road corridor and to transit stops along the corridor. The Region’s Active Transportation Master Plan identifies Erb Street as a core on-road cycling route and recommends improvements for completion of the pedestrian and cyclist connections.

In accordance with the Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines, Erb Street is identified as a “Neighbourhood Connector – Avenue”. Designing Erb Street to support active transportation modes including walking and cycling is a fundamental character of this road classification. Erb Street from Fischer-Hallman Road to Ira Needles Boulevard is also an IXpress transit route which supports the need for complete and continuous pedestrian facilities for accessing transit use.

This project is being planned as a Schedule ‘C’ project in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA). Schedule ‘C’ projects are typically larger, more complex projects with the potential for significant environmental impacts (natural, social, cultural and economic) and require multiple opportunities for input through consultation with the public, involved stakeholders and agencies in consideration of alternatives and their impacts on the project environment.

This Class EA Study is being directed by a “Project Team” consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo and City of Waterloo, along with Region of Waterloo Councillor Jane Mitchell and City of Waterloo Councillor Bob Mavin. The consulting engineering firm of WalterFedy has been retained by the Region of Waterloo to provide engineering
planning and design services on this project, as well as contract administration and inspection services during construction.

2.0 Project Environment

In accordance with the Class EA, an environmental inventory for the study area was undertaken through completion of environmental studies in order to identify areas of concern related to potential for impacts along the corridor. Environmental studies completed include: Traffic and Transportation; Natural Environment; Heritage and Cultural Environment; and Archeological.

2.1 Traffic and Transportation

A detailed Transportation Report has been completed for this section of Erb Street, from Fischer-Hallman Road to Wilmot Line, to examine existing traffic operations within the study area, forecast future traffic volumes and identify transportation improvement needs. The Transportation Report confirms that the existing 2-lane and 3-lane sections of Erb Street are in need of widening to 4-lanes in order to provide the needed traffic capacity to accommodate existing and future projected traffic. In addition to road widening, construction of a new eastbound left-turn lane at Beechwood Place is required, as well as extension of existing turn lanes at intersections along Erb Street. The report also suggests that the existing right turn lane off Erb Street to the Bilingual School entrance on the north side of Erb Street, east of Erbsville Court, is not currently being used nor necessary for site access and its removal would provide additional space within the existing road allowance for the needed road widening.

The Transportation Report also confirms the lack of connected sidewalk and cycling facilities along this section of Erb Street and recommends consideration for continuous pedestrian and cyclist facilities on both sides of Erb Street with access to transit.

As part of the Transportation Report, concerns previously expressed by the public regarding traffic safety at the intersection of Wilmot Line and Erb Street were reviewed. Although vehicles turning from Wilmot Line to Erb Street are required to encroach beyond the stop bar in order to see approaching traffic from the east on Erb Street (due to adjacent property elevations and road grades), existing sightline distances meet the required standards. In addition, the collision history at this intersection is comparable to other similar intersections and the posted speed limits on this section of Erb Street have been reduced from 80 kph to 60 kph in association with the implementation of roundabouts on Erb Street at the West Waterloo Commercial/Costco site. The report suggests that no improvements are currently required at this intersection and recommends monitoring operations to identify any future improvement needs.

As part of the Region’s Transportation Capital Program, other road improvements in the project area that have recently been completed are as follows:
• Development of the West Waterloo Commercial Centre lands (known as the Costco site) on the north side of Erb Street, west of Ira Needles Boulevard and opposite the Region’s Waste Management Centre, was completed in 2016. Two roundabouts on Erb Street were constructed to provide access improvements to the development site as well as a connection to a future north-south City collector road (Platinum Drive).

• Widening of Ira Needles Boulevard to 4 lanes from University Avenue to Erb Street and improvements to the roundabout at Erb Street were completed in 2016 to provide increased road capacity and operational improvements.

Region staff are also working with the developer of the West Waterloo Commercial Centre (Costco) site to address existing traffic queuing and backup concerns on Erb Street at the Gate 1 Waterloo Waste Management Centre/West Waterloo Commercial Centre (Costco) roundabout. As part of continuing site development the developer is required to improve on-site traffic access by relocating internal stop signs and increasing traffic circulation within the site to reduce traffic backup onto Erb Street.

Current conditions of development on the Waterloo West Commercial lands restrict full buildout until completion of the needed traffic capacity improvements on Erb Street west of Ira Needles Boulevard. Approval of the recommendations for road improvements as included in this Erb Street Improvements Environmental Assessment Study will allow the necessary road improvements to be constructed to remove the development restriction on the property.

In addition, a second inbound scale at the Region’s Waste Management Centre Small Vehicle Transfer Station (Gate 2) was installed in 2016. This second scale enhances public access operations at the Small Vehicle Transfer Station (Gate 2) and has reduced landfill traffic queueing onto Erb Street.

The detailed design and construction information for these other area road improvements has been incorporated into the background information for this EA study.

2.2 Natural Environment

The Natural Environment study undertaken for this project includes a Background Review documenting the natural features and wildlife within the study area. The review determined that there are no Core Environmental Features, Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI) or provincially designated areas within the study area. There is however a local wetland within the study area on the south side of Erb Street west of Ira Needles Boulevard, in the vicinity of the Hydro One corridor. Although this wetland complex is considered to have minimal significance, proposed road improvements will require GRCA permits and approvals for encroachments and alterations. No further significant environmental constraints or potential for impact were identified from this study.
2.3 Heritage and Cultural Environment

A built heritage and cultural landscape inventory of cultural heritage resources was completed to identify existing conditions of the study area and potential impacts associated with improvements along the Erb Street corridor. The results of the background research and field review indicate that the only cultural heritage resources within the study area are a cultural heritage building at the north-east corner of Erb Street at Erbsville Court and an existing cemetery on the east side of Fischer-Hallman Road. No encroachment outside of the existing road allowance is expected in these areas and as such no potential for impact has been identified.

2.4 Archeological Environment

A Stage 1 archeological assessment was completed for this project to review the history, current land conditions, geography and previous archeological field work to evaluate the archeological potential in the study area. Based on the background study and property inspection completed, much of the lands along and adjacent to Erb Street are considered not to retain archeological potential and no further archeological assessment is required. There are however selected areas along Erb Street that are considered to possess archeological potential and require further archeological assessment. These lands require Stage 2 archeological assessment by test-pit survey prior to any proposed land disturbance to the property. The Stage 2 archeological assessment on these lands will be completed as part of detailed design.

3.0 Design Alternatives

Based on all identified needs and objectives for the Erb Street corridor, between Fischer-Hallman Road and Wilmot Line, including the recommendations in the Transportation Study, the Region’s Transportation Master Plan, the Region’s Active Transportation Master Plan and the Region’s Context Sensitive Corridor Design Guidelines for a Neighbourhood Connector – Avenue, 5 design alternatives were developed by the Project Team for improvements to Erb Street as follows:

Do Nothing

- Aside from general maintenance (asphalt repair/overlay, etc.), this alternative would retain the road in its current number of traveled lanes without widening or the addition of curbs and storm sewers, sidewalks or cycling facilities.

Alternative 1 – Urbanize the Existing Road with Widening to 4-lanes west of Ira Needles and Adding Active Transportation Facilities

- This alternative would widen the road from 2-lanes to 4-lanes west of Ira Needles to the roundabout at the West Waterloo Commercial Centre (Costco) entrance and retain the current number of travelled lanes elsewhere, in addition to adding the following facilities:
- Curb and gutter and a storm drainage system;
- Cycling facilities (either on-road, cycle tracks or multi-use trails); and,
- Pedestrian sidewalks (or multi-use trails).

**Alternative 2A - Widen the Road to 4-lanes, Urbanize and Add Active Transportation Facilities for Sidewalks and On-Road Bike Lanes**

- This alternative would include all improvements under Alternative 1, as well as widening of Erb Street from 3-lanes to 4-lanes between Gateview Drive and Erbsville Court, and include sidewalks and on-road bike lanes throughout the project limits.

**Alternative 2B - Widen the Road to 4-lanes, Urbanize and Add Active Transportation Facilities for Multi-Use Trails**

- This alternative would include all improvements under Alternative 2A, with multi-use trails in lieu of sidewalks and on-road bike lanes.

**Alternative 2C - Widen the Road to 4-lanes, Urbanize and Add Active Transportation Facilities for Sidewalks and Cycle Tracks**

- This alternative would include all improvements under Alternative 2A, with cycle tracks between Fischer-Hallman Road and Erbsville Court in lieu of on-road bike lanes.

Common to all alternatives is the consideration of intersection design alternatives, such as turn lanes, roundabouts and traffic signals, as well as turn lanes at driveway entrances and provision of transit stop pads and shelters. Typical cross-sections of the Design Alternatives are shown in Appendix ‘B’.

**4.0 Assessment and Evaluation of Design Alternatives**

The Design Alternatives were assessed against a set of evaluation criteria by the Project Team to determine a recommended alternative that is considered to best address the needs and opportunities for improvements on Erb Street in comparison to their potential environmental impacts. The evaluation criteria included the following:

1) **Technical**

   How well does the alternative manage traffic performance and network connectivity, transit access and pedestrian/cyclist needs?

2) **Natural Environment**

   What impact does the alternative have on the natural environment features such as trees and wetlands, wildlife, aquatic habitat, air quality and surface drainage?
3) Socio-Cultural Environment

What impact does the alternative have on adjacent communities and properties (access, property acquisition), landscapes, archaeological or heritage resources and traffic noise?

4) Costs

How do the alternatives compare for anticipated capital, operating and property acquisition costs?

The evaluation criteria developed by the Project Team and the assessment and evaluation of the Design Alternatives are shown in Appendix ‘C’. Based on the preliminary evaluation of the design alternatives using the above noted criteria, a modified Design Alternative No. 2C to Widen the Road to 4-lanes, Urbanize and Add Active Transportation Facilities for Sidewalks, Multi-use Trail and Cycle Tracks, was presented at PCC#2 as being preferred by the Project Team.

5.0 Public & Stakeholder Consultation

In accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Class EA, two Public Consultation Centres (PCC’s) have been held for this Erb Street Improvements Class EA Study. Notices in advance of the Public Consultation Centres were advertised in the local newspaper as well as mailed, hand delivered or emailed to adjacent property owners, residents, businesses, authorities and agencies.

Public Consultation Centre #1 was held on May 28, 2015 and provided information on the project needs and project environment. Plans of the study area and preliminary alternatives were on display with Project Team members present to answer questions and receive feedback from the public. The Public Consultation Centre was well attended and in total eleven (11) comment sheets were received and five (5) email responses. Comments received at PCC#1 generally supported the need for traffic, pedestrian and cyclist improvements along Erb Street, however, concerns were expressed regarding the increase in traffic and associated noise.

Public Consultation Centre #2 was held on May 4, 2017 and provided information on the design alternatives being considered for traffic and transportation system improvements, evaluation of their potential impact on the Project environment, and to identify the preliminary preferred design alternative being considered by the Project Team. Members of the Project Team were present at the PCC to answer questions and receive feedback from the public. PCC#2 was well attended with sixty one (61) members of the public signing in and eight (8) comment sheets received along with seven (7) email/voice message responses. Comments received generally support the need for traffic improvements as well as sidewalks and cycling facilities along the corridor. Concerns were expressed regarding the increase in traffic and difficulties in
accessing properties along the corridor in addition to increased traffic noise to adjacent residential properties. Comments received from the Public Consultation Centres and responses from the Project Team are available for review on the Regions website.

As part of the Project Team’s preferred design alternative a combination of sidewalks, multi-use trails and on-road cycle tracks have been incorporated to provide for pedestrian and cycling access and connections along Erb Street.

The Project Team’s preliminary preferred design alternative was presented to the Region’s Active Transportation Advisory Committee (ATAC) on January 17, 2017. ATAC expressed general support of sidewalks, multi-use trails and cycle tracks along Erb Street and requested staff consider cyclist safety when designing the road crossings within the project area. Staff confirm that cyclist safety will be an important consideration during design.

6.0 Noise Assessment Study

A Noise Assessment Study was completed for this project in accordance with Regional practices and policies and recommends noise attenuation barrier installations as follows:

- Erb Street (north side) – 2.0m high noise wall from Beechwood Drive westerly for approximately 170 m, for abutting residential properties only, where noise walls do not currently exist.
- Erb Street (south side) – 2.0m high noise wall from Gateview Drive westerly for approximately 340 m, for abutting residential properties only, where noise walls do not currently exist.

For all other road sections, the increase in noise level from existing to future conditions is less than 2 dBA, and all projected noise levels are below 65dBA and therefore no other noise mitigation will be required as part of the road improvements. See figure 1 below for the location of existing and proposed noise barriers.
7.0 Recommended Design Alternative

Based on a review of the technical information gathered for this project as well as a review of all public comments received, the Project Team is recommending that Regional Council approve Alternative 2C (Modified) – Widen the Road to 4-lanes and Add Active Transportation Facilities for Sidewalks, Multi-use Trail and Cycle Tracks as the Recommended Design Alternative for Erb Street Improvements, from Fischer-Hallman Road to Wilmot Line. The Recommended Design Alternative includes:

- Urbanizing and Widening Erb Street to four lanes from Fischer-Hallman Road to the roundabout at Gate 2 of the Region’s Waste Management Centre (east of Wilmot Line);
- Construction of an eastbound left-turn lane on Erb Street at Beechwood Place and extension of existing turn lanes at intersections;
- Removing the right-turn lane to the Bilingual School entrance on the north side of Erb Street east of Erbsville Court;
- Completing the sidewalk on the south side of Erb Street between Gateview Drive and Erbsville Court, and on the south side of Erb Street from the commercial plaza entrance west of Ira Needles Boulevard to the traffic signals at the Westside Marketplace entrance;
- Constructing a Multi-use trail on the north side of Erb Street from the Westside Marketplace entrance to the roundabouts at the West Waterloo Commercial
(Costco) site entrance;

- Maintaining existing on-road bike lanes between Erbsville Court and Wilmot Line;
- Constructing cycle tracks on both sides of Erb Street from Fischer-Hallman Road to Erbsville Court; and
- Constructing noise walls abutting residential properties along the north side of Erb Street from Beechwood Drive westerly for approximately 170 m, and south side of Erb Street from Gateview Drive westerly for approximately 340 m.

Please refer to Appendix 'B' for drawings of the typical cross-sections for the Recommended Design Alternative 2C (Modified).

Implementation of the Project Team’s Recommended Design Alternative for improvements will require that parcels of property be obtained along Erb Street from Hydro One and commercial properties west of Ira Needles Boulevard, as well as one existing residential property east of Ira Needles Boulevard. Property required for road widening is expected to impact landscaped areas only along the frontage or side/yard of a property. All of the alternatives require the acquisition of property from Hydro One and the relocation of hydro towers adjacent to the Regions Waste Management Centre.

In order to relocate hydro towers, Hydro One is required to complete their own Environmental Assessment (EA) and detailed design which along with property transfer and construction can take one to two or more years. The EA and design for the hydro tower relocations required is ongoing by Hydro One.

Letters advising of the recommendations contained in this Report TES-DCS-18-12 have been mailed to all agencies and those who attended the Public Consultation Centres, as well as mailed or hand delivered to all owners/residents abutting the Erb Street project limits, in advance of this Planning and Works Committee meeting.

In order to support the roadway improvements on Erb Street, Region staff is recommending that the Region’s Traffic and Parking By-law be amended to enable installation of lane designation signs and markings on Erb Street for the cycling lane improvements on the north and south side of Erb Street from Fischer-Hallman Road to Ira Needles Boulevard in the City of Waterloo.

8.0 Project Cost

The total estimated cost for the proposed Erb Street improvements including engineering, construction, utility relocation, property acquisition and other project costs is $8.5 million to $10.5 million. The total estimated cost includes $2.0 million to $4.0 million for utility work such as Hydro One tower relocations west of Ira Needles Boulevard.
9.0 Next Steps

Subject to Regional Council approval of the Recommended Design Alternative, a Notice of Completion will be filed for this project by means of mail-outs and advertised notices; and the Environmental Study Report, which will include all relevant documentation regarding the planning and decision-making process, will be placed (filed) on the public record for a minimum mandatory review period of thirty (30) days. During this thirty (30) day filing period, any party may object to the Recommended Design Alternative by requesting the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change grant a Part “II” Order requesting that the project subject to a full environmental assessment. A request for a full environmental assessment must be made in writing to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change with a copy to the Region’s Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services. When the thirty (30) day public filing has expired and if no requests for a full environmental assessment are received by the Minister within that thirty (30) days, the Recommended Design Alternative will be considered approved for implementation.

Subject to Regional Council approval of the Recommended Design Alternative, it is anticipated that this Class EA Study will be completed and filed in September 2018 with detailed design, property acquisition and utility relocations being completed in the 2018 and 2019. Funding for the Erb Street improvements is currently included in 2019 to 2020 in the Region’s 2018 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program. The timing of construction is subject to receipt of all technical and financial approvals, acquisition of the required property, relocation of utilities (including Hydro One tower relocations) and will be reviewed and revised as necessary during the preparation of the recommended 2019 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This project supports the Region’s 2015 – 2018 Corporate Strategic Plan in that the implementation of the Erb Street improvements aligns with Focus Area 2.3 to build infrastructure for and increase participation in, active forms of transportation (cycling and walking), and Focus Area 2.4 to optimize road capacity to safely manage traffic and congestion.

Financial Implications:

The Region’s 2018 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program (TCP) includes $11.725 million for road improvements on Erb Street which is provided in the TCP by the following budget line items:

- Urban Resurfacing –Erb Street (Reg. Rd. No.9), Erbsville Court to Ira Needles Boulevard (Project #6983) $595,000 (2018 – 2019), to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve ($595,000);
• Reconstruction and Major Rehabilitation – Erb Street (Reg. Rd. No.9), Fischer-Hallman Road to Gateview Drive (Project #5390) $1,740,000 (2018 – 2020), to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve ($1,380,000) and Roads Development Charges Reserve Fund ($360,000);
• Road Widening – Erb Street (Reg. Rd. No.9), Gateview Drive/Beechwood Drive to Erbsville Court (Project #7297) $3,215,000 (2018 – 2020), to be funded from the Roads Development Charges Reserve Fund ($2,732,750) and Roads Capital Levy Reserve ($482,250); and
• Road Widening – Erb Street (Reg. Rd. No.9), Ira Needles Boulevard to Wilmot Line (Project #7327) $6,175,000 (2018 – 2020) to be funded from the Roads Development Charges Reserve Fund ($6,175,000).

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:
Nil

Attachments

Appendix ‘A’ Key Plan of the Erb Street Project Limits
Appendix ‘B’ Typical Cross-sections of Design Alternatives and Plan View/Typical Cross-sections of Recommended Design Alternative 2C (Modified)
Appendix ‘C’ Evaluation of Design Alternatives

Prepared By: William Gilbert, Senior Project Manager, Design and Construction
Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner Transportation and Environmental Services
Appendix “A” – Key Plan

ERB STREET
(FISCHER-HALLMAN ROAD TO WILMOT LINE)
Appendix “B” – Typical Cross-sections of Design Alternatives

Design Alternative 1

Urbanize the Existing Road and retain the current number of travelled lanes with the exception of Widening to 4-lanes west of Ira Needles Boulevard to the roundabout at the Waterloo Waste Management Centre/Costco entrance and Adding Active Transportation Facilities.

---

FISCHER-HALLMAN ROAD TO GATEVIEW DRIVE & ERBESVILLE COURT TO ROUNDABOUT AT GATE 1 REGION WASTE MANAGEMENT CENTRE / WEST WATERLOO COMMERCIAL CENTRE (COSTCO) ENTRANCE TYPICAL SECTION
Design Alternative 1 (continued)
Design Alternative 2A

Widen the Road to 4-lanes, Urbanize and Add Active Transportation Facilities for Sidewalks and On-Road Bike Lanes

FISCHER-HALLMAN ROAD TO
ROUNDABOUT AT GATE 1 REGION WASTE MANAGEMENT CENTRE /
WEST WATERLOO COMMERCIAL CENTRE (COSTCO) ENTRANCE
TYPICAL SECTION
Design Alternative 2B

Widen the Road to 4-lanes, Urbanize and Add Active Transportation Facilities for Multi-Use Trails

FISCHER-HALLMAN ROAD TO
ROUNDABOUT AT GATE 1 REGION WASTE MANAGEMENT CENTRE /
WEST WATERLOO COMMERCIAL CENTRE (COSTCO) ENTRANCE
TYPICAL SECTION
Design Alternative 2C

Widen the Road to 4-lanes, Urbanize and Add Active Transportation Facilities for Sidewalks and Cycle Tracks

FISCHER-HALLMAN ROAD TO ROUNDABOUT AT GATE 1 REGION WASTE MANAGEMENT CENTRE / WEST WATERLOO COMMERCIAL CENTRE (COSTCO) ENTRANCE TYPICAL SECTION
Recommended Design Alternative 2C (Modified)

Widen the Road to 4-lanes, Urbanize and Add Active Transportation Facilities for Sidewalks, Multi-use Trails and Cycle Tracks
Recommended Design Alternative 2C (Modified) (continued)

Widen the Road to 4-lanes, Urbanize and Add Active Transportation Facilities for Sidewalks, Multi-use Trails and Cycle Tracks
Recommended Design Alternative 2C (Modified) (continued)

Widen the Road to 4-lanes, Urbanize and Add Active Transportation Facilities for Sidewalks, Multi-use Trails and Cycle Tracks
### Appendix “C” - Evaluation of Design Alternatives

#### Erb Street Reconstruction
Wilmot Line to Fischer-Hallman Road
Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2A</th>
<th>Alternative 2B</th>
<th>Alternative 2C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road network continuity</td>
<td>No continuity between existing &amp; future 4-lane sections of Erb.</td>
<td>The 3-lane section of Erb Street requires merging of traffic between sections of 4-lane roadway.</td>
<td>Maintains 4 lanes throughout</td>
<td>Maintains 4 lanes throughout</td>
<td>Maintains 4 lanes throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Service Impacts</td>
<td>Erb Street remains serviceable</td>
<td>Erb Street remains serviceable</td>
<td>Added lane minimizes traffic impacts at bus stops.</td>
<td>Added lane minimizes traffic impacts at bus stops.</td>
<td>Added lane minimizes traffic impacts at bus stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling/Walking Impacts</td>
<td>Lack of continuity for cycling and walking infrastructure, but no separation for cyclists.</td>
<td>Provides continuity for cycling and walking infrastructure, but no separation for cyclists.</td>
<td>Provides continuity for cycling and walking infrastructure.</td>
<td>Provides continuity for cycling and walking infrastructure.</td>
<td>Provides continuity for cycling and walking infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td>No change to impacts</td>
<td>Minimal impacts to natural environment</td>
<td>Minimal impacts to natural environment</td>
<td>Minimal impacts to natural environment</td>
<td>Minimal impacts to natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Impact</td>
<td>No change to impacts</td>
<td>Minimal impacts to air quality</td>
<td>Minimal impacts to air quality</td>
<td>Minimal impacts to air quality</td>
<td>Minimal impacts to air quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Impact</td>
<td>No change to impacts</td>
<td>Improvements to be made to stormwater collection.</td>
<td>Improvements to be made to stormwater collection.</td>
<td>Improvements to be made to stormwater collection.</td>
<td>Improvements to be made to stormwater collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage/Cultural Landscape Impacts</td>
<td>No anticipated impacts</td>
<td>No anticipated impacts</td>
<td>No anticipated impacts</td>
<td>No anticipated impacts</td>
<td>No anticipated impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Impacts</td>
<td>No change in noise levels</td>
<td>No change in noise levels</td>
<td>No change in noise levels</td>
<td>No change in noise levels</td>
<td>No change in noise levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic/Financial</td>
<td>Minimal capital cost</td>
<td>Lowest capital cost</td>
<td>Some additional capital cost</td>
<td>Some additional capital cost</td>
<td>Some additional capital cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating &amp; Maintenance Cost</td>
<td>Ongoing maintenance required</td>
<td>Maintenance improvements</td>
<td>Maintenance improvements</td>
<td>Maintenance improvements</td>
<td>Maintenance improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Acquisition</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td>Some widening at Hydro One lands, other minor widening required</td>
<td>Some widening at Hydro One lands, other minor widening required</td>
<td>Some widening at Hydro One lands, other minor widening required</td>
<td>Some widening at Hydro One lands, other minor widening required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Legend
- Most Preferred
- Less Preferred
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Transportation
Design and Construction

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

Date: June 19, 2018
File Code: T01-20/10 Herrgott Road; 07446
T01-20/17 Ament Line; 07446

Subject: Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) and Ament Line (Regional Road 17) Roundabout By-Law Amendments

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-law 16-023, as amended, upon completion of construction of the roundabout at the intersection of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) and Ament Line (Regional Road 17) to:

a) Add to Schedule 10, Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover, Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) at Ament Line (Regional Road 17), on All Entry and Exits;

b) Remove from Schedule 17, Maximum Speed of 80 km/h on Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) between Ament Line (Regional Road 17) and 450m North of Sunset Drive;

c) Remove from Schedule 17, Maximum Speed of 80 km/h on Ament Line / Hawkesville Road (Regional Road 17) between 715 m East of Manser Road (Regional Road 5) and 450m West of Northside Drive (St. Jacobs);

d) Add to Schedule 17, Maximum Speed of 80 km/h on Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) between 400m South of Ament Line to 450 m North of Sunset Drive;

e) Add to Schedule 17, Maximum Speed of 60 km/h on Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) between Ament Line (Regional Road 17) to 400m South of Ament Line;

f) Add to Schedule 17, Maximum Speed of 80 km/h on Ament Line / Hawkesville...
Road (Regional Road 17) between 715 m East of Manser Road (Regional Road 5) and 400m West of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10);

\[\text{g) Add to Schedule 17, Maximum Speed of 60 km/h on Ament Line / Hawkesville between 400 m West of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) and 400m East of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10); and}\]

\[\text{h) Add to Schedule 17, Maximum Speed of 80 km/h on Ament Line / Hawkesville Road (Regional Road 17) 400m East of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) and 450m West of Northside Drive (St. Jacobs).}\]

**Summary:**

In 2016, Regional Council approved a new roundabout at the intersection of Herrgott Road and Ament Line in the Township of Wellesley. Appendix A illustrates the proposed roundabout configuration.

In order to facilitate the operation of the roundabout, amendments to the Region’s Traffic and Parking By-law must be approved, specifically for speed limit changes and for proposed Level 2 Pedestrian Crossovers.

**Report:**

1. **Background**

In December 2016, Regional Council approved the implementation of a roundabout at the intersection of Herrgott Road and Ament Line in the Township of Wellesley. The work has been tendered and construction is scheduled to occur in the summer of 2018.

2. **Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover**

In January 2016 the Ministry of Transportation issued a new regulation (402/15) under the Highway Traffic Act, which established a new traffic-control device called a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover that consists of signs and pavement markings and when used, provides pedestrians the right-of-way to cross roadways. These devices can be implemented on roadways with a posted speed of 60 km/h or less.

At its February 10, 2016 meeting, Region of Waterloo Council approved an implementation strategy for the Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover as outlined in Report TES-TRP-16-05, which planned for the installation of Level 2 Pedestrian Crossovers at all roundabouts starting in 2016.

3. **Recommendations**

In order to facilitate the proposed roundabout operation at Herrgott Road and Ament Line, staff is recommending that the Region’s Traffic and Parking By-law be amended to
change speed limits and add Level 2 Pedestrian Crossovers.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

This project supports Focus Area 2 (“Sustainable Transportation”) of the Corporate Strategic Plan; specifically, Strategic Objective 2.4 which is to optimize road capacity to safely manage traffic and congestion.

**Financial Implications:**

The Region of Waterloo’s approved 2018 Transportation Capital Program includes a budget of $2,035,700 in 2018 for the Herrgott Road at Ament Line roundabout construction (Project 07446) to be funded from Tax Supported Debentures (96%: $1,955,700) and the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve (4%: $80,000).

The cost of the Level 2 Pedestrian Crossovers and speed limit sign changes at the planned roundabout on Herrgott Road at Ament Line is approximately $17,000. Sufficient funding is provided in the abovementioned project budget to implement the Level 2 Pedestrian Crossovers and speed limit sign changes.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

The Council and Administrative Services Division will be required to prepare the amending By-law.

**Attachments**

Appendix A illustrates the location requiring by-law changes; Herrgott Road at Ament Line.

**Prepared By: Satinder Bahia,** Engineering Technologist (Traffic)

**Michael Halloran,** Project Manager (Transportation Base)

**Approved By: Thomas Schmidt,** Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Appendix A – Key Plan
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Rapid Transit

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: June 19, 2018  File Code: C13-20
Subject: Hespeler Road Grade Separation Reserved Bus Lane – Traffic and Parking By-law Amendments

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-law 16-023, as amended, to:

a) Remove from Schedule 4, No Stopping Anytime on both sides of Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) from Highway 401 to Avenue Road;

b) Add to Schedule 4, No Stopping Anytime on both sides of Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) from Highway 401 to Coronation Boulevard/Dundas Street (Regional Road 8);

c) Add to Schedule 15, Southbound Right-Turn Lane Designation on Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) at Jaffray Street, Buses Excepted;

d) Add to Schedule 15, Southbound Right-Turn Lane Designation on Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) at Coronation Boulevard (Regional Road 8), Buses Excepted; and,

e) Add to Schedule 24, Reserved Bus Lane, anytime, west side of Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) from Jaffray Street to 170m south of Jaffray Street;

In the City of Cambridge, as outlined in Report TES-RTS-18-05 dated June 19, 2018.
Summary:

Faster transit service benefits all users and can attract new riders. The Region’s Transit Supportive Strategy (TSS) for Cambridge Working Group identified a quick-win that could shed up to 60 seconds off travel times for southbound Route 51 and 200 iXpress buses during peak traffic times, by creating a dedicated GRT bus lane leading up to the Delta Station along Hespeler Road. The proposal consists of converting the southbound painted shoulder over the grade separation to a bus-only lane, and allowing buses to use the right-turn lanes at Jaffray Street and at Coronation Boulevard. Appendix A provides a location map of the proposed initiative. Transit delay data suggests that this new bus-only lane would speed up service times by up to 60 seconds in afternoon peak periods, and would benefit approximately 1,150 passengers per day. The cost estimate for pavement markings and signage to convert the existing painted shoulder to a dedicated bus-only lane is $5,000.

To implement the proposed Hespeler Road reserved bus lane, staff recommends that the Region’s Traffic and Parking By-law 16-023 be amended to enable the installation of all pavement markings and signage and changes as listed in the report.

Report:

GRT Route 51 Hespeler and 200 iXpress travelling southbound on Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) approaching Coronation Boulevard (Regional Road 8), also known as “the Delta”, currently experience 62 and 50 seconds delay, respectively, during the PM peak period. During peak periods southbound Hespeler Road queues at the Delta stretch to 300 metres north of Jaffray Street. While the southbound ION bus station at the Delta has a short reserved lane and transit signal priority to cross the Delta, GRT buses do not have priority or a reserved lane upstream of the ION bus station.

Staff have identified an existing paved shoulder, 3.50m wide, on the west side of Hespeler Road between Jaffray Street and Coronation Boulevard for conversion to a bus-only lane. When combined with bus exceptions for the southbound right-turn lane on Hespeler Road at Jaffray Street and at Coronation Boulevard, the final configuration will allow GRT buses to travel directly from Jaffray Street to the existing ION bus station at the Delta using the curb lane (combination of the reserved lane and right-turn lanes).

To create the reserved bus lane, new diamond-shape pavement markings and reserved lane signage would be installed. The existing right turn lanes will be designated with signage and “buses excepted” tabs.

Full “queue jump” during peak periods would require widening the west side of Hespeler Road to construct a 300 metre extension of the southbound right turn lane approaching Jaffray Street, which would impact the existing street lights and potentially other underground utilities. Full transit priority would include transit signal priority at Hespeler
Road and Jaffray Street. Based on the magnitude and cost, the TSS working group and Regional staff are not pursuing full queue jump and transit signal priority at this time.

Regional staff recommend that the existing southbound Hespeler Road paved shoulder between Jaffray Street and Coronation Boulevard be converted to a bus-only lane, and buses be excepted from the right turn lane designations. This lane re-purposing makes more effective use of the Region’s existing infrastructure, and is expected to reduce delays for an average of 144 and 255 passengers on the 51 Hespeler and 200 iXpress routes, respectively, during the PM peak period, and 1,150 passengers over a full weekday. The success of the reserved lane will be monitored for reductions in delay and improvements to on-time performance. Current on-time performance at the Delta timepoint during the PM peak is below the GRT system average of 77%.

This initiative was raised and developed through the TSS Working Group.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

This initiative supports the Region’s goal to optimize road capacity to safely manage traffic and congestion (Strategic Objective 2.4).

**Financial Implications:**

Funding of $5,000 for the proposed reserved lane concept has been approved as part of the Regional Transit Supportive Strategy for Cambridge (TSS) (Report PDL-CPL-18-14 / TES-TRS-18-10; March 20, 2018). Approved TSS costs are funded entirely from the RTMP Reserve Fund.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Corporate Services and Design and Construction were consulted in the preparation of this report.

**Public and Area Municipality Consultation:**

Staff at the City of Cambridge were consulted and they support the proposed changes.

**Attachments:**

Appendix A – Proposed Reserved Bus Lane Southbound Hespeler Road at the Delta

**Prepared By:** Matthew O’Neill, Project Manager, Rapid Transit
Eric Pisani, Principal Planner, Grand River Transit

**Approved By:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Appendix A - Proposed Reserved Bus Lane Southbound Hespeler Road at the Delta

Delta Station

Minimal right-turning vehicles

300m queue length
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services

Transportation

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

Date: June 19, 2018

File Code: T01-20/9 Waterloo

Subject: Proposed Relocation of Intersection Pedestrian Signal (IPS) – Bridgeport Road (Regional Road 9), in the City of Waterloo

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo relocate the existing intersection pedestrian signal from the current location at the Bridgeport Road (Regional Road 9) Peppler Street intersection to a new location approximately 130 metres to the east on Bridgeport Road at the Laurel Creek Trail crossing, as outlined in Report TES-TRP-18-07 dated June 19, 2018.

Summary:

City of Waterloo staff approached Regional staff requesting that the Region consider relocating the existing Intersection Pedestrian Signal (IPS) from the current location at the Bridgeport Road/Peppler Street intersection to a new location approximately 130 metres to the east where the Laurel Creek Trail crosses Bridgeport Road. Based on the Region’s analysis, public and area municipal consultation, Regional staff recommend that the IPS be relocated to the Laurel Creek Trail crossing.

Results from the Region’s origin-destination study indicate that 61% of pedestrians were crossing Bridgeport Road at the Laurel Creek Trail crossing, as opposed to 38% of pedestrians crossing Bridgeport Road at Peppler Street. North and southbound trail users crossed Bridgeport Road at the Laurel Creek Trail access. No trail users were observed travelling from the trail to the existing Intersection Pedestrian Signals at Bridgeport/Peppler intersection and back to the trail access.
In an effort to best utilize the intersection pedestrian signals based on origin-destination and traffic count data, City of Waterloo and Regional staff are recommending the relocation of the signals to a new location approximately 130 metres to the east where the Laurel Creek Trail crosses Bridgeport Road.

The relocation of intersection pedestrian signals located at Bridgeport Road and Peppler Street would create a public transportation network that is integrated and accessible by pedestrians and cyclists. The cost to relocate the traffic signal will be split equally between the Region and the City of Waterloo.

Report:

1.0 Background

Over the past 10 years the City of Waterloo has been developing a city wide active transportation network to provide opportunity for people to travel without a vehicle, and still access key destinations such as Uptown Waterloo, universities, schools, and places of employment. This network consists of trails, sidewalks and on-road facilities such as bike lanes, signed bike routes and road crossings.

The Laurel Creek Trail sees a high number of users and is an integral part of the high priority trail system, connecting people and neighbourhoods. Continuing to build on the City wide active network, City of Waterloo staff requested that the Region consider the relocation of the existing Intersection Pedestrian Signal from the current location at the intersection of Bridgeport Road and Peppler Street to a new location approximately 130 metres to the east where the Laurel Creek Trail crosses Bridgeport Road.

2.0 Existing Conditions

Bridgeport Road is a one-way road with three lanes in the westbound direction. The Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) on Bridgeport Road is 14,500 vehicles per day. There is an existing Intersection Pedestrian Signal (IPS) located at the intersection of Bridgeport Road and Peppler Street. The posted speed limit along this section of Bridgeport Road is 50km/h.

Approximately 130 metres to the east of the intersection of Bridgeport Road and Peppler Street is the Laurel Creek Trail crossing. The location of the crossing is not controlled and as such, pedestrians must wait for a gap in traffic before attempting to cross Bridgeport Road or walk 130m west to the signal, cross Bridgeport Road and walk back to the trail.

Figure 1 provides an overall view of the area showing the existing IPS at the intersection of Bridgeport Road and Peppler Street, and the Laurel Creek Trail crossing.
Figure 1 – Bridgeport Road, Peppler Street to Moore Avenue

2.1 Collision Review

During the previous five years (2012 to 2016), the Bridgeport Road/Peppler Street intersection experienced 29 collisions where 21 collisions were predicted. During this period there was one collision involving a pedestrian. The intersection ranks 2609 out of 3334 locations assessed.

The midblock section between Peppler Street and Moore Avenue experienced 7 collisions during the same five-year period. Of the total collisions there were zero collisions noted at the trail crossing. This section of Bridgeport Road ranks 2592 out of the 3334 locates assessed.

3.0 Origin-Destination Study

An origin-destination study was conducted on Bridgeport Road in the area between the intersection of Bridgeport Road and Peppler Street and the Laurel Creek Trail.

An origin-destination (OD) study is typically used to determine travel patterns of traffic during a typical day. However, staff applied the same methodology to determine travel patterns of pedestrians and cyclists in the area of Bridgeport Road/Peppler Street intersection and the Laurel Creek Trail. The survey shows a detailed trip pattern of pedestrians and cyclists utilizing the uncontrolled trail crossing and the controlled crossing (IPS) at the Bridgeport Road/Peppler Street intersection.
The OD study was conducted on a Thursday and a Saturday during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m., 12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. for a total of 16 hours. Pedestrian travel patterns originating at the intersection of Bridgeport Road and Peppler Street as well as Bridgeport Road at the Laurel Creek Trail were monitored.

Appendix “A” summarizes the travel patterns captured through the origin-destination study. The survey showed that 38% of pedestrians crossed Bridgeport Road at Peppler Street, 61% crossed Bridgeport Road at the Laurel Creek Trail crossing, and that very few pedestrians and cyclists using the Laurel Trail went out of their way to use the signal.

4.0 Public and Area Municipality Consultation

The Region arranged an online survey between June 5th and June 23rd, 2017. Surveys were also mailed to property owners in the immediate area to obtain feedback regarding the proposed relocation of the IPS. Of 109 responses received, 73 were in favour, 20 were opposed and 7 requested the Region of Waterloo leave the IPS at the intersection of Bridgeport Road and Peppler Street and to add a second pedestrian signal at the Laurel Creek Trail crossing.

City of Waterloo staff support a controlled trail crossing of Bridgeport Road as it will provide a great benefit to the local and wider community, making this trail route a desirable choice for all ages and abilities.

5.0 Signal Warrant Analysis (Laurel Creek Trail)

In response to comments to consider maintaining the existing signal and adding a second pedestrian signal at the trail crossing, staff assessed the merits of a second pedestrian traffic control signal located at the Laurel Creek Trail crossing.

Current Regional practice is to follow provincial guidelines documented and shared through the Ministry of Transportation. Based on these guidelines, a second traffic control signal is not warranted based on the distance to a down stream traffic signal. The distance between the Bridgeport Road/Peppler Street intersection and the Laurel Creek Trail crossing is approximately 130 metres. Traffic control signals should only be considered if the distance between them is 200 metres or greater.

Traffic control signals located closer than 200 metres of one another can experience the following negative impacts:

- Poor progression between traffic signals;
- Potential for vehicles to queue up to and through the adjacent signal; and
- Motorists may recognize and react to the downstream traffic signal indication.

All of the above may lead to both safety and operational concerns as a result of having two traffic signals installed too close to one another.
6.0 Recommendations

Based on the Region’s analysis and public and area municipal consultation, staff recommends that the pedestrian signal be relocated from the Bridgeport Road/Peppler Street intersection to a location 130 metres east where the Laurel Trail crosses Bridgeport Road.

Relocating the traffic signal will better serve both pedestrians and cyclists based on findings that indicated the majority (61%) of pedestrians cross at the Laurel Creek trail versus 38% crossing at the Bridgeport/Peppler Street intersection.

The design of the signal will be a bike friendly design with the inclusion of bike signals for those cyclists using the Laurel Creek Trail. If approved, staff anticipate that the pedestrian traffic control signal will be operational by the fall of 2018.

Figure 2 shows the proposed location for the pedestrian signal at Bridgeport Road and the Laurel Creek Trail crossing.

Figure 2 – Proposed Pedestrian Signal on Bridgeport Road at the Laurel Creek Trail Crossing
Corporate Strategic Plan:

This report addresses the Region’s Strategic Objectives:

**Strategic Objective 2.1** – Create a public transportation network that is integrated, accessible, affordable and sustainable;

**Strategic Objective 2.3** – Build infrastructure for, and increase participation in, active forms of transportation (cycling and walking); and

**Strategic Objective 4.4** – Promote and support healthy living and prevent disease and injury.

Financial Implications:

The estimated cost to relocate the IPS is approximately $45,000. This project will be cost-shared equally between the Region and the City of Waterloo. The Region’s 2018 Transportation Capital Program includes sufficient funds in the New Traffic Signal Installation budget.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil

Attachments:

Appendix A – Origin-Destination Survey Summary

Prepared By: Valerie MacQueen-Pearcey, Engineering Technologist (Traffic)

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Appendix A – Origin-Destination Survey

Pedestrian Origin-Destination Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Total Number of Pedestrians</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Weekday Pedestrians</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weekend Pedestrians</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Captured</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Breakdown</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGEND
- Laurel Creek Trail – North and Southbound Pedestrians crossing Bridgeport Road (1)
- Southbound Laurel Creek Trail – west on Bridgeport – south on Peppler – east on Bridgeport to Laurel Creek Trail (2)
- Northbound Laurel Creek Trail - west on Bridgeport – north on Peppler – east on Bridgeport to Laurel Creek Trail (3)
- Southbound Laurel Creek Trail – west on Bridgeport Road – South on Peppler Street (4)
- Peppler Street – North and Southbound Pedestrians (5)
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services

Transportation Division

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

Date: June 19, 2018

File Code: T01-20/97, T01-20/5

Subject: Proposed Level 2 Crossover on Cedar Street (Regional Road 97) at the Westgate Plaza Entrance, in the City of Cambridge, and on Nafziger Road (Regional Road 5) at Maple Leaf Street, in the Township of Wellesley

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend the Region’s Traffic and Parking By-law 16-023, as amended, to add the following to Schedule 10:

- A Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover on Cedar Street (Regional Road 97) at the east entrance to Westgate Plaza (east approach), in the City of Cambridge, and

- A Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover on Nafziger Road (Regional Road 5) at Maple Leaf Street (north approach), in the Township of Wellesley; as outlined in Report TES-TRP-18-08, dated June 19, 2018.

Summary:

The Region assessed the warrant justification for a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover at a number of intersections within the Region. Two locations, Cedar Street at the entrance to Westgate Plaza in the City of Cambridge, and the intersection of Nafziger Road at Maple Leaf Street in the Township of Woolwich meet the justification for a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover.

Based on the Region’s review, it is recommended that a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover be installed on Cedar Street at the east entrance to Westgate Plaza (east approach), and on the north side at the intersection of Nafziger Road at Maple Leaf Street.
The addition of Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover in these locations will serve to enhance pedestrians' mobility and encourage active forms of transportation.

Report:

1.0 Background

In 2016 the Province’s Transportation Minister issued a new regulation (402/15) under the Highway Traffic Act, which established a new traffic-control device called a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover. This new traffic-control device consists of new roadside signs and pavement markings and serves to enhance the mobility of pedestrians.

After the passing of regulation 402/15, Regional staff compiled a list of locations to be assessed for Level 2 Pedestrian Crossovers. These locations were known to have concerns related to pedestrian’s crossing the main road. Appendix A provides a list of the locations staff have assessed or are currently assessing for a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover.

To date Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover control has been installed at the following locations:

- All approaches and exits at roundabouts, installed in 2016
- The intersection of Church Street at Killdeer Road/Country Club Estates Drive in the Township of Woolwich, installed in 2016
- The Lackner Boulevard/Corfield Drive intersection in the City of Kitchener, installed in 2017

Based on the Region’s assessments completed to date, the Region has identified Cedar Street at Westgate Plaza entrance and Nafziger Road at Maple Leaf Street, as potential locations to be considered for Level 2 Crossovers.

2.0 Existing Conditions

Cedar Street between Osborne Street and Dale Avenue is a 4-lane cross-section. An access to Westgate Plaza is located approximately 75 metres west of Osborne Street. The access currently has an existing pedestrian refuge island. The posted speed limit on Cedar Street is 50 km/h with an Average Annually Daily Traffic Volume (AADT) of approximately 15,939 vehicles per day.

Nafziger Road in the vicinity of Maple Leaf Street is a 2-lane cross-section. The posted speed limit on Nafziger Road is 50 km/h. The Average Annually Daily Traffic is approximately 3,651 vehicles per day. On the north leg of the intersection there is a school crossing which is controlled with a crossing guard.

Appendix B provides a figure showing existing conditions of both Cedar Street in the City of Cambridge and the intersection of Nafziger Road and Maple Leaf Street in the Township Wellesley.
2.1 Cedar Street Fronting Westgate Plaza Collision History

An analysis of the collision history (2012-2016) on Cedar Street between Osborne Street and Dale Avenue shows that there were 24 total collisions where 10 were predicted. This location ranks 174 out of 3,334 locations assessed for collisions.

Of the 24 total collisions, there was one pedestrian collision and two cycling related collisions reported. The pedestrian collision reported was a fatal collision that occurred on Cedar Street fronting the Westgate Plaza where a southbound motorist struck a pedestrian crossing Cedar Street. The collision occurred Saturday, November 26, 2016 at 5:50 p.m. under wet roadway and low light conditions.

When a fatal collision occurs on a Regional Road the Region will undertake a detailed review of collisions to determine if any countermeasures are warranted. Through the review, it was recommended to assess the need for additional pedestrian control on Cedar Street fronting Westgate Plaza.

2.2 Nafziger Road at Maple Leaf Street Collision History

During the previous five years (2012 to 2016) at the Nafziger Road/Maple Leaf Street intersection there were zero collisions.

3.0 Need and Justification for Additional Traffic Control

To assess the need for additional traffic control, current Regional practice is to follow the warrant methodology established by provincial guidelines as documented and developed through the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario. The following traffic control options were assessed by Regional staff.

- Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover
- Pedestrian Traffic Control Signals (Intersection or midblock)
- Full Traffic Control Signals.

4.0 Justification for Pedestrian Traffic Control

4.1 Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover

The Highway Traffic Act regulates the implementation of Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover to roadways posted at 60 km/h and under. Drivers approaching a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover shall stop before entering a crossover when a pedestrian is crossing the roadway within a pedestrian crossover, shall not overtake another vehicle already stopped at a crossover, and shall not proceed into the crossover until the pedestrian is no longer on the roadway. The legislation also notes that a pedestrian shall not leave the curb or other place of safety at a pedestrian crossover and walk, run or move into the path if a vehicle that is so close that it is impractical for the driver to stop. In
summary, the legislation has been set up so that legal responsibility is assigned to both the motorist and pedestrian.

The criteria used to establish the need for a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover includes pedestrian volume crossing the main road, vehicular volume on the main road and a detailed assessment of the roadway characteristics. Generally, a minimum of 100 pedestrians crossing the roadway must be observed, and traffic volumes must not exceed 35,000 vehicles (in 24 hours) as compliance can become problematic on higher volume roads. Generally traffic control signals are considered more appropriate for these higher volume roads.

On March 28, 2017 staff surveyed pedestrian volumes crossing Cedar Street and found that 189 pedestrians were crossing Cedar Street fronting the Westgate Plaza in the City of Cambridge. Applying those pedestrians captured through the survey to the warrant for a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover, a Level 2 Crossover is warranted.

On September 24, 2015 staff surveyed pedestrian volumes at the Nafziger Road/Maple Leaf Street intersection. Through the survey, there were 297 pedestrians crossing Nafziger Road. Applying the pedestrian volumes to the warrant for a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover, a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover is also warranted at this location.

Please refer to Appendix C, which provides a figure illustrating the type of Pedestrian Crossover that is warranted for both Cedar Street and the Nafziger Road/Maple Leaf Street intersection. The figures illustrate the general traffic control concepts that will be applied to each location.

4.2 Pedestrian Traffic Control Signals

Criteria used to establish the need for a Pedestrian Traffic Control Signal is very similar to a Level 2 Crossover which includes vehicular/pedestrian volumes and delay, and a detailed assessment of the roadway characteristics.

When assessing the need for a Pedestrian Traffic Control Signal there must be a minimum of 200 pedestrians crossing the main road and those pedestrians must experience excessive delay when crossing.

Through our survey on June 29, 2017, only 189 pedestrians were observed crossing Cedar Street. This volume of pedestrians does not meet the warrant for pedestrian traffic control signals.

Similarly, on September 24, 2015, 297 pedestrians were captured crossing Nafziger Road at Maple Leaf Street. Applying the volume and delay to the Region’s warrant methodology, a pedestrian traffic control signal is not justified at this time. Although the volume of pedestrians met criteria for a intersection pedestrian signal, pedestrians experienced little delay when crossing, rendering the IPS not necessary.
4.3 Full Traffic Control Signals

Criteria for traffic control signals to be met also includes a detailed review of vehicular / pedestrian volumes and delay, and a detailed assessment of the roadway characteristics. In addition however, a review of collision experience is also a criteria for review.

For the collision justification, those collisions susceptible to correction over a 3 year period were assessed. Susceptible collisions generally include both angle and turning movement collisions. For a traffic control signal to be warranted, there must be 15 collisions that were susceptible to correction over a three year period.

For traffic control signals to be considered, at least one of the following justifications must satisfy 100%, or the Minimum Vehicle Volume Warrant and Delay to Cross Traffic Warrant must both satisfy 80% in combination.

- Justification 1: Minimum Vehicle Volume
- Justification 2: Delay to Cross Traffic
- Justification 3: Combination Warrant
- Justification 4: Minimum Four-Hour Vehicle Volume
- Justification 5: Collision Experience

Below is a summary of the warrant Justifications for both Cedar Street at Westgate Plaza and at the Nafziger Road/Maple Leaf Street intersection.

1. Cedar Street at Westgate Plaza
   - Justification 1: Minimum Vehicle Volume – 68%
   - Justification 2: Delay to Cross Traffic – 98%
   - Justification 3: Combination Warrant – Not Satisfied
   - Justification 4: Minimum Four-Hour Vehicle Volume – 88%
   - Justification 5: Collision Experience – 0%

2. Nafziger Road at Maple Leaf Street
   - Justification 1: Minimum Vehicle Volume – 6%
   - Justification 2: Delay to Cross Traffic – 34%
   - Justification 3: Combination Warrant – Not Satisfied
   - Justification 4: Minimum Four-Hour Vehicle Volume – 5%
Traffic volume currently entering both intersections, and the delay to cross traffic, does not meet the need for traffic control signals at this time.

