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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

The Project Team (led by the Region of Waterloo, in partnership with the City of Cambridge, Township of Woolwich and the Grand River Conservation Authority) retained WSP to facilitate development of a Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) and Secondary Plan process for the Stage 2 Lands, a portion of the Region’s broader East Side Lands, which are being planned for long-term development and growth. The purpose of this report is to identify and analyze feasible options for the designation of the Urban Area and suitable land uses within portions of the Stage 2 Lands, in accordance with the policies of the Region of Waterloo Official Plan (ROP) and the applicable Provincial policies. This report provides the basis for a Regional Official Plan Amendment to designate the Urban Area and for the development of a Secondary Plan in the City of Cambridge. Note that the Secondary Plan will be prepared for lands planned for development in North Cambridge and it is anticipated that the Township will process Official Plan Amendment application(s) to implement the ROP Amendment once this process is complete.

This report addresses three key questions:

- Which portions of the Stage 2 Lands should be designated Urban Area, in accordance with the ROP?
- How should lands designated Urban Area be used?
- What other guiding policy should be established to ensure the Urban Area of the Stage 2 Lands are developed in a sustainable, desirable manner, which balances the needs and interests of landowners, residents, and the public?

1.2 BACKGROUND

The East Side Lands have been planned as a potential location to accommodate future growth, dating from the 2003 Regional Growth Management Strategy and confirmed through the approval of the Regional Official Plan (ROP) in 2015. To date, a Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan has been completed for the East Side Lands - Stage 1.

The Stage 1 Lands, located south of the Stage 2 Lands in Cambridge, are designated Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve in the ROP. The ROP intends for these lands to be planned for large lot employment uses. A key outcome of the East Side Lands Stage 1 MESP and Community Plan was the recommendation of a new north-south collector road combined with other improvements (sewage pumping station), connecting King Street northward to Middle Block Road (the Cambridge Business Park Collector Road Environmental Assessment). The project followed the Schedule “B” process under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment and was completed in late 2017.
The Stage 2 Lands, which are the focus of this report, are located just north of the Stage 1 Lands. The ROP contains policies which include the designation of a portion of the Stage 2 Lands for urban uses, as well as other guiding policies, in the northerly portion of the City of Cambridge and adjacent to the community of Breslau in the Township of Woolwich. The Region initiated the ROP Amendment process to designate the Stage 2 Lands as Urban Area in late 2016. Not all of the Stage 2 Lands will be designated Urban Area. For lands not designated Urban Area through this ROP Amendment, the timing of development is not currently planned within the horizon of the ROP. There may be an opportunity for lands not recommended for Urban Area designation at this time to be considered through a future Municipal Comprehensive Review of the ROP.

The location of the Stage 2 Lands within the East Side Lands is identified in Figure 1. Additionally, a Project Study Area for the Stage 2 Lands MESP/Secondary Plan, which generally coincides with the subwatershed boundaries, is also identified. Figure 2 illustrates the location of the Stage 1 Lands study area and the lands planned as the Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve, which are designated by the ROP.

1.3 REPORT OVERVIEW

This report is structured as follows:

1. Section 1 provides an overview of the report.
2. Section 2 identifies and analyzes the Provincial, Regional and local policy and other studies that will guide the determination of the Urban Area and land uses in suitable portions of the Stage 2 Lands.
3. Section 3 identifies the Urban Area designation and land use options based on the policy context.
4. Section 4 identifies criteria upon which the options will be evaluated, and analyzes the various options in relation to the evaluation criteria and policy.
5. Section 5 presents a preferred land use concept and Urban Area designation and a summary of how the preferred concept best achieves the evaluation criteria, policy and guiding documents.
6. Section 6 provides conclusions and summarizes recommendations.
Figure 1: Location of the East Side Lands, Stage 2 Lands and the Project Study Area
Figure 2: Location of the Stage 1 Lands and Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve
2. GUIDING POLICY AND STUDIES

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 designate Urban Designated Greenfield Areas within the Urban Area in accordance with the applicable ROP policies of Section 2.B.3. The purpose of this report is to provide an analysis and justification for the designation of Urban Area in portions of the Stage 2 Lands, which is to be completed in accordance with the policies of the ROP.