However for the Cedar Street/Westgate Plaza, Justification 2: Delay to Cross Traffic, is very close to meeting 100%. Regional staff believe traffic volume at the intersection was influenced by nearby construction in the area. Regional staff have not received any requests from the public to address delays at this intersection. Therefore, the Region will continue monitoring the need for full traffic control signals and when warranted will consider installation at that time.

5.0 Area Municipality Consultation/Coordination

The City of Cambridge supports the installation of a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover on Cedar Street fronting the Westgate Plaza.

The Township of Wellesley also supports the installation of a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover at the Nafziger Road at Maple Leaf Street intersection.

6.0 Recommendation

Based on the Region’s review a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover is warranted on Cedar Street fronting the Westgate Plaza, in the City of Cambridge and on Nafziger Road at its intersection with Maple Leaf Street, in the Township of Wellesley.

The installation of Level 2 Pedestrian Crossovers will serve to enhance pedestrian mobility and encourage active forms of transportation.

The Region will continue monitoring the need for traffic control signals at the intersection of Cedar Street and Westgate Plaza. As such the Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover will be an interim measure until such time traffic control signals are warranted and installed.

It is anticipated that the Level 2 Crossovers will be installed and operational prior to the 2018/2019 school season starting in September.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This report addresses the Region’s goal to build infrastructure for and increase participation in, active forms of transportation in cycling and walking (Strategic Objective 2.3).

Financial Implications:
The Region’s approved 2018-2027 Transportation Capital Program includes a budget of $350,000 in 2018 for New Traffic Signal Installation (project 07478) to be funded from the Roads Regional Development Charges Reserve Fund. The cost to implement the Level 2 Pedestrian crossovers at both Cedar Street/Westgate Plaza and at the Nafziger Road/Maple Leaf Street intersection is estimated to be approximately $20,000.

**Attachments:**

- Appendix A - Locations Reviewing a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover
- Appendix B - Existing Conditions
- Appendix C - Warranted Pedestrian Crossover

**Prepared By:** Patricia Heft, Engineering Technologist (Traffic), Transportation  
Satinder Bahia, Engineering Technologist (Traffic), Transportation

**Approved By:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
## Appendix A - Locations Reviewing a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover

### LOCATIONS AND ASSESSMENT FOR ADDITIONAL CONTROL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Installation date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roundabouts</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All approaches retrofitted with speed reduction to 60km/h</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lackner at Corefield</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug. 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church at Killdeer</td>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria at Stoke</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Not warranted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle at Laurel</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Not warranted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen at Joseph</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport at Goldbeck/Bluevale</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water at the trail crossing (south of Ainslie)</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Not warranted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erb at Goldbeck/Terrystone</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huron Street at Byron / Milton (school crossing for Holy Family &amp; Grandview PS)</td>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>Not warranted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huron Street at Mill Street</td>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Street @ Petro Canada Gas Station / Wilmot Family Resource Center</td>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Street at Forrest Avenue (school crossing near Forrest Glen PS)</td>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Installation date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar at Westgate Plaza (ped refuge), Cambridge</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Level 2 PXO, Type B Warranted</td>
<td>Proposed 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge at Paige/Stanley</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline S end of ION Terminal</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Level 2 PXO, Type B warranted</td>
<td>Proposed 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafziger Road at Maple Leaf Street (school crossing)</td>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>Level 2 PXO, Type D Warranted</td>
<td>Proposed 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport at Peppler - Re-locate signals to trail (IPS)</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>2018 Re-location</td>
<td>Proposed 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Street at Eastbridge Blvd</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Street at Dale Avenue</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Street at Osborne Street</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Not warranted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B - Existing Conditions

Figure 1 - Cedar Street Fronting Westgate Plaza, City of Cambridge

Figure 2 - Nafziger Road at Maple Leaf Street, Township of Wellesley
Appendix C - Warranted Pedestrian Crossover

Figure 1 - Cedar Street Fronting Westgate Plaza, City of Cambridge

General notes:
- Required illumination of pedestrian crosswalk and waiting area to be provided
- Accessible as per AODA

Pushbutton

N.T.S.
Figure 2 – Nafziger Road at Maple Leaf Street, Township of Wellesley

General notes:
- Required illumination of pedestrian crosswalk and waiting area to be provided
- Accessible as per AODA
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Water Services

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: June 19, 2018
File Code: E03-20/4014-20

Subject: Cambridge East Water Supply Class Environmental Assessment: Notice of Completion

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the “Cambridge Water Supply Class Environmental Assessment Project Report” summarized in this Report TES-WAS-18-14 dated June 19, 2018;

And that the Regional Municipality of Waterloo publish the Notice of Completion for the Project File Report and make the report available for public review and comment for a 30-day period, in accordance with the Municipal Engineers Association’s Class Environmental Assessment process.

Summary:

The Region of Waterloo’s Water Supply Master Plan (WSMP) was adopted in 2000 to ensure long-term water supply to the Region until the year 2041. In order to meet the recommendations of the WSMP, the Region initiated the Integrated Urban Supply Optimization and Expansion Project (IUS Project) in 2005, with the objective of developing additional groundwater supplies in select areas across the Region. The IUS project identified Cambridge East as one area to develop new groundwater supplies and enhance existing water supply and treatment infrastructure. The project was undertaken following the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) process for a Class B project.

Comprehensive hydrogeologic investigations and aquifer testing were completed in support of the Cambridge East Class EA. Throughout the project consultation was
conducted with the public including three Public Consultation Centres, with adjacent property owners, and with government agencies. During the Class EA process a range of alternatives was evaluated against environmental, social, economic, cultural and technical criteria. The preferred alternative is to develop additional groundwater supplies for the existing Pinebush and Clemens Mill (Turnbull) Water Treatment Plants from the following sources: 1) upgrade of existing well G16; 2) three new wells at the existing well P10 site; and 3) a new well at a new site in the Clemens Mill well field on Cedarbrook Court (Cedarbrook well).

The Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process for a Class B project requires public advertisement of a Notice of Completion for the Class EA Report, and public release of the Class EA Report, for review and comment for a period of at least 30 days following issue of the notice. Water Services recommends that the Region approve the publication of the Notice of Completion, and placement of the Class EA Report for public review at the Regional Clerk’s office, on the Region’s web site, at the City of Cambridge’s Clerk’s office, and at the Township of Puslinch’s Municipal Office, tentatively from September 5 to October 5, 2018.

Report:

**Cambridge East Project Followed Class Environmental Assessment Process**

The Region of Waterloo’s Water Supply Master Plan (WSMP) was adopted in 2000 to ensure long-term water supply to the Region until the year 2041. In order to meet the recommendations of the WSMP, the Region initiated the Integrated Urban Supply Optimization and Expansion Project (IUS Project) in 2005, with the objective of developing additional groundwater supplies in select areas across the Region. The IUS project identified Cambridge East as one area to investigate and to enhance existing water supply and treatment infrastructure. The Cambridge East study followed the procedures set out in the Municipal Engineers Association Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) document for a Class B project, including public consultation and preparation of the Class EA Report.

The purpose of the Cambridge East Class EA is to identify the preferred alternatives for optimizing municipal groundwater supplies in the Pinebush, Clemens Mill and Shades Mill well fields. These well fields are currently producing approximately 272 L/s which is significantly below the existing water treatment capacity of the Pinebush, Turnbull (Clemens Mill) and Shades Mill Water Treatment Plants (WTPs) of 390 L/s.

The purpose of this report to Regional Council is to document the Class EA process followed for this project.
Cambridge East EA Project Timeline Extended to Complete Other Related Projects

Hydrogeologic investigations were undertaken for the Cambridge East project between 2005 and 2009, including test well drilling at five locations and conducting long-term pumping tests. The results of the testing program identified options to optimize supply capacity to the Cambridge East WTPs from several new well sites and were presented at the first Public Consultation Centre (PCC) for the Cambridge East Class EA in May, 2009.

As noted above, the purpose of the overall IUS Project was to develop new water supplies to meet projected future water demands as noted in the 2000 MWSP and the 2007 update. However, in the middle 2000s, water demand to the IUS system started declining which implied that the amount of water needed in the Cambridge East area may also change. In addition, Region staff were in the middle of a water quantity assessment under the ‘Clean Water Act’ and staff determined that this assessment should be completed prior to finalizing the Cambridge East EA.

As a result of these changes, the project timeline was extended to allow the Region to undertake these assessments and conduct additional investigations/studies as follows:

- Implemented a multi-year supply-well upgrade program within the IUS which included a further evaluation of opportunities to restore well capacities and to optimize water takings at existing well sites in the Pinebush, Clemens Mill and Shades Mill well fields.
- Completed a Tier 3 Water Budget and Local Area Risk Assessment (Tier 3) in 2017, of the Region’s groundwater supplies in the IUS and selected rural areas, as required under the ‘Clean Water Act’. The Tier 3 Assessment included assessing the sustainability of municipal water supplies to meet future water demands to 2031 under various water demand, urban growth, and precipitation (drought) scenarios.
- Completed an update to the WSMP in 2015 with the primary objectives to optimize the existing and planned water supply sources within the IUS for the medium-term planning horizon (to 2031) and to determine the water supply capacity required for the long-term planning horizon (to 2051).
- The Water Supply and Distribution Operations Master Plan (WSDOMP). The WSDOMP was completed in 2015, with the objective of optimizing the operating efficiency of the IUS distribution system.

The WSMP recommended the optimization of groundwater supplies to the Cambridge East Water Treatment Plants to help meet medium-term (2031) and long-term (2051) projected IUS water demands. The Cambridge East WTP facilities are crucial in the WSDOMP, due to their central locations on the east side, which would allow water to be pumped north or south as needed to help meet IUS water demands and in the event of short-term supply shutdowns at other sources.
After these studies were undertaken, the Cambridge East Class EA resumed and a second PCC was held in December 2016 to update the public on the additional studies completed and the groundwater supply alternatives identified.

Data analyses and groundwater modelling were completed to assess the sustainability of groundwater supplies in Cambridge East and potential effects on nearby sensitive environmental features and other groundwater users. A draft Hydrogeological and Natural Environment Report was completed in April, 2017. A third PCC was held in November, 2017 to gather input on the project and the recommended preferred alternative solution.

Alternative Water Supply Solutions Were Developed

During the Class EA process, a range of potential alternatives were evaluated in terms of their ability to meet the water supply and quality objectives for the project, as well as impacts of the alternatives on the natural, social, cultural, and economic environments and technical considerations. The evaluation process included comments from the public and agencies during the public consultation process. The results of this evaluation were used to help determine the preferred alternative solution for the Cambridge East Study Area.

Alternative solutions developed to help meet projected IUS 2031 demands from wells in Cambridge East included: increased pumping from existing wells at existing well sites; increased pumping from modified wells at existing sites; increased pumping from new wells at existing sites, and increased pumping from new wells at new sites. These alternative solutions were applied to each of the treatment plants.

The alternative solutions and an assessment of whether these solutions would achieve the Cambridge East project goal of maximizing use of the treatment plants are presented in Attachment 1. The alternatives in these tables include the ‘do nothing’ alternative as required under the Class EA process, and each subsequent alternative utilizes the previous alternative as a starting point and adds additional supply sources as part of that alternative.

As noted in these tables, the ‘do nothing’ alternative does not maximize the use of the treatment plants. In addition, two of the alternatives for Pinebush (alternatives PB-3A and PB-3B) provided more water than was needed for 2031. As there were other suitable alternatives available, these two were screened out of the Class EA process. For Shades Mill, neither the use of existing wells (alternative SM-1) nor the installation of new wells at the existing wells sites (alternative SM-2) could achieve the objective of maximizing use of the treatment plant. As there was adequate capacity identified in the alternatives for the Pinebush and Clemens Mill WTPs, it was decided that Shades Mills alternative SM-3 (new well at a new site in Clyde) would not be carried forward through the Class EA process but may be considered for future, depending on water demands.
Following the screening of alternative solutions as to whether they could maximize the use of the treatment plants, the set of alternative solutions shown in Table 1 was developed and were evaluated through the Class EA.

### Table 1: Alternative Solutions Identified for Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Alternative Number and Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do Nothing</td>
<td>1) Use existing wells. Maintain pumping at recent average rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrades at Existing Sites</td>
<td>2A) Increase supply from Clemens Mill existing wells (modified G16 well) &lt;br&gt;2B) Increased supply from Pinebush new wells at existing P10 site: P10A, P10B, PBTW1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New wells at New sites</td>
<td>3A) Increased supply from Clemens Mill at new well site (Cedarbrook well) &lt;br&gt;3B) Increased supply from Clemens Mill at new well (Portuguese Club well)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrades at Existing Sites and New wells at New sites</td>
<td>4) Increase Supply from Clemens Mill existing wells (modified G16 well), new wells in Pinebush (P10 site) and Clemens Mill (Cedarbrook Well)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conceptual Level Cost Estimates were Developed

Conceptual level capital costs have been estimated for alternative solutions identified in Table 1 and are shown in Table 2.

### Table 2: Conceptual Level Cost Estimate of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
<th>Conceptual Level Cost Estimate for Capital Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1: Do Nothing</td>
<td>No Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2A: Increased Supply from Deepened Well G16</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2B: Increased supply from Pinebush new wells at existing site: P10A, P10B, PBTW1-10</td>
<td>&lt;$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3A: Increased supply from Clemens Mill new well: Cedarbrook well</td>
<td>$3.5M to $5.5M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preferred Water Supply Alternative Was Selected
A summary of the results of the evaluation of the Alternative Solutions is shown in Attachment 2. Based on this evaluation, the Recommended Preferred Solution is Alternative 4 in Table 1 and includes the following components:

- increased supply from existing well G16, through well upgrades (i.e. deepening);
- increased supplies from three new wells at the Region’s existing well P10 site; and
- increased supply from a new well at a new site in the Clemens Mill well field (Cedarbrook well).

There are several reasons for selecting this Preferred Solution including: it provides good quality groundwater from multiple additional deep bedrock aquifer sources with low degree of interaction with surface water features; it meets the water supply requirement for increase of 38 L/s by 2031 from both the Pinebush and the Clemens Mill WTPs; it provides greater operational flexibility to supply water from multiple sources at varying pumping rates; it provides flexibility for optimizing pumping between wells and well fields if monitoring shows potential impacts.

Although Alternative 4 has the greatest estimated conceptual cost ($4 million to $6 million), it ranks better in terms of the other criteria as described above.

Expanded Monitoring Required Along With Adaptive Management Plan
Increases in groundwater pumping from Cambridge East will mirror increases in water demands that are expected to occur gradually over the coming decades. One of the comments received as part of the public consultation was that the pumping tests were of a limited duration and that the impacts from this long-term increased pumping may not have occurred during the testing. Accordingly and to ensure the long-term sustainability of the resource, an expanded long-term surface water and groundwater monitoring program coupled with an adaptive management plan will be required. The adaptive management plan will provide a framework for assessing the environmental effects of the well field operations and provide a mechanism for making adjustments to pumping from the various wells, if required, based on the results of long-term monitoring. This plan will be developed based in part on planned operational testing to be conducted once the preferred alternative solution has been commissioned.
Public and Agency Consultation Was Undertaken

The evaluation process incorporated significant public consultation. This included the three Public Consultation Centres noted previously, three meetings held with property owners around Puslinch Lake in the Township of Puslinch, and a further meeting with the Puslinch Lake Cottagers Association. In addition, several meetings were held with Township of Puslinch staff and their hydrogeologic consultant. Notices of the Public Consultation Centres were mailed to adjacent and nearby property owners and advertised in the Waterloo Region Record and The Wellington Advisor newspapers and on the Region’s website. A complete record of the consultation process is provided in the Class EA Report.

Feedback from residents in Cambridge was generally limited to concerns expressed by some residents on and near Cedarbrook Court regarding the exterior design of the new well house, which can be addressed through the future detailed design portion of the project. Concerns were expressed by Puslinch residents, Township staff and their hydrogeologic consultant regarding potential well interference, impacts to water levels in Irish Creek, Puslinch Lake and nearby wetlands, and land use impacts from new well head protection areas created for the new well. The project team concluded that the risks of well interference and surface water features were low. No measurable impacts were observed on these features and no adverse effects on private wells were observed during the pumping tests. Groundwater modelling was used to predict effects over the long term. Some reduction in baseflow rates to Irish Creek and an increase in outflow rates of groundwater from Puslinch Lake were predicted, but these may be too small to measure and are not expected to significantly affect aquatic habitat. Enhanced monitoring coupled with long-term operational testing is needed to confirm if effects on surface water features would actually occur with increased pumping. The impacts on land use from the new well head protection areas are limited and are only expected to affect a few properties near the new Cedarbrook supply well. Some of these properties may need septic system inspections and/or requirements for improved chemical handling and application/storage of fertilizers and manure.

Report Posted For Public Comment

The Class EA project has now been completed. The background studies, systematic evaluation of alternatives and identification of the preferred alternative have been documented in the Class EA Report for this study.

The Class EA process requires public advertisement of a Notice of Completion for the Class EA Report, and public release of the report, for review and comment for a period of at least 30 days following issue of the notice. Water Services recommends that the Region approve the publication of the Notice of Completion, and placement of the Class EA Report for public review at the Regional Clerk’s office, on the Region’s web site, at
the City of Cambridge’s Clerk’s office, and at the Township of Puslinch Municipal Office, tentatively September 5, to October 5, 2018.

After the public comment period has expired and any comments received on the report are addressed, the Class EA Report will be finalized and then filed with the MOECC as a final requirement of the Class EA. Following filing of the Class EA Report, the project will move to preliminary and detailed design. It is expected that construction of the works will be completed by 2027.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

The Cambridge East Water Supply Class EA Report supports the 2015 - 2018 Corporate Strategic Focus Area 1: “Thriving Economy,” Strategic Objective 1.2: “Plan for and provide the infrastructure and services necessary to create the foundation for economic success.”

**Financial Implications:**

The Council approved 2018 Ten Year Water Capital Forecast includes $5 million between 2023 and 2027 for design and construction of the Cambridge East Water Supply System expansion. The preliminary estimated cost of construction from the EA Report is $4 to $6 million. More detailed cost estimates will be developed during the preliminary and detailed design phases of the project, and will be used for updating future Water Capital Forecasts.

This project is being funded by the Water Development Charges Reserve Fund (100%).

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Nil

**Attachments**

Attachment 1: Tables of Alternative Solutions for the Pinebush, Clemens Mill and Shades Mill Treatment Plants
Attachment 2: Alternative Solutions
Attachment 3: Cambridge East Study Area
Attachment 4: IUS Project Test Well and Monitoring Well Installation Locations

**Prepared By:** Richard Wootton, Senior Hydrogeologist, Water Services

**Approved By:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Attachment 1: Tables of Alternative Solutions for the Pinebush, Clemens Mill and Shades Mill Treatment Plants

**Pinebush (PB) Well Field Alternative Solutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solutions</th>
<th>Maximizes Use of Treatment Plant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PB-1: Do Nothing: Use existing wells: P10, P11, P17</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB-2: Apply Alternative Solution PB-1 and construct new wells at existing sites: P10A, P10B, PBTW1-10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB-3A: Apply Alternatives PB-1 and PB-2 and use well at new site: PBTW1-06 (Witmer Park)</td>
<td>Yes (Provides more water than is needed in 2031 so is not carried forward)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB-3B: Apply Alternatives PB-1 and PB-2 and use well at new site: PBTW2-08 (Can-Amera Parkway)</td>
<td>Yes (Provides more water than is needed in 2031 so is not carried forward)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Clemens Mill (CM) Well Field Alternative Solutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solutions</th>
<th>Maximizes Use of Treatment Plant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM-1: Do Nothing: Use existing wells only: G16, G17, G18</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM-2: Apply Alternative CM-1 and adapt and modify wells at existing sites: Increase pumping from deepened G16</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM-3A: Apply Alternatives CM-1 and CM-2 and use well at new site: CMPW2-06 (Cedarbrook)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM-3B: Apply Alternatives CM-1 and CM-2 and use well at new site: CMPW1-06 (Portuguese Club)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shades Mill (SM) Well Field Alternative Solutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solutions</th>
<th>Maximizes Use of Treatment Plant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Solutions</td>
<td>Maximizes Use of Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM-: Do Nothing: Use existing wells: G7, G8, G38 and G39</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM-2: Apply Alternative SM-1 and construct new well at existing site: G40</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM-3: Apply Alternatives SM-1 and SM-2 and use well at new site: NDPW1-06 (Clyde Park)</td>
<td>Yes (As supplies can be more cost effectively provided at Pinebush and Clemens Mill, this alternative is not carried forward)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 2: Alternative Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solutions</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>&quot;Meets Supply Requirement&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Provides Operational Flexibility&quot;</th>
<th>Natural Environment</th>
<th>Social / Cultural</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Do Nothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A) Increase supply from existing wells only: deepened well G16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B) Increase supply from Pinebush new wells at existing site: P10A, P10B, PBTW1-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A) Increase supply from Clemens Mill new well: Cedarbrook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B) Increase supply from Clemens Mill new well: Portuguese Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Increase supply from existing wells (G16) and new wells in Pinebush (P10 site) and Clemens Mill (Cedarbrook well). (Combine solutions 2A, 2B &amp; 3A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most Preferred
Least Impact

Least Preferred
Greatest Impact
Attachment 3: Cambridge East Study Area
Attachment 4: IUS Project Test Well and Monitoring Well Installation Locations
Bleams Road Improvements
Strasburg Road to Fischer-Hallman Road
City of Kitchener
Public Consultation Centre #1
Information Package

What: The Region of Waterloo is undertaking a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) of Bleams Road to determine improvements to the corridor.

Where: Bleams Road from Strasburg Road to Fischer-Hallman Road in the City of Kitchener.

Why: To provide road improvements for traffic growth and transportation system improvements for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit along the corridor.


Who: Region of Waterloo Project Manager
Justin Armstrong, P. Eng.
Region of Waterloo
Phone: (519) 575-4757 Ext. 3164
Email: JuArmstrong@regionofwaterloo.ca

Public Consultation Centre #1
Tuesday, June 26, 2018 from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Country Hills Community Centre, Room 2
100 Rittenhouse Road
Kitchener, Ontario

There is a comment sheet at the back of this package. Please fill it out and share your comments with us.
REGIONAL ROAD 56 (BLEAMS ROAD)
STRASBURG ROAD TO FISCHER-HALLMAN ROAD
CITY OF KITCHENER
1. **Why is the Region considering this project?**

The 2011 Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) and the 2018 RTMP Update have identified this section of Bleams Road for widening from 2 to 4 lanes.

The Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP) has identified this road section for the installation of a boulevard Multi-Use Trail (MUT).

2. **Who is directing this project?**

The planning and design for this project is being directed by staff from the Region of Waterloo and City of Kitchener, along with Region of Waterloo (Kitchener) Councillor Tom Galloway and City of Kitchener (Ward 5) Councillor Kelly Galloway-Sealock. The consulting engineering firm Associated Engineering (Ont.) Ltd. has been retained by the Region of Waterloo to provide planning and preliminary design services during the study phase of this project, as well as detailed design, contract administration, and inspection services through the construction phase.

3. **How is this project being planned?**

This project is being planned in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) process. The Municipal Class EA process is a planning and decision-making process approved under the Environmental Assessment Act that is used by municipalities to plan public infrastructure projects in order that potential environmental impacts are considered before a project is approved. It requires consultation with the public, involved stakeholders, and agencies in consideration of alternatives and their potential impacts on the project environment.

This project is being planned as a Schedule ‘C’ Class EA project which applies to larger, more complex projects with the potential for significant environmental impacts (natural, social, cultural and economic) and requires multiple opportunities for public input.

This project is in the early phase of the Class EA process and this initial Public Consultation Centre is being held for members of the public to become aware of the project and to provide input into the project for further development of alternatives and their environmental impacts.
4. **What is the purpose of this Public Consultation Centre?**

The purpose of this Public Consultation Centre is to have interested groups and individuals learn about and provide input on:

a) The needs and opportunities for improvements on Bleams Road;

b) The project environment (natural, social, cultural/heritage, and economic);

c) The alternative solutions for improvements being considered by the Project Team;

d) How the alternative solutions for improvements will be evaluated and how a preferred alternative will be identified; and

e) Future public input opportunities planned.

Region and project consultant staff are available at this Public Consultation Centre to answer any questions you may have. We request that you fill out the Comment Sheet attached to the back of this Information Package and either put it in the Comment Box at the Public Consultation Centre or send it to the address noted on the Comment Sheet. Your comments will be considered by the Project Team in conjunction with all other relevant information in recommending a preferred alternative for this project.

5. **What alternatives are being considered for this project?**

The alternative solutions for improvements currently being considered by the Project Team are listed below and are included in Appendix A:

1) **Do Nothing** – this alternative would include reconstructing the road in its current 2-lane ditched (rural) cross-section.

2) **Widen the Road to 4-lanes and Add Multi-Use Trail** – this alternative would widen this section of Bleams Road to 4-lanes (undivided) and add the following facilities:
   - Curb and gutter and a storm drainage system;
   - Additional street lighting; and
   - Active transportation facilities (3.0 metre wide multi-use trail along both sides).

3) **Widen the Road to 4-lanes and Add Sidewalk and On-road Cycle Track** – this alternative would widen this section of Bleams Road to 4-lanes (undivided) and add the following facilities:
   - Curb and gutter and a storm drainage system;
   - Additional street lighting;
   - 1.8 metre wide on-road, separated cycle tracks along both sides; and
   - 1.8 metre wide pedestrian sidewalks along both sides.
4) **Widen the Road to 4-lanes and Add Sidewalk and Off-road Cycle Path** – this alternative would widen this section of Bleams Road to 4-lanes (undivided) and add the following facilities:

- Curb and gutter and a storm drainage system;
- Additional street lighting;
- 1.5 metre wide off-road, separated cycle paths along both sides; and
- 1.8 metre wide pedestrian sidewalks along both sides.

Widening this section of Bleams Road to 4-lanes is common to all alternatives but the Do Nothing alternative.

6. **How do the improvements being considered relate to the objectives of the Regional Transportation Master Plan, the Active Transportation Master Plan, and the Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines?**

The 2011 Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) and the 2018 RTMP Update have identified the need to widen Bleams Road to 4-lanes between Strasburg Road and Fischer-Hallman Road. The Region’s 2018 Transportation Capital Program (TCP) includes widening (construction) in 2020.

The Region’s Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP) has identified this road section for the installation of a Boulevard Multi-Use Trail (BMUT). BMUT may be preferable along this corridor due to existing and forecasted traffic volumes, as well as design speed.

The Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines (CDG) is a planning policy document that guides the design of Regional roads. The CDG identifies design parameters for necessary features within the road allowance such as vehicle lanes, cycling facilities, sidewalks, and boulevards. In accordance with the CDG, Bleams Road is identified as a “Neighbourhood Connector – Avenue”. Designing Bleams Road to support active transportation modes, including walking and cycling, is a fundamental character of this road classification.

Transit (GRT) routes are planned for the future and will also be considered in this study.

The Regional Transportation Master Plan, Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP), and Corridor Design Guidelines all support complete and continuous pedestrian facilities on this section of Bleams Road for the full length of this project. Boulevard multi-use trails or sidewalks and cycle paths/tracks on both sides of the road would satisfy that requirement.

7. **Who will be responsible for the winter maintenance of the new multi-use trails, sidewalks, and/or cycle paths/tracks?**

Maintenance of new active transportation facilities along Regional roads is the responsibility of the local municipality.
8. **Will the posted speed be changed?**

The existing posted speed limit is 60km/hr. along Bleams Road between Strasburg Road and Fischer-Hallman Road. No change to the posted speed is being considered at this time in order to maintain a uniform and consistent posted speed along the entire corridor.

9. **Are noise attenuation measures being considered for this project?**

A noise study has been completed following Part B of the Region’s Noise Policy for Bleams Road from Strasburg Road to Fischer-Hallman Road assuming a 4-lane road with 2031 forecasted traffic volumes. The noise study (modelling) results indicate that widening Bleams Road to 4-lanes will not significantly increase the future sound levels at the closest noise sensitive receptor locations.

As such, there is no recommendation to consider additional physical noise attenuation along Bleams Road from Strasburg Road to Fischer-Hallman Road in the 2031 horizon.

10. **Is any private property required for this project?**

One of the goals of the planning and design process for this project is to minimize the impact on adjacent properties and the need to acquire private property. An initial review of the existing road allowance indicates that along the road corridor the width of the road right-of-way is sufficient for all options being considered: this includes along the Steckle Heritage Homestead (811 Bleams Road) frontage. The Region may need to obtain temporary access at some locations along the right-of-way limit for construction grading activities. Identification of property needs will be completed during the evaluation of alternatives as the study proceeds and will be confirmed during detailed design, following completion of the study.

In areas where property or temporary access is required, the property owner will be contacted directly by the Region of Waterloo’s Land Purchasing Officer. Compensation would be provided at fair market rates based on recent similar area sales. Please refer to Appendix B for further information on the property acquisition process.

11. **How is the natural environment being considered?**

As part of the environmental inventory for the project, a Natural Environment Impact Study (EIS) has been initiated with completion of a Background Review Summary documenting the natural features and wildlife within the study area. Included within the EIS are: amphibian and reptile road mortality surveys, turtle surveys, amphibian call surveys, vegetation community surveys and boundary delineation, and bat habitat assessment. The review determined that there are no Core Environmental Features, Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI), wildlife movement corridors, or provincially designated areas within the study area. Based on available background information candidate “suitable habitat” for 4 significant species was identified at the project outset within the study area. None of these species were detected during targeted field work. Field studies also focused on identifying existing wildlife movement across the road to determine the need for road mortality mitigation. The need for such mitigation was not identified. Given the
urbanized nature of the corridor and because the proposed undertaking is likely to be confined to the disturbed Bleams Road right-of-way, it is not anticipated that wildlife or their habitats will be impacted by the proposed undertaking.

A tributary to Strasburg Creek flows south from Thistledown Pond through an existing storm sewer toward the main branch of Strasburg Creek and its associated wetland complex. Within the road right-of-way this feature is characterized by a defined drainage channel lined with cattails which are disturbed in nature and not classified as significant.

A tree assessment will be completed in the Spring/Summer of 2018 to inventory the various trees within the Study Area. The trees will be assessed for overall health and significance in order to develop mitigation and protection plans for any trees to be retained. Where trees may be impacted or removed, a compensation strategy will be developed as part of the tree management and landscaping design.

12. How is the cultural/heritage/archaeological environment being considered?

A Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment was completed in July 2017. A review of available cultural heritage resource inventories revealed that there is one (1) designated cultural heritage resource within the study area. No additional resources were identified through field review. Once a Preferred Alternative has been selected, impacts and mitigation measures for cultural heritage resources will be confirmed.

A Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (Background Research and Property Inspection) was completed in August 2017. The Stage 1 Background Research indicated that three (3) previously registered sites are within the Study Area, but do not retain further cultural heritage value or interest. Some parts of the Study Area exhibit archaeological potential and will require Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment by test pit or pedestrian survey, prior to any proposed construction; other parts of the Study Area have been previously assessed by Stage 2 pedestrian survey and do not require further (Stage 2) survey; and the remainder of the Study Area does not retain archaeological potential due to deep and extensive land disturbance or low and wet conditions.

In addition, a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) will be completed for Cultural Heritage Landscape 1 (CHL-1), Steckle Heritage Homestead. The Farmscape of Steckle Heritage Homestead, 811-831 Bleams Road, is recognized as a CHL by the City of Kitchener. The Farmhouse is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA).

13. What is the estimated cost of this project?

The cost of this project will depend on the approved improvement alternative, as well as necessary infrastructure relocations and property acquisitions. Funding of $9.575 million for improvements on Bleams Road is included in the Region’s 2018 10-Year Transportation Capital Program.
14. What is the project schedule and what are the next steps for improvements on Bleams Road?

The Project Team will review the public comments received from this Public Consultation Centre and use them as input for completion of the Bleams Road Class Environmental Assessment. An assessment of the potential impacts of each alternative on the project environment will be completed and the Project Team will evaluate the alternatives for presentation of a Preferred Alternative for improvements at a second Public Consultation Centre to be held in the Fall or Winter of 2018 for further public review and input. After consideration of the technical information completed and all public input received, the Project Team will present a recommendation to Regional Council in the Winter/Spring of 2019 for approval of an improvement alternative that best meets the needs of the public while minimizing the impact on the project environment.

Pending project approval by Regional Council, detailed design and property acquisition (if required) is scheduled in the 2018 Region Transportation Capital Program to be completed throughout 2019, with utility relocations in late 2019, and construction commencing in 2020.

15. How will I receive further notification regarding this project?

Property owners and tenants abutting the project site and members of the public registering at this Public Consultation Centre will receive all forthcoming public correspondence, and will be notified of all future meetings.

16. How can I provide my comments?

In order to assist the Project Team in addressing any comments or concerns you might have regarding this project, we ask that you fill out the attached Comment Sheet and leave it in the comment box provided at the registration table. Alternatively you can mail, fax, or email your comments to the Project Team member listed below, no later than Tuesday, July 10, 2018.

We thank you for your involvement and should you have any questions or concerns please contact one of the following:

**Justin Armstrong, P. Eng.**
Senior Project Manager
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
Telephone: 519-575-4757 Ext. 3164
Fax: 519-575-4430
Email: [JuArmstrong@regionofwaterloo.ca](mailto:JuArmstrong@regionofwaterloo.ca)

**Peter Lejcar, P.Eng.**
Manager, Infrastructure
Associated Engineering (Ont.) Ltd.
508 Riverbend Drive, Suite 302
Kitchener, ON N2K 3S2
Telephone: 226-214-3187
Fax: 226-214-3188
Email: [LejcarP@ae.ca](mailto:LejcarP@ae.ca)
17. **How can I view project information following the PCC?**

All of the PCC display materials and other relevant project information, notifications of upcoming meetings and contact information are available for viewing at the Region of Waterloo municipal office as identified above. Alternatively, you may visit the Region’s website at [www.regionofwaterloo.ca](http://www.regionofwaterloo.ca).
Comment Sheet
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Bleams Road Improvements
Public Consultation Centre #1 – Tuesday, June 26, 2018

Please complete and hand in this sheet so that your comments can be considered for this project. If you cannot complete your comments today, please take this home and mail, fax, or email your comments by Tuesday, July 10, 2018 to:

Justin Armstrong, P. Eng.  
Senior Project Manager  
Region of Waterloo  
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor  
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3  
Telephone: 519-575-4757 Ext. 3164  
Fax: 519-575-4430  
Email: JuArmstrong@regionofwaterloo.ca

Peter Lejcar, P.Eng.  
Manager, Infrastructure  
Associated Engineering (Ont.) Ltd.  
508 Riverbend Drive, Suite 302  
Kitchener, ON N2K 3S2  
Telephone: 226-214-3187  
Fax: 226-214-3188  
Email: LejcarP@ae.ca

Comments regarding this project:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Name:

Address:

Postal Code:

Phone:            Email:

Collection Notice:

All comments and information received from individuals, stakeholder groups, and agencies regarding these projects and meetings are being collected to assist the Region of Waterloo in making a decision. Under the “Municipal Act”, personal information (such as name, address, telephone number, and property location) which may be included in a submission becomes part of the public record. Questions regarding the collection should be forwarded to the staff member noted above.
Appendix A – Design Alternative #1

Do Nothing

DESIGN ALTERNATIVE #1 'DO NOTHING'
Appendix A – Design Alternative #2

Widen the Road to 4-lanes and Add Multi-Use Trail (MUT)

DESIGN ALTERNATIVE #2 - MULTI-USE TRAIL (MUT)

MULTI-USE TRAIL ON BOTH SIDES OF THE ROAD
Appendix A – Design Alternative #3

Widen the Road to 4-lanes and Add Sidewalk and On-Road Cycle Track
Appendix A – Design Alternative #4

Widen the Road to 4-lanes and Add Sidewalk and Off-Road Cycle Path

![Diagram of Design Alternative #4: One-Way Off-Road Cycle Path]
Appendix B

Property Acquisition Process Information Sheet

The following information is provided as a general overview of the property acquisition process and is not legal advice. Further, the steps, timing, and processes can vary depending on the individual circumstances of each case.

Once the Class Environmental Assessment is complete and the Environmental Study Report outlining the Recommended Design Concept has been approved, the property acquisition process and the efforts of Regional Real Estate staff will focus on preparation for acquiring the required lands to implement the approved design. Regional staff cannot make fundamental amendments or changes to the approved design concept.

Property Impact Plans

After the project has been approved and as it approaches final design, the project planners will generate drawings and sketches indicating what lands and interests need to be acquired from each affected property to undertake the project. These drawing are referred to as Property Impact Plans (PIP).

Initial Owner Contact by Regional Real Estate Staff

Once the PIPs are finalized and available, Regional Real Estate staff will retain an independent appraiser to provide preliminary valuations of the land requirements and their effect on the value of the property. As this process nears completion Real Estate staff will contact the affected property owner/s by telephone and mail to introduce themselves and set-up initial meetings to discuss the project, appraisals, and proposed acquisitions.

Initial Meetings

The initial meeting is attended by the project engineer and the assigned real estate staff person to brief the owner on the project, what part of their lands are to be acquired or will be affected, what work will be undertaken, when, with what equipment, etc. and to answer any questions. The primary purpose of the meeting is to listen to the owner and identify issues, concerns, effects of the proposed acquisition on remaining lands and businesses that can be feasibly mitigated and/or compensated, and how the remaining property may be restored. These discussions may require additional meetings. The goal of staff is to work with the owner to reach mutually agreeable solutions.

Goal – Fair and Equitable Settlement for All Parties

The goal is always to reach a fair and equitable agreement for both the property owner and the Region. Such an agreement will provide compensation for the fair market value of the lands and address the project impacts (such as repairing or replacing landscaping, fencing, paving, etc.) such that the property owner will receive the value of the lands acquired and the restoration of their remaining property to the condition it was prior to the Project.
The initial meetings will form the basis of an initial offer of settlement or agreement of purchase and sale for the required lands or interests.

**Steps Toward Offer of Settlement or Agreement of Purchase and Sale**

The general steps toward such an offer are as follows;

1) the Region will obtain an independent appraisal of the fair market value of the lands and interests to be acquired, and an appraisal of any effect on the value of the rest of the property resulting from the acquisition of the required lands and interests;
2) compensation will be estimated and/or works to minimize other effects will be defined and agreed to by the property owner and the Region;
3) reasonable costs of the owner will be included in any compensation settlement;
4) an offer with a purchase price and any other compensation or works in lieu of compensation will be submitted to the property owner for consideration; and
5) an Agreement will be finalized with any additional discussion, valuations, etc. as may be required.

Depending on the amount of compensation, agreements may require the approval of Council. The approval is undertaken in Closed Session which is not open to the public to ensure a level of confidentiality.

**Expropriation**

Due to the time constraints of these projects, it is the practice of the Region to commence the expropriation process in parallel with the negotiation process to ensure that lands and interests are acquired in time for commencement of the Project. Typically, over 90% of all required lands and interests are acquired through the negotiation process. Even after lands and interests have been acquired through expropriation an agreement on compensation can be reached through negotiation, this is usually referred to as a 'settlement agreement'.

Put simply, an expropriation is the transfer of lands or an easement to a governmental authority for reasonable compensation, including payment of fair market value for the transferred lands, without the consent of the property owner being required. In the case of expropriations by municipalities such as the Region of Waterloo, the process set out in the Ontario *Expropriations Act* must be followed to ensure that the rights of the property owners provided under that *Act* are protected.

For information on the expropriation process, please refer to 'Expropriation Information Sheet'.
The following information is provided as a general overview of the expropriation process and is not legal advice. For complete information, reference should be made to the Ontario Expropriations Act as well as the more detailed information in the Notices provided under that Act.

Expropriation Information Sheet

What is Expropriation?

Governmental authorities such as municipalities, school boards, and the provincial and federal governments undertake many projects which require them to obtain land from private property owners. In the case of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, projects such as the construction or improvement of Regional Roads sometimes require the purchase of land from private property owners. In many cases, the Region of Waterloo only needs a small portion of the private property owner’s lands or an easement for related purposes such as utilities, although in certain instances, entire properties are required.

Usually the governmental authority is able to buy the land required for a project through a negotiated process with the affected property owners. Sometimes, however, the expropriation process must be used in order to ensure that the land is obtained within a specific timeline. Put simply, an expropriation is the transfer of lands or an easement to a governmental authority for reasonable compensation, including payment of fair market value for the transferred lands, without the consent of the property owner being required. In the case of expropriations by municipalities such as the Region of Waterloo, the process set out in the Ontario Expropriations Act must be followed to ensure that the rights of the property owners provided under that Act are protected.

Important Note: The Region of Waterloo tries in all instances to obtain lands needed for its projects through a negotiated agreement on mutually acceptable terms. Sometimes, the Region of Waterloo will start the expropriation process while negotiations are underway. This dual approach is necessary to ensure that the Region of Waterloo will have possession of all of the lands needed to start a construction project on schedule. However, it is important to note that Regional staff continues to make every effort to reach a negotiated purchase of the required lands on mutually agreeable terms while the expropriation process is ongoing. If agreement is reached, expropriation proceedings can be discontinued and the land transferred to the Region of Waterloo in exchange for payment of the agreed-upon compensation.

What is the process of the Region of Waterloo under the Expropriations Act?

- Regional Council considers a request to begin an application under the Expropriations Act to obtain land and/or an easement for a specific Regional project. No decision is made at this meeting to expropriate the land. This step is simply direction for the Region of Waterloo to provide a “Notice of Application for Approval to Expropriate” to affected property owners that the process has started to seek approval to expropriate the land.
• As stated in the Notice, affected property owners have 30 days to request a Hearing to consider whether the requested expropriation is “fair, sound and reasonably necessary in the achievement of the objectives” of the Region of Waterloo. This Hearing is conducted by a provincially-appointed Inquiry Officer. Prior to the Hearing, the Region of Waterloo must serve the property owner with a Notice setting out its reasons or grounds for the proposed expropriation. **Compensation for lands is not determined at this Hearing.** The Inquiry Officer can order the Region of Waterloo to pay the property owner up to $200.00 as compensation for the property owner’s costs in participating in this Hearing, regardless of the outcome of the Hearing.

• If a Hearing is held, a written report is provided by the Inquiry Officer to the property owner and the Region of Waterloo. Council must consider the Report within 90 days of receiving it. The Report is not binding on Council and Council may or may not accept the findings of the Report. After consideration of the Report, Council may or may not approve the expropriation of the land or grant approval with modifications. A property owner may wish to make written and/or verbal submissions to Council at the time that it is considering the Report.

• If no Hearing is requested by the property owner, then Council may approve the expropriation of the land after expiry of a 30 day period following service of the Notice of Application for Approval to Expropriate.

• If Council approves the expropriation then, within 3 months of this approval, the Region of Waterloo must register a Plan at the Land Registry Office that describes the expropriated lands. The registration of this Plan automatically transfers title of the lands to the Region of Waterloo, instead of by a Deed signed by the property owner.

• Within 30 days of registration of the Plan, the Region of Waterloo must serve a Notice of Expropriation on the affected property owner advising of the expropriation. Within 30 days of this Notice, the property owner may serve the Region of Waterloo with a Notice of Election selecting the valuation date under the *Expropriations Act* for calculation of the compensation.

• In order to obtain possession of the expropriated lands, the Region of Waterloo must also serve a Notice of Possession setting out the date that possession of the land is required by the Region of Waterloo. This date has to be 3 months or more from the date that this Notice of Possession is served on the affected property owner.

• Within 3 months of registration of the Plan, the Region of Waterloo must provide the affected property owner with payment for the full amount of the appraised fair market value of the expropriated land or easement and a copy of the appraisal report on which the value is based. If the property owner disagrees with this amount, and/or claims other compensation and/or costs under the *Expropriations Act*, the compensation and/or costs matter may be referred to a provincially-appointed Board of Negotiation in an effort to reach a mediated settlement and/or an appeal may be made to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) for a decision. In any event, the Region of Waterloo continues in its efforts to reach a negotiated settlement with the affected property owner prior to the OMB making a decision.
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services Department
Transportation Division

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Work Committee

Date: June 19, 2018

Subject: Moving Forward (Transportation Master Plan Update) – Recommended Plan Additional Information

Recommendation:


Summary: Nil.

Report:

Staff brought Report TES-TRP-18-09 (Attachment 1) to the May 29, 2018 meeting of the Regional Planning and Works Committee, including the Recommended Plan for Moving Forward, the update to the Transportation Master Plan. The Recommended Plan had also been presented to Area Municipal Councils in advance. Three Area Municipal Council meetings occurred after the writing of that report, and comments and responses could not be included. This report provides responses to questions and comments received at these Council meetings, as well as comments received at the May 29, 2018 Planning and Works Committee Meeting.

These reports (TES-TRP-18-09 and TES-TRP-18-09.1) to the Planning and Works Committee are summary reports conveying the overall direction of the Recommended Plan. Council approval on this direction would enable staff to develop the entire plan in detail and start to develop capital plans in time for the next budget cycle.

Document Number: 2744016
Active Transportation (Walking and Cycling)

Area Municipal Councils and the Planning and Works Committee have sought clarification regarding the implementation of active transportation facilities in the Recommended Plan, including the speed of deploying the network, the type of facilities that will be provided, and coordination with the Area Municipalities.

The current plan for active transportation is the 2014 Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP), which was developed by a team that included Area Municipal staff and fully integrated with the planned networks of the Area Municipalities. It recommends a rapid implementation of the network with significant progress towards a minimum grid of facilities within ten years, including:

- Sidewalks: Addition of more than 120 km
- Boulevard multi-use trails: Addition of more than 120 km
- Painted bike lanes: Addition of 180 km
- Rural bike lanes (paved shoulders): Addition of more than 210 km

As noted in the May 29, 2018 report, the Project Steering Committee (PSC) developed a Vision for transportation that includes an all-ages-and-abilities network consistent with "Complete Streets" principles. Staff recommends exploring opportunities to improve separation from traffic, primarily by converting existing and planned painted bike lanes into physically separated bike lanes, to address the top barrier to cycling cited by the public, governed by considerations on available space, budget and adjacent facilities. The recommended Regional Cycling Network is shown in Attachment 2.

More broadly, the Transportation Master Plan is one piece of a larger integrated planning framework that includes the Regional Official Plan, Official Plans and transportation plans for the Area Municipalities, land use plans at ION stations areas, etc. Staffs from the various municipalities coordinate continuously in the development of these plans. For active transportation, there is ongoing work to facilitate trail crossings of Regional roads and to identify opportunities to use local streets in the minimum grid network, if doing so on Regional roads would be impractical.

New Mobility Technologies

There was considerable interest from Area Municipal Councils and the Planning and Works Committee in the potential for "New Mobility" technologies, and a desire for the Region to demonstrate leadership in this area. Staff has added additional reporting mechanisms back to Regional Council on developments in New Mobility, including annual progress reports, and have already recommended concrete measures such as the GRT Alternative Service Delivery Pilot described in Report TES-TRS-18-23 (May 29, 2018). Staff has a report planned for the August meeting of the Planning and
Works Committee on new and emerging Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technology, which highlights Regional initiatives and partnerships with local technology firms.

Staff has included in the Recommended Plan the development of an Action Plan with more specific action items by June 2019. To mitigate the risks of the new technologies, and leverage the Region's investment in public transit while maximizing other opportunities, staff believe the Region is in a good position to demonstrate leadership by coordinating land use planning with anticipated directions as the various technologies continue to develop. Some possible areas that staff will be considering for the Action Plan include:

- An integrated payment platform that would enable users to buy mobility on a variety of different modes
- Mobility pricing, such as road user charges and parking costs
- A driverless ride-hailing pilot project

Adding Road Capacity in Developing Areas

There was some concern expressed by Area Municipal Councils and the Planning and Works Committee about the level of planned road improvements in some developing areas, such as southwest Kitchener, and whether planned road capacity would be adequate. Given the current data available, the Recommended Plan includes road capacity improvements that will accommodate expected population and employment growth. Continuous monitoring of traffic conditions by staff, further review of the transportation impacts of development applications, and periodic review of the master plan itself every five years or so, will enable staff and Council to modify the plan to respond to unanticipated conditions.

Next Steps

Pending Council approval of the Recommended Plan, staff will prepare the set of full reports detailing the Recommended Plan, to be delivered to Regional Council and the public for information in Fall 2018. Staff will also develop the Transportation and Transit Capital Plans for inclusion in the 2019 Budget.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

As detailed in Attachment 1.

Financial Implications:

As detailed in Attachment 1.
Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:
As detailed in Attachment 1.

Attachments

2. Recommended Regional Cycling Network

Prepared By: Geoffrey Keyworth, Acting Manager, Transportation Planning

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services Department

Transportation Division

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

Date: May 29, 2018

File Code: D09-90 / 07066

Subject: Moving Forward (Transportation Master Plan Update) – Recommended Plan

Recommendation:

That the Regional Planning and Works Committee endorse the Recommended Plan for Moving Forward (the Transportation Master Plan Update), described in Report TES-TRP-18-09, dated May 29, 2018.

Summary:

The Region is updating its Transportation Master Plan (TMP) called “Moving Forward”. A TMP defines how the Region’s transportation system will grow and change in the coming decades. TMPs consider high-level transportation needs in a strategic manner. This update to the previous 2010 RTMP is for a 23-year period to 2041, and is being led by a Project Steering Committee (PSC) that includes members of Regional Council and senior staff.

Population in Waterloo Region is growing, but not as rapidly as the forecast included in the Provincial Growth Plan. Trends observed over the past 20 years suggest that travel is still dominated by private cars, despite significant investments in public transit that have succeeded in growing ridership. Global changes on the horizon outside of Regional control, such as the population growing older, new technologies like automated and electric vehicles, and changes to society such as online commerce and the sharing economy, mean that transportation could change significantly in the coming decades.
Through public consultation for Moving Forward, the PSC heard there is a need for a well-integrated transportation network that would provide sustainable, healthy transportation choices while supporting the economy. The PSC developed the following vision for transportation to guide the project:

“Waterloo Region will be a prosperous, sustainable and healthy community, with viable transportation choices for people of all ages and abilities, and for the goods supporting our economy.”

To realize the vision, the PSC confirmed the goals from the previous 2010 RTMP:

- Optimize the transportation system
- Promote transportation choice
- Foster a strong economy
- Support sustainable development

The PSC developed and evaluated three scenarios, or ways of achieving the goals:

- **Scenario 1: Continue and Extend the 2010 RTMP**: This scenario would extend the existing TMP strategy of a “Transit-Oriented Network with Strategic Road Improvements” to 2041.
- **Scenario 2: Invest More Heavily in Transit and Active Transportation**: Extensive new investments in public transit, walking and cycling over and above Scenario 1 would be added.
- **Scenario 3: Invest in a “New Mobility” Future with Advanced Transportation Technologies**: This scenario would seek to harness the potential of new transportation technologies, such as driverless cars.

Scenario 3 was removed from consideration as the overall Regional focus because there is too much uncertainty surrounding emerging transportation technologies. After evaluating Scenarios 1 and 2 with a framework based on the four goals, the PSC could find no clear “winner” because each scenario performed well in different aspects. The PSC selected Scenario 1 (i.e. extending the 2010 RTMP) on the basis that it was a strong, well-balanced plan that would benefit from some adjustments to take advantage of higher performing aspects of Scenario 2, such as constructing a larger number of separated bike lanes to improve user comfort. Although Scenario 3 was not carried forward, staff will continue to actively explore “new mobility” opportunities as part of the Recommended Plan for Moving Forward.

The Recommended Plan builds on the findings of surveys of the general public that found strong interest in public transit, walking and cycling, but the following barriers to using specific modes more generally:
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- It takes too long to get between destinations (public transit, cycling and walking)
- Safety concerns (cycling)
- Does not meet my schedule needs/requires too many connections (public transit)

At least half of the population indicate that some barrier is hindering more walking, cycling or use of public transit, so the Recommended Plan must explicitly try to address the above barriers. The recommendations of the Plan fall into the following areas:

- **Active Transportation (Walking and Cycling):** The recommendations for active transportation generally involve updating and incorporating the 2014 Active Transportation Master Plan by identifying opportunities, enhancing the network and separation from motor vehicles, and enabling children to travel by themselves to school.

- **Public Transit:** The recommendations for public transit are organized around a principle of "developing a frequent transit network", building generally on the recently approved GRT Business Plan and identifying future rapid transit corridors.

- **Inter-regional Transportation and Goods Movement:** The recommendations in this area are aimed at enhancing inter-regional connections to support economic growth, by supporting High Speed Rail and GO Rail/Bus.

- **Roads:** The recommendations for Regional roads are organized around a principle of "building a transportation network that supports all modes of travel", and include a strategic road expansion program targeted at relieving traffic congestion and/or enabling development.

- **New Mobility:** While there is considerable uncertainty around new transportation technologies, the recommendations in this area are organized around a principle of "preparing Waterloo Region for New Mobility" because it is likely these technologies will be a significant factor of daily life by 2041, if not sooner.

Moving Forward was developed in consultation with a wide variety of the general public and agency stakeholders, reached through surveys, public consultation centres, online consultation, and panel discussions. Responses to the Recommended Plan have generally been positive about how Moving Forward addresses Waterloo Region's needs in a balanced way.

Moving Forward is an affordable plan. As a continuation and extension of the 2010 RTMP and other Council-approved plans, it does not present significant new costs to the Region. A significant portion of the identified costs for the 2016–2031 period have
already been planned for and reflected in the approved 2018–2027 Transportation and Transit Capital Plans.

Report:

1.0 – Background

1.1 – Introduction

The Region is updating its Transportation Master Plan (TMP) called “Moving Forward”. This update is being led by a Project Steering Committee (PSC) composed of members of Regional Council (Elizabeth Clarke and Tom Galloway), and senior staff from the following departments:

- Corporate Services
- Planning, Development and Legislative Services
- Public Health and Emergency Services
- Transportation and Environmental Services

1.2 – Need for Transportation Master Plans

A TMP defines how the Region’s transportation system will grow and change in the coming decades. The TMP provides the justification for the Ten Year Transportation Capital Program, updates to the Regional Development Charges By-Law, and many other strategic plans. The Regional Transportation Master Plan (2010 RTMP), the current TMP, was approved by Council in 2010. Changes to provincial and local policy initiatives, such as new growth forecasts in the Provincial growth plan and approval of the Regional Official Plan, mean it is now time to update the TMP.

1.3 – Growth Forecast

Waterloo Region is experiencing moderate population growth. This population growth is lower than the projections of the Province of Ontario Places to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Ontario Ministry of Infrastructure, June 2006) used in the 2010 RTMP. A moderate growth scenario was developed for Moving Forward. This scenario was based on the growth in Waterloo Region since 2007 to better support the development of infrastructure needs and capital budgets.

1.4 – What is in a TMP?

TMPs provide an opportunity to:

- Review the current state and long-term vision for transportation;
- Analyze the overall transportation system in a strategic manner;
- Integrate transportation planning with other strategic plans; and
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- Consult with a broad range of stakeholders.

Consequently, TMPs include very long-term viewpoints and review transportation needs and opportunities at a high level. Moving Forward considers the future needs of the Region until 2041.

1.5 – What is Not in a TMP?

In contrast with the above, TMPs generally do not include minor projects or those that will not affect the long-term direction of trends in transportation. In other words, road reconstructions, intersection improvements, locations of new bus stops, and local trail connections were not reviewed in detail as part of this update. Such projects will still occur in conjunction with improvements to road condition and operations, when new developments are proposed, or when opportunities arise.

The TMP also does not provide detailed timelines of the background work that goes into delivery of projects. For example, if a road is proposed to be widened, a typical timeframe of required work in advance of this project might look like the following figure.

![Timeline Diagram]

1.6 – What are some Trends in Transportation?

There are some overall trends in how people travel in Waterloo Region. Attachment 1 contains graphs supporting the following trends:

- **Internal travel is typical of smaller urban areas**: Travel in Waterloo Region is typical of smaller urban areas, with regular peaks in the morning and afternoon. Shifting travel times to avoid congestion during the peaks has not become a major factor in Waterloo Region over the past 20 years, as it has in larger cities such as the Greater Toronto Area. This means Waterloo Region generally has adequate road capacity to support existing travel patterns.

- **Commuters are still highly auto-dependent**: While growth in the number of
commuters by public transit and cycling has outpaced growth in the number by private car, driving a car remains, by far, the dominant mode for commuting to work. High car reliance is likely a result of the dispersed employment centres across Waterloo Region and to Guelph and the Greater Toronto Area, historic land use patterns, and the Region as a whole being generally more spread out than larger cities like Toronto.

- **Transit ridership growth has been strong and correlated with investment in service:** Transit ridership and riders per capita grew significantly in Waterloo Region from 2000 to 2013, reflecting the Region’s strong investment in transit service hours since establishing Grand River Transit (GRT) and taking over local municipal transit services. A more recent decline in transit ridership is being seen across North America as a result of several non-local factors, such as comparatively low fossil fuel prices, the emergence of new private transportation services (e.g. Uber, etc.), an increase in active transportation, and changes in teleworking-from-home habits. In Waterloo Region, transit ridership began growing again in late 2017 after temporary disruptions (i.e. transit detours due to construction) and one-time events (i.e. local school boards have shifted many high school trips to school buses) have run their course.

- **Residents continue to drive even for short trips less than two kilometres:** For trips under two kilometres in Waterloo Region, 71 percent are made by car (driver or passenger) and 21 percent by walking. Walking, cycling and public transit use for these short trips has been increasing slowly over the past 20 years.

- **Inter-regional travel is growing:** Work trips to/from Waterloo Region from the 2016 Census are shown in the table below. The City of Guelph accounts for a significant amount of all inter-regional travel, and this may grow with completion of the new Highway 7 now under construction. Also, work trips to/from the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) are about the same as work trips to Guelph. The implications for Moving Forward may be the need to support different forms of inter-regional transit than are currently offered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Trips (2016 Census)</th>
<th>Trips*</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All work trips by Waterloo Region residents</td>
<td>229,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To external</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Guelph</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To GTA</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All work trips to Waterloo Region by external residents</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Guelph</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From GTA</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of trips rounded to nearest 1,000.
2.0 – Outlook for the Future

2.1 – What is Changing?

The world is changing in complex, inter-related ways, a few of which are listed below. Most of these are beyond direct Regional control, and we can only manage and adapt to the change.

- **Demographic changes**: The overall population is getting older and the needs for mobility are changing. As the ability to drive deteriorates with age, society needs to ensure that people who get around primarily by car today are not isolated as they age. Additionally, the current generation of young people entering the workforce appear to have a greater acceptance of walking, cycling and public transit, and are delaying getting driver’s licenses or purchasing cars.

- **Energy**: The predominance of car use has been enabled by fossil fuels being widely available. The continued availability of fossil fuels at affordable prices, and the deployment of new vehicle technologies such as electric cars, will have a significant effect on whether private vehicular transportation continues to be prevalent.

- **New technologies**: The development of new technologies, such as automated vehicles, will play a big role in determining how motorized trips are made in the future. Alternatively, progress in other technologies may affect the need for trips to be made at all. For example, telecommuting may reduce the need to travel to centralized offices, while increased automation may displace large numbers of jobs, as it has already done in manufacturing and is starting to do in other sectors.

- **Social change**: The rise of the sharing economy, facilitated through information technology, has created new ways of offering and delivering services. For example, VRTUCAR provides an alternative way for local residents to reserve a car over the Internet for trips, potentially reducing the need to own a car. Other examples include flexible work times, or mixed-use developments that combine living, working and recreation in one place, reducing the need to travel.

- **Acceptance of mobility pricing**: Jurisdictions around the world have implemented a variety of methods to more directly price mobility, such as toll highways, charges to enter downtown areas, and distance-based pricing of private vehicle insurance. Mobility pricing could significantly reduce traffic congestion and generate revenues, but may also affect equity and therefore would need to be carefully considered.

The above factors could also combine in novel ways, holding the potential to radically
change how people and goods get around. For example, Connected-Automated-Shared-Electric (CASE) vehicles, perhaps owned by private corporations and operated as shared-use fleets, would make “robo-taxis” possible that could provide the flexibility of a car, mitigate the environmental impacts of fossil fuels, and reduce or eliminate the need to own a car. However, this technology could increase traffic congestion and be highly disruptive to established transportation businesses, such as conventional taxis or couriers.

3.0 – What Did Moving Forward Study?

3.1 – Vision and Goals

After significant consultation, the PSC developed the following vision statement for transportation to guide the project:

“Waterloo Region will be a prosperous, sustainable and healthy community, with viable transportation choices for people of all ages and abilities, and for the goods supporting our economy.”

To realize the vision, the PSC affirmed the validity of the following goals for Waterloo Region transportation from the 2010 RTMP:

- **Optimize the transportation system**: Make the most of what exists. Maximize the use of existing transportation services and facilities.
- **Promote transportation choice**: Offer competitive choices to move people and goods in an integrated, seamless manner.
- **Foster a strong economy**: Support existing businesses and attract sustainable economic activity.
- **Support sustainable development**: Support sustainable growth in both urban and rural areas, and reduce transportation greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution.

3.2 – Scenarios

To meet the challenge of the future, the PSC studied three different scenarios, or ways of achieving the goals:

- **Scenario 1: Continue and Extend the 2010 RTMP**: The 2010 RTMP already includes significant investment in public transit service, improvements to cycling and walking, and Regional road expansions. Scenario 1 extends that plan to 2041, and establishes a baseline for testing other scenarios.
- **Scenario 2: Invest More Heavily in Transit and Active Transportation**: This scenario examines adding extensive new transit, walking and cycling investments over and above Scenario 1 to provide residents with more
competitive alternative forms of transportation to reduce their dependency on the automobile. This scenario identifies projects that would provide significant benefit beyond those from Scenario 1.

- **Scenario 3: Invest in a “New Mobility” Future with Advanced Transportation Technologies:** Scenario 3 would further reduce the emphasis on “conventional” transportation (i.e. roads, transit and active transportation) and emphasize new mobility options achieved through technological and social change. This scenario attempts to determine how new mobility trends, such as driverless cars, alternative fuels, protected automated vehicle or shuttle corridors, increased road capacity using intelligent infrastructure, and lower car ownership, can help meet the Region's goals. It tests a “what if” plan and identifies corresponding risks and opportunities, such as an increase or decrease in vehicle use.

3.3 – Why No “Business As Usual” or Roads/CAR-Oriented Scenario?

The Region has continued to implement the 2010 RTMP, therefore the closest scenario to a “Business As Usual” scenario is Scenario 1. The 2010 RTMP study included a review of a “Roads-Oriented Plan” and concluded that it would not meet the vision and goals for transportation, as it would not help to optimize the transportation system, promote transportation choice, and support sustainable development. The PSC believed there was no need to consider a roads-oriented plan again in this update.

4.0 – What Did the PSC Find?

4.1 – Evaluation of the Scenarios

The PSC developed an evaluation framework based on the four goals (Optimize the Transportation System, Promote Travel Choice, Foster a Strong Economy, Support Sustainable Development). In applying the framework for Scenario 3, it quickly became evident that there are major uncertainties with respect to what technologies end up being adopted, the impacts of those technologies, and the timeframes over which these technologies will evolve. Therefore, the PSC removed Scenario 3 from consideration as the overall Regional focus because there is too much uncertainty at this time. However, as it is highly likely these technologies will be a significant factor of daily life by 2041, if not sooner, the Region should continue to explore the opportunities presented by these technologies as noted in subsequent sections of this report.

The evaluation of the remaining two scenarios is shown in Attachment 2. Both scenarios scored well in different ways and there was no clear “winner”. Scenario 2 scored higher than Scenario 1 for Promote Travel Choice and Support Sustainable Development, because of its greater focus on walking, cycling and public transit. However, it had a lower score for Foster a Strong Economy, mainly because of the higher operating costs.
May 29, 2018  

- **Enthused & Confident**: Probably would consider walking, cycling or public transit
- **Interested but Concerned**: May consider if barriers to adoption were removed
- **No Way No How**: Would not consider walking, cycling or public transit as an option even if barriers to adoption were removed

The survey found large groups of the population are “Interested but Concerned” respondents who might consider walking, cycling and public transit, if barriers to adoption were addressed, as shown in the figure below. This suggests there is considerable opportunity for increasing walking, cycling and public transit use, if barriers can be mitigated.

For the Interested but Concerned group, the top barriers were:

- It would take too long to get between destinations (walking, cycling, public transit)
- Safety concerns (cycling)
- Does not meet my schedule needs (public transit)
- Requires too many connections to get to my destination (public transit)

5.0 – What is the Recommended Plan?

The 2010 RTMP recommended that the Region adopt a "Transit oriented plan with strategic road improvements". This was an aggressive plan with significant investment in public transit, cycling and walking, in addition to road improvements tied to planned development. The PSC recommends that the Region continue this general direction as described by Scenario 1, subject to some refinements in the following areas:
for significantly more investment in public transit. This suggested that Scenario 1 was a strong, well-balanced plan, but that it would also benefit from some adjustments to take advantage of the higher performing areas of Scenario 2, such as constructing a larger number of separated bike lanes to enhance user comfort.

The evaluation also led to specific observations in the following areas:

4.2 – Public Transit

The Region has invested in public transit, and ridership growth has generally kept pace with the targets that were established in the 2010 RTMP. Growth in ridership is likely to continue in areas supportive of transit. There are certain Regional roads where traffic congestion has been increasing, which public transit could bypass through priority treatments such as transit signal priority and queue-jump lanes. Transportation technologies are changing, and the paradigm of either owning a private car or using public transit is starting to shift as new providers, such as Uber and VRTUCAR, have become more prevalent, as shown in the figure below. Public transit needs to consider this shift and integrate its operations.

4.3 – Goods Movement

While goods movement by rail and air are important contributors to the Regional economy, most goods are moved by truck, including almost all goods moved from their initial point of origin and/or to their final destination. The Regional road network is a critical distributor of goods, carrying about $1.2 billion of goods per week to, from or within Waterloo Region. The broad range of goods that are moved suggests a resilient industrial base. Connections to/from the highway network are important, and the Region
needs to ensure that goods movement works safely and efficiently with other users of Regional roads.

4.4 – Roads

The Region has acted on the recommendations of the 2010 RTMP and, in partnership with the area municipalities and the Ministry of Transportation, has expanded Regional roads through widening or new road construction. While there are congestion “hotspots”, they tend to be localized in nature, and some of them will be relieved by planned Provincial or Regional road expansions. Given available capacity and projected growth, there appears to be opportunities to defer some previously recommended road expansions.

4.5 – Active Transportation (Walking and Cycling)

The Region adopted the Active Transportation Master Plan in 2014, and while active transportation facilities have been constructed as part of Regional road projects, as well as some standalone projects, other elements of the plan have not yet been implemented. This includes a larger standalone budget for infill projects, better winter maintenance, more signage and wayfinding, and performance monitoring.

4.6 – New Mobility

Technologies like automated vehicles carry significant risks, such as increased traffic and energy use redeploying empty vehicles, more traffic congestion, reduced revenues for cities (i.e. less revenue from parking, etc.), and inefficient use of public transit. On the other hand, there are also significant opportunities that could be realized, in the form of more efficient use of land, safer roads, and enhanced mobility. Without proactive planning, the risks are more likely to occur: traffic increases as unlicensed users switch to automated vehicles, and it becomes more difficult for public transit to compete with the door-to-door service offered by these vehicles. Therefore, this plan seeks to continue studying these new technologies, to minimize the risks, maximize the opportunities, and prepare the Region for their arrival.

4.7 – Behaviours, Attitudes and Barriers

Surveys have found a strong interest in public transit, walking and cycling, but also a general belief they would not be practical for respondents’ daily lives. This suggests that “barriers” are hindering more widespread adoption. A Region-wide survey of travel behaviours, attitudes and barriers around walking, cycling and public transit classified respondents into four groups:

- **Fearless & Strong**: Currently consider walking, cycling or public transit an option
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- **Enthused & Confident**: Probably would consider walking, cycling or public transit
- **Interested but Concerned**: May consider if barriers to adoption were removed
- **No Way No How**: Would not consider walking, cycling or public transit as an option even if barriers to adoption were removed

The survey found large groups of the population are “Interested but Concerned” respondents who might consider walking, cycling and public transit, if barriers to adoption were addressed, as shown in the figure below. This suggests there is considerable opportunity for increasing walking, cycling and public transit use, if barriers can be mitigated.

For the Interested but Concerned group, the top barriers were:

- It would take too long to get between destinations (walking, cycling, public transit)
- Safety concerns (cycling)
- Does not meet my schedule needs (public transit)
- Requires too many connections to get to my destination (public transit)

5.0 – What is the Recommended Plan?

The 2010 RTMP recommended that the Region adopt a “Transit oriented plan with strategic road improvements”. This was an aggressive plan with significant investment in public transit, cycling and walking, in addition to road improvements tied to planned development. The PSC recommends that the Region continue this general direction as described by Scenario 1, subject to some refinements in the following areas:
5.1 – Addressing Barriers

The significant potential to increase the use of public transit, cycling or walking by the "Interested but Concerned" group means that all aspects of Moving Forward should attempt to address barriers. These barriers can be mitigated, as follows:

- **It would take too long to get between destinations:** This barrier was cited for all three of walking, cycling and public transit, and generally relates to land use intensification (i.e. providing more interesting destinations close by), directness of the route (i.e. the effective distance between destinations can be reduced if routes are more direct), and the speed of public transit (i.e. measures such as transit priority can reduce delays for transit vehicles, reducing travel time).

- **Safety concerns:** This barrier was cited primarily for cycling, and safety concerns are consistently observed in other Canadian cities with respect to cycling. This can be mitigated through enhanced designs, including bike lanes and multi-use trails that are physically separated from traffic to enhance user comfort, and more education for drivers and cyclists.

- **Does not meet my schedule needs/Requires too many connections:** Addressing these barriers for public transit means investing in an all-day frequent transit network to expand the hours of service, making transit routes more direct for the majority of trip patterns, and exploring "first/last mile" connections from transit stops to reduce the need for transfers.

5.2 – Active Transportation (Walking and Cycling)

The Region’s 2014 Active Transportation Master Plan provides a strong basis for developing the active transportation network and supporting strategies. Moving Forward builds on the plan with the following strategies:

- **Update and Incorporate the Active Transportation Master Plan:**
  - Identify opportunities to upgrade facilities to improve separation from traffic, such as separated bike lanes or multi-use trails
  - Identify opportunities for, and implement, crossings of major barriers such as highways and rivers
  - Enhance network connections, such as more convenient and comfortable trail crossings of Regional roads
  - Enhance walk and bike access to transit, such as through improved winter maintenance of bus stops and bike parking at major transit nodes
  - Integrate active transportation with municipal facilities and destinations, such as providing more bike parking and enhanced site designs.
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- **Emphasize safe, active travel for children** travelling to/from school and other destinations, through programs such as TravelWise or Active and Safe Routes to School.
- **Continue to engage with other stakeholders** to emphasize safety in design and monitoring, such as working with police to determine opportunities/needs for enforcement, including automated speed enforcement (ASE) in school zones.
- **Define and measure** the health benefits for people walking, cycling, and taking public transit in and around Waterloo Region.

Through the analysis of enhanced investment in active transportation explored through Scenario 2, the PSC recommends consideration of the following lane reduction projects to implement separated cycling facilities:

- Erb Street East and Bridgeport Road East, from Highway 85 to Caroline Street
- Frederick Street/Benton Street, from Lancaster Street to Courtland Avenue
- Some sections of Victoria Street following completion of the new Highway 7

5.3 – Public Transit

To address the barriers identified above, the following recommendations are organized under a principle of "developing a frequent transit network":

- **Extend ION to Cambridge** (ION Stage 2).
- **Implement a frequent transit network** that provides high quality 10-minute or better service all day by 2041.
- **Identify additional corridors for future rapid transit.**
- **Continue to encourage land use intensification** along transit corridors.
- **Include transit priority measures in capital budgets** to maintain or improve time-competitiveness with cars.
- **Investigate smaller scale, more flexible transit** to provide service to underserved areas.

The above recommendations align with the directions of the recently approved GRT Business Plan and build on the 2010 RTMP. Consistent with addressing the land use intensification barrier, the Region should explore and identify additional future rapid transit corridors. A number of corridors were evaluated, and based on projected future ridership the two most promising routes were:

- Highland Road—Charles Street—Victoria Street
- Erb Street—University Avenue—King Street

Attachment 3 shows the recommended frequent transit network.
5.4 – Inter-regional Transportation and Goods Movement

The following recommendations intend to enhance inter-regional connections to support economic growth:

- **Support and promote enhanced connections**, such as GO Regional Express Rail, High Speed Rail and GO Bus, with the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area and other destinations such as Guelph, London, Brantford and the Region of Waterloo International Airport.
- **Work with the Ministry of Transportation and support managed lanes** on Provincial highways, such as dedicated high-occupancy vehicle lanes, high-occupancy toll lanes, or truck lanes.
- **Support goods movement** with a balanced plan that maintains service levels, accessibility and safety, and accommodates all modes in Regional corridors.

5.5 – Roads

The following recommendations for Regional roads are organized under a principle of “building a transportation network that supports all modes of travel”:

- **Complete projects in progress** (ION, the Active Transportation Master Plan, etc.) to provide a foundation for a multi-modal focus moving forward.
- **Slow implementation of some road widening**. Projects should continue to be driven by development and congestion.
- **Review Regional Corridor Design Guidelines** to continue to support urban intensification, enhance comfort and convenience for all users, encourage reduced traffic speeds, and accommodate all modes of transportation.
- **Support reduced or eliminated parking space minimums** in area municipal zoning bylaws for new developments.
- **Undertake a goods movement study** to identify how the Region could manage the transportation system differently to respond to local needs (e.g. Should some Regional roads prioritize or prohibit trucks?) or changes in society and technology (e.g. Does online shopping and delivery significantly alter the Region's needs?).
- **Proactively manage transportation demand** by funding transportation demand management through capital projects and development charges, to facilitate reducing the need for travel or the shifting of trips to different times, routes or modes.

A list of the major capacity-related projects to be included in the Regional roads expansion program is provided in Attachment 4. The timing of these projects is based mostly on when the capacity improvement is needed, which was determined using the
existing capacity of the road and the anticipated increases in traffic. Further, the timing of each project was confirmed based on the project’s ability to meet the four TMP goals: Optimize the Transportation System, Promote Transportation Choice, Foster a Strong Economy, and Support Sustainable Development. Based on this secondary review and the changes in need determined by the anticipated growth in traffic, the timing of most of the projects in the 2010 RTMP remains unchanged, while the timing of some projects was shifted to a later date.

Some examples demonstrating this timing review process are as follows:

• **East Boundary Road**: The East Boundary Road was initially identified as a “Beyond 2031” project in the 2010 RTMP. The review process confirmed this timing based on the growth forecast, and is recommending completion of construction in the 2031–2041 timeframe. Regional staff are separately completing a corridor protection study for this area, which will allow developments in the vicinity of the new road to proceed.

• **Arthur Street widening/Elmira bypass**: The 2010 RTMP initially identified Arthur Street to be widened from Highway 85 to Sawmill Road in the 2021–2031 timeframe, with no need for improvements identified along Arthur Street north of Sawmill Road. The need to address a capacity bottleneck at the Listowel Road intersection has since been identified, including a request from Woolwich Council to consider a bypass of Elmira. A preliminary understanding of the timing of these projects indicates that Arthur Street (Sawmill Road to Listowel Road) should be widened in the 2031–2041 timeframe, with a bypass road around Elmira constructed after 2041, as noted in Attachment 4. This timing should be confirmed by an Environmental Assessment to be commenced in the next three years.

It is important to note that, aside from capacity needs, the specific year of construction for a particular project to be identified as part of upcoming Transportation Capital Programs will depend on a number of additional factors, such as:

• The condition of the existing road (for widening projects)
• The condition of underground services
• The need for new underground services
• New or revised land development projects
• Coordination with area municipal capital programs
• Traffic management to minimize traffic disruption
• Available funding.

5.6 – New Mobility

While the PSC did not carry forward Scenario 3 as an overall recommendation because
of the uncertainty around new transportation technologies, it is highly likely these
technologies will be a significant factor in daily life by 2041, if not sooner. At this early
stage, it is important for the Region to devise strong policies around community form
and allowable uses of the technology. For example, integrating New Mobility
considerations into land use planning, such as updates to the Regional Official Plan, will
strengthen the Region's ability to determine its own community form, rather than this
being determined by the technology, as was the case with private cars over the past
100 years.

The recommendations of this section are framed around the principle of “preparing
Waterloo Region for New Mobility”, to maximize the opportunities and minimize the risks
of the new technologies.

- **Integrate mobility services with public transit**, such as through a shared
  payment platform that would enable users to buy mobility on a variety of
different modes. For example, through a smartphone app, users could plan
trips and potentially purchase Grand River Transit credits, rent bicycles or
cars, and ride taxis or Uber.

- **Consider subsidized ride-hailing** through transportation network companies
such as Uber, Lyft or conventional taxis, for areas of Waterloo Region with
limited or no public transit.

- **Consider rethinking how ride-hailing providers are regulated.** This
includes both taxis and taxi-like services such as Uber and Lyft. Providers
must be large enough to provide economies of scale, but cannot be allowed
to monopolize the mobility market.

- **Examine on-demand and dynamically routed public transit service** that
would enable transit services to modify existing routes based on demand. For
example, Grand River Transit is already examining a pilot of an on-demand
flexible service for customer satisfaction and service effectiveness.

- **Investigate road user charging and other policies**, such as parking cost, to
help manage demand, reduce traffic congestion, and provide an additional
source of revenue.

- **Plan for a driverless ride-hailing pilot program** to learn how new
  technologies and delivery models for transportation can enhance mobility in
Waterloo Region.

- **Develop a New Mobility Action Plan** that includes specific objectives and
actions to support the above initiatives.

- **Update Regional Council annually** on any developments in the technology
and staff's progress on the New Mobility Action Plan.
6.0 – Is Moving Forward a Representative Plan?

6.1 – Forms of Consultation

A critical component of any master planning exercise is the public consultation. Only through varied and comprehensive consultation can a plan be considered representative of the community it seeks to serve. Moving Forward consulted with a wide variety of the general public and agency stakeholders in multiple formats, including:

• Two surveys of the general population conducted by professional firms, reaching about 3,000 respondents;
• Three rounds of public consultation centres hosted in Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo, in September 2016, September 2017 and March 2018, reaching more than 200 attendees and receiving 40 comments;
• Online surveys on the Engage Region of Waterloo platform throughout the project on multiple topics, reaching more than 2,000 visitors and garnering almost 600 responses;
• Detailed conversations over 30 hours with two dedicated panels:
  • The General Public Panel, a group of volunteers from the general public selected to represent a diverse group of ages, genders, municipality of residence, employment status, and primary mode of transportation;
  • The Stakeholder Panel, a group of staff and members from the area municipalities, Provincial ministries, other public sector agencies such as the Grand River Conservation Authority, and interested organizations such as TriTAG, the Chambers of Commerce, Communitech and Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region.

6.2 – Common Themes

Throughout these consultations, a number of common themes have emerged expressing what is important to members of the community:

• **Interest in sustainable transportation choices**: Initial surveys indicated that the public has a great deal of interest in public transit, cycling and walking. However, there was widespread belief that, while these alternatives had great potential for other people, these were not realistic choices for their own lives. This suggests that residents are experiencing “barriers”, such as a lack of time, travel distance, etc. Moving Forward reinforces the 2010 RTMP in promoting transportation choice as a key driver of the overall plan, and all recommendations are tied to overcoming the barriers mentioned by the
public.

- **Importance of healthy choices**: Residents were strongly in favour of a transportation system that offers choices about how to get around and enables a healthy lifestyle. This included a strong desire for children to be able to safely travel to school and other activities by themselves. Walking, cycling and public transit would also help to mitigate the contributions of the transportation sector to greenhouse gas emissions, which were estimated to be 49% of total emissions in 2015. Key recommendations of Moving Forward seek to enhance the walking and cycling experience through increased separation from motor vehicles, and partnering with other members of the community to enhance active transportation.

- **Importance of transportation to the economy**: It was clearly expressed that transportation plays a critical role in a sustainable economy. This includes how people get to work and shopping, and also how the goods that support our economy are moved from place to place. Moving Forward seeks to address this by continuing to advocate on behalf of the Region for improved transportation choices to the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area, and by establishing a comprehensive goods movement plan.

- **The need for better network integration**: Residents have pointed out the need for better integration across the transportation network. This includes how different ways of getting around interact at transition points: for example, getting to public transit by walking, biking or driving. Additionally, there are gaps in the networks, such as bike lanes that end at intersections, delays at trail crossings of Regional roads, or areas that cannot be accessed by public transit. A variety of the Moving Forward recommendations, such as making crossings in the active transportation network more comfortable and convenient, creating a frequent transit network, and even the New Mobility recommendations, will directly improve network integration.

6.3 – Feedback on Moving Forward

Responses from the members of the general public, the General Public Panel, and the Stakeholder Panel, have generally been positive about how Moving Forward addresses Waterloo Region’s needs in a balanced way. The plan contains improvements in all aspects of transportation, providing for stronger active transportation and public transit networks that facilitate choices in how to get around, while making strategic investments in road capacity when they are needed. The PSC believes that residents and businesses in all area municipalities, of all ages and preferred mode of transportation, should be able to find something for them in this plan.

Members of the General Public Panel and the Stakeholder Panel were asked about the plan and the process used by the PSC. These observations are provided in
Attachment 5, and a few are highlighted below:

- "Felt that there was a bias towards anti-auto initially, but I don't feel that way anymore. Realistic, achievable, has a balance towards the different groups that we have."
- "Very impressed with this plan, you have to balance and there is no magic money tree. Attempting to balance everything, and was surprised by the barrier findings. As you remove those barriers, you will get more participation, as I have experienced."
- "Good consultation process. It was good listening to the reps from the Townships for their perspective. Need for explicit recognition of importance of connecting AT [active transportation] network, wayfinding and signage. Also need more emphasis on accessibility for seniors, which will continue to grow. Like the amount of emphasis on separated cycling facilities."

6.4 – Consultation with Regional Planning and Works Committee

Staff brought an information report to the Regional Planning and Works Committee on May 1 (Report TES-TRP-18-03). Regional Council provided the following comments, and staff have prepared the attached responses:

- Staff recommendations on "positioning Waterloo Region for New Mobility" need to be more proactive and actionable. Staff have examined the recommendations, have added more detail, and have connected the recommendations with ongoing actions already underway.

6.5 – Consultation with Area Municipal Councils

Staff presented Moving Forward to all Area Municipal Councils, as follows:

- May 1, 6:45 pm: Township of Wellesley Council
- May 7, 6:30 pm: City of Waterloo Committee of the Whole
- May 15, 7:00 pm: City of Cambridge Council
- May 15, 7:00 pm: Township of Woolwich Council
- May 28, 12:00 pm: City of Kitchener Community and Infrastructure Services Committee
- May 28, 7:00 pm: Township of North Dumfries Council
- May 28, 7:00 pm: Township of Wilmot Council

Area Municipal Councils provided the following comments on Moving Forward, and staff have prepared the attached responses:

- How to transform attitudes and behaviours? The review of barriers focused more on the "Interested but Concerned" group, because two of the
other groups are already amenable to sustainable modes, while the "No Way No How" group say they will not change their behaviour even if their barriers are removed. Consequently, addressing the barriers cited by the Interested but Concerned group are the key aspects of the plan because that will lead to more adoption of sustainable modes, and all programs and policies need to target those barriers for the plan to be effective.

- **Will there be evident changes to roads in urban cores?** This plan, and the 2010 RTMP before it, did not include significant road widening within urban cores. All road changes in urban cores will involve making roads and intersections more accessible to all modes, consistent with the philosophy for Regional roads noted above, of “building a transportation network that supports all modes of travel”.

- **Moving Forward needs to have more detail about trail crossings of Regional roads.** A key element of the Active Transportation recommendations is to review and update the Active Transportation Master Plan for opportunities to enhance the network. This includes ensuring that Regional roads do not act as barriers at their intersections with trails.

- **Moving Forward needs to emphasize active transportation connections with public transit.** The Active Transportation section also includes recommendations on improving the connections between active transportation, public transit, and municipal facilities, such as adding bike routes to ION stations and iXpress hubs, bike parking at transit stops, transit shelters, shade, pedestrian rest areas and other transit amenities, etc.

- **Can the East Boundary Road be advanced? It is unacceptable to be in the 2031-2041 timeframe.** The timing proposed in the Recommended Plan represents staff's best estimate of when this new road would be needed. The Environmental Assessment is almost complete. There remains significant work to be done on this large project, such as preliminary and detailed design, property acquisition, utility relocation, and construction, all of which will take an estimated ten years to complete, at a minimum.

- **Please advance the timing of the road widenings of Arthur Street between King Street and Listowel Road, including a potential bypass of Elmira, to a timeframe earlier than what is currently proposed.** Region staff will initiate a Class Environmental Assessment (EA) study by 2021 to examine the need, justification, and required timing of the widening of Arthur Street between King Street and Listowel Road. The Class EA study will include more refined assessments of required timing of the widening of the various segments as well as assess the need and feasibility of a bypass around Elmira. In addition, Region staff will also examine short-term intersection improvements at the Sawmill Road and Listowel Road.
intersections to address traffic bottlenecks at those locations, to be implemented within two years.

7.0 – Is Moving Forward an Affordable Plan?

Moving Forward is an affordable plan. The original recommendation from the 2010 RTMP, to pursue a "Transit-oriented plan with strategic road improvements", significantly reduced the capital costs of road network expansion by eliminating or deferring the road improvements that would have been required to accommodate growth entirely by private automobile. Moving Forward continues and builds on that recommendation, further identifying opportunities for building a more efficient road network that enhances choice in transportation.

As a continuation and extension of the 2010 RTMP and other Council-approved Regional plans, such as the Active Transportation Master Plan and the GRT Business Plan, Moving Forward does not present significant new costs to the Region. A significant portion of the identified costs for the 2018–2031 period have already been planned for and reflected in the approved 2018–2027 Transportation and Transit Capital Plans. The projects and associated costs identified in the Moving Forward plan are subject to Council approval through the annual budget process.

7.1 – Roads

As detailed in the following table, Moving Forward identifies strategic road improvements totalling $290 million over the 2018–2031 timeframe, representing 91 additional lane kilometres (the current Regional road system is about 1,680 lane-kilometres). Of the $290 million of anticipated capital costs in the 2018–2031 timeframe, approximately $240 million is currently accommodated within the approved 2018–2027 Transportation Capital Program. The remaining $50 million would be within the 2028–2031 time period and would be subject to future budget discussions. These projects are predominantly funded by Regional Development Charges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Capital Costs ($M)</th>
<th>2018-2031</th>
<th>2032-2041</th>
<th>Beyond 2041*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Additional Lane-Kilometres</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Costs by Period</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$190*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Road Capital Costs</td>
<td>$520</td>
<td></td>
<td>$190*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Beyond the horizon of this plan, provided for information only.

As lane kilometers are added and the Road System expands, additional resources are required to operate and maintain the system at the required levels of service. The estimated additional lane kilometers and resulting projected incremental operating and maintenance costs for the 2018–2023 period are as shown in the table below:
### Estimated Incremental Roads Operating, Maintenance & Debt Servicing Costs ($M)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Lane-Kilometres</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incremental Costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Operations</td>
<td>$0.021</td>
<td>$0.047</td>
<td>$0.061</td>
<td>$0.066</td>
<td>$0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to Rehabilitation Reserve</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Lifecycle Management</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Incremental Operating Costs</strong></td>
<td>$0.056</td>
<td>$0.099</td>
<td>$0.129</td>
<td>$0.130</td>
<td>$0.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incremental Property Tax Impact</strong></td>
<td>0.011%</td>
<td>0.018%</td>
<td>0.022%</td>
<td>0.022%</td>
<td>0.038%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The operating and maintenance cost estimates and the resulting incremental property tax impacts are refined on an ongoing basis and subject to Council approval through the annual budget process. Based on the information presented above, the 2019 Roads operating budget requirements could potentially increase by $56,000 which would lead to a 0.011% increase in the property tax levy if approved.

### 7.2 – Active Transportation

Estimated capital costs relating to Active Transportation projects are set out in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Transportation Capital Costs ($M)</th>
<th>2018–2031</th>
<th>2032–2041</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network Expansion</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Upgrade</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Costs by Period</strong></td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Active Transportation Capital Costs</strong></td>
<td>$170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The costs to improve the active transportation network are largely funded by Regional Development Charges. Most of the capital expansion for active transportation is targeted to be complete by 2031. Of the $120 million of anticipated capital costs in the 2018–2031 timeframe, approximately $50 million is currently accommodated within the approved 2018–2027 Transportation Capital Program as part of rehabilitation and reconstruction projects for Regional roads. The remaining $70 million (i.e. $50 million network expansion and $20 million facility upgrades) within the 2019–2031 timeframe will be subject to future budget discussions.

Operating costs relating to Active Transportation are reflected in the overall Roads Operating budget as presented above.
7.3 – Transit

Moving Forward identifies $247 million in transit-related capital projects over the 2018–2031 timeframe. These projects are funded from a combination of Regional Development Charges, grants from senior levels of government and debt financing. Moving Forward integrates the capital requirements identified in the Council-approved GRT Business Plan 2017–2021 (Report TES-TRS-17-15, dated August 15, 2017) which, as directed by Council, have been incorporated into the 2018–2027 Transit Capital Program. Of the $247 million of anticipated capital costs in the 2018–2031 timeframe, approximately $217 million is currently accommodated within the approved 2018–2027 Transit Capital Program. The remaining $30 million would be within the 2026–2031 time period and would be subject to future budget discussions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Capital Costs ($M)</th>
<th>2018–2031</th>
<th>2032–2041</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus Fleet Growth</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Transit Garage</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Priority</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary Costs</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Costs by Period</td>
<td>$247</td>
<td>$271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transit Capital Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Transit service expands, additional resources are required to operate and maintain the system at the required levels of service. Estimates for transit revenue and operating and maintenance costs are based on the proposed transit service levels as identified in the GRT Business Plan. The estimated incremental net costs and incremental property tax impact over the 2019–2023 timeframe are as shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Incremental Transit Operating, Maintenance &amp; Debt Servicing Costs ($M)</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating, Maintenance &amp; Debt Servicing Costs</td>
<td>$3.3</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$3.5</td>
<td>$3.1</td>
<td>$3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>(1.7)</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Incremental Operating Cost</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$2.2</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Property Tax Impact</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transit revenue projections and operating, maintenance and debt servicing cost estimates and the resulting incremental property tax impacts are refined on an ongoing basis and subject to Council approval through the annual budget process.

Based on the information presented above, the 2019 Transit new operating cost could
potentially increase by $1.6 million, which would lead to a 0.3% increase to the property tax levy, if approved.

Additional capital and operating costs for LRT Stage 2 are not included in these budget estimates because the route, and associated costs, are not defined.

The importance of addressing the barriers to walking, cycling and public transit use cannot be overstated. As more members of the public adopt these modes instead of private cars, Moving Forward will become more affordable because of a reduced need for Regional road expansion, and more revenue through public transit fares.

8.0 – Conclusions

The PSC believes the Recommended Plan for Moving Forward is a balanced plan for the long-term future of transportation for Waterloo Region. It includes a significant study of current trends, considers how global factors may shape the future, and examines meaningfully different scenarios of how to achieve the Region’s vision and goals. By incorporating an understanding of behaviour, it aims to reframe infrastructure investments as addressing barriers to change, with road expansions driven by need. Through comprehensive and sustained consultation, the PSC is confident the Recommended Plan addresses the needs of the general public and organizations within Waterloo Region. Finally, Moving Forward is an affordable investment in Regional transportation, with costs similar to what the Region has already been spending.

9.0 – Next Steps

Subject to Regional Council approval of the overall plan, the final project reports would be completed incorporating contributions from the General Public Panel and Stakeholder Panel. Additionally, appropriate elements of the plan would be incorporated into other Regional work, such as the Transportation Capital Program and Regional Development Charges Background Study. A list of other “Action Items” is provided in Attachment 6.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The Transportation Master Plan is directly related to the Sustainable Transportation Focus Area and all four Strategic Objectives:

- Create a public transportation network that is integrated, accessible, affordable and sustainable;
- Improve inter-city rail transportation services to and from Waterloo Region;
- Build infrastructure for, and increase participation in, active forms of transportation (cycling and walking); and
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Optimize road capacity to safely manage traffic and congestion.

It also influences all other Focus Areas, namely:

• Thriving Economy;
• Environment and Sustainable Growth;
• Healthy, Safe and Inclusive Communities; and
• Responsive and Engaging Government Services.

Financial Implications:

The financial implications of Moving Forward are presented in Section 7.0 of the main report.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

The Region’s Planning, Development & Legislative Services Department and Corporate Services Department have been involved in the development of this report.
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• Attachment 3 – Recommended Frequent Transit Network
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Attachment 1 – Supporting Graphs for Observed Travel Trends

Trend 1: Internal Travel is Typical of Smaller Urban Areas

Start Times of Trips within Waterloo Region, by Mode

- Auto driver (1996)
- Public transit (1996)
- Pedestrian and cycling (1996)
- Auto driver (2006)
- Public transit (2006)
- Pedestrian and cycling (2006)
- Auto driver (2016)
- Public transit (2016)
- Pedestrian and cycling (2016)
Trend 2: Commuters are Still Highly Auto-Dependent

![Pie charts showing mode of transportation for Commuters 1996 vs. Commuters 2016]

Trend 3: Transit Ridership Growth has been Strong and Correlated with Investment in Transit Service

![Graph showing Grand River Transit Ridership from 1999 to 2017]
Trend 4: Residents Continue to Drive, Even for Short Trips Less than Two Kilometres

Way of Travel for Very Short Trips (0 to 2 km)

- **Walk**
  - 2016: 16.9%
  - 2006: 17.8%
  - 1996: 20.7%

- **Cycle**
  - 2016: 2.6%
  - 2006: 1.3%
  - 1996: 2.7%

- **Transit (incl. schoolbus)**
  - 2016: 4.6%
  - 2006: 3.4%
  - 1996: 2.6%

- **Auto passenger**
  - 2016: 17.4%
  - 2006: 17.4%
  - 1996: 13.6%

- **Auto driver**
  - 2016: 60.9%
  - 2006: 59.5%
  - 1996: 57.6%

Trend 5: Inter-regional Travel is Growing Rapidly

Destinations of external trips by Waterloo Region residents, 2016

Origins of external trips to Waterloo Region, 2016
## Attachment 2 – Scenario Evaluation

### Goal 1: Optimize the Transportation System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scenario 1</th>
<th>Scenario 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency of road and transit networks</td>
<td>Roads are neither overbuilt nor underbuilt to meet demand</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit vehicles carry more passengers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency of transportation demand</td>
<td>People choose sustainable modes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People make shorter trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 1: Score out of 10**  
6  
6

### Goal 2: Promote Travel Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scenario 1</th>
<th>Scenario 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of active transportation options</td>
<td>More people live near high-quality cycling facilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional roads include reserved space for cyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional roads offer physical separation of pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of public transit options</td>
<td>More people live near frequent transit service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More transit service is offered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit trips are faster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 2: Score out of 10**  
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Goal 3: Foster a Strong Economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scenario 1</th>
<th>Scenario 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic competitiveness</td>
<td>Goods and services move with less delay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employers have better access to labour market by transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter-city travel improvements support growth in regional investment, employment and population</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waterloo Region is more attractive to prospective residents and workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of transportation</td>
<td>The total social benefits of transportation are higher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>User costs are lower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government capital costs are lower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government operating costs are lower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 3: Score out of 10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal 4: Support Sustainable Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scenario 1</th>
<th>Scenario 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on climate change, air, land and water</td>
<td>Less space is occupied by hard surfaces</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower use of motor vehicles reduces emissions and noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on public health and safety</td>
<td>More travel by active modes prevents chronic disease</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More travel by active modes reduces death from all causes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel is safer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall resilience</td>
<td>The system can withstand disruptions related to energy supply, security, and extreme weather associated with climate change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 4: Score out of 15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 3 – Recommended Frequent Transit Network
Attachment 4 – Regional Roads Expansion Program
# Road Expansions 2018–2031

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arthur Street South</td>
<td>Highway 85 to Sawmill Road</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Northfield Drive</td>
<td>Davenport Road to University Avenue</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fountain Street (extension)</td>
<td>Victoria Street to New Highway 7</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fischer-Hallman Road/ Bearinger Road</td>
<td>Columbia Street to Westmount Road</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>9,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Erb Street</td>
<td>Gateview Drive/Beechwood Drive to Wilmot Line</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>University Avenue</td>
<td>Keats Way to Erb Street</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>University Avenue</td>
<td>Ira Needles Boulevard to Fischer-Hallman Road</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fischer-Hallman Road (transit priority)</td>
<td>Highway 7/8 to Columbia Street</td>
<td>Kitchener/Waterloo</td>
<td>16,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Highland Road</td>
<td>Highland Hills Mall to Ira Needles Boulevard</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Trussler Road</td>
<td>Bleams Road to Highway 7/8</td>
<td>Kitchener/ Waterloo</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Bleams Road</td>
<td>Strasburg Road to Fischer-Hallman Road</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Fairway Road</td>
<td>Briarwood Drive to Pebblecreek Drive</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Fischer-Hallman Road</td>
<td>Bleams Road to Plains Road</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>18,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>River Road (extension)</td>
<td>King Street to Bleams Road (at Manitou)</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>67,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Fountain Street</td>
<td>Kossuth Road to Maple Grove Road</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Maple Grove Road</td>
<td>Fountain Street to Hespeler Road</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>23,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Speedsville Road</td>
<td>Maple Grove Road to Eagle Street</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>11,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Fountain Street</td>
<td>Blair Road to Dickie Settlement Road</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Can-Amera Parkway</td>
<td>Conestoga Boulevard to Franklin Boulevard</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Townline Road</td>
<td>Saginaw Parkway to Avenue Road</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Franklin Boulevard (extension)</td>
<td>Myers Road to South Boundary Road</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>South Boundary Road</td>
<td>Water Street to Dundas Street</td>
<td>Cambridge/ North Dumfries</td>
<td>31,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Victoria Street*</td>
<td>Park Street to Lawrence Avenue</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Road Expansions 2031–2041

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Erbsville Road</td>
<td>Erb Street to Columbia Street</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Fountain Street</td>
<td>Kossuth Road to Victoria Street</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Shantz Station Road</td>
<td>New Highway 7 to Kossuth Road</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Fairway Road</td>
<td>King Street to Wilson Avenue</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Kossuth Road</td>
<td>Fountain Street to Hespeler Road</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Hespeler Road</td>
<td>Maple Grove Road to Kossuth Road</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Townline Road</td>
<td>Jamieson Parkway to Blackbridge Road</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Fischer-Hallman Road (extension)</td>
<td>New Dundee Road to Cedar Creek Road (at Highway 401)</td>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>New Dundee Road (extension across Highway 401)</td>
<td>New Dundee Road to Dickie Settlement Road</td>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Hespeler Road</td>
<td>Old Hespeler Road to Queen Street</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>East Boundary Road</td>
<td>Dundas Street to Townline Road</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Arthur Street</td>
<td>Sawmill Road to Listowel Road</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Ottawa Street</td>
<td>Charles Street to Mill Street</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Deferred from previous timing in 2010 RTMP
# New project not in 2010 RTMP

## Road Expansions Beyond 2041

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Victoria Street</td>
<td>Ira Needles Boulevard to Fischer-Hallman Road</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Ottawa Street (extension across Grand River)</td>
<td>Old Chicopee Drive to Fountain Street</td>
<td>Kitchener/Woolwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Trussler Road</td>
<td>Bleams Road to Highway 401</td>
<td>Kitchener/North Dumfries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Distance (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Cambridge South Link *</td>
<td>Water Street to Spragues Road Cambridge</td>
<td>60,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Elmira Bypass *</td>
<td>Arthur Street to Arthur Street Woolwich</td>
<td>16,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Deferred from previous timing in 2010 RTMP

# New project not in 2010 RTMP
Attachment 5 – Observations from Consultation Panels

General Public Panel

The plan is based on data and input sought from the public in a variety of ways. It is complex and ties together a variety of issues. Well-informed, passionate staff have balanced the needs of cars, transit users, trucks, cyclists and pedestrians.

Impressed by level of detail in these studies, hope that they are not influenced heavily by special interest groups and big money. Hope they reflect the interests of the community. Also want the Region to learn from other communities.

Plan is ambitious and clearly values AT and public transit. There will be challenges getting it funded. How this is sold to Council and general public will affect its success.

Impressed by the whole process. Like most of things we have talked about. Feel that the public has had a lot of input. Echo comment about special interests. Action items feel anti-climatic, don't feel I see concrete steps here in the next five years.

Felt that there was a bias towards anti-auto initially, but I don't feel that way anymore. Realistic, achievable, has a balance towards the different groups that we have.

My reason for coming here was to bring attention to congestion issues in Cambridge. Would like to see understanding that more congestion is coming. Glad that relief is coming for the Cambridge core. Sense that there is a reasonable plan, and sense that things are getting better. I have come to realize that there is not endless money, limited resources, trying to optimize what we can do with what we have.

Don't know exactly what to make of this plan. Was hoping to see more of a shift towards AT and transit. But previous plan wasn't fully funded and we are about to experience ION, am excited to see what this will look like when fully implemented.

Very impressed with this plan, you have to balance and there is no magic money tree. Attempting to balance everything, and was surprised by the barrier findings. As you remove those barriers, you will get more participation, as I have experienced.

Very pleased with the process and the plan as discussed tonight. Am very concerned about the funding, great plans need investment to see positive returns. Like the data-driven approaches such as the barrier study and annual reports, the backup data will make it easier to support the plan.

Stakeholder Panel

The plan shows that the Region has forward thinking in a number of different areas.
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It seems like this plan does a good job of considering a lot of different stakeholder needs. I would like a stronger statement on Vision Zero and safety, especially in regards to pedestrians and vulnerable populations. Happy to see TDM and active & safe routes to school support.

Region has done well based on the data that we have seen, trends are slowly shifting away from cars. Would like to see that go faster. Could use more budget towards AT and safety, which really drives whether people use AT.

The plan does a good job of maintaining a solid high-level direction and leaves room for further study. Good starting point, room for more investigation.

Good consultation process. It was good listening to the reps from the Townships for their perspective. Need for explicit recognition of importance of connecting AT network, wayfinding and signage. Also need more emphasis on accessibility for seniors, which will continue to grow. Like the amount of emphasis on separated cycling facilities.

Truth about cities’ aspirations are in the budget, not in the vision. So this plan shows good aspirations. However, good transportation plans are also good land use plans, and this is where this plan falls short.

Traditionally TMPs have been about new roads, but this plan is encouraging in that it’s less about roads. Fits in with the work that has been done investigating sustainable transportation solutions.

Good and interesting consultation process. There should be a more coordinated effort on GO advocacy. Would like to see the airport more linked to this plan, this plan could help the airport grow.