Consideration has been given to the City of Cambridge and Township of Woolwich Official Plans. Future amendments to the City of Cambridge and Township of Woolwich Official Plans will be required to ensure consistency with the ROP. This section also reviews other studies and guiding documents which are relevant to the determination of the Urban Area designation and development of supportive land use policies.

Planning within Ontario’s municipalities is undertaken through a framework established by the Province of Ontario. The Planning Act is the legislation that establishes the framework for municipalities to manage land use and growth in Ontario. Under the Planning Act, municipalities must have regard to various matters of Provincial interest (Section 2). Further, municipal planning decisions must be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 (PPS), conform to or not conflict with the 2017 Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (The Growth Plan) and any other applicable Provincial Plans, where applicable.

The determination of the Urban Area designation and land use within portions of the Stage 2 Lands, will be implemented through a Regional Official Plan Amendment and subsequent local Official Plan amendments including a Secondary Plan for Cambridge.

2.1 GROWTH PLAN FOR THE GREATER GOLDEN HORSESHOE, 2017

The Growth Plan is a long-term plan that sets out policies to manage growth and services/infrastructure, build complete communities, curb urban sprawl and protect the
natural environment. The Growth Plan establishes a more detailed Provincial policy framework for implementing Ontario’s vision for building stronger, prosperous communities in the GGH by better managing growth and establishing a long-term framework for where and how the GGH will grow. The proposed ROP Amendment does not constitute a settlement area boundary expansion and therefore does not conflict with the Growth Plan for the reasons set out in this report. 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).

The following provides an overview of the Growth Plan’s policies which are relevant.

2.1.1 COMPLETE COMMUNITIES

The 2017 Growth Plan promotes development of more complete communities, which, as stated in Section 2.2.1.4, will:

a) feature a diverse mix of land uses and housing options;
b) improve social equity, human health and quality of life for all ages, abilities and incomes;
c) provide a mix of housing options;
d) expand convenient access to a range of transportation options, public service facilities, open spaces and recreational facilities, and healthy, affordable food options;
e) ensure development of high quality, compact built forms with vibrant public realms and public open spaces;
f) mitigate and adapt to climate change impacts; and,
g) promote sustainability and resiliency through green infrastructure and low impact development.

These principles will be applied and implemented through the development of the Secondary Plan for Cambridge as well as the review of development applications in Cambridge and Woolwich Township.

2.1.2 DESIGNATED GREENFIELD AREAS

The 2017 Growth Plan defines Designated Greenfield Areas as:

“Lands within settlement areas but outside of delineated built-up areas that have been designated in an official plan for development and are required to accommodate forecasted growth to the horizon of this Plan.”
The designated Greenfield Areas are illustrated conceptually in the Growth Plan and are intended to be designated by the Regional Official Plan. Once the suitable portions of the Stage 2 Lands are designated within the Urban Area, they would be designated by the Regional Official Plan as Designated Greenfield Area on Map 3a of the Regional Official Plan and subject to the policies of the Growth Plan under Section 2.2.7. As such, new development within the designated Urban Area of the Stage 2 Lands will be planned and designed in a manner which supports the achievement of complete communities, supports active transportation, and encourages integration and sustained viability of transit services (Section 2.2.7.1).

The Growth Plan also intends for Designated Greenfield Areas to be planned to achieve a minimum density of 80 residents and jobs combined per hectare (Section 2.2.7.2). This density target is to be measured across the entire Designated Greenfield Areas in the Region (excluding certain features as listed in the Growth Plan) (Section 2.2.7.3). However, within the outer ring municipalities of the GGH (that the Region of Waterloo is a part of), it is the intent of the Plan that the greenfield density targets established and made applicable in the Official Plan as of July 1, 2017 will continue to apply (Section 2.2.7.4). In accordance with the Regional Official Plan, this means that the minimum density target of 55 residents and jobs combined per hectare continues to apply in the Region until the next municipal comprehensive review, at which point there is a need to work towards implementing the target of 80 residents and jobs combined per hectare.

### 2.1.3 SETTLEMENT AREA BOUNDARY EXPANSIONS

170 hectares of Urban Designated Greenfield Area were identified through the approval of the ROP. This Planning Rationale Report provides the technical review for the designation of the Urban Area in accordance with the locational criteria set out in the policies of the ROP (Sections 2.B.3 (i) and 2.B.3 (j)).