Agree with the consultation process, a diverse set of stakeholders were consulted. Like the shift away from only roads in the plan itself and also about what it will take to reach our goals. Disappointed about the lack of Vision Zero. Would like to see more budget spent on AT rather than roads.

The people I talk to generally say they will never use the ION. However, the consultation process has been done well and I am excited for the future.

Goods movement studies are key for us, and we have been looking for this for quite some time.
### Attachment 6 – Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Proposed Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Incorporate appropriate elements of Moving Forward into the Transit and Transportation Capital Programs</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Complete ION Stage 2 corridor planning study</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Prepare a Regional roads transit priority strategy, including proposed implementation locations and timing</td>
<td>2018–2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Complete a feasibility study, and preliminary design and business case if warranted, for GO Train service between Cambridge and Guelph along the Fergus Subdivision</td>
<td>2018–2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Work with the Ontario Ministry of Transportation to identify Transportation System Management measures, such as ramp metering, to improve traffic operations on Highway 7/8/85 (i.e., the Conestoga Parkway)</td>
<td>2018–2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Update the Transportation Impact Study Guidelines to align better with the four goals of Moving Forward</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Update the Context-Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines to support urban intensification, enhance safety, encourage reduced traffic speeds, and accommodate all modes</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Undertake a goods movement study</td>
<td>2019–2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Complete a Commuter/Park-N-Ride/Kiss-N-Ride parking lot feasibility study</td>
<td>2019–2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Define and measure the health benefits of walking, cycling and public transit, for people travelling in and around Waterloo Region</td>
<td>2019–2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Investigate smaller scale, more flexible transit options, including subsidized ride-hailing through transportation network companies, as an option to provide transit to underserved areas</td>
<td>2019–2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Identify additional corridors for future rapid transit and initiate planning along those corridors</td>
<td>2019–2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Investigate the feasibility of a shared payment platform for Waterloo Region that would enable users to buy mobility on a variety of different modes</td>
<td>2020–2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Investigate mobility pricing, such as road user charges and parking cost</td>
<td>2022–2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Prepare annual reports regarding the Region’s progress towards achieving the goals of Moving Forward</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Incorporate policy initiatives into the Regional Official Plan and other Regional policy documents</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Cycling Network (2031)
- Lane Reduction for Separated Bike Lane
- Trail (Boulevard or Off-Road)
- Separated Bike Lane
- Bike Lane
- Paved Shoulder
- Constrained Corridor - Bike Lane Desirable

*Through the TMP, opportunities are being explored to upgrade existing/planned bike lanes to separated bike lanes.
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Transit Services

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: June 19, 2018
File Code: D28-50

Subject: Pilot Transit Service Proposal in Elmira

Recommendation:

That the Region of Waterloo permit Kiwanis Transit and the Township of Woolwich to operate a community circulator transit service as a pilot project from September 4, 2018 to March 1, 2019, subject to sufficient funding being provided by Kiwanis Transit and the Township of Woolwich, as described in report TES-TRS-18-17 dated June 19, 2018.

Summary:

At the May 29, 2018 Planning and Works Committee, staff were directed to report back on a proposal brought forward by Councillor Shantz on behalf of the Township of Woolwich. The proposal is for a pilot transit neighbourhood circulator service in Elmira to be operated by Kiwanis Transit. The pilot service would provide expanded service coverage in Elmira and would connect with the existing Route 21 fixed-route GRT service.

Some of the primary users are anticipated to be residents of a senior’s home and the Elmira Community Living development with connections to various shopping, employment and medical destinations plus connections to the Route 21. The proposed routing of the Kiwanis Transit pilot service is similar to the neighbourhood circulator routing staff presented to the township in previous meetings.

Staff have had on-going discussions with Township staff and elected officials on potential transit service improvement options for the Township including:
• Increased hours and frequency of service on Route 21 ELMIRA

• A circulator route in Elmira using a smaller-sized vehicle to increase neighbourhood service coverage and connect with Route 21 ELMIRA

• Improved service to the St. Jacob’s farmers market area commercial development

• Initial service to the Breslau area

Pursuant to the Municipal Act and By-law 99-077, the Region of Waterloo has exclusive authority to operate a public transit system within the geographic area of the Region of Waterloo and, as such, permission of the Region of Waterloo is required in order for the proposed transit service pilot to proceed. Staff have reviewed the pilot proposal and associated options for this service and recommend to Council that the Region permit the pilot project to be undertaken. If Council decides to allow Kiwanis Transit and Woolwich Township to proceed with the pilot this year, staff will require the following parameters be adhered to:

• The funding for the pilot service would be provided by Kiwanis Transit and / or the Township;

• The pilot service would not have fare integration with Grand River Transit;

• The pilot service would not be identified as a service of the Region (Grand River Transit); and

• Any results, including ridership numbers, would be shared with the Region in order to allow a proper assessment of the viability of the service as a regular transit service.

In order to potentially extend the pilot service, a budget issue paper will be submitted as part of the Region’s 2019 budget process to fund the extension of the pilot from March 2019 until the end of January 2020.

Report:

Background

Currently, Route 21 ELMIRA provides fixed-route scheduled service to the town of Elmira, village of St. Jacob’s, the St. Jacob’s farmers market area and connects to the rest of the regional transit network at the Conestoga Mall Transit Terminal in Waterloo (Figure 1). This route was extended from St. Jacob’s to Elmira in April 2009.

Route 21 ELMIRA currently operates with a regular-sized GRT bus Monday to Friday between 6:00 am and 7:00 pm and provides 30-minute service during peak periods and
60 minute during the midday. On Saturdays, Route 21 ELMIRA operates between 7 am and 4 pm and provides 40-minute service. Ridership on the route is about 400 boarding passengers daily with a ridership increase of 12% in 2017 (Figure 2) following a decline in 2016 largely due to major road construction detours in St. Jacob’s.

For several years, staff have had on-going discussions with Township staff and elected officials on potential transit service improvement options for the Township including:

- Increased hours and frequency of service on Route 21 ELMIRA;
- A circulator route in Elmira using a smaller-sized vehicle to increase neighbourhood service coverage and connect with Route 21 ELMIRA;
- Improved service to the St. Jacob’s farmers market area commercial development; and
- Initial service to the Breslau area.

At the most recent meeting of Regional staff with Township staff and elected officials, it was indicated that staff would prepare a 2019 budget issue paper recommending frequency and hours of service improvements to existing Route 21 ELMIRA. It was also noted that with the redesigned network that would be implemented when ION LRT begins service, a branch of proposed Route 19 would provide additional service to the St. Jacob’s market area via Weber Street connecting with LRT at the Northfield and University of Waterloo stations.

Staff also noted that a meeting was held with Kiwanis Transit to discuss their potential role in the delivery of a neighbourhood circulator service in Elmira. The neighbourhood circulator was seen as a service improvement that would follow improvements to the existing Route 21 ELMIRA, which is the main carrier, which connects with LRT and the rest of the regional transit network.

New service to Breslau would be scheduled for the 2020 and 2021 time frame.

**Kiwanis Transit Proposal**

Kiwanis Transit and the Township of Woolwich are proposing a pilot service of a circulator route through Elmira using a rented vehicle. While the original concept was for a three month pilot beginning in mid-July, after review and discussion between Kiwanis Transit, Woolwich and Regional staff, a six month trial beginning September 4th, running to the beginning of March 2019, has been proposed. The service would operate for 6.25 hours per day during the morning and afternoon peaks Monday to Saturday.

Funding for the service would be provided by Kiwanis Transit, and pending Woolwich Council approval, the Township of Woolwich. Woolwich would also be responsible for advertising and signage, including bus stop markers.
Some of the primary users are anticipated to be residents of a senior’s home and the Elmira Community Living development with connections to various shopping, employment and medical destinations plus connections to the Route 21. The proposed routing of the Kiwanis Transit pilot service is similar to the neighbourhood circulator routing staff presented to the township in previous meetings.

**Service Options**

There are several options with respect to the Region’s role with respect to the proposed Kiwanis Transit pilot service:

1. The Region could contract with Kiwanis Transit directly;
2. The Region could issue an expression of interest for supply of service;
3. The Region could provide the service directly using a GRT vehicle;
4. The Region could, pursuant to its exclusive authority under the Municipal Act to operate a transit system, refer the proposed pilot service to be considered as part of the Region’s 2019 budget deliberations; or
5. The Region could permit Kiwanis Transit and Woolwich Township to proceed with the proposed pilot service.

Options 1 to 4 would require additional process requirements and budget approvals suggesting implementation could occur in 2019 at the earliest. Option 5 would require the Region’s permission as, pursuant to the Municipal Act and By-law 99-077, the Region of Waterloo has exclusive authority to operate a public transit system within the geographic area of the Region of Waterloo.

Staff had a number of concerns regarding the proposed pilot service, some of which have been mitigated with the revised proposal. These include:

- The initial duration of the pilot may not allow an accurate gauge of potential ridership.
- Stopping the pilot after three months may frustrate riders; continuity is valuable and an end date where a potential extension to the service would be valuable. The revised length and timing of the pilot has improved potential to satisfy riders, better illustrate potential demand and fit with budget timelines.
- The proposed hours of service are limited to peak periods whereas midday service is important for riders targeted by a neighbourhood circulator.
- Fare integration on a temporary contracted cannot be readily accommodated in this timeline. With the current fare system, on contracted services, GRT relies on
small fareboxes installed in the vehicles and requires the operator to manually record boardings by pass users. These services have not been transitioned to the new electronic fare management system. The new fare system will require handheld validator units that will not be deployed until sometime this fall.

- The riding public may be confused seeing a vehicle without GRT and Regional logos picking up passengers at locations not identified as a GRT bus stop.
- The budget and area specific property tax rates for 2018 have been approved with no provision for additional service such as the pilot in 2018 or the continuation of the service after the pilot period.

With those concerns noted, staff continues to support improvements to the transit service in Elmira and the operation of this pilot service. If Council decides to allow Kiwanis Transit and Woolwich Township to proceed with the pilot this year (Option 5), staff would require the following parameters be adhered to:

- The funding for the pilot service would be provided by Kiwanis Transit and / or the Township;
- The pilot service would not have fare integration with Grand River Transit;
- The pilot service would not be identified as a service of the Region (Grand River Transit); and
- Any results, including ridership numbers, would be shared with the Region in order to allow a proper assessment of the viability of the service as a regular transit service.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

Elmira community circulator pilot project would support the implementation of Council’s Strategic Focus Area Objective 2.1: Create a public transportation network that is integrated, accessible, affordable and sustainable.

**Financial Implications:**

Kiwanis Transit estimates the cost for the six month pilot to be $54,000. The majority of the cost ($45,000) will be funded directly from Kiwanis Transit’s restricted reserve fund that comes from individual / community donations to the agency. The remainder of the cost ($9,000) is to be funded by the Township of Woolwich and is subject to approval by Woolwich Council. No revenues would accrue to, and no funding would come from, any Regional resources for the proposed pilot service.

The budget and area specific property tax rates for 2018 have been approved with no provision for additional service such as the pilot in 2018 or the continuation of the
service after the pilot period. In order to potentially extend the pilot service, a budget issue paper will be submitted, as part of the Region’s 2019 budget process, proposing to fund the extension of the pilot from March 2019 until the end of January 2020. Further details related to how the proposed extension of service would operate will be included in the budget issue paper.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

The report and recommendation was developed in consultation with Legal and Finance staff.

Attachments

Figure 1: Proposed Community Circulator and Route 21 ELMIRA

Figure 2: Annual Route 21 ELMIRA Boardings

Prepared By:  Blair Allen, Supervisor Transit Development

Approved By:  Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Figure 1: Kiwanis Transit and Route 21 Map
Figure 2: Annual Route 21 ELMIRA Boardings
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Water Services

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: June 19, 2018 File Code: C06-60
Subject: Hidden Valley Intake Operating Protocol Redevelopment with Expert Panel

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a Consulting Services Agreement with C3 Water Inc. to provide consulting engineering services for undertaking the review and updating of the Hidden Valley Low Lift (HVLL) Intake Operating Protocol, at an upset limit of $242,058 plus applicable taxes.

Summary:
Nil

Report:

The Mannheim Water Treatment Plant (MWTP) supplies water to approximately 25 per cent of the Region’s Integrated Urban System (IUS), which includes the cities of Cambridge, Kitchener, and Waterloo, and the towns of Elmira and St. Jacobs. The MWTP was designed in the late 1980s based on industry design standards of that time and was commissioned in June 1992. The facility is a conventional water treatment process with chemically assisted filtration designed to treat Grand River water. Treated water from this facility is critical to maintaining an adequate water supply for the communities noted above.

Since the commissioning of the MWTP in the early 1990s, water taken from the Grand River has been managed by adhering to a strict protocol designed to mitigate waterborne pathogen risks. This protocol requires that the intake is shut down for chemical spills, high turbidity, sewage by-passes and sewage spills. This protocol was
developed and put into place during an upset in the Grand River watershed in early 1993. Advances in water quality monitoring, water treatment technologies, and our understanding of microbial risk have provided an opportunity to redevelop this protocol.

Some of these advancements include:

- The use of Ultra Violet Light Irradiation (UV) as a treatment barrier to chlorine resistant pathogens. UV has since become the primary disinfectant for protozoa such as Cryptosporidium.
- Hydraulic models used to estimate the time of travel of particulate and dissolved matter through a watershed.
- Monitoring technologies used to act as a part of a raw water contamination early warning system.
- Qualitative Microbiological Risk Assessment (QMRA) as a widely accepted methodology for assessing the health risk associated with a specific raw water source pathogen and the proposed or actual water treatment process. A means of quantifying and defining risk against set standards that did not exist during the commissioning of the MWTP.

Updates to the protocol should be supported by the current technological and scientific understanding relevant to each issue. The protocol was first developed with significant input from leading experts in the appropriate technical fields who acted as subject matter experts (SME). Therefore, a similar approach is recommended for this assignment.

The protocol for operating the HVLL involves shutdowns for upset events in the watershed. When the water quality risk exceeds the water supply risk a shutdown is an appropriate response. These shutdowns have the potential of taking the MWTP off-line thereby, introducing water supply risk such as storage and fire protection. However, operational experience, new technology and advancing science indicate that some of the risks that cause a shutdown of the Hidden Valley Low Lift (HVLL) intake may no longer be science-based.

Water Services staff asked C3 Water for a proposal to oversee the redevelopment of the HVLL intake operating protocol. C3 Water has unique skills and background when it comes to ultraviolet (UV) disinfection for the treatment of pathogenic waterborne microorganisms and the Mannheim Water Treatment Plant. As part of this assignment, C3 Water will assemble an expert panel with representation from various levels of competence such as public health, academia, the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) and provincial regulators. Based on the review of their proposal and comparable pricing to prior work, Region staff are recommending C3 Water for this assignment.
Section 21(1)(i) of the Purchasing By-law allows for acquisition by negotiation where the acquisition is beneficial for the standardization of goods for the Region and Section 21(1)(g) allows the extension of an existing or previous contract that would prove more cost effective or beneficial for the Region. As C3 Water, has unique experience with the Mannheim WTP and in the knowledge of pathogenic treatment, Region staff are recommending C3 Water for this assignment. Region staff have negotiated a purchase price of $242,058 excluding all applicable taxes and are satisfied that this price is fair, reasonable and competitive. The price was compared to previous projects for Water Services based on competitive bidding.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

This initiative supports Corporate Strategic Plan Focus Area 3: Protect and Enhance the Environment.

**Financial Implications:**

The Region’s approved 2018-2027 Water Capital Program includes a budget of $8,787,000 in 2018 for Facilities Upgrades (project #04893) to be funded from the Water Capital Reserve (74%; $6,502,400) and Development Charge Reserve (26%; $2,284,600). An amount of $250,000 was allocated for this work. The remaining funds would be available for other facility upgrade projects.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Corporate Services - Finance staff was consulted in the preparation of this report.

**Attachments:**

Nil

**Prepared By:** Olga Vrentzos, Manager Water Operations and Maintenance, Water Services

**Approved By:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Economic Development
Corporate Services
Treasury Services

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: June 19, 2018   File Code: F25-20
Subject: Brownfields Financial Incentives Program – Tax Increment Grant Application – 181 King Street South, City of Waterloo

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions regarding the property municipally known as 181 King Street South in the City of Waterloo, as described in Report PDL-CPL-18-29/COR-TRY-18-62 dated June 19, 2018:

a) Approve a joint Tax Increment Grant with the Regional amount not to exceed $1,064,487 net of any other future brownfield assistance, to be financed from the incremental tax revenue for the property following remediation, redevelopment and reassessment;

b) Provide a Tax Increment Grant subject to the redevelopment of the property; and

c) Authorize the Region’s Commissioner of Planning, Development and Legislative Services and Commissioner, Corporate Services / Chief Financial Officer to execute any associated agreements with the registered owner of 181 King Street South and the City of Waterloo, with the form and content of such agreement(s) to be satisfactory to both the Regional and City of Waterloo Solicitors.
Summary:

The Region of Waterloo has received a Tax Increment Grant (TIG) application for the remediation and redevelopment of 181 King Street South in Waterloo, also known as Circa 1877. Please see Attachment A for a reference map.

The Circa 1877 development supports the Region’s intensification and transit oriented development objectives. The property has been approved for a high-density, mixed use development project adding 188 residential units and approximately 528.6 square metres (5,689.8 square feet) of commercial space.

If approved, this TIG would represent the first successful joint TIG application in the City of Waterloo. The redevelopment represents a significant increase in assessed value and tax assessment with an estimated total current value assessment increase of $65,393,750.

Based on a detailed assessment of the anticipated remediation costs from a remedial work plan, a total of $1,505,000 in direct remediation costs are considered eligible for this TIG. With a 10 per cent allowance for incidental costs afforded under the TIG program ($150,500), the total maximum potential TIG (before deductions for brownfield financial assistance) is $1,655,500.

On July 7, 2017, the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accepted a Regional Development Charge (RDC) Exemption Application for this site. Once eligible remediation costs and invoices are accepted and deemed complete, it is anticipated that the site will be eligible to receive a RDC exemption totalling $1,361,040, which is the total Regional Development Charges for the site. Therefore, the total maximum potential TIG, net of other assistance, for Circa 1877 is $294,460. Remediation of the site is currently underway in association with their accepted Risk Assessment, and remedial activities are being integrated with the building’s construction activities. No other brownfield financial assistance is pending for this application.

The TIG would be cost-shared between the Region and the City of Waterloo with grant proportions determined by each municipality’s share of the municipal taxes levied on the property in the year the application was submitted (2017). Property taxes in 2017 determine that approximately 64.3% (maximum of $1,064,487) of the TIG would be provided by the Region and the remaining 35.7% (maximum of $591,013) would be provided by the City of Waterloo. However, since the site will be eligible to receive a RDC exemption totaling $1,361,040 the maximum potential TIG would be $294,460. It is anticipated that the Region’s portion of the joint TIG would be approximately $189,296 (64.3%) and the remaining City portion would be approximately $105,164 (35.7%). The Region’s portion of the joint TIG would be funded from the incremental tax revenue following the redevelopment of the property.
The Region’s total liability for making grant payments will be the lesser of the amount approved by Regional Council through this report, the final net eligible remediation costs incurred by the Applicant, or 10 years of the final annual tax increment, which is determined following MPAC’s reassessment of the property.

Annual payments are expected to last one year and the payment could start as early as 2020, depending on the timing of completed construction and occupancy.

City of Waterloo Council approved the joint TIG application on May 14, 2018.

Report:

Background – Tax Increment Grant

The Regional Brownfield Financial Incentive Program (BFIP) has been operational for over 10 years. The BFIP program has consisted of three forms of financial assistance for the development community:

- Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Grant (now discontinued)
- Regional Development Charge (RDC) exemption
- Joint Tax Increment Grant (TIG) – The joint TIG program is offered in Area Municipalities where Community Improvement Plans (CIP) have been approved for the purposes of encouraging brownfield remediation and redevelopment (currently in the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener, and Waterloo).

The joint TIG program assists with the cost of remediating brownfield sites. Applicants must meet a number of eligibility criteria and the approved TIG is not paid until after remediation, redevelopment and reassessment of the property. The actual amount of the TIG is the lesser of:

- The Council approved maximum total potential TIG established when the application is approved;
- The final actual net remediation costs (final allowable costs net of all other brownfield assistance); or
- Ten years of tax increment payments (the final annual tax increment multiplied by 10)

181 King Street South Application

On June 30, 2017, the Region of Waterloo received a Tax Increment Grant (TIG) application from 2430290 Ontario Inc. (the Applicant) for the remediation and redevelopment of 179-181 King Street South in the City of Waterloo (please see location map in Attachment A). This property is referred to as “Circa 1877” or “181 King Street South”. The 0.294 hectare (0.73 acre) property is a former industrial property that once included a microbrewery, furniture factory, and a plywood and veneer wholesaler and warehouse.
Located at the entrance of Uptown Waterloo near the Allen Street ION LRT Stop between the Adult Recreation Centre and Erb Good Funeral Home, the Circa 1877 development supports the Region’s intensification and transit oriented development objectives. A total of 188 new residential units and 528.6 square metres (5,689.8 square feet) of commercial space are planned for this former brownfield site.

**Environmental Remediation and Accepted Costs**

The Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) confirmed the presence of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, metals and petroleum hydrocarbons in the soil and groundwater exceeding Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) standards. Based on the findings of the Phase Two ESA, a remedial work plan dated January 23, 2015 was prepared to address the identified soil and groundwater impacts in order to obtain a Record of Site Condition. On March 15, 2017, the MOECC issued a Letter of Acknowledgement that a RSC (No. 223043) has been filed in the Environmental Site Registry for the subject property.

City of Waterloo and Regional staff have conducted a review of the Remedial Work Plan for the site. Because a risk assessment was prepared and accepted by the MOECC in support of the RSC, environmental rehabilitation, disposal of contaminated soil, building demolition costs and all other eligible direct remediation costs will be submitted to the City and Region once these activities are completed. Based on direct remediation costs identified in the TIG application and after a review of the Remedial Work Plan, a total of $1,505,000 in direct remediation costs will likely be acceptable as eligible remediation costs for the site. This amount plus a 10 per cent allowance for indirect costs afforded under the joint TIG program ($150,500) results in a net maximum eligible joint TIG of $1,655,500.

On July 7, 2017, the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accepted a Regional Development Charge (RDC) Exemption Application for this site. Once eligible remediation costs and invoices are accepted and deemed complete, it is anticipated that the site will be eligible to receive a RDC exemption totalling $1,361,040, which is the total Regional Development Charges for the site. Therefore, the potential Total Tax Increment Grant net of other assistance for Circa 1877 is $294,460.

No other brownfield financial assistance is pending for this application. Please see Attachment B for detailed illustration of the tax increment grant calculations and methodology, and Attachment C for a summary of the joint TIG review process.

**Joint TIG Calculations and Payment Schedule**

The estimated payment schedule for the joint TIG is based on the following information:

- The Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC) assessment value of the property before remediation and redevelopment;
• An MPAC estimate of the assessed value of the property after remediation and redevelopment;
  
  o The estimated increase in Regional and City taxes (tax increment) based on the difference between the ‘before’ and ‘after’ assessed value of the site; and

• An estimated total net eligible remediation costs (including a 10 per cent allowance for indirect remediation costs) less any other government financial assistance received.

The joint TIG is paid to the Applicant on an annual basis for a maximum of 10 years, or until the net eligible remediation costs have been recovered or the Council approved maximum has been paid, which ever comes first.

In the case of Circa 1877, the final net eligible remediation costs are not completely known but the remediation cost estimates included in the Remedial Work Plan and TIG application form were used to calculate the proposed joint TIG amount. The joint TIG is cost-shared between the Region and the City of Waterloo, with grant proportions determined by each municipality’s share of the municipal taxes levied on the property in the year the application was submitted (2017).

Property taxes in 2017 determine that approximately 64.3% (maximum of $1,064,487) of the joint TIG would be provided by the Region and the remaining 35.7% (maximum of $591,013) would be provided by the City of Waterloo. After allowing for the expected RDC exemption of $1,361,040, it is anticipated that the potential Total Tax Increment Grant net of other assistance for Circa 1877 will be $294,460. Hence, the Region’s portion of the joint TIG would be approximately $189,296 (64.3%) and the remaining City portion would be approximately $105,164 (35.7%).

Given the substantial tax increment and net eligible remediation costs, annual payments to pay back the remaining eligible remediation costs are expected to last one year. The first payment could start as early as 2020, depending on the timing of completed construction and occupancy.

**Joint TIG Calculations**

Table 1 (next page) shows how joint TIGs are calculated. It summarizes the estimated tax increment for Circa 1877, as well as the eligible TIG amount based on the net remediation costs submitted with the joint TIG application. The lesser of these values ($105,164 for the City; $189,296 for the Region; and a total of $294,460 combined) is highlighted. These calculations indicate that, if approved, eligible remediation costs will be paid back in a short amount of time (1 year), given the significant tax increment available and the net eligible remediation costs.
Table 1 – Joint TIG Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Tax Increment</th>
<th>Eligible Remediation Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Total (10 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Waterloo</td>
<td>$227,517</td>
<td>$2,275,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td>$409,531</td>
<td>$4,095,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TIG</td>
<td>$637,048</td>
<td>$6,370,480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total TIG based on total eligible remediation costs net of the Regional Development Charge Exemption

Estimated TIG Payment Schedule

Table 2 (below) provides an estimated payment schedule for the site. The final payment schedule is not confirmed until all the units are reassessed by MPAC. The Region’s share of the TIG would be capped at $189,296, as highlighted.

Table 2 – Estimated TIG Payment Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>City of Waterloo</th>
<th>Region of Waterloo</th>
<th>Total TIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020*</td>
<td>$105,164</td>
<td>$189,296</td>
<td>$294,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TIG</td>
<td>$105,164</td>
<td>$189,296</td>
<td>$294,460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*subject to construction and occupancy timing

Impact of the Joint TIG Program in Waterloo

The infusion of private investment in the redevelopment of brownfield properties which is supported by the Region’s Brownfield Program is helping to ensure the efficient use of existing infrastructure, as well as helping to achieve the Region’s broader economic development and land use planning objectives.

If approved, the Circa 1877 joint TIG would represent the first successful joint TIG application in the City of Waterloo. Across Waterloo Region, these grants are contributing to the anticipated development of more than 2,000 residential units, more than 1,000,000 square feet of office and retail space, and an estimated total assessment increase of over $600,000,000.

Once Circa 1877 is complete, MPAC estimates it will have a total assessed value of $66,168,000 compared to $774,250 in 2017. Figure 1(below) illustrates the projected changes to the Region’s share of the tax increment on Circa 1877 compared to projected Regional TIG payments.
Next Step – Executing an Interim Tri-Partite Agreement

As a condition of approval under the joint TIG program, an interim Tri-Partite Remediation and Redevelopment Agreement (“Agreement”) for the development is required between the Applicant, the Region of Waterloo, and the City of Waterloo. This Agreement establishes a number of conditions including, but not limited to, the following:

- The owner must pay all property taxes levied upon the property during remediation and redevelopment (failure to pay and keep in good standing all municipal property taxes will deem the owner in default);

- The owner must submit a Record of Site Condition, prepared by a Qualified Person, to the Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change and have it be accepted and registered on title; and

- The owner must demonstrate that the remediation and redevelopment of the site has resulted in a minimum $100,000 increase in the assessed value of the property.

In the case of Circa 1877, once the redevelopment and assessment is complete and verified, the executed interim Agreement will be finalized and have a new payment schedule inserted into it as a “New Schedule”. This New Schedule will include the final TIG payment schedule based on the actual remediation costs and the actual reassessment value of the redeveloped property as determined by MPAC.
Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

City of Waterloo and Regional staff have jointly reviewed the application and are satisfied that the application meets the eligibility and application requirements. City of Waterloo Council approved the joint TIG application on May 14, 2018. City staff also received a draft copy of this report on April 27, 2018 and they concur with its recommendations.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The TIG recommended for Circa 1877 is consistent with the 2015-2018 Corporate Strategic Focus, which directs the Region to: Improve environmental sustainability and livability in intensifying urban and rural settlement areas (Strategic Objective 3.6).

Financial Implications:

If approved, the Region’s share of the joint TIG for Circa 1877 is capped at $1,064,487. It is expected that the Region’s share of the joint TIG for Circa 1877 will not exceed $189,296 due to future brownfield assistance. The final TIG payment schedule will be determined when the redevelopment is completed and has been reassessed by MPAC.

Under the funding model for joint TIGs adopted by Regional Council in 2013, the annual TIG payments would be funded from the increased tax revenue on the property occurring in the same year. In other words, the tax revenue resulting from the increased assessment following the redevelopment of a brownfield property is used to fund the annual TIG payment. TIG payments are expected to last one year and the first and only payment could start as early as 2020, depending on the timing of completed construction and occupancy. Once the TIG is fully paid, the increased assessment resulting from the redevelopment would benefit the overall tax levy.

A listing of approved TIGs and the applicable funding sources, as approved in the 2018 capital budget and 2019 – 2027 capital forecast, is attached as Attachment D. Subject to Council’s approval, this TIG will be reflected in the Region’s 2019-2028 capital plan. The property tax levy impact, which is currently projected to be $189,296, would likely affect the 2020 budget as a result of this approval. Staff will be reviewing the timing of the TIG payments as part of the development of the 2019 and subsequent year’s budgets and will make any necessary adjustments.

Regional Council recently approved a TIG for 1 Adam Street in Kitchener (June 6, 2018). Approval for two additional TIGS, 1011 Homer Watson Blvd. (also included in the June 19th Planning and Works agenda) and 181 King Street South are pending. The following table shows the cumulative impact of these three tax levy funded tax increment grants.
## Cumulative Impact of Recently Approved and Pending Tax Levy Funded TIGS (000’s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024-2028</th>
<th>10 Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved 1 Adam St.</td>
<td>$0.379</td>
<td>$0.707</td>
<td>$0.420</td>
<td>$0.600</td>
<td>$0.379</td>
<td>$0.698</td>
<td>$3.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending Homer Watson*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.269</td>
<td>$1.145</td>
<td>$1.059</td>
<td>$1.848</td>
<td>$5.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending 181 King **</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0.379</td>
<td>$0.896</td>
<td>$1.689</td>
<td>$1.745</td>
<td>$1.438</td>
<td>$2.546</td>
<td>$8.693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* preliminary – final payment stream will depend on phasing  
** assumes future brownfield assistance is paid

### Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from Community Planning, Finance, Economic Development, and Legal Services was involved in the review of the joint TIG application and the preparation of this report, and are in support of the staff recommendation.

### Attachments:

Attachment A – Location Map  
Attachment B – Detailed Joint TIG Calculation Methodology - Illustration  
Attachment C – Joint TIG Application Review Process  
Attachment D – Listing of Approved TIGS and Funding Sources (2018 Capital Budget)

**Prepared By:** Peter Ellis, Principal Planner, Community Planning  
Angela Hinchberger, Director, Treasury Services / Deputy Treasurer

**Approved By:** Rod Regier, Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services  
Craig Dyer, Commissioner, Corporate Services / Chief Financial Officer
Attachment B – Detailed Joint TIG Calculation Methodology - Illustration

This methodology is outlined as an illustration only and is not related to any specific application. The anticipated joint Tax Increment Grant payments and schedule are determined for each application based on the following steps:

The first step includes a calculation of the anticipated assessment increment. This is based on the pre-remediation MPAC assessment value(s) and the estimated post-remediation and redevelopment assessment value(s) for each phase of development as provided by the Applicant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Value “Pre”</th>
<th>Assessment Value “Post”*</th>
<th>Assessment Increment*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$942,750 (2013)</td>
<td>$62,900,000 (est.)</td>
<td>$61,957,250 (est.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These values are for illustration purposes and are based on estimates and will be confirmed by MPAC upon project completion.

The anticipated assessment increment is then used to calculate the expected increase in municipal taxes (Region and City) that would be generated by the remediation and redevelopment for each phase, referred to as the ‘tax increment’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Municipal Taxes “Pre”*</th>
<th>Municipal Taxes “Post”*</th>
<th>Total Tax Increment*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>$7,210</td>
<td>$252,757</td>
<td>$245,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>$11,542</td>
<td>$404,650</td>
<td>$393,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$18,752</td>
<td>$657,407</td>
<td>$638,656</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tax amounts do not include the education portion of annual taxes levied and are rounded to the nearest dollar. For illustration purposes only.

The final step is to determine the estimated total eligible remediation costs for the joint TIG program which includes a 10% allowance for indirect remediation costs to be added to the eligible remediation cost estimates. This total is then reduced by an amount equal to any other government brownfield remediation financial assistance received for the project. At this time, no other assistance is applicable to this application.
### Estimated Rem. Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Rem. Costs</th>
<th>Indirect Rem. Allowance (10%)</th>
<th>Less Other Assistance</th>
<th>Total Eligible Rem. Costs Through TIG*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,672,646</td>
<td>$267,265</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$2,939,911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounded to the nearest dollar.

These steps culminate in the maximum eligible joint TIG for this application which is then cost shared between the Region and City based on the proportion of each municipality’s share of the municipal taxes levied on the property. The following table summarizes the maximum joint TIG and estimates of the Regional and City financial commitments for this illustration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum TIG*</th>
<th>Maximum Regional Portion (61.6%)*</th>
<th>Maximum City Portion (38.4%)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,939,911</td>
<td>$1,809,588</td>
<td>$1,130,323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounded to the nearest dollar.

The City and Region’s total liability for making grant payments are capped by the lesser of the equivalent of ten (10) years of tax increment, which is determined following MPAC’s reassessment of the property, the total actual net eligible remediation costs incurred by the Applicant or the amount approved by Council.

Payments related to the development do not commence until at least one (1) year following the re-assessment of the development by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC).

The TIG is not an exemption from the property taxes levied, but a grant payable to the owner according to the payment schedule in accordance with an agreement between the parties. Therefore the Applicant is required to pay all applicable property taxes for the property at all times during and after remediation and redevelopment or until such time as ownership is transferred to the intended end-user (if applicable).

The joint TIG Program applies only to the municipal portion of the tax bill and does not include the education portion that is remitted to the Province.

The final amounts of the TIG payments will be determined by the actual MPAC assessment value and classification and the final net eligible remediation costs, thus the final schedule of payments is subject to change.
Attachment C – Joint TIG Application Review Process

As part of the application process, the TIG requires the Applicant to provide an estimated remediation cost at the time an application is submitted. This estimate is provided in a Remedial Work Plan prepared by a Qualified Person under Ontario Regulation 153/04 (as amended). Further, as a condition of final approval of eligible costs, invoices must be submitted by the Applicant and must be approved for eligibility by City of Waterloo and Regional staff.

As part of City and Regional staff’s review, the site and proposed redevelopment are evaluated based on the following standard eligibility criteria developed by the Region and Area Municipalities for the joint TIG program.

1. The site must be located within the designated Area Municipal Community Improvement Plan (CIP) Project Area where the CIP allows for implementation of the Regional Brownfield Financial Incentive Program.

2. The Applicant must be the registered owner of the site or an assignee of the owner.

3. The Applicant cannot be responsible for causing the on-site contamination that requires remediation.

4. The remediation and redevelopment undertaken must result in a minimum increase of $100,000 in the assessed value of the property.

5. A “Qualified Person” (as per Ontario Regulation 153/04) must complete the Environmental Site Assessments.

6. Redevelopment plans must meet all approved policy and should comply, where feasible and appropriate, with applicable design guidelines.

7. The site must not be in a position of tax arrears or have any outstanding municipal financial obligations.

8. Application for a TIG must be made prior to issuance of building permit(s) for the redevelopment.

City of Waterloo and Regional staff are satisfied that the site and redevelopment of Circa 1877 meets the eligibility criteria of the joint TIG program.
### Economic Development

**Ten Year Capital Budget and Forecast (Thousands) 2018 - 2027**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99054 51 Breithaupt Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>953</td>
<td></td>
<td>953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99056 170 Water (North 2) Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99057 130 Water (South Parcel) Tax Increment G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99058 36 Francis Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99059 750 Lawrence Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99060 55 Mooregate Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99061 Environmental Site Assessment Grants</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99062 Community Improvement Plans</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99063 19 Guelph Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>646</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99065 350 Dundas Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99066 83 Elmsdale Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99067 445 King Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,066</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,138</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,071</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,494</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,792</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,792</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,288</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,277</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,565</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FUNDING & FINANCING

**Property Taxes**

Reserves and Reserve Funds

- 3980020 General Tax Supported Capital Reserve 35 35 264 236 334 334 1,568 2,374 3,942
- 3980140 Brownfield Incentive Program Reserve Fund 13 198 211 79 290 290
- 3980180 Water Capital Reserve 13 198 211 79 290 290
- 3980460 Federal Gas Tax Reserve Fund 13 198 211 79 290 290
- Other Reserves 471 471 571 1,258 1,258 1,258 4,816 3,903 8,719

**Contributions from Operating**

| Contributions from Operating | 471 | 471 | 571 | 1,258 | 1,258 | 1,258 | 4,816 | 3,903 | 8,719 |

**TOTAL FUNDING & FINANCING**

| 72 | 1,066 | 1,138 | 1,071 | 1,494 | 1,792 | 1,792 | 7,288 | 6,277 | 13,565 |
Region of Waterloo

Planning, Development and Legislative Services

Community Planning

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

Date: June 19, 2018

File Code: D16-40

Subject: Recommendation for Proposed Amendment to the Regional Official Plan (East Side Lands – Stage 2)

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains (December 2017) and Addendum to the Subwatershed Study (March 2018) (WSP) pursuant to Regional Official Plan policy 7.F.6 to the extent that it addresses matters of Regional interest; and

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo adopt the proposed amendment to the Regional Official Plan with respect to lands in the northern part of the City of Cambridge and the southern part of the Township of Woolwich, as set out in Attachment ‘4’; and

That Regional staff be directed to prepare the implementing by-law for the proposed amendment to the Regional Official Plan as set out in Attachment ‘4’.

Summary:

The proposed Regional Official Plan (ROP) amendment relates to the delineation of the Urban Area boundary for lands located in the northern part of the City of Cambridge and the southern part of the Township of Woolwich within the area commonly identified as the East Side Lands – Stage 2 (Attachment 1). An amendment is required to revise and delineate the Urban Area related to a maximum of 170 hectares of Urban Area (55 hectares in the Township of Woolwich and 115 hectares in the City of Cambridge) as provided for in the ROP, as approved by the Ontario Municipal Board in June, 2015.
This amendment would delineate the Urban Area to include 169.49 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Area (55 hectares in the Township of Woolwich and 114.49 hectares in the City of Cambridge) (Attachment 1).

This report:

- provides a summary of the overall process including the consultation undertaken, summarizing responses to public and agency input received;
- identifies the proposed changes to the ROP Amendment as a result of public and agency input; and
- considers the proposed ROP Amendment in the context of the Provincial Policy Statement and the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

Report:

The ROP was adopted by Regional Council on June 16, 2009, in conformity with the former Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2006). The ROP was approved by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, with modifications, on December 22, 2010. The ROP was subsequently appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) and approved with modifications by the OMB on June 18, 2015.

ROP Policy 2.B.3 (d) identifies that an additional 170 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas, combined, in the Township of Woolwich and the City of Cambridge has been justified. The quantity of land is further broken down to specify the areas in which the lands are to be designated through a subsequent ROP Amendment:

1. A maximum of 55 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas located west of Fountain Street and north of the future Ottawa Street extension in the southern portion of the Township of Woolwich, south of Breslau (Policy 2.B.3 (i)); and,

2. A maximum of 115 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas to be located between Speedsville Road and the Grand River in the northern part of the City of Cambridge (Policy 2.B.3 (j)).

In order to refine the location of the 170 hectares provided for above, additional supporting work was completed in accordance with ROP Policies. Specifically, Policies 2.B.3 (g) and 2.B.3 (h), state:

2.B.3 (g) any applicable watershed studies have been completed consistent with the policies in Section 7.F, prior to the approval of the expansion;

2.B.3 (h) for any proposed Urban Area expansions east of the Grand River the Township of Woolwich and the City of Cambridge, in collaboration with the Region, have undertaken a planning process to determine the
development densities, and general mix and location of land uses appropriate for that area;

The lands identified in ROP Policies 2.B.3 (i) and (j) are generally referred to as the East Side Lands – Stage 2 (Attachment 1). The technical requirements of these policies have been satisfied through the completion of the Planning Rationale Report (Attachment 5) and the Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains and Addendum (Attachment 6). The Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains (December 2017) and Addendum to the Subwatershed Study (March 2018) will not result in any revisions to the ROP mapping of the Greenlands Network within the project study area. The Subwatershed Study and Planning Rationale Report are components of the larger East Side Lands – Stage 2 project, which is a collaborative effort being led by the project consultant, WSP, undertaken in partnership with the Region, the City of Cambridge, the Township of Woolwich, and the Grand River Conservation Authority. The East Side Lands – Stage 2 work will result in a Master Environmental Servicing Plan for the Stage 2 lands and a Secondary Plan for the Urban Designated Greenfield Area in the City of Cambridge.

As detailed in the Planning Rationale Report (Attachment 5), criteria were developed to assist in the evaluation which resulted in the development of a preferred land use scenario, as reflected in the proposed ROP Amendment.

The amendment is required to revise and delineate the settlement area boundary of a maximum of 170 hectares of Urban Area (55 hectares in the Township of Woolwich and 115 hectares in the City of Cambridge) as provided for in the ROP, as approved by the Ontario Municipal Board in June, 2015.

The proposed ROP Amendment would¹:

1. designate 55 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the southern portion of the Township of Woolwich (Areas 1 and 2);
2. designate 100.37 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the northern part of the City of Cambridge (Area 3);
3. designate 14.12 hectares of land, combined, as Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced) in the northern part of the City of Cambridge (Areas 6 and 7);
4. redesignate 14.12 hectares from Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced) to Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the northern part of the City of Cambridge (Areas 4 and 5); and

¹ Areas identified in brackets correspond to Areas identified on Attachment 1.
5. incorporate policies guiding the future development and development applications of the subject lands.

Consultation

Four Public Consultation Centres (PCCs) were completed in advance of the statutory public meeting on May 1, 2018 as part of the East Side Lands – Stage 2 project. The first PCC (June 16, 2016) provided an introduction to the East Side Lands – Stage 2 and an overview of the project and its components. The second PCC (December 5, 2016) was held to present the draft Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains. The third PCC (November 2, 2017) presented potential land use scenarios for the East Side Lands - Stage 2 as well as the criteria which were established to assess the land use scenarios. Public comment was invited on both the criteria for assessing the land use scenarios and the potential land use scenarios presented. Extensive input was received on the land use scenarios from the public. The input received was examined, and in combination with the Subwatershed Study, preliminary technical information developed through the MESP, and the criteria established for the assessment of the potential land use scenarios, contributed to the identification of a Preliminary Preferred Land Use Scenario as detailed in the Planning Rationale Report (Attachment 5). The Preliminary Preferred Land Use Scenario was presented to the public at the fourth PCC on March 20, 2018. Project team members met with various interested land owners to discuss specific comments following the third and fourth PCC.

Input received through the statutory process

The proposed ROP Amendment has been circulated to agencies for input, as prescribed by the Planning Act, and a statutory public meeting was held on May 1, 2018 (PDL-CPL-18-21). Nineteen delegations presented at the statutory public meeting, and three written submissions were made. Summaries of the written and oral submissions are provided below, and copies of written submissions are available in Attachment 9 (public input) and Attachment 10 (agency comments). A summary of the delegations and responses to comments or concerns raised during the statutory public process are provided in Table 1. The majority of the oral submissions can be grouped into the following broad categories:

1. Submissions in support of the proposed ROP Amendment; and
2. Submissions requesting the inclusion of additional lands (e.g. along Riverbank Drive south of Middle Block Road, on the west side of Riverbank Drive, lands at the northwest corner of Fairway Road North and Fountain Street North, and lands at the northeast corner of Fountain Street North and Middle Block Road).
Detailed responses to submissions made through the statutory public process for the proposed ROP Amendment are provided in the Planning Rationale Report (Attachment 5). The meeting minutes from the May 1, 2018 statutory public meeting, including a list of delegations and visual presentations are available through the Region’s website (https://calendar.regionofwaterloo.ca/Council/Detail/2018-05-01-0900-Planning-and-Works-Committee-Public-Input-re-Propo/PM%20Pl%20-%2020180501.pdf) and the delegations can be viewed through the archived webcast recording of the statutory public meeting (https://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/regional-government/live-webcast.aspx).

The City of Kitchener, Canadian National Railway, Energy+ Inc., have responded to the circulation of the proposed ROP Amendment indicating that their respective agencies have no concerns.

The Waterloo Catholic District School Board (WCDSB) indicated that the lands proposed for Urban Area designation in the Township of Woolwich include a site that has been identified as a preferred school site by the WCDSB, and have requested that this area remain in the proposed Urban Area and that the current ROP Amendment process be expedited and not delayed.

The Waterloo Region District School Board (WRDSB) has requested that the lack of access to school facilities in the proposed Urban Area be noted.

Waterloo North Hydro has responded to provide information regarding infrastructure availability and requirements for the lands in the Township of Woolwich, but did not provide any comments directly related to the proposed ROP Amendment.

Regional staff have met with Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) staff and consulted on the proposed ROP Amendment. At the time of writing this report MMAH had not provided formal comments.

The Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA), a project partner, provided comments supporting the proposed ROP Amendment, with a request to slightly modify the proposed language as it relates to subwatershed studies. The ROP Amendment as presented on May 1, 2018, included language specific to the Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains. The GRCA requested the language be modified to be more general in order to address any lands outside of the Randall and Breslau Drain subwatersheds. This modification has been made to the ROP Amendment being brought forward for consideration through this report.

The City of Cambridge, a project partner, prepared a report for consideration by the City’s Planning and Development Committee on May 8, 2018 (Report 18-049 (CD)).
The staff report endorsed the ROP Amendment as presented at the statutory public meeting on May 1, 2018 (Report PDL-CPL-18-21), requested staff authorization to address minor changes to the configuration of lands affected through the proposed ROP Amendment, requested a recommendation to deem development applications for the lands to be designated Urban Area premature until the Official Plan Amendment to the Cambridge Official Plan for the Secondary Plan for these lands is in full force and effect, and requested the inclusion of a policy to address lands along Riverbank Drive through long range planning completed through the upcoming Municipal Comprehensive Review.

The Planning and Development Committee identified two changes to the recommendations in the staff report, including a request for the addition of approximately three hectares of land at the northwest corner of Middle Block Road and Fountain Street North as Urban Designated Greenfield Area to follow the property boundary, and the removal of the recommendation by City staff to include a policy to consider long range planning for the Riverbank Drive corridor through the upcoming municipal comprehensive review. Cambridge City Council approved the recommendation of the Planning and Development Committee on May 15, 2018. The City Staff Report from the May 15, 2018 meeting accompanied by a letter advising of the recommendation is appended (Attachment 7).

The Township of Woolwich Council considered the proposed ROP Amendment on May 29, 2018 and endorsed the proposed Urban Area boundary in the Township of Woolwich. The Township of Woolwich staff report is appended to this report (Attachment 8).

The input received through the statutory public process has been considered and evaluated, resulting in some changes to the proposed ROP Amendment. The changes proposed to the ROP Amendment since it was presented at the statutory meeting (May 1, 2018) are provided in the table below, and have been incorporated into the proposed ROP Amendment (Attachment 4). Areas identified in the table correspond to the areas labeled on Attachment 1. The changes proposed to the ROP Amendment since the statutory public meeting are minor in nature and as such it was determined that the ROP Amendment proposed through this report did not require issuance of a new notice under the Planning Act. The proposed mapping changes were identified through the public process both through the presentation of potential land use scenarios and as requests made at the statutory public meeting. The proposed policy changes do not introduce any new policies which materially change the ROP Amendment as presented on May 1, 2018.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROP Amendment – policy and mapping amendments as presented on May 1, 2018</th>
<th>Modified ROP Amendment – policy and mapping amendments changed subsequent to May 1, 2018</th>
<th>Basis for / effect of change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modification of “Note 4” to Table 1 of the ROP, adding language which states the Urban Designated Greenfield Area (UDGA) identified through the proposed ROP Amendment is in conformity with the 2031 population forecast of the Growth Plan.</td>
<td>No changes made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of portion of 2.B.3 (d) which identifies the need for the subject ROP Amendment, and which will be redundant if the ROP Amendment is approved.</td>
<td>No changes made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletion of policy 2.B.3 (i) in its entirety, which is the policy identifying the parameters for the UDGA to be designated in Woolwich</td>
<td>This policy was proposed to be removed in its entirety as it would be redundant if the subject ROP Amendment was approved. New policy language is proposed to be included (2.D.36) related to the alignment of the Ottawa Street extension in order to maintain an ultimate boundary for the southern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ROP Amendment – policy and mapping amendments as presented on May 1, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modified ROP Amendment – policy and mapping amendments changed subsequent to May 1, 2018</th>
<th>Basis for / effect of change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Township.</td>
<td>edge of the Urban Area in the Township of Woolwich.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletion of Policy 2.B.3 (j) in its entirety, which is the policy identifying the parameters for the UDGA to be designated in the City of Cambridge.</td>
<td>No changes made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renumbering of Policy 2.B.3 (k) as 2.B.3 (i). This policy does not pertain to the subject lands, it is being maintained for future reference and implementation.</td>
<td>No changes made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Policy 2.D.35 added regarding applicable Subwatershed Studies for the lands in Woolwich Township.</td>
<td>Language specifically referencing the Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains has been changed to reference the “applicable” subwatershed study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the areas proposed to be designated as Urban Area and Urban Designated Greenfield Area through the subject ROP Amendment lie outside of the Randall or Breslau Drains Subwatersheds. The inclusion of the more generic language will ensure that the applicable subwatershed study is referenced for future development applications. The need for this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROP Amendment – policy and mapping amendments as presented on May 1, 2018</td>
<td>Modified ROP Amendment – policy and mapping amendments changed subsequent to May 1, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Policy 2.D.36 added, to maintain the identification of the southern boundary of the Urban Area in the Township of Woolwich as the future Ottawa Street extension.</td>
<td>Not proposed previously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Policy 2.D.37 added regarding applicable Subwatershed Studies for the lands in the City of Cambridge</td>
<td>Language specifically referencing the Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains has been changed to reference the “applicable” subwatershed study; previously proposed as New Policy 2.D.36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Policy 2.D.38, ensuring the City of Cambridge is not obliged to process development</td>
<td>Not proposed previously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROP Amendment – policy and mapping amendments as presented on May 1, 2018</strong></td>
<td><strong>Modified ROP Amendment – policy and mapping amendments changed subsequent to May 1, 2018</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applications until the relevant policies are in place for the UDGA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Policy 2.D.39, identifying lands to specifically be considered through the future Municipal Comprehensive Review.</td>
<td>Not proposed previously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 3a – Urban Area; addition of UDGA</td>
<td>3 hectares have been added as UDGA (Area 5, Attachment 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROP Amendment – policy and mapping amendments as presented on May 1, 2018</td>
<td>Modified ROP Amendment – policy and mapping amendments changed subsequent to May 1, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the three hectares. Staff explored the inclusion of the land and is satisfied that the inclusion of the lands meets the criteria of the ROP policies. The lands are currently designated Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve – Serviced (PISR). In order to designate these lands UDGA, and equal amount of land must be designated PISR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 3a – Urban Area; removal of proposed PISR</td>
<td>Removal of 4 hectares within the Urban Area proposed to be designated PISR (Area 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 3a – Urban Area; addition of PISR</td>
<td>Addition of 8 hectares of PISR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ROP Amendment – policy and mapping amendments as presented on May 1, 2018 | Modified ROP Amendment – policy and mapping amendments changed subsequent to May 1, 2018 | Basis for / effect of change

| Map 7 – The Countryside | Modifications to Map 7 were proposed to correspond to the changes to the Urban Area designations identified in Map 3a. | Map 7 is proposed to be modified such that the Urban Area Boundary, the Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve, and the Urban Designated Greenfield Areas correspond to the changes proposed to Map 3a.

Policy Assessment

Regional Official Plan

ROP Policy 2.B.3(d) provides that “In conformity with the provisions of subsection 2.B.3(a) and the Schedule 3 2031B forecast of the Places to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and to further implement the Ontario Municipal Board decision relating to the final approval of this Plan, justification exists for the designation of a maximum of 170 ha of Urban Designated Greenfield Area for residential purposes over and above that included in the Urban Area as of the time of the final approval of this Plan”. The geographic location of these lands is further defined as:

1. A maximum of 55 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas located west of Fountain Street North and north of the future Ottawa Street extension in the southern portion of the Township of Woolwich (Policy 2.B.3 (i)); and
2. A maximum of 115 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas to be located between Speedsville Road and the Grand River in the northern part of the City of Cambridge (Policy 2.B.3 (j)).

The proposed ROP Amendment will delineate Urban Designated Greenfield Areas within the Urban Area in accordance with the applicable ROP policies.

**The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2017**

The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2017 (Growth Plan (2017)), came into effect in July, 2017, putting in place a number of new requirements and policies (Refer to Report PDL-CPL 17-23 for additional information). As the settlement area boundary expansion for the East Side Lands – Stage 2 was completed through the approval of the ROP, the Growth Plan (2017) policies pertinent to settlement boundary expansions are not applicable to this exercise.

The Growth Plan (2017) is a comprehensive policy document and requires that the Plan be read in its entirety and the relevant policies be applied to each situation. Although the settlement expansion policies of the Growth Plan do not apply, the background work undertaken in support of the proposed ROP Amendment has considered the entirety of the Growth Plan (2017), and the proposed ROP Amendment meets the intent of the policies of the Growth Plan (2017). Growth Plan policies relevant to this exercise include development in designated greenfield areas, development of complete communities, active transportation, encouraging integration of transit services, infrastructure planning, and the use of subwatershed studies to inform and guide planning.

These policies are reflected in the evaluation to assess and identify the most appropriate areas to designate the maximum 170 hectares of Urban Area, and include avoiding and minimizing impacts to sensitive environmental features, efficient use of infrastructure, development contributing to complete communities, support for active transportation and support for transit, among others. The work associated with the ROP Amendment has included a Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) which has assessed servicing of the proposed Urban Area water and wastewater servicing, transportation and utilities. The MESP has demonstrated that the proposed Urban Area can be effectively serviced and integrated with existing infrastructure in a manner that supports the long-term planning of the East Side Lands and the surrounding areas.

A major supporting component of the proposed ROP Amendment was the Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains and Addendum (Attachment 6). The proposed ROP Amendment maintains requirements for future development to respect the findings of applicable subwatershed studies.
Natural heritage features have been reviewed through the completion of a Subwatershed Study which provides recommendations for the maintenance, enhancement or restoration of natural heritage features. Future development will be required to respect the recommendations of the applicable Subwatershed Study.

The Agricultural System was considered historically through the development of the Regional Growth Management Strategy (RGMS) and the development and approval of the ROP, including the delineation of the Countryside Line. This work was augmented by considering the land classifications identified within the Project Study Area, considering current agricultural operations in and around the Project Study Area, and a review of the elements of the surrounding agricultural food network.

The Provincial Policy Statement, 2014

The Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 (PPS) came into effect on April 30, 2014 and provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development. The PPS is to be read in its entirety and the relevant policies are to be applied to each situation. Planning decisions must be consistent with the PPS.

The proposed ROP Amendment meets the objectives of and is consistent with policies 1.1.1.1, 1.1.3.2, 1.1.3.6, 1.4.4.3 and 1.6.6.1 of the PPS through the delineation of 170 hectares of Urban Area identified in ROP policies 2.B.3 (i) and 2.B.3 (j) of the Township of Woolwich and the City of Cambridge in manner which promotes:

- efficient development patterns that will accommodate a range and mix of units and that minimize land consumption and servicing costs;
- the use of active transportation and public transit through development densities that are transit-supportive;
- the efficient use or land, infrastructure and public service facilities;
- focusing of growth in settlement areas; and
- directing expected growth to areas which optimize the use of existing municipal sewage and water services.

The proposed ROP Amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2014).

Related Applications under the Planning Act

The land proposed to be designated as Urban Area through this proposed amendment in accordance with ROP Policy 2.B.3 (j), will be subject to a subsequent amendment to the City of Cambridge Official Plan to implement the associated Secondary Plan. It is anticipated that privately initiated Official Plan Amendment(s) will be brought forward in
association with any lands designated Urban Area south of Breslau in accordance with ROP Policy 2.B.3 (i). The Township of Woolwich Council will not accept any planning applications for the Urban Areas proposed through this ROP Amendment until such time as the ROP Amendment is approved and in full force and effect.

Next Steps

If the proposed ROP Amendment is approved, the City of Cambridge will complete a Secondary Plan to identify appropriate designations and development criteria for the Cambridge lands delineated through this ROP Amendment. The Secondary Plan will build on the information developed through the MESP and further implement the ROP policies, including the development of the beginning of a complete community. The Township of Woolwich will not undertake a Secondary Plan for the lands delineated through the proposed ROP Amendment, but will implement the ROP policies through privately-initiated applications made under the Planning Act.

Conclusion

Regional staff recommends that the proposed ROP Amendment be approved for the following reasons:

1. The proposed ROP Amendment conforms to the Regional Official Plan and has been undertaken in accordance with Regional Official Plan policies 2.B.3.

2. The proposed ROP amendment conforms to or does not conflict with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2017.

3. The amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 issued under Section 3(1) of the Planning Act.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

If approved, the proposed ROP Amendment would support the Region’s strategic objectives 1.2 (Plan for and provide the infrastructure and services necessary to create the foundation for economic success) and 3.6 (Improve environmental sustainability and livability in intensifying urban and rural settlement areas).

Financial Implications:

There are no direct financial implications related to the proposed ROP Amendment. A fiscal analysis is being undertaken through the MESP which will consider financial implications of providing the necessary infrastructure to support future development in the area.
Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Technical teams for the Master Environmental Servicing Plan include staff from Planning, Development and Legislative Services (Community Planning, Economic Development) and Transportation and Environmental Services (Transportation Planning and Water Services).

Area Municipal Consultation:

This project has been undertaken in consultation with staff from the City of Cambridge, the Township of Woolwich and the GRCA.

Attachments:

Attachment 1 – Map of Study Area
Attachment 2 – Summary of comments submitted through statutory public meeting process and responses
Attachment 3 – Regional Official Plan Section 2.B.3
Attachment 4 – Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment
Attachment 5 – Planning Rationale Report (available online: regionofwaterloo.ca/eastsideplanningreport)
Attachment 6 – Subwatershed Study for the Breslau and Randall Drains and Addendum (available online: regionofwaterloo.ca/eastsideSWS)
Attachment 7 – City of Cambridge Staff Report, May 15, 2018
Attachment 8 – Township of Woolwich Staff Report, May 29, 2018
Attachment 9 – Public Input
Attachment 10 – Agency Input

Prepared By: Jane Gurney, Principal Planner
Approved By: Rod Regier, Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services
ATTACHMENT 1 – MAP OF STUDY AREA
**ATTACHMENT 2 - Summary of comments submitted through statutory public meeting process and responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation/Author</th>
<th>Summary of comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Mino-Leahan, Partner, KLM Planning Partners Inc.</td>
<td>Representative of Madison Group (within Area 3); expressed support of the proposed ROP amendment.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair Capling</td>
<td>Expressed support of the staff recommendation, identified challenges with maintaining lands on the northwest corner of Fountain Street North and Fairway Road North North as Agricultural (within Area 7).</td>
<td>The lands referenced (northwest corner of Fountain Street North and Fairway Road North North) are within the Airport Reserve as identified in the Airport Master Plan. As a result of additional lands proposed to be redesignated from Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced) to UDGA, a portion of the lands at the northwest corner of Fountain Street North and Fairway Road North is proposed to be designated for employment uses through the subject ROP Amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Puopolo, Chief Marketing Officer, Polocorp Inc.</td>
<td>Requested the proposed amendment be modified to extend the Urban Area designation to the west side of Riverbank Drive.</td>
<td>The addition of lands to the west side of Riverbank Drive was considered through the evaluation process to identify the preferred land use alternative. Adding lands on the west side of Riverbank Drive does not directly contribute to the creation of a complete community proposed to be anchored around a mixed use hub at the intersection of Fountain Street North and Middle Block Road. Adding smaller parcels of land outside of the cohesive, contiguous area in the proposed ROP Amendment may detract from achieving the minimum required residential densities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Kindrachuk, President,</td>
<td>Requested the proposed amendment be modified to</td>
<td>The parcels requested for inclusion on the east side of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2. Areas identified in brackets correspond to Areas identified on Attachment 1
3. Includes submissions received by June 6, 2018.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation/Author</th>
<th>Summary of comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermarket Inc.</td>
<td>extend the Urban Area to the west side of Riverbank Drive, include three separate parcels on the east side of Riverbank Drive, and for staff to provide comprehensive planning in the East Side area to address properties that were not included Stage 1 before moving the Urban Area further north.</td>
<td>Riverbank Drive, south of Middle Block Road do not contribute directly to the creation of a complete community proposed to be anchored around a mixed use node at the intersection of Fountain Street North and Middle Block Road. Adding smaller parcels of land outside of the cohesive, contiguous area as proposed through the ROP Amendment may detract from the ability to achieve the minimum required residential densities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Kindrachuk, President, Intermarket Inc.</td>
<td>Submitted a modified request to above (May 7, 2018), to include a 2.5 hectare parcel at the northeast corner of Riverbank Drive and Allendale Road in the Urban Area. The property is proposed to accommodate approximately 13 residential lots fronting onto Riverbank Drive, but with access from a rear alley.</td>
<td>Although this proposal may address concerns of residents in immediate vicinity of the proposed addition, it would add a smaller, isolated area for residential development outside of the cohesive, contiguous area as proposed through the ROP Amendment. As noted above, such proposals may detract from the ability to achieve the minimum required residential densities. It does not directly contribute to the creation of a complete community proposed to be anchored around a mixed use node at the intersection of Fountain Street North and Middle Block Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank, Tommy and Glory Zaja</td>
<td>Expressed a desire to subdivide their lands on the west side of Riverbank Drive in order to create residential parcels for family, and requested inclusion in future communications with the Region of Waterloo.</td>
<td>The parcels requested for inclusion on the east side of Riverbank Drive, south of Middle Block Road do not contribute directly to the creation of a complete community proposed to be anchored around a mixed use node at the intersection of Fountain Street North and Middle Block Road. Adding smaller parcels of land outside of the cohesive, contiguous area as proposed through the ROP Amendment may detract from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation/Author</td>
<td>Summary of comments</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Roussakis</td>
<td>Expressed desire to have the west side of Riverbank Drive included in the Urban Area, and that his property would benefit from having municipal services brought to Riverbank Drive.</td>
<td>The parcels requested for inclusion on the east side of Riverbank Drive do not contribute directly to the creation of a complete community proposed to be anchored around a mixed use node at the intersection of Fountain Street North and Middle Block Road. Adding smaller parcels of land outside of the cohesive, contiguous area proposed may detract from achieving the minimum required residential densities. Installing services along Riverbank Drive to serve existing residences was identified as being challenging due to the road configuration and proximity of a number of houses to the edge of the right-of-way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Boudreau</td>
<td>Expressed support for the inclusion of the lands on the west side of Riverbank Drive in the Urban Area, and supports the servicing of the lands along Riverbank Drive.</td>
<td>The parcels requested for inclusion on the east side of Riverbank Drive, south of Middle Block Road do not contribute directly to the creation of a complete community proposed to be anchored around a mixed use node at the intersection of Fountain Street North and Middle Block Road. Adding smaller parcels of land outside of the cohesive, contiguous area as proposed through the ROP Amendment may detract from the ability to achieve the minimum required residential densities. Installing services along Riverbank Drive to serve existing residences was identified as being challenging due to the road configuration and proximity of a number of houses to the edge of the right-of-way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation/Author</td>
<td>Summary of comments</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Murphy</td>
<td>Identified the current constraints for farming equipment on the road and the increased risk development will bring to the lands at the northwest corner of Middle Block Road and Fountain Street North; requested the balance of this property (3 hectares; within Area 4) be included in the mixed use designation as opposed to being left as Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced).</td>
<td>Cambridge City Council requested the referenced property (3 hectares) be included in the mixed use designation proposed at the northwest corner of Middle Block Road and Fountain Street North; this modification has been made and is reflected in the proposed ROP Amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grainne Aitken</td>
<td>Expressed support for the staff recommendation; requested increased efforts regarding communication with landowners and stakeholders.</td>
<td>Request for increased communication is noted, and staff will endeavour to ensure there are regular updates provided and be available to address any concerns or questions, as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rose, Oak Bridge Private Investments</td>
<td>Expressed support of the staff recommendation, requested a decision be made in order to move forward.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Rier</td>
<td>Expressed support of the recommendation presented by Regional staff, and expressed concerns with including lands west of Riverbank Drive for development. Submitted a request that staff preserve Riverbank Drive as a scenic route.</td>
<td>Comments noted; lands west of Riverbank Drive are not proposed to be added to the Urban Area through the subject ROP Amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Young</td>
<td>Expressed support for the proposed amendment as presented and a disinterest in having municipal services</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation/Author</td>
<td>Summary of comments</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Fridich</td>
<td>Expressed support of the proposed amendment as presented, requested Riverbank Drive be recognized as a scenic route.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Sauder</td>
<td>Expressed support for the proposed amendment as presented, suggested Riverbank Drive is a heritage road and should be recognized as such.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Kidd</td>
<td>Expressed support for the proposed amendment as presented and a disinterest in having municipal services extended to his property on Riverbank Drive.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Aitken</td>
<td>Expressed support for the proposed amendment as presented, and expressed concern with the consideration of lands on the west side of Riverbank Drive as Urban Area due to environmental impacts.</td>
<td>Comments noted; lands west of Riverbank Drive are not proposed to be added to the Urban Area through the subject ROP Amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adriana Vazanova</td>
<td>Expressed support of the proposed amendment as presented, and indicated she was not supportive of extending the Urban Area designation to the west side of Riverbank Drive.</td>
<td>Comments noted; lands west of Riverbank Drive are not proposed to be added to the Urban Area through the subject ROP Amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Puopolo, Polocorp Inc.</td>
<td>Spoke in response to comments raised by delegations; indicated that appropriate permits were obtained for work done on Polocorp lands on Riverbank Drive.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Wilson</td>
<td>Requested the Kossuth</td>
<td>Comments noted. The Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation/Author</td>
<td>Summary of comments</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfly Conservatory</td>
<td>Road corridor/Fairway Road North extension be recognized as a mixed use corridor, as was intended by previous actions of Council.</td>
<td>Area designation being proposed through this ROP Amendment is primarily for residential uses, and there is not an ability to designate Urban Area along the Kossuth Road corridor, or anywhere else, to accommodate exclusively commercial or employment uses at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarter Grespan Lawyers, on behalf of 957859 Ontario Limited</td>
<td>Submitted two letters on behalf of “Forwell Lands”, an aggregate extraction operation located south of Breslau, east of the Grand River and west of Fountain Street North. Letter indicates that the Forwell Lands have been prejudiced by identification of the limits of the Stage 2 Lands, that they should have been considered in the servicing strategy (completed through the MESP), and should have received priority consideration over the Stage 2 lands based on their “Rural” designation. The letter states the position that they believe the ROP Amendment should be considered as a settlement area expansion under the Growth Plan (2017).</td>
<td>The OMB-approved ROP provides guidance on the location that could be considered for Urban Area designation in the Township of Woolwich. The Forwell Lands are south of the limited area that could be considered, and the proposed ROP Amendment adheres to this policy (2.B.3 (i)). The proposed ROP Amendment is to accommodate residential uses in the Township of Woolwich, and the Forwell Lands would need to undergo extensive rehabilitation, and potentially remediation, before the below-water table extraction operation could be deemed suitable for residential development. The servicing strategy of the MESP has accounted for potential contribution to sanitary flows and water needs from the Forwell Lands, but did not examine specific servicing options. The settlement area boundary expansion for the East Side Lands – Stage 2 was completed through the approval of the ROP under the Growth Plan (2006). As such, the Growth Plan (2017) policies pertinent to settlement boundary expansions are not applicable to this exercise for the reasons identified in this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorne Kumer</td>
<td>Submitted as an owner of lands north of Middle Block</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation/Author</td>
<td>Summary of comments</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road, west of Fountain Street and east of Riverbank Drive; Expressed support for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proposed ROP Amendment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Water Holdings Inc.</td>
<td>Submitted as an owner of lands north of Middle Block Road, west of Fountain Street and east of Riverbank Drive; Expressed support for proposed ROP Amendment.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT 3 – REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN SECTION 2.B.3

2.B.3 Future expansions to the boundaries of the Urban Area are only permitted onto lands within the Countryside Line as shown on Map 7 where:

(a) the expansion is justified through the preparation of a Regional Land Budget completed by the Region as part of a five-year municipal comprehensive review of this Plan, or the completion of a municipal comprehensive review as otherwise initiated by Regional Council;

(b) the density targets and reurbanization targets contained in this Plan have been met or exceeded for the Region as a whole, or it can be clearly demonstrated that achievement of such targets will not be hindered by the proposed expansion;

(c) sufficient opportunities to accommodate the population and employment forecasts in this Plan, through reurbanization and in Urban and Township Designated Greenfield Areas, are not available:

   i. within the region as a whole; and
   ii. within the applicable Area Municipality to accommodate the growth allocated to the Area Municipality by this Plan;

(d) the expansion provides sufficient lands for a time horizon not exceeding 20 years, using the density targets, reurbanization targets and other policies in this Plan. In conformity with the provisions of subsection 2.B.3 (a) and the Schedule 3 2031B forecast of the Places to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and to further implement the Ontario Municipal Board decision relating to the final approval of this Plan, justification exists for the designation of a maximum of 170 ha of Urban Designated Greenfield Area for residential purposes over and above that included in the Urban Area as of the time of the final approval of this Plan. This additional land will be designated in accordance with the provisions of subsections 2.B.3 (i) and (j);

(e) the existing or planned infrastructure required to accommodate the proposed expansion can be provided in a financially and environmentally sustainable manner and is consistent with any applicable Regional and/or Area Municipal infrastructure master plan;

(f) the expansion is of a sufficient size to be developed as a complete community by itself, or can be integrated with existing development to contribute to a complete community;

(g) any applicable watershed studies have been completed consistent with the policies in Section 7.F, prior to the approval of the expansion;
(h) for any proposed Urban Area expansions east of the Grand River the
Township of Woolwich and the City of Cambridge, in collaboration with the
Region, have undertaken a planning process to determine the development
densities, and general mix and location of land uses appropriate for that
area;

(i) As provided for through the *municipal comprehensive review* process
associated with the final approval of this Plan and to further implement the
Ontario Municipal Board decision relating to the final approval of this Plan,
priority consideration will be given to a future amendment to this Plan to
designate a maximum of 55 ha of Urban Designated Greenfield Area
located west of Fountain Street North and north of the future Ottawa Street
extension in the southern portion of the Township of Woolwich to establish,
through the development of these lands for residential purposes, what is
expected to be an appropriate medium to longer term settlement boundary,
subject to the following:

i. Designation of these lands as Urban Area will be
considered through a future amendment to this Plan
commenced in 2016 and may be considered concurrently
with a corresponding amendment to the Township of
Woolwich Official Plan;

ii. Consideration of the implementing amendment to this
Plan will be subject to the provisions of subsection 2.B.3
(g) and subsection 2.B.3 (h); and

iii. The southern edge of the Urban Area east of Woolwich
Street South through to Fountain Street North will be
deemed to be the final alignment of Ottawa Street as
determined through the applicable environmental
assessment process without further amendment to this
Plan.

(j) As provided for through the *municipal comprehensive review* process
associated with the final approval of this Plan and to further implement the
Ontario Municipal Board decision relating to the final approval of this Plan,
priority consideration will be given to a future amendment to this Plan to
designate a maximum of 115 ha of Urban Designated Greenfield Area to be
located between Speedsville Road and the Grand River in the northern part
of the City of Cambridge, subject to the following:
i. Designation of these lands as Urban Area will be considered through a future amendment to this Plan commenced in 2016 and may be considered concurrently with a corresponding amendment to the City of Cambridge Official Plan;

ii. Consideration of the implementing amendment to this Plan will be subject to the provisions of subsection 2.B.3 (g) and subsection 2.B.3 (h);

iii. Priority consideration will first be given to enhancing the size of the residential area currently comprised of the lands designated rural residential in the City of Cambridge Official Plan located west of Fountain Street North, north of Middle Block Road and south of Fairway Road North North, with the objective being to create a residential cluster of sufficient size so as to permit its integration with the surrounding employment uses to form the beginning of a mixed use community that will permit future residents the opportunity to live close to where they work;

iv. Subject to iii) above, as part of the amendment process additional consideration may also be given to a reconfiguration of the existing Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve designation so as to better integrate the lands to be designated Urban Area by the amendment for residential purposes to ensure compatibility of existing and future residential uses with adjacent employment lands; and

v. Any reconfiguration of the Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (serviced) lands as provided for in iv) above will not result in an increase in either the amount of land currently designated Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve lands or the amount of additional Urban Area for residential purposes permitted by this policy (115 hectares including any portion of the Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (serviced) lands converted to residential).

(k) As part of the next municipal comprehensive review process to be undertaken not later than 2019 and to further implement the Ontario Municipal Board decision relating to the final approval of this Plan, priority consideration will be given to expanding the Urban Area boundary and Urban Designated Greenfield Area designation to include the lands within the Township of North Dumfries located between the permanent Countryside Line located coincident with the southern boundary of the South Boundary Road and the City of Cambridge municipal boundary as of the date of the final approval of this Plan. The municipal comprehensive review process may be undertaken concurrent with the processing of applications to amend the area municipal official plan.
applicable to the subject lands. Prior to the completion of this municipal comprehensive review process, such lands will be considered as developable for the purposes of infrastructure planning, including any infrastructure master plan updates undertaken by the Region in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 5.
ATTACHMENT 4

Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment No. X

REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN 2031

Draft Amendment No. X

Identification of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the City of Cambridge and the Township of Woolwich

Region of Waterloo

May 2018
AMENDMENT NO. X TO THE REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN

IDENTIFICATION OF URBAN DESIGNATED GREENFIELD AREAS IN THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE AND THE TOWNSHIP OF WOOLWICH

1. The “Notes” to Table 1 are modified to add the following:

4. In accordance with the Ontario Municipal Board decision relating to the final approval of this Plan, 170 hectares of Urban Area Designated Greenfield Area has been brought into to this Plan through Amendment No. X in conformity with the revised 2031 population forecast contained the Provincial Growth Plan. Inclusion of the population associated with the 2031 forecasted population in Table 1 will be addressed through the next Municipal Comprehensive Review of the Regional Official Plan.

2. Policy 2.B.3 (d) is modified to remove the second and third sentences, such that the policy states:

“the expansion provides sufficient lands for a time horizon not exceeding 20 years, using the density targets, reurbanization targets and other policies in this Plan.”

3. Policy 2.B.3 (i) including subsections, is deleted in its entirety.

4. Policy 2.B.3 (j), including subsections, is deleted in its entirety.

5. Policy 2.B.3 (k) is renumbered as 2.B.3 (i)

6. New Policy 2.D.35 is added:

For the 55 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas generally located west of Fountain Street North and north of the future Ottawa Street extension, added to the Urban Area in the Township of Woolwich through Regional Official Plan Amendment X, future development will respect the findings and recommendations of the applicable Subwatershed Study.

7. New Policy 2.D.36 is added:

For the 114 hectares of land in the City of Cambridge added to the Urban Area and designated as Urban Designated Greenfield Areas, generally located north of Middle Block Road, east of Riverbank Drive, and fronting onto Fountain Street North:

(i) future development and Secondary Plans for these lands will respect
the findings of the applicable Subwatershed Study; and
(ii) development applications for the Urban Designated Greenfield Area
will be considered premature until the City of Cambridge Official Plan
amendment for the secondary plan is in full force and effect.

8. New Policy 2.D.37 is added:
   For the lands north of the lands designated PISR north of Fairway Road
   North, south of the Grand River and west of Fountain Street North, future
   consideration will be given to including these lands as part of a potential
   future airport employment reserve through the next Municipal Comprehensive
   Review.

9. Map 3a – URBAN AREA
   Map 3a is amended to:
   a) designate the areas shown with a diagonal-hatched pattern on Schedule
      A as “Urban Designated Greenfield Areas”; and
   b) designate the area shown with a dotted pattern on Schedule A as “Prime
      Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced)”;
   c) redesignate the area shown with a cross-hatched pattern on Schedule A
      from “Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced)” to “Urban
      Designated Greenfield Areas”; and
   d) revise the “Urban Area Boundary” in accordance with the above, as
      shown on Schedule A.

10. Map 7 – THE COUNTRYSIDE
    Map 7 is amended to:
    a) remove the areas shown with diagonal-hatched pattern and yellow
       background on Schedule B from the “Prime Agricultural Area” designation;
       and
    b) remove the area shown with a vertical-hatched pattern and pink
       background on Schedule B from the “Rural Areas” designation.

PART I - PURPOSE AND EFFECT OF THE AMENDMENT

Purpose and Effect
The ROP provides for the designation of a maximum of 170 hectares of Urban
Designated Greenfield Areas. The location and extent of lands to be designated as
Urban Designated Greenfield Areas are shown on Map 1.
The purpose of this amendment is to:

1. designate 55 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the southern portion of the Township of Woolwich;
2. designate 100 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the northern part of the City of Cambridge;
3. designate 14.49 hectares of land as Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced) in the northern part of the City of Cambridge;
4. redesignate 14.49 hectares from Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced) to Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the northern part of the City of Cambridge;
5. modify and maintain policy to identify future Ottawa Street alignment as the southern boundary of the Urban Area in the Township of Woolwich;
6. incorporate policies to deem planning applications for the Urban Designated Greenfield Area in the City of Cambridge premature until the Official Plan Amendment to the City of Cambridge Official Plan for the Secondary Plan is in full force and effect;
7. incorporate policies to require development applications to respect the applicable Subwatershed Studies; and
8. incorporate policy to provide for future consideration of lands through the Municipal Comprehensive Review.

PART II - BASIS OF THE AMENDMENT

The ROP was approved, with modifications, by the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) on June 18, 2015. ROP Policy 2.B.3 (d) identifies the need for a maximum of 170 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas for residential purposes and to form the beginning of a mixed use community, as set out in policies 2.B. 3 (i) and 2.B.3 (j).

The maximum 170 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas are to be located in the Township of Woolwich and the City of Cambridge:

3. A maximum of 55 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas located west of Fountain Street North and north of the future Ottawa Street extension in the southern portion of the Township of Woolwich (Policy 2.B.3 (i));
4. A maximum of 115 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas to be located between Speedsville Road and the Grand River in the northern part of the City of Cambridge (Policy 2.B.3 (j)).

In order to identify the specific location of the 170 hectares additional supporting work was required in accordance with ROP Policies 2.B.3 (g) (the completion of applicable watershed studies) and (h) (the completion of a planning process to determine development densities and the general mix and location of land uses appropriate for the area). The required work, including the Randall and Breslau Drains Subwatershed Study and the planning process, has been completed. Based on this work the areas proposed for Urban Area designation are identified on Map 1.

ROP Policies related to the designation of a maximum of 55 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the Township of Woolwich provide a defined area that
that could be considered. This defined area, considered in concert with the completion of applicable subwatershed studies and the planning process, provided a scoped option for the location of the lands to be designated Urban Designated Greenfield Areas. The resulting configuration of the 55 hectares of land to be designated as Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in accordance with ROP Policy 2.B.3 (i) is provided in Map 1.

ROP Policies pertaining to the designation of a maximum of 115 of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the northern part of the City of Cambridge provide for a broader geographical area, with priority consideration given to the area located between Speedsville Road and the Grand River. The policies allow for the ability to reconfigure existing Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced) (PISR) lands in order to redesignate PISR lands as Designated Urban Greenfield Area provided there is no impact to the overall quantity of PISR. The policies also give priority consideration to enhancing the size of the residential area currently comprised of the lands designated rural residential in the City’s Official Plan (north of Middle Block Road, south of Fairway Road North North), with the objective of creating a residential cluster of sufficient size so as to permit its integration with the surrounding employment uses to form the beginning of a mixed use community that will provide future residents the opportunity to live close to where they work. The policy framework was applied and resulted in the proposed land designations depicted on Schedule A. This includes the proposed designation of approximately 100 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the vicinity of Middle Block Road and Fountain Street North, the redesignation of 14.49 hectares of PISR to Designated Greenfield Urban Area and the addition of 14.49 hectares of PISR to locations on the eastern periphery of the existing PISR (5.88 hectares) and an area on the northwest corner of the intersection of Fountain Street North and Fairway Road North (8.24 hectares).

This amendment identifies the location of 169.49 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Area, completing the implementation of the Urban Area delineation identified ROP policies 2.B.3 (i) and 2.B.3 (j). In addition, the policies of the ROP enabling the designation of a maximum of 170 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas are being deleted as they will be redundant. A note will be added to Table 1 to recognize the revised 2031 population forecast. Policies are being added to provide for the incorporation of the findings and recommendations of the applicable Subwatershed Study, to maintain the southern limits of the Urban Area in the Township of Woolwich as the future alignment of the Ottawa Street extension, and to ensure that planning applications are deemed premature until the applicable Official Plan Amendments are in full force and effect (Regional Official Plan or Cambridge Official Plan).

This amendment conforms to the policies of the ROP, the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

PART III - DETAILS OF THE AMENDMENT

The following changes to policies 2.B.3 (i) and 2.B.3 (j) and the changes to Map 3a and Map 7 constitute the amendment to the ROP:

1. The “Notes” to Table 1 are modified to add the following:
4. In accordance with the Ontario Municipal Board decision relating to the final approval of this Plan, 170 hectares of Urban Area Designated Greenfield Area has been brought into this Plan through Amendment No. X in conformity with the revised 2031 population forecast contained the Provincial Growth Plan. Inclusion of the population associated with the 2031 forecasted population in Table 1 will be addressed through the next Municipal Comprehensive Review of the Regional Official Plan.

2. Policy 2.B.3 (d) is modified to remove the second and third sentences, such that the policy states:

"the expansion provides sufficient lands for a time horizon not exceeding 20 years, using the density targets, reurbanization targets and other policies in this Plan."

3. Policy 2.B.3 (i), including subsections, is deleted in its entirety.

4. Policy 2.B.3 (j), including subsections, is deleted in its entirety.

5. Policy 2.B.3 (k) is renumbered as 2.B.3 (i).

6. New Policy 2.D.35 is added:
For the 55 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas generally located west of Fountain Street North and north of the future Ottawa Street extension, added to the Urban Area in the Township of Woolwich through Regional Official Plan Amendment X, future development will respect the findings and recommendations of the applicable Subwatershed Study.

7. New Policy 2.D.36 is added:
For the 55 hectares of land designated Urban Designated Greenfield Area located west of Fountain Street North and north of the future Ottawa Street extension, the southern edge of the Urban Area east of Woolwich Street South through to Fountain Street North will be deemed to be the final alignment of Ottawa Street as determined through the applicable environmental assessment process or equivalent study to the satisfaction of the Region of Waterloo without further amendment to this Plan.

8. New Policy 2.D.37 is added:
For the 114 hectares of land in the City of Cambridge added to the Urban Area and designated as Urban Designated Greenfield Areas, generally located north of Middle Block Road, east of Riverbank Drive, and fronting onto Fountain Street North North, future development and Secondary Plans
for these lands will respect the findings of the applicable Subwatershed Study.

9. New Policy 2.D.38 is added:
   Development applications for the Urban Designated Greenfield Area will be considered premature until the City of Cambridge Official Plan amendment for the secondary plan is in full force and effect.

10. New Policy 2.D.39 is added:
    For the lands north of the lands designated PISR north of Fairway Road North North, south of the Grand River and west of Fountain Street North, future considered will be given to including these lands as part of a potential future airport employment reserve through the next Municipal Comprehensive Review.

11. Map 3a – URBAN AREA
    Map 3a is amended to:
    a) designate the areas shown with a diagonal-hatched pattern on Schedule A as “Urban Designated Greenfield Areas”; and
    b) designate the area shown with a dotted pattern on Schedule A as “Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced)”; and
    c) redesignate the area shown with a cross-hatched pattern on Schedule A from “Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced)” to “Urban Designated Greenfield Areas”; and
    d) revise the “Urban Area Boundary” in accordance with the above, as shown on Schedule A.

12. Map 7 – THE COUNTRYSIDE
    Map 7 is amended to:
    c) remove the areas shown with diagonal-hatched pattern and yellow background on Schedule B from the “Prime Agricultural Area” designation; and
    d) remove the area shown with a vertical-hatched pattern and pink background on Schedule B from the “Rural Areas” designation.

PART IV - IMPLEMENTATION
This amendment will be implemented through the Region’s consideration and approval
of this Official Plan Amendment, as well as further implemented through future amendments to the Official Plans and Zoning By-laws of the Township of Woolwich and the City of Cambridge, and through the review and approval of development applications on the affected lands.
Map 1. Lands affected by proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment X.
Schedule B – Modifications to ROP Map 7 – THE COUNTRYSIDE
To: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Meeting Date: 05/08/18

Subject: North Cambridge Urban Boundary Expansion

Report No: 18-049(CD)

From: April Souwand MA, MCIP, RPP, AICP - Manager of Policy Planning

File No: D03.01.14.01

RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT Cambridge Council generally endorse the proposed new Urban Area boundary in North Cambridge as presented at the statutory public meeting held at Regional Planning and Works Committee on May 1, 2018;

AND THAT minor adjustments made to the lands affected by the proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment agreed to by City of Cambridge staff in discussion with Regional staff do not need further endorsement by Cambridge Council;

AND THAT development applications for the added lands in the Urban Designated Greenfield Area will be considered premature until the Official Plan Amendment to the Cambridge Official Plan (2012) for the Secondary Plan on these lands is in full force and effect.

AND FINALLY THAT Cambridge Council request the Region of Waterloo to consider long range planning for the remaining lands outside the Urban Area along Riverbank Drive in a comprehensive way through the Municipal Comprehensive Review being done for the next Regional Official Plan update in 2019.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Settlement of appeals to the Region of Waterloo Official Plan (approved by the Ontario Municipal Board on June 18, 2015), require up to 115 hectares (284 acres) of land to be added to the Urban Area in the north west of the city of Cambridge.
- Region of Waterloo, City of Cambridge and Grand River Conservation Authority staff with the Region’s consultant, WSP identified the preferred lands
to be added to the Urban Area, presented at a Public Consultation Center on
March 20, 2018 and presented at a statutory public meeting at Regional
Planning and Works Committee on May 1, 2018.

- Cambridge Council endorsement of the preferred lands is recommended at this
time in order for the Region of Waterloo to finalize the amendment to designate
these lands as Urban Area (from Prime Agricultural Area).
- Staff and the consultants will then begin working on a more detailed land use
plan (Secondary Plan) to bring forward to Cambridge Council for adoption as
an Official Plan Amendment.
- Remaining lands along Riverbank Drive outside the urban boundary should be
planned for in a comprehensive way as part of the next update to the Regional
Official Plan.
- This report does not include consideration of lands being brought in to the
Urban Area in the township of Woolwich, which also part of the proposed
Regional Official Plan Amendment.

BACKGROUND
The Region of Waterloo Official Plan (ROP) was approved by Regional Council in 2009
and subsequently the Ministry of Municipal Affairs in 2010, but this approval was
appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board. As part of the settlement of the appeal,
policies were added to the ROP requiring a maximum of 115 hectares (284 acres) to be
added to the Urban Area to be located between Speedsville Road and the Grand River
in the northern part of the City of Cambridge (ROP Policy 2.B.3 (j)).

Technical studies, including servicing infrastructure (Master Environmental Servicing
Plan) and environmental (Randall Drain Subwatershed Study) are well underway to
provide the necessary information to support the choice of lands to be brought into the
City’s Urban Area at this time (this is the East Side Lands – Stage 2 Master
Environmental Servicing Plan and Secondary Plan study being conducted by the
Region’s consultant WSP).

ANALYSIS

Strategic Alignment:

PEOPLE To actively engage, inform and create opportunities for people to participate in
community building – making Cambridge a better place to live, work, play and learn for
all.

Goal #1 - Community Wellbeing
Objective 1.4 Promote, facilitate and participate in the development of affordable, welcoming and vibrant neighbourhoods.

The Regional Official Plan directs that in locating the additional lands, priority consideration be given to enhancing the size of the rural residential area located west of Fountain Street, north of Middle Block Road and south of Fairway Road North. The objective is to, “create a residential cluster of sufficient size so as to permit its integration with the surrounding employment uses to form the beginning of a mixed use community that will permit future residents to live close to where they work.” There is also opportunity to “swap out” some of the already designated Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve employment lands to the south and east with new residential, as long as the overall quantity of employment land remains.

Comments

The Region of Waterloo hired consulting firm WSP in 2016 to conduct the necessary technical studies to provide background for identifying where the maximum 115 hectares (284 acres) of development land should be located and what land uses will be planned. The subwatershed study for Randall Drain was an important first step to identify the key environmental areas. Next, various land use options were developed and the consultants applied several evaluation criteria to them:

- Avoid and minimize impacts to natural features and hazards
- Maximize development opportunities
- Compact development form
- Mix of uses
- Ensure land use compatibility
- Achieve minimum density
- Conserve heritage resources
- Minimize impacts to existing community, businesses and agricultural operations
- Capitalize on existing planned infrastructure
- Efficient servicing
- Support active transportation
- Support transit
- Provide efficient and safe road network

The result of applying these criteria was presented as the Preliminary Preferred Option – North Cambridge at a Public Consultation Centre on March 20, 2018.

*The following description of the preferred option and lands around it are shown on the map on the next page.*
Area A: The preferred option showed 100 hectares (247 acres) of land to be added to the urban area in Cambridge bounded by Riverbank Drive, Middle Block Road, Fountain Street North and Fairway Road just north of the planned North Cambridge Business Park. The proposed land uses there are residential (yellow on the map) with a mixed use (residential/commercial) area (purple on the map) northwest of the intersection of Middle Block Road and Fountain Street North.

Area B: Approximately 11 hectares (27 acres) of land (already in the urban area) at the northeast corner of Middle Block Road and Fountain Street North are proposed to be swapped out from employment to a mixed use (residential and commercial) land use (purple on the map). Area A + B will total 111 hectares (274 acres) of the 115 hectares (284 acres) allowed in the Regional Official Plan.

Areas C and D: The swap of Area B lands from employment to mixed use is balanced by adding approximately 6 hectares (15 acres) on the east side of Speedsville Road, south of Middle Block Road (Area C) and approximately 4 hectares (10 acres) on the east side of Fountain Street North, just north of the Loblaw Distribution Centre to the Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve designation (Area D) (blue on the map). This “reconfiguration” of the employment designation is allowed for in Regional Official Plan policy 2.B.3 (j iv) and v). Additionally, Area C was directed by Cambridge Council in March 2014 to be included as employment lands, as part of the approval of the Stage 1 Master Environmental Servicing Plan (Report No. 14-019-PLN).

Area E: There will be an area of land remaining between the Grand River (Cambridge’s municipal boundary with Kitchener) and Riverbank Drive from the city limit in the southwest to Fairway Road in the north which will remain outside the Urban Area (outlined in purple on the map). There are landowners in this area who have expressed interest in developing their lands for residential purposes while other residents are concerned about the impact of increased population in the area affecting the scenic heritage quality of Riverbank Drive, among other concerns. None of these lands are proposed to be brought in to the Urban Area at this time, as they would be isolated, unconnected blocks, not contributing to the complete community envisioned in the preferred option and the Regional Official Plan. In order to deal with planning for these lands in a comprehensive way, it is proposed that Cambridge Council request the Region to include this in the upcoming Municipal Comprehensive Review of the Region’s Official Plan, to be started in 2019.
In general, the proposed area is a “best fit” of a very complex land use planning exercise to locate up to 115 hectares (284 acres) of a new residential/commercial community which fits in to surrounding rural residences and planned employment lands. A planning analysis is found in Attachment 2. It is recommended that the remaining 4 hectares (9.8 acres) not be allocated at this time as it would piecemeal the complete community.

**Existing Policy/By-Law:**

2012 Cambridge Official Plan

The subject lands are primarily designated Prime Agricultural and Natural Open Space System and are outside the Urban Area, but inside the Countryside Line, which is intended to contain future urban growth over the long term and protect farmland across the region.

**Financial Impact:**

The study is being cost-shared by the Region and the City of Cambridge as follows:

- **Region of Waterloo:** $502,900
- **City of Cambridge:** $147,400

**TOTAL:** $650,300

The City’s approved 2016 budget included Project 16S004 East Side Lands MESP in the amount of $150,000 funded from Development Charges.

**Public Input:**

Public Consultation Centres

1. June 16, 2016 – launched the study, identified interested persons and obtained input on issues and existing conditions
2. December 5, 2016 – presented findings of the environmental component of the study and obtained input
3. November 2, 2017 – presented high-level and use options for review and input
4. March 20, 2017 – presented the preferred land use scenario to the public and landowners

In summary, some landowners who have not had their lands included in the preferred scenario have provided reasons why their lands should be considered, while others living in the area (particularly along Riverbank Drive) have asked that the same lands not be considered for inclusion. A summary of public input is provided in Attachment 1.
A Statutory Public Meeting under the Planning Act to consider the draft amendment to the Regional Official Plan 2031 to identify Urban Areas in the City of Cambridge and the Township of Woolwich was held May 1, 2018 at Regional Planning and Works Committee (Attachment 3).

There will be additional opportunities for public input planned as the study continues and concludes as an integrated Planning Act project. The next step is for the Region to adopt a Regional Official Plan Amendment which adds the lands to the Urban Area (requires Provincial Approval). The City’s Secondary Plan Official Plan Amendment will not likely be brought forward to Cambridge Council for adoption until early 2019, as it will have to come after the Regional Official Plan amendment to bring the lands into the City’s Urban Area and finalization of the technical studies. There will be opportunity for further public input into the Secondary Plan (a more detailed land use plan) as it is developed.

Internal/External Consultation:

The Steering Committee for the study is staffed by the Region of Waterloo, Grand River Conservation Authority, City of Cambridge and Township of Woolwich (there are lands to be added to the urban boundary in Woolwich as well which are not addressed in this report).

CONCLUSION

The Region of Waterloo is moving to identify the location of a maximum of 115 hectares (284 acres) of Urban Area in the northwestern part of the city of Cambridge as provided for in the Regional Official Plan (approved, with modifications, by the Ontario Municipal Board on June 18, 2015). Regional staff has requested Cambridge Council’s endorsement of the lands identified to be added to the Urban Area at the statutory public meeting under the Planning Act for the proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment held at Regional Planning and Works Committee on May 1, 2018. They have also requested that Cambridge staff be given the authority to agree to minor changes to the lands affected by the proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment, in consultation with Regional staff, without having to come back to Cambridge Council for further endorsement.

It is also prudent for Cambridge Council to indicate that development applications for the added lands in the Urban Area will be considered premature until the Official Plan Amendment to the Cambridge Official Plan (2012) for the Secondary Plan on these lands is in full force and effect. This will allow for a comprehensive planning framework to be in place against which to review and approve development applications in the new Urban Area.
Finally, given the public interest and need to comprehensively plan for any remaining development along Riverbank Drive, it is also recommended that Cambridge Council request the Region to consider long range planning for the remaining lands outside the Urban Area along Riverbank Drive in a comprehensive way through the Municipal Comprehensive Review being done for the next Regional Official Plan update in 2019. An approach for designating 111 hectares (274 acres) of the 115 hectares (284 acres) is recommended in this report. The remaining 4 hectares (9.8 acres) is not required nor recommended to be allocated at this time as it would piecemeal the complete community as presented.

SIGNATURE

Prepared by:

[Signature]

Name: April Souwand
Title: Manager of Policy Planning

Departmental Approval:

[Signature]

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

ATTACHMENTS

1. Summary of Public Input
2. Brief Planning Analysis
Attachment 1. Summary of Public Input

Summary of Public Input received on Preliminary Preferred Option-North Cambridge presented March 20, 2018*

- Want lands on the west side of Riverbank Drive included - think both sides should be planned for now as part of the urban area
- Pleased that lands on the west side of Riverbank Drive are not included
- Looking for Riverbank Drive scenic route to be dealt with in Secondary Plan
- Concerned that design of interface with new development is done in a sensitive manner along Riverbank Drive
- Concerned that development on east side of Riverbank Drive will increase trespass on lands on west side unless they are part of a comprehensive plan to provide trails and public access to Grand River, which has been offered
- Support mixed use along Fountain Street North at Middle Block Road
- Want municipal services on west side of Riverbank Drive
- Do not want municipal services/upgrading of Riverbank Drive/change of road profile
- Concern from some landowners that only portions of their properties have been included (both along Riverbank Drive and around the periphery of the lands included in the preferred option)
- Want further consideration of swapping employment lands with mixed use/residential along Riverbank Drive and along Middle Block Road at Fountain Street North
- Want mixed use to extend along the Kossuth Road corridor now to open up opportunities for further expansions in that direction

*As the proposed Official Plan Amendment is to the Regional Official Plan, copies of comments received are presented as the above summary. The Regional report will present those documents.
Attachment 2. Brief Planning Analysis

Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 (PPS, 2014)

Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan, 2017)

Regional Planning staff will be providing the discussion on the Provincial Plans when the Regional Official Plan Amendment is brought to Regional Council for approval after the statutory Public Meeting on May 1, 2018.

Region of Waterloo Official Plan (approved with modifications by the Ontario Municipal Board on June 18, 2015)

Regional Official Plan policies 2.B.3 (g), (h) and (j) (i) through (v) provide the policy direction for this Urban Area Expansion.

- (g) requires applicable watershed studies to be completed;
  - The Randall Drain Subwatershed Study is substantially complete although not yet approved.

- (h) requires a land use planning process to be undertaken to determine the development densities and general mix and location of land uses appropriate for the area;
  - The Stage 2 MESP and Secondary Plan process has advanced to provide the general mix and location of land uses and the completion of the Secondary Plan will finalize this process.

- (j) provides the criteria and policies regarding the use, location and designation of this Urban Area;
  - These policies have been used to guide the choice of the preferred option for where the new Urban Area should be located, along with the reconfiguration of the Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve lands. A comprehensive analysis has been completed by the planning consulting team hired by the Region to conduct the Stage 2 MESP and Secondary Plan and reviewed by Regional, City and Township staff. It is appended to the Statutory Public Meeting Report prepared by Regional staff in support of the proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment held on May 1, 2018.

Lands located within the Urban Area are intended to accommodate the majority of the Region’s growth and will be planned and developed in accordance with Section 2.D.

Specifically, Section 2.D.1, requires Urban Areas to be planned and developed in a manner that (in part):

- is serviced by municipal water and sanitary sewer;
A long-term servicing solution to servicing these lands is identified in the East Side Lands Sanitary Servicing Environmental Assessment (EA) undertaken by the Region. The Stage 2 MESP will identify servicing required in the interim and has advanced enough to show that the majority of the area can be serviced by gravity sanitary sewers, with some localized areas possibly requiring sanitary pumping facilities, to be confirmed through development application review.

- contributes to the creation of complete communities;
  - The preferred land use option shows residential and mixed-use (residential/commercial) areas, with a major employment area lying to the south.

- protects the natural environment;
  - The Randall Drain Subwatershed Study provides comprehensive background of how surface water, groundwater, terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems function in the subwatershed, and recommends how planned land use changes can take place in a sustainable manner. Scoped Environmental Impact Statements will be required at the time a development application is received for parcels contiguous to environmental features to verify natural features in the field and confirm and ensure the recommendations in the subwatershed study are implemented.

- conserve cultural heritage resources;
  - Riverbank Drive is recognized in the City’s Heritage Master Plan as a scenic route. The character defining elements have been identified as: curving alignment; undulating profile; historic residential and agricultural buildings; farmsteads and woodlots; and archaeological potential (First Nations, ford and sawmill sites). The Heritage Master Plan also identified the removal of traffic from Riverbank Drive as an opportunity for conservation. The future North-South Collector Road to the east of Riverbank Drive will divert traffic away from this route. The existing curving alignment and undulating road profile is not proposed to change, thus preserving the existing cultural heritage attributes. However, staff recognizes that the view from the road looking east will be impacted by the new Urban Area.

  - The property at 1035 Riverbank Drive is listed on the City’s Heritage Properties Register. Detailed policies coming forward in the Secondary Plan will outline the cultural heritage review requirements for development of and adjacent to this property, in accordance with the City’s Official Plan.

In review of the above-noted, staff is of the opinion that the proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment generally complies with the Regional Official Plan.
City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012) as amended

The subject lands are currently designated Prime Agricultural, Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve, and Natural Open Space System in the City’s Official Plan. Section 2.4 indicates that the urban area boundary is established by the Region through the Regional Official Plan and that the forecasted population and employment growth is to be accommodated within the urban area to the year 2031. As explained in the section above on the Regional Official Plan policy analysis, the 115 hectares (284 acres) of land was provided for in the approval of the Plan in 2015 by the Ontario Municipal Board. Once the proposed Regional Official Plan amendment is in place to complete the identification of the Urban Area, the City will be able to proceed with amendments to the Cambridge Official Plan to reflect this change and plan for the new area through a Secondary Plan (per Section 10.2) being developed as part of the Stage 2 MESP study. A complete planning analysis of the Secondary Plan will be brought forward with that proposed Official Plan Amendment.

Heritage Master Plan (2008)

Riverbank Drive is recognized in the City’s Heritage Master Plan as a scenic route. The character defining elements have been identified as: curving alignment; undulating profile; historic residential and agricultural buildings; farmsteads and woodlots; and archaeological potential (First Nations, ford and sawmill sites). The Heritage Master Plan also identified the removal of traffic from Riverbank Drive as an opportunity for conservation. The future North-South Collector Road to the east of Riverbank Drive will divert traffic away from this route. The existing curving alignment and undulating road profile is not proposed to change, thus preserving the existing cultural heritage attributes. However, staff recognizes that the view from the road looking east will be impacted by the new Urban Area. Long range planning for the remaining lands outside the Urban Area along Riverbank Drive during the next Municipal Comprehensive Review would be a way to assess the future conservation of the scenic route.
REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN 2031

Draft Amendment No. X
Identification of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the City of Cambridge and the Township of Woolwich

Region of Waterloo

May 2018
AMENDMENT NO. X TO THE REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN

IDENTIFICATION OF URBAN DESIGNATED GREENFIELD AREAS IN THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE AND THE TOWNSHIP OF WOOLWICH

PART I - PURPOSE AND EFFECT OF THE AMENDMENT

Purpose and Effect

The ROP provides for the designation of a maximum of 170 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas. The location and extent of lands to be designated as Urban Designated Greenfield Areas are shown on Map 1.