Accommodating forecasted growth is a key intention of the Growth Plan: “This Plan is about accommodating forecasted growth in complete communities” (Section 2.1). Further, “The population and employment forecast and plan horizon contained in the upper-tier official plan that is approved and in effect as of July 1, 2017 will apply to all planning matters in that municipality...” (5.2.4.3). Completing this planning exercise of delineating the Urban Area as provided by 2.B.3 (i) and (j) is a key component of the Region being able to achieve its growth forecasts that were in effect as of July 1, 2017.

Although this process is not a settlement boundary expansion under the Growth Plan, consideration has been given to the Growth Plan criteria for the appropriate location and extent of the Urban Area to be designated, including:

- a) whether there are existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities to support complete communities;
- b) infrastructure and public service facilities will be financially viable;
- c) alignment with a water/wastewater master plan;
- d) alignment with a stormwater master plan;
e) watershed planning demonstrates there are no negative impacts on water quality and quantity;
f) key hydrologic areas and the Province’s Natural Heritage System are avoided where possible;
g) water and wastewater treatment capacity is addressed in a fiscally and environmentally sustainable manner;
h) prime agricultural areas are avoided and impacts to the Agricultural System are minimized, through preparation of an agricultural impact assessment;
i) compliance with minimum distance separation formulae;
j) adverse impacts on agricultural operations and the agri-food network are avoided or minimized/mitigated;
k) the policies of wise use and management of resources and protecting public health and safety of the PPS are applied; and
l) requirements of any other provincial plans and source protection plans.

Consideration has been given to these criteria in the identification of Urban Area designation options and the evaluation of the options, as discussed in Sections 3 and 4 of this Report, respectively.

2.1.4 EMPLOYMENT AREAS

The policies of Section 2.2.5 of the 2017 Growth Plan provide requirements for the planning of employment areas. While the implementation of policies 2.B.3 (i) and (j) of the ROP are principally intended to designate new residential areas and associated uses, the policies of Section 2.2.5 of the 2017 Growth Plan are considered because the policies of the ROP also enables the reconfiguration of the Prime Industrial / Strategic Reserve area to better integrate with the lands to be designated Urban Area in the north part of the City of Cambridge, in accordance with the criteria of the ROP (2.B.3 (j) (iv) and (v)).

The Growth Plan only permits conversion of employment areas to non-employment uses through a municipal comprehensive (2.2.5.9 and 2.2.5.10). The reconfiguration of the employment lands provided for by ROP policy 2.B.3 (j)(iv) is not an employment conversion. The ROP policies that expressly permit the reconfiguration were established through the approval of the ROP in 2015 and through this approval were deemed not to be an employment conversion.

The Growth Plan also generally promotes more efficient use of employment areas, the availability of sufficiently sized land to accommodate a range of employment uses, providing for transit-supportive employment areas, and other principles. The reconfiguration of employment lands as may be proposed through this process is supportive of these relevant principles and directions of the 2017 Growth Plan.

2.1.5 GROWTH-SUPPORTIVE INFRASTRUCTURE

The 2017 Growth Plan intends for a coordinated and integrated approach to land use planning and infrastructure (Section 3.2.1), to identify appropriate options for
sustainably accommodating forecasted growth and achieving complete communities. This includes identifying full life cycle costs of infrastructure and identification of options to pay for these costs. As such, development within municipalities is expected to ensure the optimization of existing infrastructure systems by planning for more compact built forms.

Similarly, transportation, land use planning and transportation investment are to be coordinated (Section 3.2.2). There is an overall intent to achieve a balance of transportation modes to reduce automobile reliance, to take a complete streets approach to transportation infrastructure and to provide for transportation demand management approaches. Transit is a priority for transportation infrastructure as well as the provision of active transportation (Section 3.2.3).

Water and wastewater systems are to be planned for optimization, fiscal feasibility, improved efficiency including conservation and demand management and to support future growth in accordance with minimum intensification and density targets (Section 3.2.6).

Stormwater management is to be addressed through master plans or equivalent processes to protect the quality and quantity of water. Stormwater management planning is to be based on watershed planning and an understanding of environmental conditions (Section 3.2.7). Large-scale development including secondary plans are to be supported by a stormwater management plan or equivalent which is informed by a subwatershed plan and considers integrated treatment approaches, low impact development and green infrastructure as well as practices to minimize impacts. This process, which has been informed by the Subwatershed Studies for the Randall and Breslau drains, will include development of the Master Drainage Plan in conjunction with the Secondary Plan for lands in Cambridge and future planning applications in Breslau.