The purpose of this amendment is to:

1. designate approximately 55 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the southern portion of the Township of Woolwich;
2. designate approximately 100 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the northern part of the City of Cambridge;
3. designate approximately 6 hectares of land as Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced) in the northern part of the City of Cambridge;
4. redesignate approximately 11 hectares from Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced) to Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the northern part of the City of Cambridge;
5. redesignate approximately 4 hectares of land from Urban Designated Greenfield Areas to Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced) in the northern part of the City of Cambridge.

The proposed amendment is being undertaken in accordance with ROP Policies 2.B.3 (i) and 2.B.3 (j). ROP Map 3a and Map 7 would be modified accordingly to reflect the Urban Designated Greenfield Areas and Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced) designated through this amendment, and to amend the Urban Area Boundary accordingly.

PART II - BASIS OF THE AMENDMENT

The ROP was approved, with modifications, by the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) on June 18, 2015. ROP Policy 2.B.3 (d) identifies the need for a maximum of 170 ha of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas for residential purposes and to form the beginning of a mixed use community, as set out in policies 2.B. 3 (i) and 2.B.3 (j).

The maximum 170 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas are to be located in the Township of Woolwich and the City of Cambridge:
1. A maximum of 55 ha of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas located west of Fountain Street and north of the future Ottawa Street extension in the southern portion of the Township of Woolwich (Policy 2.B.3 (i));

2. A maximum of 115 ha of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas to be located between Speedsville Road and the Grand River in the northern part of the City of Cambridge (Policy 2.B.3 (j)).

In order to identify the specific location of the 170 hectares additional supporting work was required in accordance with ROP Policies 2.B.3 (g) (the completion of applicable watershed studies) and (h) (the completion of a planning process to determine development densities and the general mix and location of land uses appropriate for the area). The required work, including the Randall and Breslau Drains Subwatershed Study and the planning process, has been completed. Based on this work the areas proposed for Urban Area designation are identified on Map 1.

ROP Policies related to the designation of a maximum of 55 ha of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the Township of Woolwich provide a defined area that that could be considered. This defined area, considered in concert with the completion of applicable subwatershed studies and the planning process, provided a scoped option for the location of the lands to be designated Urban Designated Greenfield Areas. The resulting configuration of the 55 ha of land to be designated as Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in accordance with ROP Policy 2.B.3 (i) is provided in Map 1.

ROP Policies pertaining to the designation of a maximum of 115 ha of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the northern part of the City of Cambridge provide for a broader geographical area, with priority consideration given to the area located between Speedsville Road and the Grand River. The policies allow for the ability reconfigure existing Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced) (PISR) lands in order to redesignate PISR lands as Designated Urban Greenfield Area provided there is no impact to the overall quantity of PISR. The policies also give priority consideration to enhancing the size of the residential area currently comprised of the lands designated rural residential in the City’s Official Plan (north of Middle Block Road, south of Fairway Road North), with the objective of creating a residential cluster of sufficient size so as to permit its integration with the surrounding employment uses to form the beginning of a mixed use community that will provide future residents the opportunity to live close to where they work. The policy framework was applied and resulted in the proposed land designations depicted on Schedule A. This includes the proposed designation of approximately 100 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the vicinity of Middleblock Road and Fountain Street, the redesignation of approximately 11 hectares of PISR to Designated Greenfield Urban Area and the addition of approximately 11 hectares of PISR to locations on the periphery of the existing PISR.

This amendment identifies the location of a maximum of 170 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas, completing the implementation of the Urban Area Expansion identified in the ROP. In addition, the policies of the ROP enabling the designation of 170 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas are being deleted as they will be redundant. A note will be added to Table 1 to recognize the revised 2031 population forecast. Policies are being added to provide for the incorporation of the findings and recommendations of the Randall and Breslau Drains Subwatershed Study.
This amendment conforms to the policies of the ROP, the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

PART III - DETAILS OF THE AMENDMENT

The following changes to policies 2.B.3 (i) and 2.B.3 (j) and the changes to Map 3a and Map 7 constitute the amendment to the ROP:

1. The “Notes” to Table 1 are modified to add the following:

   4. In accordance with the Ontario Municipal Board decision relating to the final approval of this Plan, 170 hectares of Urban Area Designated Greenfield Area has been brought into to this Plan through Amendment No. X in conformity with the revised 2031 population forecast contained the Provincial Growth Plan. Inclusion of the population associated with the 2031 forecasted population in Table 1 will be addressed through the next Municipal Comprehensive Review of the Regional Official Plan.

2. Policy 2.B.3 (d) is modified to remove the second and third sentences, such that the policy states:

   “the expansion provides sufficient lands for a time horizon not exceeding 20 years, using the density targets, reurbanization targets and other policies in this Plan.”

3. Policy 2.B.3 (i), including subsections, is deleted in its entirety.

4. Policy 2.B.3 (j), including subsections, is deleted in its entirety.

5. Policy 2.B.3 (k) is renumbered as 2.B.3 (i)

6. New Policy 2.D.35 is added:

   For the 55 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas generally located west of Fountain Street and north of the future Ottawa Street extension, added to the Urban Area in the Township of Woolwich through Regional Official Plan Amendment X, future development will respect the findings and recommendations of the Randall and Breslau Drains Subwatershed Study.

7. New Policy 2.D.36 is added:

   For the approximately 111 hectares of land in the City of Cambridge added to the Urban Area and designated as Urban Designated Greenfield Areas through Regional Official Plan Amendment X, generally located north of Middle Block Road, east of Riverbank Drive, and fronting onto Fountain Street North, future development and Secondary Plans for these lands will respect the findings of the Randall and Breslau Drains Subwatershed Study.

8. Map 3a – URBAN AREA
Map 3a is amended to:

a) designate the areas shown with a diagonal-hatched pattern on Schedule A as “Urban Designated Greenfield Areas”; and
b) designate the area shown with a dotted pattern on Schedule A as “Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced)” ; and
c) redesignate the area shown with a cross-hatched pattern on Schedule A from “Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced)” to “Urban Designated Greenfield Areas”; and
d) redesignate the lands shown in a vertical-hatched pattern on Schedule A from “Urban Designated Greenfield Areas” to “Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced)” ; and
e) revise the “Urban Area Boundary” in accordance with the above, as shown on Schedule A.

9. Map 7 – THE COUNTRYSIDE

Map 7 is amended to:

a) remove the areas shown with diagonal-hatched pattern and yellow background on Schedule B from the “Prime Agricultural Area” designation; and
b) remove the area shown with a vertical-hatched pattern and pink background on Schedule B from the “Rural Areas” designation.

PART IV - IMPLEMENTATION

This amendment will be implemented through the Region’s consideration and approval of this Official Plan Amendment, as well as further implemented through future amendments to the Official Plans and Zoning By-laws of the Township of Woolwich and the City of Cambridge, and through the review and approval of development applications on the affected lands.
Map 1. Lands affected by proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment X.
Schedule B – Modifications to ROP Map 7 – THE COUNTRYSIDE
Recommendation:

That in accordance with Report E29-2018 respecting Woolwich’s comments to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo on the proposed Regional Official Plan for the East Side Lands – Stage 2 Area, the Council of the Township of Woolwich:

1. Endorses the proposed Urban Area boundary in Woolwich Township adjacent to the Breslau Settlement Area as presented at a statutory public meeting held at the Regional Planning and Works Committee meeting on May 1st, 2018 and outlined in Appendix ‘A’ to Report E29-2018; and

2. That planning applications for the new lands identified as Urban Designated Greenfield within Woolwich adjacent to the Breslau Settlement Area will be considered premature until the proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment as outlined in Appendix ‘A’ and related to the Woolwich lands is approved and in full force and effect.

Background:

The Township received notice from the Regional Municipality of Waterloo (the “Region”) concerning a proposed amendment to their Official Plan (the “ROPA”) to delineate the Urban Area for lands located at the north part of the City of Cambridge and the south part of the Township of Woolwich within an area referred to the East Side Lands – Stage 2 Area (see Appendix ‘A’ – Proposed ROPA). The purpose of this report is to evaluate and provide input on the proposed ROPA to form Woolwich’s comments to the Region.
The Region’s Official Plan (the “ROP”) was approved with modifications by the Ontario Municipal Board to bring it into conformity with Provincial Policy and the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (the “Growth Plan”). The ROP is a guiding planning document for Waterloo Region in directing growth to accommodate the forecasted population to the year 2031 primarily within the Built-Up areas/Urban Centres and Designated Greenfield Areas of Urban (e.g. Cambridge, Kitchener, Waterloo and Breslau) and Township Urban Areas (e.g. Elmira and St. Jacobs). Included in this 2031 population forecast was the identification of an additional 170 hectares of Urban Area lands that were required in north Cambridge and south Woolwich in an area currently designated in the ROP for agriculture. The policies in the ROP provided only a general description of the location and amount to be designated which would form the 170 hectares of new Urban Area lands, being:

- Up to 55 hectares of Designated Greenfield lands in Woolwich with priority consideration in areas west of Fountain Street and north of the future Ottawa Street extension adjacent to the Breslau Settlement Area; and
- Up to 115 hectares of Designated Greenfield lands in Cambridge to be located between Speedsville and the Grand River.

To refine and finalize the specific amount and location of the 170 hectares that will be designated Urban Area in the ROP, additional technical work is being completed in support of the proposed ROPA, which include:

- A Sub-Watershed Study for the Randal and Breslau Drains identifying significant Core Environmental features and associated buffer areas within the East Side Lands – Stage 2 Area and addressing other matters such as providing stormwater management criteria for new development;
- The development of a Master Drainage Plan which includes the delineation of hazard lands (e.g. floodplains);
- The development of a Preliminary Preferred Land Use Scenario in identifying up to 170 hectares of Urban Greenfield Area in south Woolwich and north Cambridge;
- A Planning Rationale Report justifying the preferred land use scenario; and
- The preparation of a Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) to determine whether the preferred land use scenario is technically feasible from a servicing, transportation and environmental perspective.

The above works, known as the MESP 2 and Secondary Plan Study, was initiated in early 2016 by the Region in collaboration with the Township, City of Cambridge and the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA). WSP Canada Group Limited (i.e. WSP) was retained to complete this project, as well as a secondary plan, on behalf of the City, for only the preferred lands within Cambridge. Given that the Township recently completed the Breslau Secondary Plan last year, the Woolwich lands would be included in the Breslau Settlement Area by subsequent local planning applications initiated by the respective owners.
Several public consultation meetings were held over the last two years for this study including a public meeting in November of 2017 to present four land use options for the Cambridge lands and one land use option in for the Woolwich lands. Given the location parameters in the ROP in identifying up to 55 hectares of new Urban Area in Woolwich as previously noted, there was only one option that could be considered. A preferred land use scenario was subsequently developed by the project team and presented at a public meeting in March of this year.

The proposed ROPA that the Region prepared and circulated to the Township implements the preferred land use scenario that was presented at the March public meeting. The Region subsequently held a statutory public meeting pursuant to the Planning Act on May 1st, 2018 to present the proposed ROPA and to solicit comments from the local municipalities, public, stakeholders and concerned agencies.

**COMMENTS:**

**Proposed ROPA**

The proposed 55 hectares of Woolwich lands that are contained in the proposed ROPA and identified in the preferred land use scenario for the MESP 2 Study are located west of Fountain Street and north of the Ottawa Street extension, immediately adjacent of the Breslau Settlement Area as illustrated in Appendix ‘B’ (Map – Preferred Land Use Scenario). The proposed 115 hectares of Cambridge lands that are contained in the ROPA and identified as the preferred land use scenario for the MESP 2 Study are located between Fairway Road and Middleblock Road, east of Riverbank Road.

Township Staff’s subsequent comments on the proposed ROPA will focus solely on the Woolwich lands, while City Staff has commented and supported, through their Council, specifically on the Cambridge lands.

**Detail Description of Woolwich Lands**

Approximately 35 hectares of the Woolwich lands that are affected by the proposed ROPA are located between Woolwich Street South and Fountain Street, immediately adjacent to an existing residential area to the north and west, and an existing industrial area to the south. These lands are owned by Breslau Properties Limited (Parcel 1) and 805232 Ontario Limited c/o Nedlaw Roofing (Parcel 2). The vacant lands are designated and zoned for Agriculture and are currently rented out for crop farming. The remaining 10 hectares of vacant land west of Woolwich Street South (Parcel 3) is owned by Riverland Area II GP Ltd (i.e. Empire), is also designated and zoned for Agriculture, was part of a former gravel extraction operation and is situated next to Empire’s current draft approved plan. The 1st phase of Empire’s draft approved plan is being developed this year.
Appropriateness of the Proposed Urban Designation of the Woolwich Land

Township Staff have been involved and collaborated with our municipal partners, WSP and the GRCA throughout the MESP 2/ROPA planning and public consultation process. After substantial completion and review of the draft technical work (e.g. sub-watershed, master drainage plan, planning rationale report and preliminary servicing and transportation analysis) and after consideration of stakeholders/public submissions/discussions, a preferred land use scenario was developed and is being implemented through the proposed ROPA. The proposed ROPA, as it relates specifically to the Woolwich lands, is appropriated and can be supported by Township Staff based on the following:

- It conforms to and does not conflict with Provincial policies, such as planning for sustainable and complete communities in a compact and dense form, managing existing services/infrastructure and protecting significant environmental resources;
- It conforms to the policies in the ROP, including Policy 2.B.3 (i) which limits the Woolwich lands to be designated Urban Area to a maximum of 55 hectares, with priority consideration to properties located west of Fountain Street and north of the Ottawa Street extension;
- It is contiguous to the Breslau community in a compact urban form and is a logical extension of services, infrastructure and transportation corridors;
- Does not remove significant farming operations on any of the three sites nor impact adjacent farming operation as it relates to minimum distance separation;
- Will facilitate the extension of key transportation corridors as recommended in the Breslau Secondary Plan, including the Ottawa Street, Andover Drive and Dolman Street extensions;
- The wastewater services for the subject lands can all drain by gravity to the Victoria Street North Pumping Station via the existing Breslau sanitary sewer system to the north. In addition, preliminary work during the Breslau Secondary Plan has determined that there may be sufficient wastewater capacity available to accommodate the majority or all of the lands proposed to be designated.
- It will support and implement the approved sub-watershed studies by protecting significant Core Environmental Features and their associated buffer areas such as the Provincially-significant wetland feature located on Parcel 1. Staff note that this Core Environmental feature on Parcel 1 was netted out of the 55 hectares because it is Provincially significant in conformity with the Growth Plan. Other Core Environmental Features that may be regionally or locally significant are not netted out and may be further evaluated and/or refined as part of a detailed environmental impact statement (EIS) that would be submitted in conjunction with a development application.
- The future land use will be primarily residential which is in keeping with the adjacent residential neighbourhood. The ROP prescribes a minimum density of 55 people/jobs per hectare for designated Greenfield Areas throughout the
region. Staff notes that the specific residential form and density for the proposed lands, which will be in keeping with the Breslau Staging Policies and sensitive to the existing residential neighbourhood, will ultimately be determined during the review and processing of their respective local planning applications (i.e. Township Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Subdivision approval).

- The lands are located outside the Airport Reserve Area as identified in the Region’s Airport Master Plan which is a specific area around that airport that discourages the location of new sensitive land uses such as residential due to the potential noise conflicts; and
- It will resolve some local planning issues. For instance, the inclusion of the Parcel 3 in the Urban Area may allow Empire to convey additional lands to the Waterloo Catholic School Board (the “WCDSB”) for their new school site in Breslau. In the interim, WCDSB is using a portion of Empire and Township lands within the current Urban Area for a playfield and parking area until Parcel 3 is added to the Breslau Settlement Area.

Staff note that the three properties owners has provided written or verbal support of the proposed ROPA and some have actively participated through the MESP 2 planning and public consultation process.

Staff would like to acknowledge a minor mapping error that was identified in the preferred land use scenario for the Breslau lands during the MESP 2 process. Due to the maximum 55-hectare constraint, there was a small gap of lands designated Urban Area between the proposed Urban Area and Woolwich Street South abutting the Nedlaw Roofing Parcel 2 and a gap between Breslau Properties (Parcel 2) and the railway corridor. Township Staff have less of an issue with the latter because the gap is within the railway right-of-way and not on the proposed Urban area lands. Regional Staff has indicated that the proposed ROPA can deal with the minor mapping error adjacent to Woolwich Street, but due to the 55-hectare urban expansion limitation, the gap within the railway corridor would have to be addressed in a future ROP conformity exercise.

Public Comments on the Proposed ROPA

Regional and Township Staff received a letter (dated April 23, 2018) from Breslau Properties offering their support to the proposed ROPA. They also cited a minor issue with the identification of a locally significant feature at the northwest corner of their property on Parcel 2. Regional Staff indicated that they will continue the dialogue and review this issue as part of finalizing the Breslau Drain Sub-Watershed Study. This issue could also be deferred until the review of their local planning applications which will require the submission of an EIS that will include a much more detailed evaluation of the feature.

The Region also received a letter (dated April 30, 2018) from McCarter Grespan, who represents the Forwell gravel extraction property south of the Ottawa Street extension.
and immediately east of the Grand River, requesting that the MESP 2 study consider their property. Staff notes that the Forwell property is outside the location parameters for Urban Area expansion as it relates specifically to this proposed ROPA as per ROP Policy 2.B.3 (i).

The Waterloo Catholic District School Board provided comments (dated May 7, 2018) supporting the proposed ROPA because the inclusion of the Empire lands into the Urban Area would allow them to obtain additional lands for their new school site in Breslau. The Grand River Conservation Authority (dated May 14, 2018) has no objection to the Region’s proposed ROPA.

There was only one delegation at the statutory public meeting held by the Region on May 1st speaking to the Woolwich portion of the proposed ROPA. There were several delegations providing submissions concerning the Cambridge portion of the proposed ROPA. John Rose on behalf of Breslau Properties again offered their support to the Region’s proposed amendment related to the Woolwich lands.

Next Steps

WSP will continue to finalize the remaining technical work associated with this study to support the proposed ROPA such as the sub-watershed studies (which are substantially completed), the planning rationale report, the master drainage plan and the Master Environment and Servicing Plan. In addition, they will complete their work on the secondary plan for the lands in Cambridge.

Regional Staff has indicated that they will prepare a report which summarizes and considers the supported technical work and the comments received from the Township, City, GRCA, stakeholders and public. Their report will include a formal recommendation concerning the proposed ROPA for Regional Council’s consideration later in the spring. If Regional Council ultimately supports Regional Staff’s recommendation and approves the proposed ROPA, then the amendment will proceed through an appeal period before it can come into effect. The Woolwich property owners affected by this amendment, being Empire, Breslau Properties and Nedlaw Roofing, would subsequently be allowed to submit the required planning applications (i.e. OPA, ZBA and plan of subdivision) and supporting documents for consideration concerning the development of their respective lands upon final approval of the ROPA. Any planning applications received by the Township concerning the said Woolwich lands prior to final approval of the ROPA will be considered premature. The Township does not want to be involved in any potential litigation by accepting a planning application before final approval, should there be an appeal on the proposed ROPA.

Interdepartmental Implications:

None
Financial Implications:
None

Strategic Plan Focus Area:

*Planning for Growth and Exploring Economic Development Opportunities* – provide for the contiguous extension of the Breslau Settlement Area in a compact and dense form that is sensitive to the existing residential area and respects the community’s staging policies.

*Infrastructure Maintenance and Transportation Planning* – logical extension of the existing services and transportation corridors.

Conclusion:

The proposed ROPA, as it relates specifically to the Woolwich lands, is appropriate and can be supported by Township Staff. There was no public or stakeholder issues raised on the Woolwich portion of the proposed amendment. WSP will continue to finalize the remaining technical work associated with this study to support the proposed ROPA. If Regional Council ultimately approves the proposed ROPA, then Woolwich property owners affected by this amendment would subsequently be allowed to submit the required planning application. Any planning applications received by the Township prior to final approval of the proposed ROPA will be considered premature.

Attachments:

Appendix ‘A’ – Proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment

Appendix ‘B’ – Map Identifying the Preliminary Preferred Land Use Scenario
Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment No. X

REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN 2031

Draft Amendment No. X

Identification of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the City of Cambridge and the Township of Woolwich

Region of Waterloo

May 2018
AMENDMENT NO. X TO THE REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN

IDENTIFICATION OF URBAN DESIGNATED GREENFIELD AREAS IN THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE AND THE TOWNSHIP OF WOOLWICH

PART I - PURPOSE AND EFFECT OF THE AMENDMENT

Purpose and Effect

The ROP provides for the designation of a maximum of 170 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas. The location and extent of lands to be designated as Urban Designated Greenfield Areas are shown on Map 1.

The purpose of this amendment is to:

1. designate approximately 55 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the southern portion of the Township of Woolwich;
2. designate approximately 100 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the northern part of the City of Cambridge;
3. designate approximately 6 hectares of land as Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced) in the northern part of the City of Cambridge;
4. redesignate approximately 11 hectares from Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced) to Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the northern part of the City of Cambridge;
5. redesignate approximately 4 hectares of land from Urban Designated Greenfield Areas to Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced) in the northern part of the City of Cambridge.

The proposed amendment is being undertaken in accordance with ROP Policies 2.B.3 (i) and 2.B.3 (j). ROP Map 3a and Map 7 would be modified accordingly to reflect the Urban Designated Greenfield Areas and Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced) designated through this amendment, and to amend the Urban Area Boundary accordingly.

PART II - BASIS OF THE AMENDMENT

The ROP was approved, with modifications, by the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) on June 18, 2015. ROP Policy 2.B.3 (d) identifies the need for a maximum of 170 ha of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas for residential purposes and to form the beginning of a mixed use community, as set out in policies 2.B. 3 (i) and 2.B.3 (j).

The maximum 170 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas are to be located in the Township of Woolwich and the City of Cambridge:
1. A maximum of 55 ha of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas located west of Fountain Street and north of the future Ottawa Street extension in the southern portion of the Township of Woolwich (Policy 2.B.3 (i));

2. A maximum of 115 ha of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas to be located between Speedsville Road and the Grand River in the northern part of the City of Cambridge (Policy 2.B.3 (j)).

In order to identify the specific location of the 170 hectares additional supporting work was required in accordance with ROP Policies 2.B.3 (g) (the completion of applicable watersheds studies) and (h) (the completion of a planning process to determine development densities and the general mix and location of land uses appropriate for the area). The required work, including the Randall and Breslau Drains Subwatershed Study and the planning process, has been completed. Based on this work the areas proposed for Urban Area designation are identified on Map 1.

ROP Policies related to the designation of a maximum of 55 ha of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the Township of Woolwich provide a defined area that that could be considered. This defined area, considered in concert with the completion of applicable subwatershed studies and the planning process, provided a scoped option for the location of the lands to be designated Urban Designated Greenfield Areas. The resulting configuration of the 55 ha of land to be designated as Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in accordance with ROP Policy 2.B.3 (i) is provided in Map 1.

ROP Policies pertaining to the designation of a maximum of 115 ha of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the northern part of the City of Cambridge provide for a broader geographical area, with priority consideration given to the area located between Speedsville Road and the Grand River. The policies allow for the ability reconfigure existing Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced) (PISR) lands in order to redesignate PISR lands as Designated Urban Greenfield Area provided there is no impact to the overall quantity of PISR. The policies also give priority consideration to enhancing the size of the residential area currently comprised of the lands designated rural residential in the City's Official Plan (north of Middle Block Road, south of Fairway Road North), with the objective of creating a residential cluster of sufficient size so as to permit its integration with the surrounding employment uses to form the beginning of a mixed use community that will provide future residents the opportunity to live close to where they work. The policy framework was applied and resulted in the proposed land designations depicted on Schedule A. This includes the proposed designation of approximately 100 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the vicinity of Middleblock Road and Fountain Street, the redesignation of approximately 11 hectares of PISR to Designated Greenfield Urban Area and the addition of approximately 11 hectares of PISR to locations on the periphery of the existing PISR.

This amendment identifies the location of a maximum of 170 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas, completing the implementation of the Urban Area Expansion identified in the ROP. In addition, the policies of the ROP enabling the designation of 170 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas are being deleted as they will be redundant. A note will be added to Table 1 to recognize the revised 2031 population forecast. Policies are being added to provide for the incorporation of the findings and recommendations of the Randall and Breslau Drains Subwatershed Study.
This amendment conforms to the policies of the ROP, the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

PART III - DETAILS OF THE AMENDMENT

The following changes to policies 2.B.3 (i) and 2.B.3 (j) and the changes to Map 3a and Map 7 constitute the amendment to the ROP:

1. The "Notes" to Table 1 are modified to add the following:
   
   4. In accordance with the Ontario Municipal Board decision relating to the final approval of this Plan, 170 hectares of Urban Area Designated Greenfield Area has been brought into this Plan through Amendment No. X in conformity with the revised 2031 population forecast contained the Provincial Growth Plan. Inclusion of the population associated with the 2031 forecasted population in Table 1 will be addressed through the next Municipal Comprehensive Review of the Regional Official Plan.

2. Policy 2.B.3 (d) is modified to remove the second and third sentences, such that the policy states:

   "the expansion provides sufficient lands for a time horizon not exceeding 20 years, using the density targets, reurbanization targets and other policies in this Plan."

3. Policy 2.B.3 (i), including subsections, is deleted in its entirety.

4. Policy 2.B.3 (j), including subsections, is deleted in its entirety.

5. Policy 2.B.3 (k) is renumbered as 2.B.3 (i).

6. New Policy 2.D.35 is added:

   For the 55 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas generally located west of Fountain Street and north of the future Ottawa Street extension, added to the Urban Area in the Township of Woolwich through Regional Official Plan Amendment X, future development will respect the findings and recommendations of the Randall and Breslau Drains Subwatershed Study.

7. New Policy 2.D.36 is added:

   For the approximately 111 hectares of land in the City of Cambridge added to the Urban Area and designated as Urban Designated Greenfield Areas through Regional Official Plan Amendment X, generally located north of Middle Block Road, east of Riverbank Drive, and fronting onto Fountain Street North, future development and Secondary Plans for these lands will respect the findings of the Randall and Breslau Drains Subwatershed Study.

8. Map 3a – URBAN AREA
Map 3a is amended to:

a) designate the areas shown with a diagonal-hatched pattern on Schedule A as "Urban Designated Greenfield Areas"; and

b) designate the area shown with a dotted pattern on Schedule A as "Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced)"; and

c) redesignate the area shown with a cross-hatched pattern on Schedule A from "Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced)" to "Urban Designated Greenfield Areas"; and

d) redesignate the lands shown in a vertical-hatched pattern on Schedule A from "Urban Designated Greenfield Areas" to "Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced)"; and

e) revise the "Urban Area Boundary" in accordance with the above, as shown on Schedule A.

9. Map 7 – THE COUNTRYSIDE

Map 7 is amended to:

a) remove the areas shown with diagonal-hatched pattern and yellow background on Schedule B from the "Prime Agricultural Area" designation; and

b) remove the area shown with a vertical-hatched pattern and pink background on Schedule B from the "Rural Areas" designation.

PART IV - IMPLEMENTATION

This amendment will be implemented through the Region’s consideration and approval of this Official Plan Amendment, as well as further implemented through future amendments to the Official Plans and Zoning By-laws of the Township of Woolwich and the City of Cambridge, and through the review and approval of development applications on the affected lands.
Map 1. Lands affected by proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment X.
Schedule A – Modifications to ROP Map 3a – URBAN AREA
Schedule B – Modifications to ROP Map 7 – THE COUNTRYSIDE
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Comments:

Please provide your comments in the space below. Return this page to the project team at the contact information noted on the previous page. Please attach additional sheets as required.

All comments and information received from individuals, stakeholder groups and agencies regarding this project are being collected to assist the Region of Waterloo in making decisions related to this project. Under the Municipal Act, personal information such as name, address, telephone number and property location that may be included in a submission becomes part of the public record. Questions regarding the collection of this information should be referred to Jane Gurney at JGurney@regionofwaterloo.ca.

Name (Optional):  
Address (Optional):

Phone and/or Email (Optional):

- like the North Cambridge p option, nice balance
- waiting to see other details
- hope to see bike lanes/sidewalk connections (for walkable area)
- impact to current land owners, wells?
- really like to see the mixed use area community centered

---

Stage 2 Lands MESP & Secondary Plan Study
PCC – Information Handout (March 20, 2018)
Hi Jane
Marie and I attended last night's public consultation meeting (Mar. 20/18)
We were pleased that the planning consultants have listened to our comments and
in all probably many others in regards to the various land use options. The
preliminary preferred area designations look quite reasonable. We were especially
pleased to see the strip of land east of Riverbank Dr between Middle block and
Allendale that was in one the options proposed to be employment lands was back to
public parcel.
Regards
Gary Adam

Sent from my Samsung device over Bell's LTE network.
Dear Jane,

thank you and the team sooo much for your hard work and listening ears during the process of considering the expansion on Riverbank Drive

Of course the outcome has pleased all of the residents of Riverbank....and we welcome any insight or followup that we can continue to work on as we move forward
We also will look forward t the report coming in April!

I am sure that we all understand that there continues to be further steps during the process..................and that we will continue to hopefully have a wonderful working relationship...........communication being the key to that

Please feel free to contact myself or any other resident on Riverbank Drive if you have information that would be beneficial to us

Warm Regards
Dayle Buller-Power
Riverbank Dr.,
Good morning Jane, April and John.

We attended the PIC held at the Breslau Mennonite church March 20, 2018 for the Stage 2 Mesp and Secondary Plan.

My comments are that in the north Cambridge preliminary preferred Urban Area Designation and land use there is 115 hectares as developable lands designated for that area. The map illustrating the preferred options depicted 84 ha of residential and two blocks of mixed use each consisting of 16 ha and 11 ha. Our concern is that WSP stated that the 115 hect was maxed out, however, if you add the 3 configurations it equates to 111 hectares. There is still room for an additional 4 hectares. We own the north east corner of Fountain and Middle Block rd and are part of the 11 hectares of mixed use---the problem being you bisected our property leaving 7.5 acres or 3 hectares of developable lands unaccounted for.

To date we have an engineering report that shows our lands are fully developable and have a land planning proposal in place for a viable plan of development, and in addition to this, information from the GRCA showing the floodlines illegally imposed on our property due to their imposed, gross BACK WATER condition and grossly undersized culvert - once Cambridge updates their much needed improvements our lands are no longer subjected to their engineered floodlines and those "potential environmental constraints" are lifted.

We respectfully request that the 7.5 acres or 3 hectares in stage 2 lands be allocated as residential using the natural features as a division line between mixed use and residential.

If this is not acceptable we respectfully request to know what your intentions are for the severed piece left off of our lands, and why?

Thank you

Brian and Cathy Murphy
I was very pleased to see the preferred urban area designation and land use at the stage 2 Lands in the city of Cambridge, which was presented on the meeting PCC March 20, 2018. It is a relieve to see this choice which respects the west side of the Riverbank Drive natural features and will leave this area preserved for its natural fauna and flora for future generations to admire. It will leave the opportunity to use this land in the future for nature walk and observation.

Thank you for your support in this matter.

Jitka Vok
resident of

Riverbank Drive
Cambridge
Jane, April and John,

In regards to the Stage 2 ESP and Secondary Plan.

Our comments are that in the north Cambridge preliminary preferred Urban Area Designation and land use there is 115 hectares proposed as developable lands designated for that area. The map illustrating the preferred options depicted 84 hectares of residential and two blocks of mixed use each consisting of 16 hectares and 11 hectares. Our concern is that WSP stated that the 115 hectares was maxed out, however, if you add the 3 configurations it equates to 111 hectares. There is still room for additional 4 hectares.

We own the north east corner of Fountain and Middle Block Road which is part of the 11 hectares of mixed use--the problem being you dissected our property leaving 7.5 acres of 3 hectares of developable lands unaccounted for

Recently, the omitted 3 hectares concluded by a professional, engineering report show our lands are fully developable, and have a land planning proposal in place for a viable plan of development, and in addition to this, information supplied by the GRCA showing the flood lines man-created, BACK WATER condition and grossly undersized culvert. Once Cambridge updates their much needed improvements our lands are no longer subjected to the engineered flood lines, and those "potential environmental constraints" are lifted.

We respectfully request that the 7.5 acres or 3 hectares in stage 2 lands be allocated as mixed use keeping in line with the proposals already presented.

John and Cheryl Ann Hammer
Good day Jane,

I’m sending this e-mail in hopes of getting some information from the last meeting of the East Side Lands Stage Two.

This pertains to the northeast corner of Middleblock Road and Fountain Street where land use has been designated “MIXED USE” east of the “agricultural ditch” here, 7.5 acres in Stage Two remains undesignated. We noticed 111 hectares were designated and 4 hectares are unaccounted for. Can this 7.5 acres be added to the “MIXED USE” land? Who would be able to explain why this land was dissected from the 115 hectares as this land has been recognised as fully developable?

We respectfully request the 7.5 acres be added to the “MIXED USE” land.

Thank you

Doug Hammer
Jane & April,

Thank you for the updated information in the East Side Lands Stage 2 Process provided at the recent PCC. It is clear that a lot of work has gone on behind the scenes since the previous public meeting and I appreciate it.

I was pleased that we were invited to the Landowner's Meeting prior to the PCC as it gave us time to review the material and ask pertinent questions as well as hear the explanations given by the consultant from WSP.

Firstly, I would like to say that I am pleased with the Preliminary Proposed Option presented and feel that it is a good hybrid solution of the previous 4 options presented. In particular, I am delighted that the lands to the west of Riverbank Drive remain untouched. In the presentation it was stated "The majority of rural residential residences on Riverbank Drive (i.e., west of Riverbank Drive) are not included within the urban designation, so consideration has been made to minimize direct impacts on these homes." and I feel that this was achieved.

In addition, it was mentioned that "Riverbank Dr. is noted as a scenic route, though there is no specific guiding policy or criteria. Further evaluation of how the scenic route designation will be addressed through supportive secondary plan policies, which contemplate how new urban uses will interface with Riverbank Drive." I agree with this statement and feel that it would bring clarity to the status of the road and provide better guidelines for the future.

Personally speaking, I am not thrilled at the prospect of a subdivision taking the place of the wide open fields that are currently in front of our home, but understand that it is part of the plan and therefore, my hope would be that the interface will be designed in a sensitive manner to enable the rural residential and urban residential to coexist in a harmonious way.

Once again, thank you for all the work so far. I look forward to further updates as things progress.

Regards
Gráinne Aitken
Hi Jane,

I wanted to provide comments on the recent recommendations put forth by staff for the ESL 2 MESP, specifically with regards to North Cambridge.

I realize that this is a preliminary recommendation and am concerned about the number of opportunities developers will have to adversely alter this recommendation, both through this process and the future regional Master review. Based on my experience, I'm concerned that the process inadvertently favours developers equipped with lawyers, planners and resources, and access to planning staff and politicians, all of which residents, people who will be most impacted by decisions, have relatively little recourse to. I encourage the Region (and Cambridge) to continue to develop a transparent and open process that provides as much access to/input from/regard for residents as it does for developers. Residents deserve to have an equal voice at the table and some stability regarding their neighbourhood.

Overall, I support the current recommendation, in particular, not allowing development west of Riverbank, although I remain concerned about lands immediately to the east of Riverbank - it seems that only one side of the scenic view (riverside) will be preserved along this portion of Riverbank, which is not what was recommended in Cambridge's Heritage Master Plan. I specifically and regrettably note the absence of any transition zone on the east side of Riverbank. Without transition zones, what will such development mean for the profile of the street? and for the scenic views? I'd prefer not to see sidewalks, street lights, road widening added to Riverbank Drive - please ensure the current profile is retained - and let's ensure that the view to the east is not entirely spoiled.

Given the Region's public comments on the green belt and its previous work on Cultural Heritage Landscapes, I would hope that the Region provide strong leadership on preserving this unique cultural heritage landscape in the heart of its community along the heritage river. Indeed, I continue to encourage the Region, along with Cambridge and Kitchener to develop an exceptional hiking, biking, and cultural experience in this area - there is much potential on both sides of the river between the two bridges.

I generally support incorporating some residential development into the plans to accommodate the OMB ruling, but need to know a lot more: having seen an initial concept plan for development by Madison and Puopolo for lands behind and in front of my home, I would like to know more about what type of residential development will be allowed on the 84 hectares in your diagram - some reassurances about density and height restrictions. Similarly, the meeting did not address the impact on services of proposed residential development. Will residents be forced to join municipal services? and if so at what cost? I have made significant investments in my property to be sustainable and environmentally-friendly and do not wish to be part of City services, and certainly do not expect to be billed for someone else's development/for-profit business venture. Lastly, I am concerned about quality of life during development of these lands - dust, noise, traffic, drainage, light...
Given the recent decision of Cambridge Council regarding a portion of ESL 1, I am less confident that residents' properties on Riverbank ESL 2 or the heritage value of the area will be adequately protected. Cambridge's approach for the first portion of ESL 1 struck me as very vague regarding process and required studies, and I worry that this approach will be extended further to ESL 1 and ESL 2 lands, opening the door for all kinds of poor planning. Therefore, I would like to see the Region make very solid legislation/clear parameters for this area to ensure that initially positive planning efforts are not undermined by subsequent planning processes and legislation. For example, I'm glad to see that the lands along Riverbank, east and west, ESL 1, will not be brought into the prime reserve strategic reserve, and would like to see this commitment maintained.

I also look forward to hearing more about constraints and how these will be protected/accommodated in future planning submissions to the City of Cambridge, and the impact of the interpretation of the subwatershed study on lands west of Riverbank.

I agree with the overall concept of the recommendation pending more detailed information.

Thank you for your continued work on this file.

Sincerely,

Christine Rier
April 2, 2018

Ms. Jane Gurney, MCIP, RPP AICP
Principal Planner, Community Planning
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 8th Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3

Dear Ms. Gurney:

RE: MESP and Secondary Plan – East Side Lands, Stage 2

We are writing on behalf of our client and the owner of lands referred to herein as the Forwell Lands, 957859 Ontario Limited. The “Forwell Lands” are bounded by the future extension of Ottawa Street to the north, the Grand River to the west and the built-up area to the east as shown on Map 3a of the approved Regional Official Plan. Our client’s lands are licenced under the Aggregate Resources Act (ARA). Aggregate extraction has occurred and the resource is now almost fully depleted. Our client’s lands are virtually surrounded by the designated Urban Area and are considered to be an infill site.

We have carefully considered the Urban Area expansions that are contemplated as part of the MESP and Secondary Plan process associated with Stage 2 of the East Side Lands. We note, the expansions that are proposed were considered in the context of the 2006 Places to Grow – Growth Plan (as amended). We understand the justification relates to what were previously referenced as 2031B Growth Forecasts.

As you are aware, the 2006 Places to Grow – Growth Plan (as amended) has been repealed and replaced by the 2017 Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe which took effect on July 1, 2017. The 2017 Growth Plan applies to the proposed expansions and provides (among other matters) that population and employment forecasts contained in Schedule 3 are to be used in planning and managing growth.

Policy 2.2.8 of the 2017 Growth Plan relates to settlement area boundary expansions and requires that expansions are to be based on the minimum intensification, density targets and growth forecasts of the 2017 Growth Plan. The 2017 intensification and density targets and 2041 growth forecasts have yet to be incorporated into the ROP or assigned to the lower-tier municipalities. Settlement area expansions are to be justified using a land budget methodology that has not been finalized by the Province. The MESP and Secondary Plan start with a conclusion regarding where expansions are to be considered namely, within what have been identified as the “Stage 2 Lands”. This preconceived starting point is not in keeping with the process contemplated Policy 2.2.8.3 of the 2017 Growth Plan and does not represent a Municipal Comprehensive Review as defined by the Growth Plan.
The 2017 Growth Plan establishes a process for determining the most appropriate location(s) for proposed settlement area boundary expansions. Prime Agricultural Areas are to be avoided where possible. The Stage 2 lands that are located within the City of Cambridge are within a “Prime Agricultural Area” as identified on Map 7 (The Countryside) of the ROP. The Prime Agricultural Area designation has recently been reaffirmed by agricultural system mapping prepared by the Province. The Forwell Lands are identified as “Rural Areas” on Map 7 of the ROP and are not within a “Prime Agricultural Area” as confirmed by the Province’s agricultural system mapping.

We have also reviewed proposed long-term and interim servicing strategies. The interim servicing strategy is focused on the Stage 2 lands which were identified in the absence of the evaluation contemplated by the 2017 Growth Plan. We request that the interim servicing strategy consider and accommodate our client’s lands.

In summary, we are concerned the consideration of our client’s lands has been prejudiced by the identification of the Stage 2 lands at the outset of the MESP and Secondary Plan process. We ask that our client’s lands be considered for inclusion in the Urban Area as part of the process that is underway. We also ask that our client’s lands be considered as part of the initial servicing strategy that is proposed.

We would appreciate the opportunity to meet with you to discuss matters in further detail and thank you in advance for your consideration.

Yours truly,

McCARTER GRESPAN BEYNON WEIR PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

Per: [Signature]

Stuart Hough

cc. 957859 Ontario Limited
Jane and April

Thank you so much for the hard work from both you and your respective teams in putting together an informative and positive Public Consultation Centre for East Side lands Stage 2 on March 20th. It was evident that the planning departments and consultants put a huge effort into producing visuals to explain the process to everyone at the PCC. This made our understanding of the process very simple.

Firstly, I was very much heartened to see that the proposed solution has identified the site most suitable for mixed use to be at Fountain and Middle Block. This site is perfectly situated to service both the passing traffic on Fountain Street and the needs of residents who will populate the proposed new development.

As indicated in previous correspondence, my preference would be that the lands to the West of Riverbank Drive should remain agricultural and not be included in the preferred option thus impacting less on the existing residents and preserving Riverbank Drive and its historic status as Cambridge’s last scenic route. I am more than delighted that the proposed solution does not include this area. Thank you.

It is my hope that any future development adjoining Riverbank Drive will do so in a complimentary fashion and look forward to the residents’ input in this process as it moves forward.

In short, I am very much in favour of the preferred solution. I met with many of the residents of Riverbank Drive after the PCC and my understanding is that they too were delighted with the preferred solution. I hope that many have written to tell you so.

Thank you once more for your hard work. I would be pleased if you would keep me informed of any significant changes and future meetings.

Gordon Aitken
Jane, April and John,

In regards to the Stage 2 ESP and Secondary Plan.

Our comments are that in the north Cambridge preliminary preferred Urban Area Designation and land use there is 115 hectares proposed as developable lands designated for that area. The map illustrating the preferred options depicted 84 hectares of residential and two blocks of mixed use each consisting of 16 hectares and 11 hectares. Our concern is that WSP stated that the 115 hectares was maxed out, however, if you add the 3 configurations it equates to 111 hectares. There is still room for additional 4 hectares.

We own the north east corner of Fountain and Middle Block Road which is part of the 11 hectares of mixed use--the problem being you dissected our property leaving 7.5 acres of 3 hectares of developable lands unaccounted for.

Recently, the omitted 3 hectares concluded by a professional, engineering report show our lands are fully developable, and have a land planning proposal in place for a viable plan of development, and in addition to this, information supplied by the GRCA showing the flood lines man-created, BACK WATER condition and grossly undersized culvert. Once Cambridge updates their much needed improvements our lands are no longer subjected to the engineered flood lines, and those "potential environmental constraints" are lifted.

We respectfully request that the 7.5 acres or 3 hectares in stage 2 lands be allocated as mixed use keeping in line with the proposals already presented.

John and Cheryl Ann Hammer
Subject Line MESP Stage #2 PCC Comments

Our names are George and Lori Roussakis,

We have lived here for 23 plus years and can tell you the ups and downs of living in an area that needs help. We would also would like to know how we can achieve some transparency in a process that concerns our future. We receive information, attend meetings and offer feedback still feel we there is a lack of transparency in decision making.

Currently, we strongly oppose the Preliminary Preferred Option and request changes to it ahead of the May 1st meeting.

Can you please accept this letter as a formal request to be added to the Regions/City plans for residential development.

Considerations:

Our land is zoned RR2 which allows residential development, we wish to be included in the urban envelope so we can gain full Residential zoning and develop our lands further. We require access via the Puopolo land for servicing and roads and would like to see those lands and ours included in the plans.

Having a workable plan for the future will eliminate problems as the area is bound to develop all around us. We imagined that we could work with city planners to achieve a beautiful community that helps all residents not just a lucky few who wish to maintain their own view to property they do not own.

Further Considerations:

There is NO scenic route between Middle Block and Our property: There is nothing scenic along the west side of the route until people trespass onto our land or others. The reality is that we phone the police to help with this problem as everything is blocked by houses until you go
through our driveway or other people's accesses. This creates safety issues and other concerns and will like intensify without proper trails as people seek access to the Grand River. Without proper planning we feel there were be further negative impact on our property we are generally in support of development in the area, but feel it is not being done cohesively.

**A further reality is that people like to see our land, trespass but no one wants to pay the taxes or work to maintain our property.**

We have many questions regarding the development of land around us and how this would help/hinder our future. We need a close working body that includes us in an open and transparent process.

As a note we have done prerequisite studies via NRSI regarding our property and have proof that the land we want to be added is not floodplain. There are neighbours that have suggested otherwise and I want to make sure false claims are not taken at face value.

We have stated that we would help in the allotment of land for access to the Grand River for the benefit of all people in the region. We believe this can be done with the help of the City/Region. The question is how do you get in front of the planners and people that can help in these possibilities? Since we offered our property with other families we haven’t been contacted by any group regarding this possibility of integrating trails to the Grand River. This was extremely surprising to us as why would they want to exclude someone who wanted to give land for free to the City/Region or GRCA for the greater benefit of the community.

**Questions:**

- Since developable land is across the street from our homes can you explain whether or not servicing will be made available to all of Riverbank Drive?
- It is noted that a Heritage home was included over our lands? We would like to understand the criteria that lead to this selection over our property.
- Will there be an access to Riverbank from these lands across the street from our home?
- As a resident can you explain to me the policy decisions around the Scenic route? It is unclear to me how decisions are being made regarding this if there isn't actually a policy.

Councillors Kiefer, Ward, Jowett we would like to contact you for a further discussion at your convenience.
I hope this is possible please. Can you tell me how would I organize it with other negatively impacted land owners?

**We formally request to be included in the urban area with the Puopolo and Zaja family. It is our intention to work with the City/Region/Residents in the best manner possible to resolve this issue and mitigate any concerns. We would like our input considered and incorporated to the plan.**
Dear Jane/April,

Further to my letter dated February 26th, 2018, I wanted to follow up with some of my thoughts after having attended the public open house on March 20th, 2018.

I was, quite frankly, surprised that although City/Regional councillors seemed supportive of development west of Riverbank Drive, the option presented to them by the landowners was not shown or discussed. I feel that it is a mistake to not plan for these lands now, as it could enhance the existing residential through upgraded infrastructure, amenities (trails) and safety.

**I strongly disagree with the preliminary option and other residents/owners in the area, not planning for both sides of Riverbank concurrently doesn’t make any sense.**

My understanding was that this is just the preliminary option and there would be time to review and amend, I’d like to formally request changes to this preliminary option before the next public meeting occurs in May.

At PCC meetings I keep asking for the criteria of selection and getting mixed responses or no responses from staff/consultants. As a real estate professional who is constantly evaluating properties for clients or internally, it almost feels like they have already picked lands and then working to justify it rather than picking the most logical lands. The decision criteria for selection in a few cases seem to contradict the lands they have actually selected. This is extremely confusing and frustrating to me as a professional in this space and as a land owner and resident.

When I met with staff at one of the first PCC meetings (Dec 2016) my land wasn’t even included for study and told they wouldn’t be studied. I am worried that there was predetermined bias against lands west of Riverbank from the inception of the process. I have hoped that the process would have resulted in logical decisions being made, but this appears not to be the case.

**A few specific questions I have:**

1. As a land owner I was hoping to get Municipal services to my home. Can the City and Region advise with lands being developed across the street from me, will we get servicing?

2. I was told at the meeting that a servicing plan had not been completed, why are lands being selected ahead of presentation of a servicing plan? When will the servicing plan be available? Assuming all lands were considered equally, there must be a long-term servicing plan for all lands put forwarded in the 4 options presented?

3. Will there be exits onto Riverbank Drive from the development lands across the street from me? Will there be headlights shining into existing homes from the properties East to West?

4. Finally, can you outline the criteria for including some land on Riverbank drive and not the others? I purchased my property because I knew this property was in a priority area for inclusion into the Urban envelope. Can I be provided clear criteria for the decision
and why lands west of Riverbank are being excluded?
As a realtor and due to the number of homes that are currently and have been for sale on the street, this area is currently in transition. Because this area is in transition it is the ideal time for development to occur and plan both the east and west side of Riverbank. It makes little sense to not plan this entire area as a community. I feel that some are acting in opposition are doing so only out of their self-interest rather than the long term benefit to the community. In my experience, short term thinking like this leads to further problems and conflict.
I would appreciate a written response to these questions, rather than a generic one. I have been present throughout the entire process and I have yet been given a clear response to any of my questions or concerns.
Councillors Keifer/Ward/Jowett I will contact you in the coming week to discuss further.
Sincerely,

James Boudreau
Real Estate Broker and Resident/Owner of 1000 Riverbank Dr.
cc: Michelle Sergi, Doug Craig, Karl Keifer, Helen Jowett, Donna Ried

James Boudreau
Real Estate Broker
Coldwell Banker Commercial
Peter Benninger Realty, Brokerage*
508 Riverbend Drive, Kitchener, ON N2K 3S2
jboudreau@coldwellbankerpbr.com
C: 519.580.6815
P: 519.743.5211 Ext. 3020
F: 519.743.8009
*Independently Owned and Operated Unsubscribe
Date: April 9, 2018
To: MESP Stage 2 Team

As a result of our March 27th Regional/City/Landowners meeting the following planning justification has been prepared to propose changes to the MESP Stage 2 Preliminary Option. Polocorp and other community landowners would like to be included within the Urban envelope including:

- Intermarket
- Polocorp
- Roussakis Family
- Zaja Family
- Boudreau Family

1. Position - Redefine the Preferred Plan to include Intermarket/Polocorp/Roussakis/Zaja/Boudreau as Residential (Refer to Map):
   1. Remove 10 ha North of Randall Drain.
   2. Redefine the "Urban Area" along the Creek + PSW.
   3. Add Polocorp 7.6 ha, Intermarket 5 ha and Zaja 1.4 ha for a total of 14 ha, which equals 10 ha removed plus 4 surplus ha.
   4. Recognizing the lands north of Randall drain to be included in the 2019 MCR as lands needed to accommodating in the community areas of Urban Designated Greenfield Area.
   5. The total proposed land area under this new plan is 115 Ha.
2. Justification for Changes to the Preferred Preliminary Plan:

1. **Conformity of the ROP policies regarding Priority Consideration** - Currently there are three landholders Polocorp/Rouskas/Boudreau that are currently in the priority consideration area and would like to be included in this round in advance of the next MCR.

2. **Filling in Orphan/Isolated Properties into a Complete Existing Community** - It is preferential to integrate orphan lands to create a complete community such as the Riverbank area versus extending further to the North of the Randall Drain.

3. **Logical Timing of Lands for Servicing is from South to North** - Servicing is not expected for 5+ years to lands North of the Randall Drain. Priority should be given to lands that could be serviced South to North immediately. Polocorp is also prepared to work with other developers to help front end costs for new sewer/road.

4. **Impact of topography on servicing** - The lands North of the Randall drain will have to be serviced by pumping station due to topography not gravity feed.