Public service facilities, including health, social, recreation, fire/police and education services, are to be coordinated with land use planning and planned for cost effectiveness and to promote community hubs (Section 3.2.8).

These policies will be achieved principally through the completion of the Master Environmental Servicing Plan in support of the urban area designation and Secondary Plan process. This includes an assessment of water and wastewater servicing alternatives to ensure optimization and efficiency; development of a Master Drainage Plan to ensure the protection of water quality and quantity (and informed by the Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains); as well as the Transportation Assessment, which sets out consideration for complete streets, transit and other considerations. Consideration for public service facilities is a matter to be addressed by the Secondary Plan as well as development approvals processes through the identification of needs for these services, policy guidance for identifying appropriate locations for these services, and policies to promote community hubs.
2.1.6 PROTECTING RESOURCES

The 2017 Growth Plan provides direction to protecting resources. Watershed planning is required to ensure the appropriate protection, restoration or enhancement of water quality and quantity (Section 4.2.1). A system of public parkland, open space, trails are encouraged to be identified within settlement areas and inclusive of urban agriculture (Section 4.2.5). Cultural heritage resources are to be conserved (Section 4.2.7) and policies are to be integrated in Official Plans to promote water conservation, energy conservation, air quality improvement and effective waste management (Section 4.2.8). Policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and climate change considerations are also to be developed (Section 4.2.10).

The Subwatershed Study establishes the development constraints and informs the evaluation for the preferred Urban Area as presented in Section 4. Further, the development of Secondary Plan policies provides an opportunity to support implementation of the Subwatershed Study, identify cultural heritage protection policies and related matters. The Subwatershed Study is discussed in Section 2.6.2.

2.1.7 NATURAL HERITAGE SYSTEM

Section 4.2.2 of the 2017 Growth Plan establishes the Province’s Natural Heritage System, which is mapped by the Province and intended to be implemented by municipalities. The Natural Heritage System map, as accessed online, is shown in Figures 3 and 4. There are portions of the Natural Heritage System that are located within the Stage 2 Lands.

The Natural Heritage System is to be incorporated as an overlay in Official Plans, with policies to protect, maintain, restore or enhance the diversity and connectivity of the system as well as the long-term ecological or hydrologic functions of its features (4.2.2.2). The natural heritage system mapping is intended to exclude lands within settlement area boundaries that were approved and in effect as of July 1, 2017.

In accordance with 4.2.2.3, within the Natural Heritage System, it is intended that:

a) there are no negative impacts to key natural heritage features or key hydrologic features and their functions;
b) connectivity along the system between these features located within 240 m of each other are maintained or where possible enhanced for movement of plants and animals;
c) removal of other features is avoided where possible;
d) the disturbed area including buildings and structures will not exceed 25% of the total developable area and the impervious surface does not exceed 10% of the total developable area; and

e) at least 30% of the total developable area will be returned to natural self-sustaining vegetation.
The settlement area was expanded as an outcome of the completed municipal comprehensive review of the ROP, resulting in the identification of an area where the Urban Area will be designated in detail as part of this process and in accordance with the policies of 2.8.3 (i) and (j) of the ROP. The potential areas that are being contemplated for the Urban Area designation includes some areas that have been more recently designated as part of the Natural Heritage System including some lands in the vicinity of Riverbank Drive and the Grand River, as well as areas in proximity to Speedsville Road and west of Fountain Street near Breslau (refer to Figures 3 and 4).

The specific designation of the Urban Area should therefore support implementation of policy 4.2.2.7 c) in particular, to protect, maintain, restore or enhance the natural features and areas. This will be done through the completion of the Subwatershed Study as discussed in this report. The Subwatershed Study will also inform the basis for the detailed delineation of a natural heritage system in the ROP and implementation in the local Official Plans. The Growth Plan only provides opportunity to refinements to be made to the natural heritage system through a municipal comprehensive review (Section 4.2.2.5), which is not being undertaken through this process.

![Figure 3: Provincial Natural Heritage System in Southerly Stage 2 Lands (Cambridge)](image-url)
2.1.8 AGRICULTURAL SYSTEM

In accordance with Section 4.2.6 of the 2017 Growth Plan, the Province has developed an Agricultural System map for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, which is implemented by the policies of the Growth Plan. Mapping was released on February 9, 2017. This includes delineation of prime agricultural areas which are designated by this mapping and are intended for the long-term protection of the agricultural areas. This mapping may be refined or augmented through a municipal comprehensive review (4.2.6).

Most of the Stage 2 Lands appear to be included within the Province’s Agricultural System (Figure 5). The southwesterly portion of the Stage 2 Lands adjacent to Breslau is not designated Prime Agricultural Area. The Region’s existing Urban Area is identified as Settlement Area in Figure 5, and the Airport and adjacent lands are shown as Employment Area in Figure 5.

Consideration for the Agricultural System is also noted as a criterion when considering the appropriate location and feasibility of Urban Area expansions under Section 2.2.8.3 (h). As noted, this process does not represent a settlement area expansion. Under the policies of Section 2.B.3 (i) and (j) of the ROP, the location of the proposed Urban Area designation has been determined through the previous municipal comprehensive review, and the establishment of a Countryside Line. It is now subject to more detailed mapping to determine the most appropriate location and extent in accordance with the
ROP. 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 Region, in collaboration with Township of Woolwich and City of Cambridge staff, has conducted an Agricultural Review, which is summarized in the evaluation of options (Section 4).

![Provincial Agricultural Land Base Map](image)

**Figure 5: Provincial Agricultural Land Base Map**

**2.1.9 GROWTH PLAN FOR THE GREATER GOLDEN HORSESHOE, 2017 - SUMMARY**

Based on the consideration of the policies presented above, the delineation of the Urban Area as proposed through this report will need to conform to or not conflict with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2017.
2.2 PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT, 2014

The Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 (PPS) came into effect on April 30th, 2014 and replaces the previous PPS 2005. The PPS is issued under the authority of Section 3 of the Planning Act and provides direction on key Provincial interests related to land use planning and development in Ontario.

The PPS represents the Province’s vision for community building in Ontario. The document provides policy direction related to three key themes:

a) Building Strong Healthy Communities (Section 1.0), to promote efficient land use and development patterns; promote strong, liveable, healthy, and resilient communities; and ensure appropriate opportunities for employment and residential development.

b) The Wise Use and Management of Resources (Section 2.0), to protect natural heritage, water, agricultural, mineral and cultural heritage and archaeological resources for their economic, environmental and social benefits.

c) Protecting Public Health and Safety (Section 3.0), to reduce the potential for public cost or risk to Ontario’s residents from natural or human-made hazards.

It will be important to ensure that the proposed Urban Area designation and land use concept is consistent with the policies of the 2014 PPS. The following subsections highlight relevant policies regarding the designation of the Urban Area and determination of land use.

2.2.1 SETTLEMENT AREAS

The 2014 PPS promotes more compact, efficient settlement areas. Land use patterns within settlement areas are to be based on more compact built forms, higher densities and mix of land uses (1.1.3.2). Development in designated growth areas should occur adjacent to the built-up area and are to take a compact built form with a mix of uses, densities that allow for efficient use of land, and the provision of infrastructure and public services (1.1.3.5). Compact development, use of active transportation and related principles also support energy conservation, improved air quality, reduced gas emissions and climate change adaption policies (1.8).

The policies of Section 1.1.3.8 apply to the expansion of settlement areas which may only occur at the time of a comprehensive review of the Official Plan, and in accordance with criteria. The process of delineating the Urban Area is an outcome of the previous comprehensive review of the Official Plan, where the settlement area expansion has previously occurred through the identification of ROP policies which now direct the maximum size, general permitted uses and general location of the Urban Area. Accordingly, this process is not subject to the policies of Section 1.1.3.8. The ROP policies related to these PPS policies are contained in Section 2.B.3 (a) through (g),
which require that settlement area expansions in the Region be subject to a municipal comprehensive review under the ROP.

Section 1.4 encourages an appropriate range and mix of housing types and densities. This includes promoting densities for new housing which efficiently use land, resources, infrastructure and support active transportation (1.4.3 d.).

Section 1.5 promotes healthy, active communities to facilitate active transportation and recreation facilities.