5. **Provision for a variety of housing forms**: This proposal will provide larger homes which is in keeping with the character of the Riverbank area. It will provide a housing form east of Riverbank which will be a mix of single-family homes, townhouses and multi-residential blocks.

6. **Compactness of Community** - This proposal is the most compact development form and allows integration into the existing community.

7. **Traffic Impact onto Riverbank** - The Northern Shirey lands main exit will be onto Riverbank Drive. The majority of trips South would go along Riverbank. If those lands are development appropriate appropriate measures need to be taken to minimize impact.

8. **Significant integration of Lands North of Randall Drain** - There will be significant buffers and transitional land use required to manage heritage considerations, existing homes and natural features for the Northern Shirey lands and incorporate large existing estate homes. In addition, setbacks and accesses from Fairway Road would have to be considered.

9. **Creation of an Integrated Trail System** - This proposal creates an integrated trail system through sizeable land donations by multiple families. This would create a beneficial public amenity. Currently, there are no public interfaces to the Grand River between King and Fairway on the Cambridge side of the River.

3. Questions + Points of Clarification for the Region:

To assist us in understanding the selection of Preferred Plan, we require the following information to undertake an informed evaluation:

1. We need a copy of the calculations of the Urban Area + Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) for each area to confirm the land areas.

2. When will the final Servicing and Traffic Report be completed and circulated?

3. When will the Secondary Plan (draft) be available for public review?

4. Can WSP formally provide the evaluation criteria for each area (10 Ha specifically)?

We are free to meet at any time to review as soon as possible. We would like to see modifications to the mapping as per our attached map and come to a resolution ahead of the May 1st 2018 Public meeting.
To further assist you we have attached a PowerPoint that illustrates:

1. Delegation Properties
2. History Overview
3. Environmental Considerations
4. Take a Virtual Drive down Riverbank
5. Scenic Route Discussion
6. Trails/Amenity Spaces
7. Strategic Alignment
8. Example Developments

Respectfully,

Joseph Puopolo  B.E.S, MBA
CMO Polocorp
Land Owner Riverbank Resident
Randall Drain Crossing at Riverbank Drive
Creek inv = +/- 295.0

Randall Drain Crossing at Fairway Road
Creek inv = +/- 300.0
Modifications to Preliminary Preferred Plan (April 3, 2018)

- Remove 10 ha of Shiry Lands
- Include 7.6 ha of Polocorp Lands
- Include 1.4 ha of Zaja Lands
- Include 5 ha of Intermarket Lands

NOTE: All potential development blocks are exclusive only of Provincially Significant Features. Actual developable areas will be subject to confirmation of all development constraints.
East Side Lands – Stage 2
Riverbank Drive Scenic Route
Madison Riverbank Holdings Ltd. and Polocorp Inc.
City of Cambridge

February 21, 2018
1.0 Introduction - Riverbank Drive Scenic Route

Municipal Staff are currently considering establishing Riverbank Drive as a scenic route, and integrating vehicular circulation and residential lotting fabric onto Riverbank Drive from all future development within the East Side Lands. In the context of the proposed and surrounding developments, the implications of designating the Riverbank Drive right-of-way as a scenic route remain unclear. Additional information to support the position of Staff regarding establishment of Riverbank Drive as a scenic route is required. In the interim, this report provides material that is germane to the conservation of scenic roads/routes in the City and more particularly, Riverbank Drive.

2.0 City of Cambridge - Scenic Route References

A number of City of Cambridge documents reference scenic routes/roads, although none provides policies to protect them.

**Heritage Master Plan**
The City of Cambridge adopted a *Heritage Master Plan* in 2008 which includes text on scenic routes.

**Scenic Routes**
The one remaining scenic drive still intact, but under development pressure, is Riverbank Drive, running diagonally from Highway 8 to Regional Road 17, along the east bank of the Grand River near the boundary with the City of Kitchener north of Highway 401. This route offers a range of views of farmland, woods, creeks, and historic farmhouses, interspersed with vistas across the river and glimpses of more recent rural residential development. The linking routes of Allendale Road and Middle Block Road traverse open farmland that still contains large farm complexes. The area is large enough to include woodlots, fields, and buildings within a visually coherent rural landscape. It should be preserved.\(^1\)

**Riverbank Drive**

**History**
According to accounts in Bloomfield (1995: 6, 74, 204), this route would have linked the river crossing at Freeport with Breslau, along the east bank of the Grand River. The Freeport bridge was built in the early 1830s and by 1831, a map of the area shows a route following the alignment of the current road (op. cit :74). This map also shows a ford at the river bend connecting to a road leading up the slope to intersect with what is now Middle Block Road. North of this, where the road runs close to the riverbank, the site of a sawmill is shown. Although they are not listed in the City inventory, there are several houses on this road that date from at least the mid-19th century, and this includes several fine farmsteads. Improvements to Highway 17 (Fountain Street) have resulted in Riverbank Drive being made into a dead end at the northern edge of the municipal boundary such that it no longer continues on its way to Breslau.

**Heritage Character**
This road has most of the components associated with an historic rural route: an undulating profile and rural cross section, mature trees on each side, established farmsteads on large farm properties, and smaller houses along the riverbank. Views of the river punctuate scenes of farm fields and woodlots or more intimate views of the roadside lined with dense vegetation. Aside from a few more modern houses, the road offers an excellent summary of rural visual and historic characteristics. It is one of the earlier roads in Waterloo Township and one of the few rural roads remaining within the City of Cambridge.

**Character Defining Elements:**
- rural cross section, curving alignment and undulating profile;
- historic residential and agricultural buildings;
- farmsteads and woodlots; and
- archaeological potential (First Nations, ford and sawmill sites).

\(^1\) *Cambridge Heritage Master Plan Final Report*, Bray Heritage, June 2008, p. 38
Conservation and Development Concerns and Opportunities
The removal of through traffic makes conservation of this road easier, but the area of the city in which it is situated is under development pressure for expansion of adjacent industrial uses. If conserved, the road could be an excellent heritage resource that offers unique interpretive opportunities as well as a high quality agricultural setting.  

Cultural Heritage Resources Draft Policy Paper
An Official Plan Review Cultural Heritage Resources Draft Policy Paper was prepared in May 2011 which speaks to scenic heritage roads and the Grand River.

The City recognizes the Grand River as a Canadian Heritage River and will co-operate with the Region and the Grand River Conservation Authority in efforts to conserve, manage and enhance, where practical, the river’s natural, cultural, recreational, scenic and ecological features.

The City will establish policies to protect scenic heritage roads within municipal and regional jurisdictions. Scenic heritage roads include the view from the road to prominent heritage buildings or natural landscape features. These roads are identified by their unique structural, topographic and visual characteristics, as well as abutting vegetation, built environment and cultural landscape, historical significance or location within a Heritage Conservation District.

Cambridge Official Plan, November 2012
The City’s Official Plan speaks to cultural heritage landscapes, defines scenic heritage roads, and suggests, as did the Draft Policy Paper, that policies will be established to protect same.

Chapter 13: Glossary of Terms
Cultural heritage resources – physical remains which include, but are not limited to: buildings (residential, commercial, institutional, industrial and agricultural); cultural heritage landscapes (designed, organic/evolved); structures (water tower, bridge, fence and dam); monuments (cenotaph, statue, cairn); archaeological resources; cemeteries; scenic roads; vistas/views; culturally significant natural features (tree and landforms); movable objects (archival records and artifacts); and cultural traditions (language, stories, music, dance, food, celebrations, arts and crafts. (ROP, revised).

Scenic heritage roads – Municipal and Regional roads characterized by natural, cultural heritage and recreational features that contribute to the scenic value of Municipal/Regional roads. (New)

4.8 Cultural Heritage Landscapes
7. The City recognizes the Grand River as a Canadian Heritage River and will co-operate with the Region and the GRCA in efforts to conserve, manage and enhance, where practical, the river’s natural, cultural, recreational, scenic and ecological features.

8. Development adjacent to the Grand River may require a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in accordance with Section 4.10 to determine the possible impact on views, vistas and cultural heritage significance.

4.14 Scenic Heritage Roads
The City will establish policies to protect scenic heritage roads within municipal and regional jurisdictions. Scenic heritage roads include the view from the road to prominent heritage buildings or natural landscape features. These roads are identified by their unique structural, topographic and visual characteristics, as

---

2 Ibid, pp. 131 & 132
well as abutting vegetation, built environment and cultural landscape, historical significance or location within a Heritage Conservation District.

5.4 Views and Vistas
4. Views to natural or cultural heritage elements within the vicinity of the Speed and Grand Rivers and within the Community Core Areas will be protected from negative impacts. Development proposals that are considered by the City to be located within the views of natural or cultural heritage elements will be required to submit a views analysis to the satisfaction of the City. Alterations to the development proposal shall be required where feasible to protect or enhance the view to existing natural or cultural heritage elements.

6.2 Hierarchy of Roads
2. The City will work with the Region in consultation with the Province to identify improvements to existing roads and potential new roads to improve accessibility and safety, including accommodations for pedestrians and cyclists on arterial roads. The City recognizes the need for appropriate context sensitive design in some situations, such as scenic heritage roads and Environmentally Sensitive Landscapes.

3.0 The Current Physical Context

The Madison Riverbank Holdings Ltd. (Madison) lands are comprised of the lands known municipally as 895 Riverbank Drive and the lands situated at 4300 Fountain Street. Along with the Polocorp Inc. lands situated on the west side of Riverbank Drive, known municipally as 850 Riverbank Drive, these comprise the northerly area considered in this report (Figures 1 and 2).
The section of Riverbank Drive from Middle Block Road south to the where Riverbank Drive turns to the west is the southerly area that is the subject of discussion in this report (Figures 3 and 4).
Figure 3

southerly lands considered in this report - Region of Waterloo mapping
3.1 Northern Study Area
The following photographs within the northern study area illustrate views from Riverbank Drive from 750 Riverbank in the south to 1035 Riverbank in the north (Figures 5 - 19).

Figure 5
intersection of Middle Block Road and Riverbank Drive - looking north

Figure 6
Middle Block Road at Riverbank Drive - looking east
The City’s *Heritage Master Plan* states that “This route offers a range of views of farmland, woods, creeks, and historic farmhouses, interspersed with vistas across the river and glimpses of more recent rural residential development.” While there is farmland in view on the east side of the road in the study area, there are no views of woods, creeks, or vistas across the river and the roadscape is dominated by recent rural residential development on the river (west) side throughout. One historic farmhouse is visible from Riverbank Drive (Figure 19).

The other heritage property on Riverbank Drive in the northerly area is 1035 Riverbank. It is well screened from view by dense vegetation (Figures 17 and 18).
The City’s Official Plan states that “Scenic heritage roads include the view from the road to prominent heritage buildings or natural landscape features. These roads are identified by their unique structural, topographic and visual characteristics, as well as abutting vegetation, built environment and cultural landscape, historical significance or location within a Heritage Conservation District.” Within the northerly study area, there is one view from the road to a heritage building. Views of natural landscape features are found in the form of small wooded areas and sloping topography in the farm fields to the east. The road cannot be accurately described as having unique structural, topographic and visual characteristics, abutting vegetation, built environment or cultural landscape, or being located within a Heritage Conservation District. In fact, the road, within the northerly study area has a relatively flat longitudinal profile and features numerous driveways and single family homes on one side, with farmland on the other. Two heritage structures are found, one visible from the road, the other not.

North of the northerly study area, portions of the road offer glimpses of the Grand River valley and exhibit an undulating profile and rural cross section with mature trees on each side as stated in the Heritage Master Plan. A long view of the west side of the Grand River valley and the Chicopee Ski Hill can be seen from the road (Figure 20).
3.2 Southern Study Area
South of Middle Block Road, Riverbank Drive exhibits undulating topography with vegetation on both sides, and offers the only views of the Grand River in either the northern or southern study areas (Figures 21 & 22).

The view of the Grand River from Riverbank Drive south of Middle Block Road (Figure 22) is limited to the winter months and will soon be lost as the coniferous trees in the foreground mature.
A gothic revival, fieldstone farmhouse c. 1825 and bank barn are found at 555 Riverbank Drive. They are not visible from Riverbank Drive (Figures 23 & 24) due to topography and a dense vegetation screen.

Looking north on Riverbank Drive towards the intersection of Middle Block Road, the elevation change and adjacent topography is apparent (Figure 25). A single-family residence is on the left.

As one progresses south on Riverbank Drive, mature vegetation is found on both sides, screening views. Towards Allendale Road, open farmland is found on the east side, while single-family residences occupy the river side. South of Allendale, modern residences line both sides of Riverbank Drive (Figures 25 - 32).
4.0 Proposed Development Concept and Riverbank Drive Scenic Route - northerly area

Figure 33 illustrates the proposed development concept for the Madison and Polocorp lands. The impact on Riverbank Drive as a scenic road is expected to be minimal.

The east side of the road from Middle Block Road to the existing residential lots to the north (Madison lands) is currently agricultural with sections of environmentally sensitive areas. The proposal is to protect the environmentally sensitive areas in open space and to convert the agricultural lands to stormwater management areas and park, retaining its landscape character. The Polocorp lands to the west are at a lower elevation than the road and behind the existing houses on the west side. As such, they are not visible from the road. The existing drive to 850 Riverbank Drive (Figure 32), which has a 20+ metre right-of-way width, will be used as access to the proposed residential development with an emergency access provided at the north end (Figure 33). Neither of these adjacent developments is expected to significantly alter the scenic qualities of the road.

With respect to traffic, a report by Associated Engineering (AE), April 18, 2017 notes:

The proposed development plans will also consider and respect the existing nature of Riverbank Drive, aiming to minimize impacts to the existing roadway and its fronting properties. Minor works at key locations along the existing roadway will likely be required to accommodate the proposed developments, including intersection improvements relating to an upgraded cross section on Middle Block Road as well as underground service connections to the PoloCorp lands. However, the design intent will be to direct traffic along the upgraded Middle Block Road to Fountain Street and/or the new North South Collector Road, and it is expected that changes to traffic volumes along Riverbank Drive would be negligible.

Proposed multi-use trails are provided on the east side of Riverbank Drive through the open space blocks, connecting to proposed trail to the Grand River.
Figure 33  development concept plan adjacent to Riverbank Drive - Polocorp & Madison lands

Figure 34  location of proposed emergency access to Polocorp lands
Figure 35 is a concept plan illustrating residential development and environmental conservation of parcels south of Middle Block Road on Riverbank Drive.
The steep topography and wooded area south of Middle Block Road, which screens the historic farmstead at 555 Riverbank Drive, is conserved and the relatively flat fields are proposed for low density residential development with frontage on Riverbank Drive.

6.0 Scenic Route Policy

In the absence of a scenic route policy, other municipal scenic route/road guidelines and policies were consulted.

The Region of Waterloo published *Scenic Roads and Special Character Streets, Resource Document* in December 2011. The document notes that “The City of Cambridge currently has no policy on scenic roads. At a public meeting in 2005, ‘The protection of scenic roads’ was identified as a priority. The Cambridge Heritage Master Plan (2008) lists Black Bridge Road, Riverbend (sic) Drive, Blair Road and Avenue Road as Scenic Routes.”

The document provides questions to be answered in determining the physical context of a road, *i.e.*:

- Is the road an historic road (e.g. historic alignment, association with an historic person, location or event)?
- What access does the corridor provide the public to views, interpretive information or recreation opportunities?
- What is the existing character of the surrounding landscape?
- Does the corridor travel through a Cultural Heritage Landscape, Environmentally Sensitive Landscape or Heritage Conservation District?
- What scenic and special character features have been listed as part of the corridor’s identification as a scenic road or special character street (views, built heritage, landforms, landscapes, vegetation, water features, etc.)?
- Are there additional scenic and special character features not previously identified that should be conserved?

With respect to Riverbank Drive, it is an historic road, associated with linking the river crossing at Freeport with Breslau, along the east bank of the Grand River. It currently provides the public with limited views, but does not provide interpretive information or recreation opportunities, nor links to the Grand River. The character of the landscape has been previously described. The road does not travel through an identified Cultural Heritage Landscape or Heritage Conservation District. As far as scenic and special character features are concerned, these are limited, in the study areas, to two visible built heritage resources (an 1840s farmhouse and Freeport Cemetery) and three other historic farmhouses that are not visible from the road. With regard to Environmentally Sensitive Landscapes, the Grand River valley is adjacent in limited areas and there are steep, wooded slopes in others.

The Region’s document provides conservation recommendations for a variety of scenic road types, including “rural connectors.” Although Riverbank Drive is not listed as a scenic road or character street in the Region’s document it best fits this category. Some key recommendations that might apply to Riverbank Drive are:

- Consider opportunities to provide public access to water features through views, an overlook, lookout or trails/pathways when possible.

There are opportunities with the development of the Polocorp lands to provide trails/pathways to the Grand River from the road and adjacent planned open spaces (Figure 33).

- Consider maintaining natural ditch and bank contours that complement the existing topography rural landscape.

Consideration should be given in the development of the adjacent lands to maintaining the existing road profile with open ditches and no curbs.

Section 13, Part C of the City of Kitchener’s *Official Plan* addresses scenic roads as “Heritage Corridors” and provides policies to conserve their attributes. Some of these may be of relevance to Riverbank Drive, *i.e.*:

---

4 Region of Waterloo *Scenic Roads and Special Character Streets, Resource Document*, December 2011, p. 6

5 *A Complete & Healthy Kitchener, Section 13 Part C City of Kitchener Official Plan*, pp 13-13 - 13-14
• *In cases where an existing street or multi-use pathway has an overlay designation of Heritage Corridor, alterations to the heritage attributes such as widening the carriage way or changing the surface treatment will be discouraged, and where required, will be subject to the preparation and approval of a scoped Heritage Impact Assessment and may be subject to the preparation of a Corridor Enhancement Plan.*

Widening of the road and/or changing the surface treatment of Riverbank Drive should be discouraged.

• *The City will regulate access to lands abutting Heritage Corridors in order to avoid or mitigate impacts to the cultural heritage value or interest of the street. Where proven unavoidable in planning and transportation studies accepted by the City, new streets may be permitted to cross proposed or existing Heritage Corridors subject to the preparation and approval of a Heritage Impact Assessment and may be subject to the preparation of a Corridor Enhancement Plan.*

Within the northerly study area the existing driveway to 850 Riverbank Drive is to be converted to a street providing access to the Polocorp lands (Figure 32). Additional access required within the Polocorp lands for emergency access purposes will be designed for emergency vehicles only and will not permit vehicular access to and/or from the development (Figure 34). This emergency access; however, could benefit the scenic route character by providing a connection to nearby existing or proposed networks which support access between the road and the Grand River Valley corridor or other trails.

The City of Mississauga identified scenic roads/routes and provided policies for same in 1997 and has recently reviewed and updated those policies. One such update is the recently published *Urban Design Guidelines Mississauga Road Scenic Route*6. Some guidelines (modified in this report for local conditions) that may be relevant to Riverbank Drive are:

• Driveways should connect the garage to the street in a direct and straight configuration with limited curvature to maximize landscaping.

• Driveways should not be wider than 6 m to minimize hard surface areas and maximize landscaping.

• Buildings shall face and front onto the road and include a front door, prominent porch feature, substantial fenestration, walkway connection and enhanced landscaping.

• Lots abutting the road should have upgraded building elevations with a variety of building materials, building articulation, windows, roof forms and visual interest.

• The development of lands will not be permitted if it results in an increase of the road pavement width, such as slip-off lanes, centre median left-turn lanes or other pavement widenings. Increasing the road pavement width would have a cumulative negative effect by impacting existing trees and reducing potential for future landscape opportunities.

• New buildings should not be greater than 2 storeys high and should be designed to reflect the existing residential character in terms of scale and massing.

• To maintain the character of the scenic route new lot frontages (property width) should be consistent with the surrounding lot frontages.

• New buildings should have generous front yards that align with the adjacent properties. Side yards should be generous and should reflect the existing character. All yards should meet the zoning regulations or the existing setbacks, whichever is greater.

• Where the development is proposing more than one building, they should be detached houses and each building different from others in design.

• Buildings and hard surface areas should be set back an appropriate distance to ensure existing trees are preserved.

• New development should preserve and enhance natural heritage features, including trees, woodlands, valleys and wetlands.

• The removal of landscape, cultural and heritage features located on private or public land is discouraged.

• New development should contribute to, support and enhance pedestrian routes, the cycling network and multi-use trails.

• Where feasible, provide a connection to nearby existing or proposed networks which support access between the road, the Grand River Valley corridor, or other trails.

6 City of Mississauga, *Urban Design Guidelines Mississauga Road Scenic Route*, September 2017, pp. 4 - 9
Within the study areas, there is little opportunity for new development bordering the road except on the east side.

The concept plan for the northerly study area lands (Figure 33) indicates that the majority of that land on the east is proposed as open space, with development opportunity limited to a small portion to the north.

The concept plan for the southerly study area lands (Figure 35) provides for low density development of the open, non-environmentally sensitive areas on the east and a small area on the west.

In the absence of a City of Cambridge scenic route policy, it is suggested that the City of Mississauga guidelines noted above, as modified for local relevance, could be adopted for Riverbank Drive within the study areas. Adopting guidelines similar to Mississauga’s for these limited areas and for potential future redevelopment of lands bordering the west side of Riverbank Drive would appear to be useful in conserving the scenic qualities of the road.
April 25, 2018

By E-Mail Only:  regionalclerk@regionofwaterloo.ca

Regional Clerk
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick St., 2nd Floor
Kitchener, ON  N2G 4J3

Attention:  Regional Chair and Members of Planning and Works Committee
Jane Gurney - Principal Planner, Region of Waterloo
Michelle Sergi, Director of Planning, Region of Waterloo
April Souwand, Manager of Policy Planning, City of Cambridge

REFERENCE: PROPOSED MODIFICATION TO PRELIMINARY PREFERRED PLAN (March 20, 2018)
EAST SIDE LANDS - STAGE 2 MESP AND SERVICING PLAN and
MODIFICATION TO DRAFT AMENDMENT TO REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN (ROP) 2031

Dear Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee, Ms. Sergi, Ms. Souwand, and Ms. Gurney:

On behalf of our land holdings, Laura and Joseph Puopolo, we are submitting comments and suggestions as a follow-up to the Stage 2 Lands Public Consultation meeting of March 20, 2018, and for the May 1, 2018 Statutory Public meeting for the ROP Amendment (ROPA) 2031 for Cambridge.

In consultation with Intermarket, the residents Puopolo/Roussakis/Zaja/Boudreau are suggesting modifications to the Preliminary Preferred Plan:

1. That the Preliminary Preferred Plan as part of the MESP Stage 2 Process (March 20th at PCC #4) be modified and redefine the Residential Boundary to include as Residential (Refer to Map 1) as follows:
   a. Remove 10 ha North of Randall Drain. Continue to recognize the lands North of Randall Drain as per existing ROP and include them in the 2019 MCR as lands needed to accommodate in the community areas of Urban Designated Greenfield Area;
   b. Redefine the ”Residential Area” along the Creek + PSW;
   c. Add Polocorp 7.6 ha, Intermarket 4.5 ha and Zaja 1.9 ha for a total of 14 ha, which equals 10 ha removed plus 4 surplus ha;
   d. The total proposed land area under this new plan is 115 ha as per the ROP.
MAP 1: Schedule A - Proposed Amendment to ROP

Modifications to Preliminary Preferred Plan

- Remove 10 ha North of Randall Drain
- Include 7.6 ha of Polocorp Lands
- Include 1.9 ha of Zajo Lands
- Include 4.5 ha of Intermarket Lands

Legend:
- Existing Urban Area
- Proposed Structures
  - Employment
  - Mixed Use
  - Residential
- Proposed Urban Area Designation
- Drainages
- Waterbodies
- Permanently Protected Environmental Features
- Other Potential Environmental Constraints
- Parks/Industrial Districts
- Erosion Control

Note: All potential development locations are exclusive of Provincially Significant Features. Actual developable areas will be subject to confirmation of all development constraints.
2. That Map 1 in the ROP Amendment be modified to include the Intermarket/Puopolo/ Roussakis/Zaja and Boudreau lands as “Urban Designated Greenfield Area”.

MAP 2: New Proposed Preferred Plan

Map 1 – Subject Lands, Detailed Study Area and Areas of Proposed Modifications
3. That the Regional staff convene a “Mediation” meeting with the landowners prior to adoption of the amendment, to allow all parties to resolve and find solutions to arrive at agreed planning solutions for the future landowners and servicing plans for Riverbank.

It is our position that our proposed suggestions to Map 2 of the ROP Amendment conforms to the ROP policies that were adopted by the Region of Waterloo on June 6, 2009 and approved by the OMB on June 18, 2015. Specifically, that the policy which states, “priority consideration be given to lands east of Fountain St. to the Grand River”, and these lands are in that geographical area. Also, the ROPA conforms to the Growth Plan and is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

Reasons for Supporting Modifications:

1. Conformity of the ROP policies regarding Priority Consideration
2. Filling in Orphan/Isolated Properties into a Complete Existing Community
3. Logical Timing of Lands for Servicing is from South to North
4. Impact of topography on servicing
5. Provision for a variety of housing forms
6. Compactness of community
7. Traffic Impact onto Riverbank
8. Significant integration of Lands North of Randall Drain
9. Creation of an Integrated Trail System

In conclusion, the two maps clearly illustrate the need:

- To develop and integrate orphaned pieces of land into the community;
- To develop lands in an orderly manner south to north; and
- To avoid the splitting of the Riverbank community into two parts by the Regional Amendment (west-in and east-in)

The residents of Riverbank are supportive of creating an integrated community along Riverbank Drive and we look forward to a mediated solution to arrive at proper plan for the future of the Riverbank Area.
My name is Blair Capling and I am a member of the Shiry family who operate a farm located at Fountain Street in Cambridge. Our family has successfully run a family farm operation at this location since the early 1820’s. Our property has been one of the many properties in the area considered under the Regional Official Plan Amendment for the East Side Lands. I am contacting you today to provide some background, and provide my full support for the Region’s preferred land use scenario as defined in their proposed amendments to the Regional Official Plan.

As for some background, the Shiry Family have worked well for many years with the Region of Waterloo. As part of the Fairway Road extension to Kossuth, our family had a good working relationship with Regional staff and feel we were treated fairly, even though our farm was split in two by the process. As part of the East Side Lands process, our family has participated and provided comments and again feel that Regional staff has run a fair and unbiased process. At the Public Consultation Centre #3, four scenarios were presented and we responded with comments (see attached PCC #3 Response Memo Fountain Street North Cambridge.pdf and were happy so see that some of our comments were considered and implemented as part of the Preferred Land Use Scenario that is now being forwarded to Planning and Work Committee. We do understand that not all of our request could be accommodated in such a complex plan, and we do have concern about operating a small agricultural parcel within the City of Cambridge, so we responded with PCC #4 Response Memo Fountain Street North Cambridge April 10 18.pdf (attached) where we outline this concern, but still generally agree with the designations as provided. In this document, we suggested some possible changes to the Proposed Scenario, but after discussions with Regional Staff, while the agricultural viability issue remains, we understand the underlying reasoning with which the plan was developed.

Through our years of experience with Regional staff, we know that they run their processes with the intention of developing plans which consider all angles and move forward with scenarios which are of the greatest benefit to the Regions successful development when all things are considered.

Recently, I have been informed that local land owners who were not included in the Preferred Scenario are making a focused attempt to challenge the Region’s Preferred Scenario. Some of these land owners are developers and can bring to bear considerable pressure because of their Planning knowledge and financial resources available. It is my request that Regional Staff be supported in every way possible at the upcoming Public Meeting for the Proposed Amendment to the Regional Official Plan on May 1st. Staff has conducted a complete and fair process; their Proposed Scenario is the best for the Region moving forward (even though it does not achieve all of our families personal desires as expressed in Response #4). I would like to be sure that fair and reasonable process is successful rather than less than ideal changes forced by developer pressure.

Before the meeting on May 1st, I would appreciate 10 minutes of your time to discuss. I would be more than happy to meet you at your office at a schedule that suits you best. I will be making contact in the near future to arrange a discussion.

Sincerely,

Blair Capling

cc. Hilda Shiry
Helen Shiry
Pauline Shiry
Brian Shiry
November 29, 2017

Region of Waterloo
Community Planning
150 Frederick St. 8th Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3

City of Cambridge
Development and Infrastructure Department
50 Dickson Street, 3rd Floor
Cambridge, ON N1R 5W8

Attn: Jane Gurney, MCIP, RPP, AICP
Principal Planner

April Souwand, MA, MCIP, RPP, AICP
Manager of Policy Planning

Re: Hilda Shiry - Fountain St. N, Cambridge
Master Environmental Servicing Plan & Secondary Plan
Region of Waterloo – East Side Lands – Stage 2

Dear Jane and April,

On behalf of our client Hilda Shiry (and family) and more specifically with respect to her property located at Fountain Street North in Cambridge (the “Subject Property” - as shown below) GSP Group provides the following comments in response to the information presented at the Public Consultation Centre held on November 2nd, 2017.

The Subject Property is in the City of Cambridge, west of Fountain Street and bisected by Fairway Road. Prior to the Fairway Road extension, the Subject Property was a singular, contiguous parcel.

In response to the material provided at the November 2, 2017 Public Consultation Centre we hereby provide general comments related to the overall land use and development scenarios for the East Side lands as well as specific comments with respect to each of the proposed development scenarios.
General Comments:

From a land use planning perspective there are 6 key directives identified in the Public Consultation material. These directives include:

- The creation of complete, attractive, compact communities.
- Development to achieve the Region’s density target of 55 persons and jobs per hectare.
- Development should integrate a well-connected pedestrian network.
- Natural heritage features to be protected.
- Compatibility with existing rural residential areas.
- Compatibility with the airport.

In addition to the above directives the Public Consultation material provided clear evaluation criteria including:

- Integration of land use option to existing community
- Conformity/Consistency with Provincial, Regional and local planning policy
- Infrastructure efficiency/feasibility
- Subwatershed recommendations
- Landowner / public input
- Other local planning matters

In general terms it is our submission that the Subject Property (both north and south parcels) are logically suited to meet the above directives and evaluation criteria. Rational for this submission is outlined below.

Complete Communities:

The Subject Property is located immediately north of the existing Riverbank Drive rural residential community and immediately east of the Grand River South community in Kitchener. Growth in this area would assist in connecting these communities. Residential development on the south parcel and commercial development on the north parcel would provide for a range of housing opportunities as well as supportive commercial space to service this growing community.

The inclusion of the entirety of the south parcel up to Riverbank Drive would allow for the rounding out of the Riverbank Drive residential community with a single detached housing form consistent with the established community. Higher density forms of residential development could locate towards the Fairway Road Fountain Street intersection.

A commercial block on the north parcel would provide commercial land uses required to service this new residential community. Proximity to the Grand River South community in Kitchener will further support the commercial development.

Density Targets:

Policies within the detailed secondary plan will aim to meet / exceed density targets based on providing a range and mix of housing types and tenures along with direction for compatible transitions in densities from the existing rural residential area to new higher density forms of development within the block bounded by Middleblock Road, Fountain Street, Fairway Road
and Riverbank Drive. The inclusion of the southern block allows for greater flexibility in transition from the existing Riverbank Drive rural residential area while at the same time includes sufficient land for higher density forms of residential development to achieve the density targets.

The inclusion of the northern parcel and an adjacent parcel of land would provide up to 13 ha of land for commercial purposes. Policies in the Secondary Plan will be prepared in accordance with the Region of Waterloo International Airport Reserve Lands sensitivity prohibitions. Allowing for commercial uses in this area will provide commercial opportunities to serve the residential area, Airport Reserve Lands and Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve employment lands.

**Connected Pedestrian Network**

Given that the Subject Property is bisected by Fairway Road, the inclusion of the entirety of the Subject Property greatly assists in providing a strong pedestrian link to the Grand River south community in Kitchener and the Grand River Trail network. Fairway Road has been constructed with sidewalks on both sides of the road and a direct trail linkage on the Kitchener side of the Grand River.

The inclusion of the Subject Property would establish a land use pattern of developed land on both sides of the river. Excluding the Subject Property would result in a missing link for pedestrian connectivity. Currently the sidewalks on Fairway Road do not connect to any other sidewalks / trail networks on the Cambridge side of the River. Future development will be essential to create connectivity to the Fairway Road sidewalk network.

**Natural heritage features to be protected.**

The Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains has been prepared in Draft. Natural heritage features such as wetlands, woodlands, habitat, valleylands and other features have been identified. Further refinement of these features and policies supporting their protection will be finalized in the Secondary Plan.

The Subject Property contains natural features including a section of the Randall Drain. However, the extent of the natural features and associated buffer areas are not large enough to preclude development. In fact, the available land beyond the natural features is of a size and shape that would allow for development that could link with adjacent parcels to form a comprehensive development plan.

On the north side of the Randall Drain, south of Riverbank Drive is unencumbered land from a natural heritage perspective. The inclusion of this land for future residential development would provide an opportunity for a compatible form of residential development to provide a transition to the existing Riverbank Drive rural residential area. Utilizing natural heritage features such as the Randall Drain to define the limits of future development may result in fragmented land uses and missing links of development between Kitchener and Cambridge. For this reason, it would be our suggestion that the Secondary Plan process establish setbacks and buffers to natural features and that the maintenance and inclusion of full parcels of land within the future developable land use designations be a priority.
Compatibility with existing rural residential areas

The inclusion of the Subject Property within the Secondary Plan residential land uses would allow for a transition area from the existing Riverbank Drive rural residential area. As Riverbank Drive has been connected to the Fairway Road extension, it is logical to continue a form of residential development along the southeast side of Riverbank Drive rounding out the existing residential community.

Compatibility with the airport

The northern portion of the Subject Property is within the recommend Airport Reserve lands. Sensitive land uses such as residential are intended to be prohibited from this area. However, given the desire to create a complete community and the directive to protect the Strategic Reserve Employment lands for larger scale industrial land users, the provision of a commercial block is important to ensure residents have access to commercial uses that provide for every day uses.

Review of Proposed Land Use Options:

Option 1:

In Option 1, an adjustment to the employment area is proposed north of Middle Block Road and west of
The Subject Property is outlined above on the excerpt of Option 1 land use plan. This option supports the development of commercial land uses on the northern portion of the Subject Property and identifies residential development on a portion of the south parcel.

The commercial designation is supportive of the establishment of a complete community and is in keeping with the Airport Reserve Lands objectives of limiting sensitive land uses within the reserve land area. The Fairway Road and Fountain Street intersection is going to be a key linkage intersection within the overall East Sides Lands area. The establishment of a key commercial node in this area will service the existing and future residential community, strategic employment land to the south, the airport lands to the north and the Grand River South community to the west.

Option 1 bisects the Subject Property adjacent the Randall Drain and would exclude a portion of the Subject Property from the secondary plan and development area. The excluded area is south of Riverbank Drive and north of the Randall Drain. It is our submission that this area should be included within the residential designation. Inclusion of this portion of the Subject Property allows for a rounding out of the community up to Riverbank Drive. Further, it is our opinion that the continuation of residential uses along Riverbank Drive to the intersection with Fairway Road would provide for a reasonable transition of built form from the existing rural residential community on Riverbank Drive.

Not including this portion of the Subject Property will leave a fragmented agricultural parcel that is already difficult to farm due to the constraints of Fairway Road and the limited land area does not result in an economically viable farm parcel. A remnant agricultural parcel between the Grand River south community and the East Side lands does not allow for a comprehensive land use layout.

To accommodate the inclusion of this portion of the Subject Property within the residential designation it would be our suggestion to remove the 12-hectare block of land identified for residential development as shown at the northeast corner of the intersection of Fountain Street and Middleblock Road. This 12-hectare block would require the removal of land from the Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve area. The Region of Waterloo Official Plan identifies the Strategic Reserve land for large scale land uses and specifically identifies in Section 2.D.23 that “lands will be developed as parcels greater than eight hectares in size”. Based on this policy the removal of up to 12 hectares of land for residential purposes is not consistent with the Official plan policy direction. If the land area was less than eight hectares perhaps the removal would be in keeping with the Official Plan policy direction.
Option 2:

Option 2 as shown above addresses the previous comments provided with respect to the portion of the Subject Property adjacent to Riverbank Drive. We agree with the proposed residential designation as it relates to the Subject Property. We agree that Secondary Plan policies will help to address compatibility and transition from the existing rural residential community.

Option 2 proposes a mixed use block at the southwest corner of the Fairway Road and Fountain Street intersection. While we agree a mixed use block will help with the creation of a complete community, we caution that without the larger commercial block as proposed in Option 1, the community may be underserviced from a commercial perspective which could lead to commercial development pressures within the Prime Industrial area. We support the creation of a large commercial block as proposed in Option 1.

This option also results in an undersized remnant agricultural parcel (the northern parcel). This parcel of land is already a constrained agricultural parcel due to the fragmentation caused by the Fairway Road extension. The long term viability of this land for agricultural operations is limited.

Similar to Option 1, again, we note Option 2 proposes a re-designation of Prime Industrial land to residential. Our comments with this re-designation remain the same as noted above.
Option 3:

Option 3 has many similar characteristics as Option 1 as it relates to the Subject Property. The commercial designation proposed on the northern portion of the Subject Property will service the future community and surrounding Grand River South area in Kitchener. We support this approach.

The residential designation proposed in Option 3 again creates a bisected property wherein a portion of the southern land is not included. Again, it is our submission that the rounding out of the residential area is best achieved by designating land up to Riverbank Drive for residential development. Policies within the future Secondary Plan will direct development and create a policy framework to support compatibility and a transition from the existing rural residential land along Riverbank Drive.

As noted previously, this Option would create an orphaned agricultural parcel surrounded by development. As stated above, the viability of such an agricultural operation would be limited and as such the inclusion of the entire southern parcel for development purposes (save and except any natural heritage features) is preferred. Option 3 maintains the Prime Industrial lands as is. This approach is consistent with the Regional Official Plan Policies.
Option 4:

Option 4 is similar to Option 2 in that it proposes a mixed use area at the southwest corner of Fairway Road and Fountain Street and does not propose a larger commercial block north of Fairway Road. While we agree with the mixed use land use approach and its role within the creation of a complete community we caution that a shortfall of commercial land may occur with this scenario.

From a residential land use perspective Option 4 proposes to bisect the southern portion of the Subject Property and leave the land adjacent to Riverbank Drive as agricultural. By maintaining the agricultural designation on the portion of the land adjacent to Riverbank Drive and the northern portion of the Subject Parcel there will be a noticeable disconnect to the Grand River South community in Kitchener. The Fairway Road extension has created the ability to provide greater connectivity between these two areas. The resultant fragmented agricultural land will suffer in terms of normal farm practices and the community will have a noticeable missing link (hole in the doughnut) form of development. This proposed configuration will lead to a form of leap frog development that can be avoided by including all of the Subject Property at this time.

Conclusions:

The four land use options presented contemplate various forms of development on the Subject Property. In general terms we agree with the direction that encourages growth on the East Side lands. The protection of the Strategic Reserve Prime Industrial Area along with the Airport Reserve lands is of key importance based on the Regional Official Plan and the
Waterloo Region International Airport Master Plan. The opportunities to round out these two areas require the inclusion of residential and commercial land uses to develop a complete community.

As noted above, it is our submission that:

- Residential land uses on the entirety of the southern parcel will provide for a transition from the existing rural residential land uses to a more urban form of residential development;
- A community of this size will require supportive commercial land uses. The inclusion of the northern portion of the Subject Property for commercial purposes satisfies this need and is in keeping with the Airport Master Plan and Reserve Lands policies.
- The fragmentation of the parcels should be avoided. Agricultural operations on the land are already economically constrained. The movement of large farm equipment across Fairway Road is already problematic. With additional development and potentially a smaller agricultural operation the overall viability of the farm will be impacted.

We thank you for the opportunity to provide the above noted comments and would be happy to meet with the project team to discuss further.

Yours truly,

Brandon Flewwelling, MCIP, RPP
Associate – Senior Planner
cc. Hilda Shiry – Fountain Street North, Cambridge
Pauline Shiry
Brian Shiry
Helen Shiry
April 10, 2018

Region of Waterloo
Community Planning
150 Frederick St. 8th Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3

Attn: Jane Gurney, MCIP, RPP, AICP
Principal Planner

City of Cambridge
Development and Infrastructure Department
50 Dickson Street, 3rd Floor
Cambridge, ON N1R 5W8

File No: 17028

April Souwand, MA, MCIP, RPP, AICP
Manager of Policy Planning

Re: Hilda Shiry - Fountain St. N, Cambridge
Master Environmental Servicing Plan & Secondary Plan
Region of Waterloo – East Side Lands – Stage 2 PCC #4

Dear Jane and April,

On behalf of our client Hilda Shiry (and family) and more specifically with respect to their property located at Fountain Street North in Cambridge (the “Subject Property” - as shown below) GSP Group provides the following comments in response to the information presented at Public Consultation Centre #4 held on March 20th, 2018.

The Subject Property is in the City of Cambridge, west of Fountain Street and bisected by Fairway Road. Prior to the Fairway Road extension, the Subject Property was a singular, contiguous parcel.

As you are aware we previously provided comments following PCC #3 held in November 2017. Key to the comments we previously provided was the need to avoid the further fragmentation of the Shiry farm as either parcel (north or south) would not be viable agricultural parcels on their own.
March 20 PCC #4 Preferred Land Use Option:

As shown above the preferred land use option presented at PCC #4 proposes to designate the southern Shiry parcel residential and excludes the northern parcel, which as a result would remain agricultural. To be clear the Shiry Family fully supports the residential designation proposed for the southern parcel. However, the remnant northern parcel remaining agricultural is a concern.

History of the Shiry Farm / Agricultural Feasibility:

Since approximately 1820, the Shiry family have been continuously farming the land located at Fountain Street in Cambridge. Many generations have maintained a viable agricultural operation on this property, but the viability of this agricultural operation has been strained because of a number of factors.

The construction of the Fairway Road extension through the middle of the farm to Kossuth Road presented a major impediment to the farming operations at 4650 Fountain. The reality being that the farm was now cut in half by 4 lanes of traffic with no reasonable way for large equipment to move from one side of the farm to the other.

After reviewing the preferred land use option presented at PPC #4 the Shiry Family is concerned about the future agricultural viability for the northern parcel. The northern parcel is
approximately 12 hectares in area and is bounded by two major arterial roads being Fairway Road to the south and Fountain Street to the east.

It is understood that Fountain Street is to be increased from 2 lanes to 4 lanes in the coming years in front of Fountain. Presently, access to the remaining parcel of land is unsafe from the Fairway Road side of the farm as vehicle speed is relatively fast in this area and the vehicles round a blind curve at speed before passing the farm after exiting the roundabout. This leaves access from Fountain as the only option and presently the volume of traffic on Fountain make this access unsafe. Increasing Fountain Street to 4 lanes will only make this access more difficult for the large equipment required in a viable farming operation.

The only viable farming option left for the northern parcel would be share cropping. Through past experiences the Shiry family notes that most share cropping operations will not go out of their way to bring equipment to a 12 hectare parcel of land. To access the northern parcel a share cropper would need to move large farming equipment along / across Fountain Street to access the land which would compromise the value and compensation that could be received from working the land. Additionally, the Shiry Family confirms it is not economically viable for them to farm such a small parcel themselves.

The underlying concern is that by leaving the northern parcel agricultural it will become a remnant parcel that is not viable for agricultural purposes but is not designated to allow other land uses. From a policy perspective the Region of Waterloo Official Plan identifies in Section 6.E.3 (Farm Lot Severances) that:

(a) the minimum lot area for both the newly created and retained farm parcels will be 40 hectares each; or

(b) where the newly created or retained farm parcels would have lot areas less than 40 hectares, the owner/applicant will be required to provide information satisfactory to the Region, which demonstrates that the resulting farm parcels will:

i. be of a size appropriate for the type of agricultural uses common in the area; and

ii. be sufficiently large enough to sustain an economically viable farm operation and to maintain flexibility for future changes in the type or size of agricultural operations.

While we recognize the extension of Fairway Road created the two divided parcels, we believe the above Regional policy is of importance. This policy directs the applicant to confirm that the resultant undersized parcel is appropriate and sufficiently sized to sustain an economically viable agricultural operation. As stated earlier, a 12 hectare parcel surrounded by busy arterial roads and not contiguous to other agricultural lands is not viable.

Considerations of potential amendments to the preferred option:

In reviewing the preferred option along with the evaluation criteria presented in the March 20, 2018 material and earlier documents we provide the following thoughts.

The northern Shiry parcel is constrained to residential development due to proximity to the Airport and being located within the identified Airport Reserve lands. Two of the land use
options presented at PPC #3 proposed a commercial designation on the northern Shiry parcel. This has not been brought forward in the preferred land use option. The commercial designation would provide for an urban land use while at the same time not interfering with airport operations. The inclusion of this land as a commercial block, which has not been proposed elsewhere continues to be supported by the Shiry Family.

The constraint to sensitive land use (i.e. residential land use) on the northern parcel rules out the potential for a mixed-use designation on this land. A mixed-use designation would (in the absence of the airport constraint) present a logical transition type of land use that would intervene between the residential area to the south and the airport lands to the north.

An alternative, to the strictly commercial land use for the northern parcel as presented in options at PPC #3 would be to designate this land (northern Shiry parcel) Employment use. We note that a 4 hectare parcel along the east side of Fountain Street and a 6 hectare parcel on the southside of Middleblock Road have been proposed as Employment use. While we don’t know the specific details surrounding these two parcels, we believe a similar designation for the northern Shiry parcel would also be appropriate.

The evaluation criteria among other matters seek to provide a land use framework within the Stage 2 lands that maximize development opportunities, ensures land use compatibility, creates minimum impacts to agricultural operations, capitalizes on existing infrastructure and creates a compact design within the area north of Middleblock Road and west of Fountain Street.

As indicated above, the fragmentation of the original Shiry Farm, firstly by the extension of Fairway Road and secondly as proposed by the future land use designations renders the northern Shiry parcel remnant land without viable use. As the evaluation criteria state the impacts to agricultural operations are to be minimized. The creation of an agricultural parcel of 12 hectares in area does not support agricultural land uses and would not satisfy the viability criteria of the Region of Waterloo Official Plan, Section 6.E.3.b.ii.

The introduction of an Employment designation on this parcel would resolve the agricultural impacts, would introduce a compatible land use which would nicely buffer the airport lands from the residential lands and would provide for employment uses close to residential uses.

**Conclusions:**

The Shiry family is supportive of the residential designation proposed for their southern parcel. As noted, the further fragmentation of their land by way of future land use designations is a concern. The viability of a 12 hectare agricultural parcel is minimal and the future introduction of residential lands uses in close proximity further constrain this agricultural parcel. As such, the land will become the remnant agricultural ‘hole in the doughnut’ as shown on the following page.
The introduction of a commercial or employment land use would round out this portion of the Stage 2 lands and would provide an appropriate land use buffer between the airport reserve lands and the proposed residential lands.

We thank you for the opportunity to provide the above noted comments and would be happy to meet with the project team to discuss further.

Yours truly,
GSP Group

Brandon Flewwelling, MCIP, RPP
Associate – Senior Planner

cc. Hilda Shiry – [redacted]
Pauline Shiry
Brian Shiry
Helen Shiry
Dear Jane/April,

My name is Ivan Zaja and I am the owner of (writing this email from my son’s email account). I am writing to you on behalf of myself and my family which includes my wife (Marica Zaja), two sons (Tommy & Frank Zaja), and daughter-in-law (Glory Zaja). I am writing to you in hopes to get some answers about the preliminary option and, most importantly, request to be included in the urban area with the Puopolo and Roussakis families. This is our request which we believe makes sense.

The preliminary option that was recently chosen is very devastating news to my family and I as my dream is to sub-divide my property into 5 or 6 lots, one for each of our children and grandson. My hope and dream is for my family to all live and grow up together in my retirement years while overlooking the Grand River. If we have to wait for a future MCR this will further delay our family plans and dreams for our family.

Not only are we discouraged by the preliminary preferred plan, we are also discouraged by the entire process. We have had multiple meetings and made multiple requests of the City and Region staff, however, we feel no one is listening to us and no one will help us understand why our ideas are not being included. There are other properties on Riverbank that are being sub-divided into smaller lots which is all we are looking to do and we don’t understand why we are not being considered and ignored.

We are frustrated and confused regarding many items of this process and have outlined our key questions/concerns below:

**Servicing:**
- Servicing is the most confusing part for us. Our property is less than 30m from the Urban Boundary and we will not be able to connect which doesn’t make sense to us or the Region. We don’t feel a septic tank solution makes sense when municipal services will be so close. We noticed the preliminary plan pushes further North, which is away from the proposed main servicing connection at Middleblock which is less than 100m away.
- Why does the preferred option not include our property even though we are so close to services? Is there a defined timeline to when we could expect servicing to our lands? Since other parts of Riverbank Drive will have servicing, will we be able to access these services and what would be the process to get servicing for our lands? These are questions we continue to ask and do not get any clear feedback on.

**Preliminary Plan Exclusion:**
- Can someone from the City/Region please provide us with clear decision criteria as to why our lands were excluded? At the last public meeting I asked the PCC consultant for clarification but we got the same runaround we have been getting throughout this process.
- We don’t understand how other large lots on Riverbank Drive are permitted and we cannot do the same. We understand other residents are concerned with new homes along the West side of Riverbank Drive, however, we note there are currently dozens of homes on Riverbank Drive on the West side and we are only proposing another 5-6 properties. We don’t understand the argument that our 5-6 lots would impact the “scenic route” when current residents are already doing the same.

**Scenic Route:**
- We understand the community is concerned with the beauty and nature of Riverbank Drive and how the “scenic route” policy is there to protect this. We want to ensure the City/Region/neighborhood that we are dedicated to maintain the natural beauty of the street and maintain the heritage. Despite this, we note that other lands across the “scenic route” are being included despite the PCC stating there was no official policy for the scenic route, we are asking for clarification on this. Why other lands included and not ours and what are the details of this policy because we cannot seem to find anything in writing.

**Proposed Trail:**
- We would like to express our concern with the existing development plan that does not include our proposed public trails that will provide the general public with access to the Grand River. Not only are we happy to share our lands with the general public to enjoy the river, we are also very concerned with the safety concerns and liability risks for our lands as new residents enter the area.
- As we have previously mentioned, we are willing to make a significant dedication to the GRCA/City/Region for these trails and access to the community if our properties are included with the Puopolo and Roussakis family.

**Hectare Restraints:**
- Lastly, we appreciate that there are constraints on the 115ha, all 4ha of our lands might not be reasonable to include in the preliminary plan. We are willing and open to work with other land owners to reduce our initial request of 4ha to a smaller amount and include the remaining piece at a later date to help move things forward. We are interested in finding solutions, not creating problems.

**As a result of the above, we request the following:**
- Jane/April, it was advised that this is just the preliminary option and there would be time and resources to review and amend. We formally request changes to this preliminary option before the next public meeting in May.

- We have not received any formal correspondence to any of our questions. We formally request to have our questions answered in writing.

- Lastly, and most importantly, we are formally requesting to be included in the urban area with the Puopolo and Roussakis family. We look forward to working with the City/Region in the most formal and appropriate way to help solve any issues or concerns to help move this forward.
Councillors/Mayor/Staff we will be further calling you to express our displeasure with the current proposal and hope the plan map can be amended ahead of the May 1st meeting.