Section 1.6 promotes coordinated, efficient and cost-effective infrastructure which considers climate change. Coordination is to occur to ensure financial viability and availability of infrastructure to meet needs (1.6.1). Sewage, water and stormwater infrastructure is to first accommodate efficient use and optimization of existing systems (1.6.6.1 a.) and ensure that the systems are feasible, financial viable and complies with regulatory requirements (1.6.6.1 b.). Water conservation and use is to be promoted (1.6.6.1 c.). Servicing and land use considerations are to be integrated at all stages of the planning process (1.6.6.1 e.). Further, stormwater management planning is to minimize or prevent increases in contaminant loads, minimize changes in water balance and erosion, not increase risks to human health and safety, maximize vegetative and pervious surfaces and promote stormwater management best practices (1.6.6.7).

Section 1.6.7 promotes safe, efficient transportation systems which also minimize vehicle trips and that transportation is considered at all stages of the planning process. The long-term operation and role of airports and rail facilities are to be protected and buffering/compatibility is to be addressed (1.6.9.1). Airports are to be protected from incompatible land uses by prohibiting residential development and sensitive land uses above 30 NEF/NEP and discouraging land uses which may pose an aviation safety hazard (1.6.9.2). This would include consideration for the current NEF/NEP contours as well as the projected 2035 contours as discussed in Section 2.6.1.

These principles will need to be appropriately reflected through this process. The determination of the Urban Area should be contiguous with the existing urban area, and represent an appropriate opportunity for development of a complete community. These planning principles have been integrated as evaluation criteria, presented in Section 3 of this Report, to ensure the recommended Urban Area designation is consistent with these policies of the PPS.

2.2.2 GROWTH PLANNING

It is a key intent of the PPS to ensure that the Region is effectively planning for and accommodating forecasted growth over a period of 20 years. Section 1.1.2 of the PPS requires that “Sufficient land shall be made available to accommodate an appropriate range and mix of land uses to meet projected needs for a time horizon of up to 20 years.” In order to be consistent with the PPS, it is critical for this planning process of delineating the Urban Area to proceed to a conclusion. The implementation of Section 2.B.3 (i) and (j) of the ROP is required for the Region to be able to accommodate growth
to 2031. These policies form a component of the overall growth management strategy for the Region and are a part of how the currently approved ROP satisfies Section 1.1.2 of the PPS.

2.2.3 MANAGING RESOURCES

The PPS intends for the protection of natural features and areas and linkages are to be maintained to promote the diversity and connectivity of natural features and water features (Section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2). The PPS requires identification of natural heritage systems (Section 2.1.3). Further, there are policies to prohibit development and site alteration in defined significant features and adjacent lands in accordance with the policies (Section 2.1.4 - 2.1.8). Municipalities are to protect, improve or restore quality and quantity of water resources through watershed planning, minimizing impacts, identifying water resource systems, maintaining linkages and other considerations (Section 2.2.1). Development in or near sensitive surface and groundwater features is to be restricted (Section 2.2.2).

Section 2.6 intends for the conservation of built heritage and cultural heritage landscapes to be conserved. Development and site alteration is not permitted in areas containing archaeological resources or potential unless the significant archaeological resources have been conserved.

The Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains provides the basis for protecting these important features, as required by the PPS. The Subwatershed Study forms the basis for more detailed policy and development application review to ensure features will be protected and forms a component of determining the appropriate location of the recommended Urban Area.

2.2.4 PROTECTING PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

The PPS provides for the protection of public health and safety by directing development to areas outside of hazardous lands and sites (Section 3.1.1). The impacts of climate change are to be considered (Section 3.1.3).

Similarly, the Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains identifies certain features considered to be hazardous, though there could be other areas. The Subwatershed study, development application process and Secondary Plan will ensure that these policies will be met.

2.2.5 PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT – SUMMARY

Based on the consideration of the policies presented above, the designation of the Urban Area as proposed through this report will need to be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.
2.3 REGION OF WATERLOO OFFICIAL PLAN

The Regional Official Plan (ROP) represents the policy basis and reason for initiating the Stage 2 Lands MESP and Secondary Plan. The ROP was adopted by Regional Council in June 2009 and approved by Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing with modifications in December 2010. Following this, the ROP was appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) (now the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal) in its entirety. Decisions resulting from the OMB hearings ultimately approved modifications to the ROP that established a framework for the designation of new Urban Area lands within portions of the Stage 2 Lands to meet population growth needs to 2031. The ROP came into full effect following OMB approval in June 2015.