Sincerely,
The Zaja Family
Ivan Zaja, Marica Zaja, Tommy Zaja Glory Zaja, Frank Zaja

Frank Zaja | Senior Client Relationship Manager
Hi Jane & April,
Sorry for the delayed feedback. I left for holidays March 21st after the March 20th home owners meeting.
I want to thank you for your hard work. I am very pleased that the preferred 170 hectares for future residential use did not include the 2 parcels on the river side (west side) of Riverbank Dr. I appreciate you working to preserve the natural landscape and historic nature of Riverbank Dr.
Thank you again,

Judy Sauder
April 12, 2018

Jane Gurney
Principal Planner,
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 8th Floor
Kitchener, ON,
N2G 4J3

Re: East Side Lands Stage 2 Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Secondary Plan

Dear Ms. Gurney:

Please accept the following as our preliminary comments regarding the East Side Lands Stage 2 Environmental Servicing Plan and Secondary Plan as presented at the PPC#4 March 20, 2018.

Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory, The Kossuth Bog Foundation and Butterflies Unlimited,( the owners of the property at 2500 Kossuth Road), are in the process of exploring significant, future expansion and development opportunities related to, and in conjunction with work already carried out at the Conservatory and related to education, research, environmental protection and conservation.

As this work is far-reaching in its scope and innovative and imaginative in its intention, we reserve the right to make further comments in the future.

With respect to the Preferred Land Use Scenarios presented at the March 20 PPC in Breslau, we offer the following comments:

1. It would appear the Fairway Road Extension/Kossuth Road, a major east-west corridor with tremendous economic potential, is not included nor identified in the North Cambridge Preliminary Preferred Urban Designation and Land Use
scenarios. As far back as June 2006 (Proposed East Side Community Structure Plan and Proposed Highway 401/97 Industrial Area Expansion) and as recent as the October 16, 2017 PPC#3 included the Kossuth Road Corridor as part of the Revised Stage 2 Lands. As these lands are part of our study area, it is important that this area be included in any mixed-use discussions.

2. We believe strongly that, given the cost of installing public servicing, it is important to seek alternatives. Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory built, maintains and manages its own highly efficient sewage treatment facility. This approach is one that we are actively pursuing for future development on this property.

As we continue to investigate environmentally sound and sustainable educational and research opportunities associated with Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory, I would respectively request that the Fairway Road Extension/Kossuth Road corridor be included in this first stage of development study and that the corridor be included in the plan for the various proposed land uses including employment, mixed use and residential.

Further, as I said at the outset, we would also like to reserve the right to make further comment in the future, as we continue to explore alternative uses for 2500 Kossuth Road.

Yours truly,

Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory

Doug Wilson,
President

cc. Bill Thomson
Director and Shareholder
Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory

Roberta Schofield
Director, Shareholder, Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory
Director, Butterflies Unlimited Corporation

Adrienne Brewster
Curator and Executive Director
Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory

2500 Kossuth Road
Cambridge, ON N3H 4R7
Tel: 519 653 1234
April 13, 2018

Elaine Brunn Shaw
City of Cambridge

Michelle Sergi
Region of Waterloo

Dear Ms Brunn Shaw and Ms Sergi:

RE: Intermarket Lands, North Cambridge Business Park – Urban Boundary Expansion
OUR FILE 0667 ‘A’

A portion of the Intermarket lands in the North Cambridge Business Park are located outside of the designated urban boundary. These lands are located on the east side of Riverbank Drive between Freeport Creek and Middle Block Road. Since the urban boundary designation is not coincident with Riverbank Drive but is instead located several metres to the east of Riverbank Drive, a portion of the Intermarket lands are partially within the urban area and a small “sliver” is located outside the urban boundary. Given the existing property boundaries this “sliver” consists of three areas:

- Area 1 (north of Freeport Creek and south of Allendale Road and known as 245 Riverbank Drive)
- Area 2 (lands at the north east corner of Riverbank Drive and Allendale Road)
- Area 3 (lands at the south east corner of Riverbank Drive and Middle Block Road).

Areas 1 and 2 are approximately 2 hectares in size and Area 3 is approximately 3.5 hectares, although a significant portion of Area 3 contains natural features. All three parcels are located adjacent to, but outside, the designated urban boundary. See attached Schedule.

The purpose of this letter is to review the merits and propose the inclusion of two of these small areas of Intermarket lands (Areas 1 and 2 – total of 4.5 ha) as part of the 115 hectares to be brought into the urban area.

The Region of Waterloo, City of Cambridge, and Township of Woolwich are currently going through a process to consider an expansion of the urban boundary in the area generally north...
of Middle Block Road. A total of 115 hectares is proposed to be added to the urban area. The process is to determine which lands will be included within these 115 hectares.

1. **Regional Official Plan (ROP)**
   The subject lands are designated “Prime Agricultural Area” (map 7). The intent of the Prime Agricultural Area designation is to protect prime agricultural lands and ensure that they will continue to be used for agriculture in the long term. Land uses are restricted to agricultural uses, agricultural-related uses, and secondary uses. Lot creation for residential and non-residential land uses is not permitted except to create new farm parcels, parcels for agricultural related uses or to create a lot for a second residence that is designated under the Heritage Act (See Section 6.E.)

   The portion of the Intermarket lands that are within the urban area boundary are designated Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (serviced) (Map 3a).

   Section 2.B.3 contains the policies regarding urban area expansions. Policy 2.B.3(j) applies specifically to the North Cambridge lands and the comprehensive review that is being undertaken by the Region, City of Cambridge and Township. This policy identifies that an urban area expansion and an amendment to the Official Plan will be considered for a maximum of 115 hectares of land. The policy identifies that a priority will be to consider enhancing the size of the existing rural residential area north of Middle Block Road and identifies that the reconfiguration of the Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve designated lands will also be considered.

2. **City of Cambridge Official Plan**

   Map 1a (Urban Structure) of the City of Cambridge Official Plan identifies that the lands are in the Countryside and outside the designated Urban Area Boundary. Map 1A (Countryside) designates the lands as Prime Agricultural. Map 2 (General Land Use Plan) designates Area 2 as Future Urban Reserve and designates Area 1 as Rural Residential.

   The policy framework for lands designated Prime Agricultural is the same as the ROP (Section 8.9). The intent is that lands are to be protected for agriculture and agricultural related uses for the long term.

   The Future Urban Reserve designation (Section 8.2) identifies that lands in this designation may be redesignated in the future through an official plan amendment process. Until then only existing uses will be permitted.
The Rural Residential designation permits residential uses and agricultural uses where no intensive livestock operation is involved (8.4.6.13). It is expected that Rural Residential lands will be serviced by individual services and development will be dependent on lot sizes suitable to accommodate water and waste water treatment (8.4.6.4).

The City of Cambridge OP contains policies for Scenic Heritage Roads (Section 4.14). The OP identifies that will establish policies to protect scenic heritage roads and identifies that these roads include the view from the road to the prominent heritage buildings or natural landscape features. Riverbank Drive is identified in the City of Cambridge Heritage Master Plan as a potential scenic road. However, the OP does not designate any roads as scenic heritage roads. Riverbank Drive is designated under the Ontario Heritage Act and is not listed on the City’s Municipal Heritage Register.

**Conclusions**

It is appropriate to include Areas 1 and 2 in the urban area. A summary of the rationale is as follows:

1. **The agricultural capability of the lands is limited.**
   The development of the North Cambridge Business Park lands on the Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve designated lands will result in the fracturing of the subject lands into three small areas. Due to existing property boundaries, natural environmental features and the location of Riverbank Drive, each area is approximately 2 hectares in size. The ROP identifies a minimum size of 40 hectares as the standard for viable agricultural parcels. Once the industrial lands are developed it is unlikely that these small parcels will continue to be farmed. Given the intended development of the surrounding area it is unrealistic to continue to protect these 3 areas as part of the Region’s prime agricultural lands.

2. **Integration and compatibility with existing and planned uses**
   Including the subject lands in the urban area provides greater ability to ensure the lands are used in a manner that is compatible with surrounding land uses. The Area 1 lands are directly adjacent to existing residential lands along Riverbank Drive and are currently designated Rural Residential. Development of the Area 1 lands to residential uses would appear to be the most appropriate. Given the policy context that discourages residential development on individual services it would be appropriate that these lands were included in the urban area and developed on full municipal services. Issues of compatibility with the existing, adjacent residential properties (eg, lot size, traffic, street orientation) could all be addressed through a plan of subdivision approval process.
Area 2 is adjacent to the planned North Cambridge Business Park on the east. Open Space and Rural Residential land uses are across Riverbank Drive to the west. Inclusion of Area 2 in the urban area would provide greater ability to manage the development of the lands to ensure that compatibility with surrounding lands is achieved.

3. **Availability and efficiency of servicing**
   Full municipal services are available for the subject lands. The North Cambridge Business Park lands will be developed on full municipal services. The City has recently completed the Environmental Assessment for the extension of the collector road and an interim sanitary servicing solution for the North Cambridge Business Park lands. The subject lands were included in the study area and can be serviced through the preferred solutions identified in the EA. Further, other lands that are in the “preliminary preferred option” (i.e. lands north of the Randal Drain) may have servicing issues. In this regard the subject lands are better suited to be included in the urban boundary.

4. **Meets the policies in the ROP and City of Cambridge OP regarding urban area expansion**
   The comprehensive review process consistent with policy 2.B.3 (j) is currently underway. The inclusion of the subject lands in the urban area through this process would satisfy the City, Region and Provincial policy requirements for urban area expansions.

5. **Ability to conserve the scenic qualities of Riverbank Drive.**
   Riverbank Drive is identified as a potential scenic route. However, to date there is no policy framework that further identifies or protects the scenic and/or heritage attributes. Inclusion of the subject lands adjacent to Riverbank Drive in the urban area does not preclude the ability for the City to further define and/or protect the scenic or heritage qualities of the road in the future.

Yours truly,

**MHBC**

Dan Currie, MA, MCIP, RPP
Partner

cc  Mark Kindrachuk, Intermarket
    Sandy Acchione, Intermarket
PROPOSAL:

Parcel 1: 2.5 ha included in Urban Boundary in Stage 2
Parcel 2: 2.0 ha included in Urban Boundary in Stage 2
Parcel 3: 4.5 ha included in Urban Boundary in Stage 2
Parcel 4: 3.5 ha does not need to be included in Urban Boundary in Stage 2 process
Ms. Jane E. Gurney

As a resident at Riverbank Drive for 55 years, I am in favor of your stage two plan. I appreciate that you have left the west side of Riverbank Drive and the river flats out of your master plan. All the wild life uses that land. They have been crowded out of the Kitchener side of the Grand River, and need a habitat. Being the developer of Deer Ridge Golf Course I know the corridor that the deer and other animals use, all the way up to Randall Creek watershed and the bush backing our property. We are observant of their trails and activities, as we sight deer, fox, coyotes, wild turkeys, red tail hawks, owls and an abundance of seasonal birds that come to our property from the meadow below our house. We have a deer run from the Grand River on both sides of our property. This information you might not have been aware of.

Thank you for informing me of what transpired at the meeting as I was unable to attend. I appreciate your correspondence.

Sincerely,
Jerry Cybalski
Hello,

I am responding to a need from Metrolinx interest in our property to extend Greenhouse road and a follow-up with Sam Heads contact with Mr. Scarfone about our plans at 1700 Kramp Road in Breslau.

Metrolinx is at work based on Permit to Enter on our land for design study work etc. As an organization and with multiple request for consideration for Mixed used Zoning in your comprehensive review to allow a zoning change for our land and Development. There has only been a deferment of that request.

Metrolinx is on it's way for potential expropriation of our land to build road while our persistent request for our organizational need has been ignored.

I am requesting a review that a not for profit organization in Woolwich township not be sidelined and our request taken seriously. As you are well aware of Thomasfield's push to achieve their company's goals. Our Organization has been making this request for over 18 years.

If you would like to schedule a meeting to discuss this, it will be very appreciated.

Sincerely,
Kunle

On Wednesday, April 11, 2018, Jane Gurney <JGurney@regionofwaterloo.ca> wrote:

Good Afternoon,

You are receiving this update regarding the Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) and Secondary Plan Project for the East Side Lands - Stage 2 as you have previously requested to be notified of updates related to this project.

The Region of Waterloo, City of Cambridge, Woolwich Township and Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) are working together to complete a Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) and a Secondary Plan. One part of the project is to identify approximately 170 hectares of land combined in the City of Cambridge and Woolwich Township for future residential and employment uses. WSP has been retained to provide consulting services for this project. The Secondary Plan will only be completed for the lands in Cambridge.

A Preliminary Preferred Land Use Scenario was presented at the Public Consultation Centre on March 20, 2018. A Regional Official Plan (ROP) Amendment to designate approximately 170 hectares of Urban Area reflecting the Preliminary Preferred Land Use Scenario will be considered at a statutory public meeting under the Planning Act on May 1, 2018. Additional information can be found on the “News and Public Notice” section of the Region’s website, or through the following link: https://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/Modules/News/index.aspx?newsId=4276620d-6916-45a7-b1f4-a8eeff6826

Please note that the project website has been moved and is currently being updated. If you require any information that is not included on the current webpage, please contact Jane Gurney (see below for contact information). The new website is located on the following page, with information provided under the “East Side Lands” tab: https://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/doing-business/growth-management.aspx

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the ROP Amendment, please contact the following:

Jane Gurney, MCIP, RPP, AICP
Principal Planner, Community Planning
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 8th Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
Phone: 519-575-4400 ext. 3454
Fax: 519-575-4449
Email: jgurney@regionofwaterloo.ca

--
Kunle Oluwojure
Hello, my wife and I own a property on Riverbank Drive and we were at the last public meeting back in March. I would like to notify you that we support the plan as presented (the preferred option). We do not support any amendments to the plan that would involve new building or changes to the plan, as I mentioned above, we support the plan as it was presented to us at the meeting. To be clear, we would not support new building plans on the river flats or any plan that would bring Riverbank Drive into the Urban Envelope.

Sincerely
Tom and LeeAnne Kidd
April 23, 2018

By E-mail only: regionalclerk@regionofwaterloo.ca

Regional Clerk
Region of Waterloo
150 Fredrick Street. 2nd Floor
Kitchener, ON
N2G 4J3

Attention: Regional Chair and Members of Planning and Works Committee
Jane Gurney – Principal Planner, Region of Waterloo
John Scarfone – Manager of Planning, Township of Woolwich
Michelle Sergi – Director of Planning, Region of Waterloo

Reference: East Side Lands - Stage 2 MESP & Secondary Plan Study PCC (March 20, 2018) and May 1st Public Meeting for the ROP Amendment

Dear Regional Chair, Members of Planning and Works Committee, Ms. Sergi, Ms. Gurney and Mr. Scarfone,

On behalf of Breslau Properties Limited ("BPL"), I am pleased to submit comments in follow up to the Stage 2 Lands Public Consultation #4, held on March 20, 2018 and in advance of the upcoming May 1st Statutory Public meeting for the ROP Amendments ("the "ROPAs") for Breslau and Cambridge.

The ROPAs affects lands in both the Township of Woolwich and the northern part of the City of Cambridge. The ROPA, amongst other things, designates approximately 55 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the southern portion of the Township of Woolwich. BPL owns lands within the proposed Urban Designated Greenfield Area in Breslau.

BPL is generally supportive of the direction of the Region of Waterloo’s ROPA. Specifically, BPL supports the urban designation of "Residential" on the majority of BPL’s lands on the Breslau (Township of Woolwich) Preliminary Preferred Urban Area Preferred Urban Area Designation and Land Use map and the designation of "Urban Designated Greenfield Area" as shown on Map 1 of the Regional Official Plan Amendment 2031 proposed for the lands for the Township of Woolwich Stage 2 lands. The proposed ROPA conforms to the ROP policies that were adopted by the Region of Waterloo on June 16, 2009 and approved by the Ontario Municipal Board on June 18, 2015. The ROPA conforms to the
Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

As a landowner since 1979, BPL supports the inclusion of these lands as they will enhance the current community in an efficient and effective manner. The inclusion of these lands near Breslau will create a more complete community, specifically in terms of the proximity to various transportation nodes including the anticipated GO service expansion, the proposed servicing, drainage, and the integration of parks. BPL continues its solution minded efforts in working with both Township and Regional planning professionals to help solve issues while creating a vision for the future.

BPL appreciates the Region moving forward with the ROPA as the next logical step in arriving at an appropriate Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Secondary Plan for the East Side Lands. We welcomed the opportunity to work with all parties through this process and we feel the ROPA provides a solid planning future and is the culmination of the large investment all parties have made over many years to realize on this process and see Breslau develop further into a stronger and more vibrant community.

Notwithstanding our support, we would like to bring forward one minor modification to the land uses proposed on the Preliminary Preferred Option Map for Breslau. Through our consultants, we have requested that the environmental feature, identified as ‘Other Potential Environmental Constraints’, in the northwest corner of the subject lands be excluded from the land use mapping. As recognized by the Region and WSP, detailed site work that is being completed by our terrestrial ecology consultants may result in changes to the characterization and boundaries of vegetation communities presented in the Subwatershed Study on the Breslau lands. Our team will be happy to work with the Region and WSP on this as the planning process moves forward and we prepare a draft plan of subdivision and associated environmental impact study.

In closing please know BPL is highly supportive of the Region in its efforts to move forward with the ROPA and will continue to work to provide a strong vision for tomorrow for the Breslau community. We look forward to attending the May 1st meeting and I will be available to respond to any questions related to designation of our lands as urban.

Kind Regards,

John Rose, President
Breslau Properties Limited

cc. Piper Morley and Stephen Waqué, BLG LLP
To: Regional Council, Regional Municipality of Waterloo AND
The Regional Municipality of Waterloo Planning and Works Committee

Date: April 25, 2018

From: Bill Thomson, Director, Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory,
Doug Wilson, President and Director Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory
Roberta Schofield, Director Butterflies Unlimited, Director Cambridge Butterfly
Conservatory

Re: Proposed Amendment to the Regional Official Plan

__________________________________________________________________________

This submission is to be included in the Public Comments with respect to the Proposed
Amendment to the Region Official Plan Public Meeting, May 1, 2018.

Abstract
With respect to the Preferred Land Use Scenarios presented at the March 20, 2018 Public
Consultation Centre #4 in Breslau, we note the following:

1. The Fairway Road Extension/Kossuth Road, a major east-west transportation
corridor with tremendous economic potential, and with years of Regional
Council support, has not been included nor identified in the North Cambridge
Preliminary Preferred Urban Designation and Land Use scenarios.

As far back as June 2006 and as recent as the November 2, 2017 Public
Consultation Centre #3, the Fairway Road Extension/Kossuth Road
transportation corridor was included as part of the Revised Stage 2 Lands. As
these lands are part of Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory’s future development
plan, it is important that this area be included in any mixed-use discussions.
2. Exclusion of the Fairway Road Extension/Kossuth Road corridor restricts Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory’s future development plans, thereby jeopardizing our ability to expand and putting our business at risk.

3. We believe strongly that, given the cost of installing public servicing, it is important to seek alternatives. Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory is actively pursuing environmentally sound, radically reduced carbon footprint infrastructure improvements for future development on this property.

Introduction

With reference to the Proposed Amendment to the Regional Official Plan, and more specifically with reference to the re-designation of portions of the East Side Lands study area as Urban Designated Greenfield areas in the northern part of the City of Cambridge, we offer the following comments:

1. The Fairway Road Extension/Kossuth Road transportation corridor was approved by Regional Council in 2005 to satisfy the need for an important east-west transportation corridor and as such has the potential to be a significant economic corridor.

2. When the Fairway Road Extension “Alternative D2” was approved by Regional Council in 2005, the Ottawa Street extension was turned down as an east-west corridor, yet it now forms an integral part of future development.

3. As early as June 2006 with the “Phase 1 Report: Proposed East Side Community Structure Plan and Proposed Highway 401/97 Industrial Area Expansion”, Kossuth Road formed part of the future development of North Cambridge.

4. The Regional Official Plan (approved June 18, 2015) includes the Fairway Road Extension/Kossuth Road corridor as part of the development plan for North Cambridge.

5. As recent as the November 2, 2017 Public Meeting, the Fairway Road Extension/Kossuth Road Corridor was included in the Revised Stage 2 Lands.

6. At the March 20, 2018 Public Consultation Centre, the Fairway Road/Kossuth Road Corridor had been completely removed from Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve or any proposed land use structures.

7. Proposed Amendments to the Regional Official Plan exclude The Fairway Road Extension/Kossuth Road corridor from Urban Designated Greenfield Areas.
**Background**

As far back as 2005, when a number of alternatives were proposed for the Fairway Road Extension and “Alternative D2” was approved connecting Fairway Road to Kossuth Road, Regional Council, Regional Staff and consultants of the day considered the Fairway Road Extension/Kossuth Road corridor as being, not only an important east-west transportation corridor, but also an important future economic corridor. In fact during the discussions of where to end the Fairway Road Extension, two important decisions were made by Regional Council of the day:

1. Alternative D2 was chosen causing Fairway Road to connect to Kossuth Road thereby ensuring a major east west economic corridor. (The other alternative, recommended by the consultants, was to end the Fairway Road Extension at the Airport, but Regional Council saw the importance of connecting Fairway Road to Kossuth thereby ensuring a significant east-west transportation and economic corridor).

2. The Ottawa Street extension as a possible east west and transportation and economic corridor was turned down by Regional Council of the day.

The Fairway Road Extension/Kossuth Road corridor, joining two major strategic urban centres with world class universities, manufacturing facilities and high tech enterprises, supported by an international airport, was recognized by Regional Council as an important east-west transportation corridor connecting the south side of Kitchener, The Conestoga Parkway, Waterloo, and Highway 8 in the west to Hwy 24, Guelph, the Hanlon Expressway and Highway 401 in the east. This important throughway also provides an important link to Waterloo Regional Airport.

Regional Council also recognized the prominence of this corridor in that it lies midway between two other important east west corridors – Highway 401 and Highway 7.

The Regional Official Plan approved in June 2015 shows a “proposed” regional corridor (the Ottawa Street Extension) but again, this corridor was turned down by Regional Council in favour of the Fairway Road Extension/Kossuth Road throughway.
**Our Position**

Based on years of Regional Council’s support and development of the Fairway Road Extension/Kossuth Road corridor, Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory undertook the task of actively planning for significant future development on our lands. Development which would enhance the ability of Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory (and the Region) to attract education, research and investment opportunities as well as visitors from across North America.

Abruptly changing the plans for our area and leaving the Conservatory lands outside the designated development areas, not only restricts but also jeopardizes future plans of Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory.

It is our position, that disregarding the Fairway Road Extension/Kossuth Road corridor and not including it in the Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve or the Urban Designated Greenfield Area, is to ignore an important east-west link, dismisses the potential for a significant future economic corridor and jeopardizes any future plans of Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory.

Moreover, the cost to the Region to “re-invent” another corridor (the Ottawa Street Extension), when one already exists AND build another bridge over the Grand River when one already exists, is in our opinion, an extravagance the taxpayers of the Region should not have to endure.

**Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory and Future Plans**

Since the Fairway Road Extension/Kossuth Road corridor and adjacent Airport Lands was included in the Stage 2 Lands up until March 2018, Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory has always contemplated significant future expansion and development opportunities related to, and in conjunction with work already carried out at the Conservatory. The Conservatory continues to explore future development in areas such as environmental education and research on the lands immediately to the west of the Conservatory.

Additionally, any future development that the Conservatory would undertake would explore the use of alternative, privately owned and managed infrastructures to lessen the burden on taxpayers. This sort of leading-edge alternative servicing could serve as a model for future development within the Region.
Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory In The Community
Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory is an important tourism and educational attraction demand generator in the City of Cambridge and the Region of Waterloo. Attracting over 130,000 visitors annually, many from outside the Region, The Conservatory is recognized as one of Ontario’s most important, privately held tourism assets, employing as many as 40 full and part time employees.

Since opening in 2001, Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory has educated over 250,000 school children in half day programs that are correlated to the Ontario Science and Technology Curriculum. The Conservatory is visited by schools as far away as London, Toronto, Hamilton and Orangeville.

Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory has become an integral and endearing part of the community providing seniors, children, families and the disabled with an opportunity to escape, re-charge and enjoy nature all year ‘round. The Conservatory provides an exceptional venue for weddings, meetings and special events. Our annual events have garnered significant media coverage from many print and broadcast outlets including CBC Radio, CBC Newsworld, CTV, The Globe and Mail, The Toronto Star and Sun Media to name but a few.

Over and above our regular programming, Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory is actively involved in species at risk conservation efforts in cooperation with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, Nature Conservancy of Canada, University of Guelph, York University, The Toronto Region Conservatory Authority, and the Toronto Zoo. The Conservatory is a founding member of the Butterfly Species at Risk Recovery Team, and was recently awarded a Species at Risk Stewardship Fund grant to support research and development activities.

Conclusion
For many years Regional Council has shown tremendous leadership, wisdom and foresight in supporting and developing the Fairway Road Extension/Kossuth Road corridor as a major transportation and future economic corridor. This support is well documented.

Based on this support, Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory has always planned for future development consistent with and in conjunction with educational and research programs already carried out by the Conservatory.
This sudden and surprising decision to remove the Conservatory lands and the Fairway Road Extension/Kossuth Road corridor from designated development areas is not consistent with Regional Council’s position thus far and moreover, this bewildering change of direction prevents Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory from future development by restricting our ability to expand, carry on with important educational, research and conservation activities which in turn could put our business at risk.

We respectfully ask that the Region reconsider this decision and include the Fairway Road Extension/Kossuth Road Corridor, including the Conservatory lands inside the designated development area.
Breslau (Township of Woolwich) Preliminary Preferred Urban Area Designation and Land Use:

Legend:
- Existing Urban Area
- Parcel Fabric
- Local Roads
- Railway Track
- Watercourse
- Waterbody
- Provincially Protected Environmental Features
- Other Potential Environmental Constraints
  - (Non-provincially protected features, supporting environmental features, setbacks and floodplains)
- Proposed Regional Corridor

Subject to further study

Proposed Land Use Structure
- Residential
- Proposed Urban Area Designation

North Cambridge Preliminary Preferred Urban Area Designation and Land Use:

Legend:
- Existing Urban Area
- Parcel Fabric
- Local Roads
- Railway Track
- Watercourse
- Waterbody
- Provincially Protected Environmental Features
- Other Potential Environmental Constraints
  - (Non-provincially protected features, supporting environmental features, setbacks and floodplains)
- Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve (Existing Employment)

Proposed Land Use Structure
- Employment
- Mixed Use
- Residential
- Proposed Urban Area Designation

Stage 2 Lands MESP & Secondary Plan Study
PCC - Information Handout (March 20, 2018)
April 25, 2018

By E-mail only: regionalclerk@regionofwaterloo.ca

Regional Clerk
Region of Waterloo
150 Fredrick Street, 2nd Floor
Kitchener, ON
N2G 4J3

Attn: Regional Chair and Members of Planning and Works Committee

Re: East Side Lands – Stage 2
ROPA - Master Environmental Servicing Plan & Secondary Plan
Madison Riverbank Holdings Ltd., White Water Holdings Inc., Lorne Kumer,
Madison Middleblock Limited and Madison Fountain North Limited
895 Riverbank Drive and 4300 Fountain Street
City of Cambridge
Region of Waterloo

KLM Planning Partners Inc. ("KLM") is the land use planning consultant representing Madison Riverbank Holdings Ltd., White Water Holdings Inc., Lorne Kumer, Madison Middleblock Limited and Madison Fountain North Limited hereinafter referred to as ("Madison"). Madison owns property in the East Side Lands – Stage 2 area, which is located immediately north of the North Cambridge Business Park ("NCBP") Stage 1 lands. The Madison lands are approximately 48.5 hectares in size and are situated north of Middle Block Road, west of Fountain Street, and east of Riverbank Drive and are known municipally as 895 Riverbank Drive and 4300 Fountain Street.

The purpose of this letter is to provide the Region of Waterloo Planning and Works Committee ("Committee") with our comments in relation to the proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment ("ROPA") respecting the designation of a maximum of 170 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Area within the area commonly known as the East Side Lands. The proposed amendment affects lands in both the Township of Woolwich and the northern part of the City of Cambridge. The Madison lands are situated in the northern portion of Cambridge.

At this time, we wish advise the Committee that we are supportive of the direction and thrust of the ROPA proposed to designate 170 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Area within the East Side Lands. The amendment conforms to the Regional Official Plan Policies that were adopted by the Region on June 16, 2009 and ultimately approved by the Ontario Municipal Board ("OMB") on June 18, 2015. The ROPA also conforms to the policies of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.
We note that the preliminary preferred land use scenario was presented at the Public Consultation Centre (PCC) on March 20, 2018, and that on May 1, 2018 a statutory public meeting will be held to receive public input respecting the proposed ROPA to designate lands within the urban area accordingly.

We are pleased with the preliminary preferred land use scenario, and support Staff’s decision to move forward with the ROPA as a next step in arriving at an appropriate Master Environmental Servicing Plan (“MESP”) and Secondary Plan for the East Side Lands. The preliminary preferred land use scenario provides for a complete community with residential and mixed land uses concentrated in one area making it easier to integrate parks, community facilities, and other area amenities.

Madison has been involved with the East Side Lands Stage 2 Study process since its inception and has worked collaboratively with the Region of Waterloo (the “Region”) on the ROPA as it affects the Madison Lands for a number of years. Madison has met with Planning staff and made a number of written submissions providing input to the ROPA. Madison would like to take this opportunity to express its appreciation for the opportunity to participate in that process.

Madison has been a landowner in the area for 50 years and was a party in the OMB hearing (as a cooperative and supportive party of the Region of Waterloo) which resulted in policies in the existing ROP which are today being implemented. We are excited to see years of planning and vision coming to fruition. Acknowledging that it has been a long road to get here, we believe it is important to move forward at this time with the ROPA to ensure all efforts to date are recognized. On this basis, we would respectfully request that the Committee not defer or delay the decisions respecting the final implementation of the proposed ROPA. It is our intention to further contribute to the overall growth and development within the East Side Lands, and in particular the Stage 2 lands, to establish a vibrant and healthy community.

Madison is supportive of the Region and believes the ROPA presents a strong planning vision for North Cambridge.

Please feel free to contact the undersigned at any time for further discussion.

Yours very truly,

KLM PLANNING PARTNERS INC.

Ryan Minn-Leahan, BURPI, MCIP, RPP
Partner

Copy: Ms. Michelle Sergi, Region of Waterloo
Ms. Jane Gurney, Region of Waterloo
Ms. Brenna MacKinnon, Region of Waterloo
Ms. Alyssa Bridge, Region of Waterloo
Ms. April Souwand, City of Cambridge
Ms. Kathy Padgett, City of Cambridge
Mr. Christian Lamanna, Madison Riverbank Holdings Ltd.
Mr. David Singer, Madison Riverbank Holdings Ltd.
Mr. Barry Horosko, White Water Holdings Inc.
Mr. Lorne Kumer
Mr. Stephen Waqué, Borden Ladner Gervais LLP
April 30, 2018

SENT VIA PDF EMAIL AND REGULAR MAIL

Mr. Tom Galloway & Planning and Works Committee
Regional Clerk, Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 2nd Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3

Dear Mr. Galloway:

RE: MESP and Secondary Plan – East Side Lands, Stage 2

We are writing on behalf of our client and the owner of lands referred to herein as the Forwell Lands, 957859 Ontario Limited. The “Forwell Lands” are bounded by the future extension of Ottawa Street to the north, the Grand River to the west and the built-up area to the east as shown on Map 3a of the approved Regional Official Plan. Our client’s lands are licenced under the Aggregate Resources Act (ARA). Aggregate extraction has occurred and the resource is now almost fully depleted. Our client’s lands are virtually surrounded by the designated Urban Area and are considered to be an infill site.

We have carefully considered the Urban Area expansions that are contemplated as part of the MESP and Secondary Plan process associated with Stage 2 of the East Side Lands. We note, the expansions that are proposed were considered in the context of the 2006 Places to Grow – Growth Plan (as amended). We understand the justification relates to what were previously referenced as 2031B Growth Forecasts.

As you are aware, the 2006 Places to Grow – Growth Plan (as amended) has been repealed and replaced by the 2017 Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe which took effect on July 1, 2017. The 2017 Growth Plan applies to the proposed expansions and provides (among other matters) that population and employment forecasts contained in Schedule 3 are to be used in planning and managing growth.

Policy 2.2.8 of the 2017 Growth Plan relates to settlement area boundary expansions and requires that expansions are to be based on the minimum intensification, density targets and growth forecasts of the 2017 Growth Plan. The 2017 intensification and density targets and 2041 growth forecasts have yet to be incorporated into the ROP or assigned to the lower-tier municipalities. Settlement area expansions are to be justified using a land budget methodology that has not been finalized by the Province. The MESP and Secondary Plan start with a conclusion regarding where expansions are to be considered namely, within what have been identified as the “Stage 2 Lands”. This preconceived starting point is not in keeping with the process contemplated Policy 2.2.8.3 of the 2017 Growth Plan and does not represent a Municipal Comprehensive Review as
defined by the Growth Plan. We conclude the proposed amendment to the Regional Official Plan does not conform with the 2017 Growth Plan from a number of perspectives.

The 2017 Growth Plan establishes a process for determining the most appropriate location(s) for proposed settlement area boundary expansions. Prime Agricultural Areas are to be avoided where possible. The Stage 2 lands that are located within the City of Cambridge are within a “Prime Agricultural Area” as identified on Map 7 (The Countryside) of the ROP. The Prime Agricultural Area designation has recently been reaffirmed by agricultural system mapping prepared by the Province. The Forwell Lands are identified as “Rural Areas” on Map 7 of the ROP and are not within a “Prime Agricultural Area” as confirmed by the Province’s agricultural system mapping.

We have also reviewed proposed long-term and interim servicing strategies. The interim servicing strategy is focused on the Stage 2 lands which were identified in the absence of the evaluation contemplated by the 2017 Growth Plan. We request that the interim servicing strategy consider and accommodate our client’s lands.

In summary, we are concerned the consideration of our client’s lands has been prejudiced by the identification of the Stage 2 lands at the outset of the MESP and Secondary Plan process. We are of the opinion the Secondary Plan process and draft amendment to the Regional Official Plan do not satisfy the requirements of a ‘Municipal Comprehensive Review’ and do not comply with the 2017 Growth Plan now in effect.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Yours truly,

McCarter Grespan Beynon Weir Professional Corporation

Per: [Signature]

Stuart Hough

cc. 957859 Ontario Limited
April 29, 2018

Regional Clerk
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick St., 2nd Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
Attention:

Attention: Regional Chair and Members of Planning and Works Committee

Dear Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee:

Re: Statutory Public Meeting – Proposed Amendment to the Regional Official Plan
(East Side Lands – Stage 2)

White Water Holdings Inc. is a registered owner of lands located north of Middle Block Road, west of Fountain Street, and east of Riverbank Drive. We are writing in support of the Staff Recommendations to you in their Report of May 1, 2018.

White Water Holdings Inc. has participated throughout the public process leading up to the Staff Recommendations to the you contained in their report D16-40. Further, White Water Holdings Inc. was actively involved in the earlier ROPA and subsequent Ontario Municipal Board (“OMB”) hearing in order for the OMB to consider a series of appeals to this earlier document. Again, White Water Holdings Inc. was actively involved in the series of negotiations and mediation which resulted in Minutes of Settlement between all parties to the earlier OMB hearing and an Amended ROPA, which is now in full force and effect.

In our respectful opinion, your Staff have carried out a fulsome and considerate analysis and review of all relevant matters to the current policy document.
We are writing, on behalf of White Water Holdings Inc., to support the recommendations from Staff to you and also to stress the significance of moving forward now in a timely fashion and endorse the principals contained in your Staff Recommendations.

Yours very truly,

White Water Holdings Inc.

[Signature]

Barry A. Horosko

c.c.  Ms. Sergi
     Ms. Souwand
     Ms. Gurney
     Madison Homes
     L. Kumer
     S. Waque
     R. Mino-Leahan
April 30, 2018

Regional Clerk
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick St., 2nd Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
Attention:

Attention: Regional Chair and Members of Planning and Works Committee

Dear Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee, Ms. Sergi, Ms. Souwand, and Ms. Gurney

Re: Statutory Public Meeting—Proposed Amendment to the Regional Official Plan
(East Side Lands—Stage 2)

Lorne Kumer is a registered owner of lands located north of Middle Block Road, west of Fountain Street, and east of Riverbank Drive. I am writing in support of the Staff Recommendations to you in their Report of May 1, 2018.

Lorne Kumer has participated throughout the public process leading up to the Staff Recommendations contained in their report D16-40. Further, I was involved in the earlier ROPA and subsequent Ontario Municipal Board ("OMB") hearing in order for the OMB to consider a series of appeals to this earlier document. In addition, I was involved in the series of negotiations and mediation which resulted in an Amended ROPA, which is now in full force and effect.

In my respectful opinion, your Staff has carried out a thorough analysis and review of all relevant issues to the current policy document.
I support Staff’s recommendations to you and also stress the importance of moving diligently now and support the principals contained in your Staff Recommendations.

Yours very truly,

Lorne Kumer

c.c. White Water Holdings Inc.
Madison Homes
R. Mino-Leahan
S. Waque
From: Michelle Sergi
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2018 3:08 PM
To: Jane Gurney; Brenna MacKinnon
Cc: Rod Regier
Subject: FW: Parcel 2 ONLY in Urban Boundary: MESP Stage 2
Attachments: Riverbank Drive Parcel 2 May 7 2018.pdf.DRF

FYI – can you please forward to Bobby.
Thanks, Michelle

From: Mark Kindrachuk [mailto:mmk@intermarketinc.com]
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2018 2:54 PM
To: Elaine Brunn Shaw; Michelle Sergi
Cc: Michelle Sergi; dcurrie@mhbplan.com; SANDY ACCHIONE; James Goodram; Rod Regier; helen@mcdonaldgreen.com; Karl Kiefer; Kathy Padgett; Peter Markine; Tom Galloway
Subject: Parcel 2 ONLY in Urban Boundary: MESP Stage 2

Elaine and Michelle: As a follow-up to our discussion at the PIC last week and my vmail message to Elaine from today, we are requesting that our Parcel 2, which is a 2.5 ha lot at the corner of Riverbank Drive and Allendale Road be included in the “Urban Boundary” as part of the on-going MESP Stage 2 process.

We have reduced our request by removing Parcel 1, in addition to removing Parcel 3, from the Urban Boundary request.

Our plan is to include Parcel 2 in the Urban Boundary now; and then re-zone in the future for residential uses with rear lane access. We reviewed this plan with the local City councillor (Donna Reid), James Goodram and local residents –and they thought it was a very good compromise. This revised plan addresses the key issues:

- maintain scenic route quality of Riverbank Drive
- the rear lane lots do not increase traffic on Riverbank Drive
- Parcel 2 provides a buffer to industrial uses to Riverbank residents
- Parcel 2 with rear lane lots provides built-in separation to industrial uses by planning for deep lots with garages; as well as a laneway and fence
- Resolution to this issue now provides certainty to residents and developer
Sincerely,

Mark Kindrachuk
President
Intermarket Properties
489 Queen Street East; Suite 201
Toronto, ON M5A 1V1
www.intermarketinc.com
Good morning Jane,

Thank you for circulating the proposed ROP amendment to CN Rail.

I have reviewed the information and we have no comments or objections at this time.

Regards

Susanne

Susanne Glenn-Rigny, MCIP, RPP, OUQ
Agente principale/Senior Officer
Planification et développement communautaires/
Community Planning and Development

Affaires juridiques/Law Department
935, rue de La Gauchetière Ouest
15e étage
Montréal (Québec) H3B 2M9
Téléphone: (514) 399-7844
Télécopieur: (514) 399-4296
Cell (514) 919-7844
Email: susanne.glenn-rigny@cn.ca
Good Afternoon Jane,

I received your proposed amendment to the regional official plan (File D16-40/18/Eastside) and just wanted to send you a couple of quick comments from Waterloo North Hydro.

Your map shows an area along Fountain St, just south of the railroad that is proposed to be designated for urban greenfield. We currently have no infrastructure there so any development plans we would need a minimum 1-2 years notice to ensure that we can sufficiently service this area. This would be at the developers cost, and may also require easements.

For the other areas in WNH territory that I see, we have infrastructure in place, but depending on the type of development and density we may need to reinforce or rebuild our infrastructure, again at the developers cost and it may require easements.

If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to reach out to me.

Thanks,

Bryon Hartung, P.Eng.
Supervisor - Overhead & Stations Engineering
Waterloo North Hydro Inc.
Office: 519-888-5529
Cell: 519-588-4346

CONFIDENTIALITY DISCLAIMER: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is confidential and intended only for the person(s) named above. This material may contain confidential, privileged or personal information which may be subject to the provisions of the Personal Information Protection & Electronic Documents Act (PIPEDA). Any unauthorized use or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient or have received this message in error, please notify the sender or Waterloo North Hydro immediately and permanently delete the original message including any attachments and copies. Thank you for your cooperation. This message has not been encrypted. Special arrangements can be made for encryption upon request.

** PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT BEFORE PRINTING THIS EMAIL **
May 7, 2018

Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 8th Floor
Kitchener, N2G 4J3

Attention: Jane Gurney, Principal Planner

RE: File No. D16-40/18/EASTSIDE
    Township of Woolwich (South of Breslau) and City of Cambridge (Northern Portion)
    East Side Lands – Stage 2
    Region-initiated Regional Official Plan Amendment

Waterloo Catholic District School Board (WCDSB) staff reviewed the Proposed Amendment to the Regional Official Plan, specifically the East Side Lands – Stage 2 and has the following comments.

WCDSB has been working with Riverland (Empire), Township of Woolwich, and Region of Waterloo staff to obtain a school site in Breslau. A portion of WCDSB’s preferred site includes land outside the settlement area, which is proposed to be included in the East Side Lands – Stage 2. WCDSB strongly supports this proposal and appreciates the assistance of Township and Regional staff.

If the school site portion outside the settlement area is not included in the urban boundary, this would significantly hinder the operation of the school on the remaining lands as it is an irregularly shaped small parcel. WCDSB staff attended the May 1, 2018 public meeting and heard many residents requesting their lands be included in the urban boundary. Although, WCDSB is neutral on whether their lands are included, we want to ensure that our parcel remains within the proposed urban boundary.

WCDSB has been actively looking for a school site in Breslau since 2013 so time is of the essence. It is kindly requested that this process be expedited and not delayed.

Thank you for considering our comments and if you have any questions regarding the above, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Virina Elgawly
Virina Elgawly, BES, MCIP, RPP
Planning Officer
May 10, 2018

Region of Waterloo
Planning Services
150 Frederick Street
Kitchener, ON   N2G 4J3

Attention: Jane Gurney Via: e-mail

Re: East Side Lands – Regional Official Plan Amendment to designate approximately 55 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the southern portion of the Township of Woolwich, designate approximately 100 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the northern part of the City of Cambridge, designate approximately 6 hectares of land as Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve in the northern part of the City of Cambridge, re-designate approximately 11 hectares from Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve to Urban Designated Greenfield areas in the northern part of the City of Cambridge, re-designate approximately 4 hectares of land from Urban Designated Greenfield Areas to Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve in the northern part of the City of Cambridge

_____________________________________________________________________________________________

Energy+ Inc. has no objection to the request for an Amendment to the Regional Official Plan to re-designate lands located in the northern portion of the City of Cambridge known as the East Side Lands within the Region of Waterloo.

Should additional information be required, kindly contact me at your convenience.

Yours truly,
Energy+ Inc.

Helen Robinson

Engineering Legal Coordinator
/hr
May 14, 2018

Jane Gurney  
Regional Municipality of Waterloo  
Planning, Development and Legislative Services  
Community Planning, 8th Floor  
150 Frederick Street  
Kitchener, On N2G 4J3

Re: Proposed Amendment to the Regional Official Plan  
D16-40/18/EASTSIDE, Township of Woolwich, City of Cambridge

Dear Jane:

We have received the above noted proposed amendment to the Regional Official Plan. Please be advised we have no objection to the approval of the amendment in principle, however we recommend Policy 2.D.35 be revised to recognize that some of the lands in the City of Cambridge are within the study area for another Subwatershed Study, in addition to the referenced Randall and Breslau Drains Subwatershed Study.

For your consideration, we suggest the following revision (italized) to Policy 2.D.36 - …future development and Secondary Plans for these lands will respect the findings of the applicable Subwatershed Study.

GRCA staff look forward to our continued participation as a Project Team member for the East Side Lands – Stage 2 project. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Beth Brown  
Supervisor of Resource Planning

c.c. April Souwand, City of Cambridge  
John Scarfone, Township of Woolwich
May 16, 2018

Kris Fletcher
Regional Clerk
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 2nd Floor
Kitchener, ON
N2G 4J3

Dear Sir or Madam,

RE: Item 10 – North Cambridge Urban Boundary Expansion

Please be advised that the Planning & Development Committee at its meeting held on the 8th day of May, 2018, put forth the following recommendation, which was approved at Council on May 15, 2018, as part of Motion 81-18:

Moved By: Councillor Mann
Seconded By: Councillor Adshade

THAT Council generally endorse the proposed new Urban Area boundary in North Cambridge as presented at the statutory public meeting held at Regional Planning and Works Committee on May 1, 2018;

AND THAT minor adjustments made to the lands affected by the proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment agreed to by City of Cambridge staff in discussion with Regional staff do not need further endorsement by Cambridge Council, including the rounding off of the designation of the Murphy’s land with the additional 3 hectares;

AND THAT development applications for the added lands in the Urban Designated Greenfield Area will be considered premature until the Official Plan Amendment to the Cambridge Official Plan (2012) for the Secondary Plan on these lands is in full force and effect.

CARRIED

Enclosed is a copy of the staff report that went forward to the Planning and Development Committee meeting.

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

Michael Di Lullo,
City Clerk

cc.  April Souwand, Manager of Policy Planning
     Elaine Brunn Shaw, City Planner
June 6, 2018

By Email

Michelle Sergi  
Region of Waterloo

Dear Ms. Sergi,

RE: Resolution – Woolwich Township Comments – Proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment (East Side Lands - Stage 2), 2018

This letter is to inform you that the Council of the Township of Woolwich ratified the following resolution at the Council meeting held on May 29th, 2018:

That in accordance with Report E29-2018 respecting Woolwich’s comments to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo on the proposed Regional Official Plan for the East Side Lands – Stage 2 Area, the Council of the Township of Woolwich:

1. Endorses the proposed Urban Area boundary in Woolwich Township adjacent to the Breslau Settlement Area as presented at a statutory public meeting held at the Regional Planning and Works Committee meeting on May 1st, 2018 and outlined in Appendix ‘A’ to Report E29-2018; and

2. That planning applications for the new lands identified as Urban Designated Greenfield within Woolwich adjacent to the Breslau Settlement Area will be considered premature until the proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment as outlined in Appendix ‘A’ and related to the Woolwich lands is approved and in full force and effect.

For further information, please contact Dan Kennaley, Director of Engineering and Planning Services, by email at dkennaley@woolwich.ca or by phone at 519-669-6028.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Val Hummel  
Municipal Clerk  
Township of Woolwich  
519-669-6005

Cc:  
Brenna MacKinnon  
Jane Gurney

“Proudly remembering our past; Confidently embracing our future.”
May 31, 2018

Jane Gurney
Principal Planner
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street 8th Floor
Kitchener Ontario, N2G 4J3

Re: Proposed Amendment to the Regional Official Plan
File: D16-40/18/Eastside

Dear Ms. Gurney,

Thank you for circulating the details of the above noted Regional Official Plan amendment. As described in your letter, the amendment seeks to address the Ontario Municipal Board decision relating to the final approval of the plan. As such, 170 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Area has been brought into the plan – 55 hectares in the Township of Woolwich, 100 hectares in the northern part of the City of Cambridge, comprise the bulk of the lands.

**North Cambridge**

We also understand that a Secondary Plan is being undertaken through the East Side Lands – Stage 2 project for lands designated as Urban Designated Greenfield Areas in the City of Cambridge through this amendment.

Regarding the North Cambridge area, the policies are stated to

“give priority consideration to enhancing the size of the residential area currently comprised of the lands designated rural residential in the City’s Official Plan (north of Middle Block Road, south of Fairway road North), with the objective of creating a residential cluster of sufficient size so as to permit its integration with the surrounding employment uses to form the beginning of a mixed use community that will provide future residents the opportunity to live close to where they work.”

The Board supports this effort.

In terms of school accommodation, we will need more information through the secondary planning processes to determine if current and planned schools (e.g., the proposed public elementary Hunt Club/River Mill school) can serve the new residential area identified on Map 1, north of Middle Block
Road. At present, the area shown will likely not yield enough housing to warrant an elementary school site; therefore, it lacks the opportunity to be serviced by a walkable community school.

While we may be able to service this by busing students to the proposed school near Briardean (Hunt Club site) our staff questions whether it satisfies the current provincial policy (PPS 1.1.3.2 (a) 2) of making the most efficient use of existing and planned public service facilities and to:

Places to Grow Policy 2.2.1 (c) - Managing growth, which in settlement areas will be focused in
   i. delineated built-up areas;
   ii. strategic growth areas;
   iii. locations with existing or planned transit, with a priority on higher order transit where it exists or is planned; and
   iv. areas with existing or planned public service facilities;

and,

Policy 2.2.7 Designated Greenfield Areas

1. New development taking place in designated greenfield areas will be planned, designated, zoned and designed in a manner that:
   a) supports the achievement of complete communities;
   b) supports active transportation

And, finally within the overall environmental goal of dealing with Climate Change, Policy 4.2.10, referring to actions in Official Plans that will include:

   a) supporting the achievement of complete communities as well as the minimum intensification and density targets in this Plan;
   b) reducing dependence on the automobile and supporting existing and planned transit and active transportation;

**Woolwich**

We note that the existing Woolwich Official Plan, Schedule B - Settlement Plan - Breslau does not include the lands to be added through this proposed amendment. We are anticipating there would be a consultation process undertaken by the township as they bring the local OP into conformity with the Region OP. We look forward to receiving additional details about the future residential development so we can review and provide comment.
In terms of elementary school accommodation, we will need more detailed housing information to determine if current and planned schools (e.g., the proposed public elementary school in the Hopewell Creek/Thomasfield subdivision) can serve the new residential area identified on Map 1, West of Fountain Street North. At present, the area shown will likely not yield enough students from its limited housing to warrant an elementary school site; therefore, it lacks the opportunity to be serviced by a walkable community school.

The Development Area (DA) in the Thomasfield Subdivision (northeast Breslau) is currently assigned to Mackenzie King Public School for grades 1-6 and Stanley Park Public School for grades 7-8. The proposed public elementary school in this subdivision has not yet received funding approval from the Ministry of Education.

A Development Area has also been designated for the Riverland subdivision in the southwest portion of Breslau. This DA is currently assigned to Crestview Public School for grades 1-6 and Stanley Park Public School for grades 7-8, these schools are located in Kitchener East (Stanley Park).

Enrolment projections for Breslau Public School, which are exclusive of the new development in the two DAs identified above, indicate that the school is expected to remain over-utilized over a ten year period.

Given the pressure on Breslau Public School, there is potential for this newly designated residential area to be identified as a Development Area so that students could be accommodated in East Kitchener public schools or elsewhere as space allows. Again, the need for this is contrary to the policies set out in Places to Grow, detailed above.

Information about the proposed unit types and counts will help the Board in developing enrolment projections for this area and identifying other potential capital solutions to the accommodation pressures in Breslau.

We wish to continue to be circulated on this amendment as a decision is made and if there are any additional steps of implementation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Sarah Galliher
Senior Planner
sarah_galliher@wrdsb.ca
(519)-570-0003 x4439