2.3.1 STAGE 2 LANDS CONTEXT

Currently, the Stage 2 Lands are outside of the Region’s Urban Area but are within the Countryside Line (Figures 6 and 7). The Countryside Line represents the long-term boundary between the existing Urban Area and the Countryside.

The designation of up to 170 hectares of Urban Area within portions of the Stage 2 Lands is specifically contemplated under Section 2.B.3 of the ROP. These policies are an outcome of the Region’s comprehensive Official Plan review. Through the approval of the ROP, forecasted growth was intended to be accommodated through the lands mapped as Urban Area as well as the policies providing for the final designation of 170 hectares of land to be designated Urban Area. The policies provide other guidance about the configuration and location of up to 170 hectares. There is now a need to implement these policies through the specific designation of the Urban Area for up to 170 hectares. This Urban Area designation is required for the Region to accommodate planned growth within the 2031 planning horizon.

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:

a) 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,

b) 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 finalize the location of up to 170 hectares of Urban Area, supporting work is required in accordance with 2.B.3 (g) and 2.B.3 (h) of the ROP, as follows:

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;

It is the intent of the Stage 2 Lands MESP and Secondary Plan process including this Planning Rationale Report to fulfill these requirements. The Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains, discussed in Section 2.4.5, is intended to fulfill the requirement of 2.B.3 (g). A land use planning process including public consultation is being undertaken, inclusive of this report, in accordance with Section 2.B.3 (h). The planning process has included:

1. The Stage 2 Lands MESP and Secondary Plan process has included four public consultation events to date:
   a. The first public meeting was held on June 16, 2016 to present the purpose of the Stage 2 Lands MESP and Secondary Plan and background review conducted.
   b. The second public consultation centre was held on December 5, 2016 to present the Draft Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains.
   c. The third public consultation centre was held on November 2, 2017 to present options for the Urban Area designation as well as land use, and the criteria developed to assess the options.
   d. The fourth public consultation centre was held on March 20, 2018 to present evaluation criteria and a draft preferred Urban Area designation and land use concept.

2. This Planning Rationale Report provides the opinion for the guiding policy, identification and analysis of options and the justification and recommendations for the preferred Urban Area designation. This report addresses the appropriate development densities and general mix and location of land uses that are appropriate. This report has been developed with input from the Region of Waterloo, the City of Cambridge, Township of Woolwich and the Grand River Conservation Authority.

3. A Statutory Public Meeting in accordance with the Planning Act occurred on May 1, 2018 to obtain formal input on the proposed ROP Amendment to designate the Urban Area.

4. Following the Statutory Public Meeting, this Planning Rationale Report has been finalized to consider public input. Input received along with a response to comments made prior to and at the Statutory Public Meeting is attached to this report as Appendix A.

Other criteria and policies apply regarding the use, location and designation of this Urban Area, as discussed further in Section 3.1.
Figure 6: Excerpt from ROP Map 3a – Urban Area
2.3.2 OTHER APPLICABLE POLICIES

In addition to setting out the framework for the specific designation of Urban Area in portions of the Stage 2 Lands, the ROP provides other relevant policies that guide land use, development and community planning which are applicable to this analysis.

Section 1.B of the ROP sets forth a vision for the Region that is based on the themes of sustainability and livability. Sustainability means maintaining, enhancing and restoring the natural environment as well as developing complete communities which have a sense of place and encourage inclusion and healthy living. Livability means designing communities for residents at all stages of life, with easy access to different destinations. It also refers to creating a compact, mixed-use community with a sense of character and place. This vision is supplemented by various policies regarding the creation of communities within the Region, which are contemplated by the evaluation criteria selected within this Study and reflected in the preferred concept which will recommend land uses for the Stage 2 Lands.

Section 2.D.1 outlines general development policies to ensure that development of the Urban Area contributes to achieving a wide range of objectives. Development is to contribute to creating complete communities with development patterns, densities and land use mix that supports walking, cycling and transit (2.D.1 (c)). Development is to be
serviced by municipal drinking water and wastewater systems (2.D.1 (b)). Development is to protect the natural environment, surface water and water resources (2.D.1 (d)) and is to conserve cultural heritage resources (2.D.1 (e)). Development is also to facilitate residents’ access to locally grown and other healthy foods (2.D.1 (g)) and the Region is to promote building designs and orientations that incorporate energy conservation features and alternative/renewable energy (2.D.1 (h)).

Furthermore, the policies of Sections 2.D.16 through 2.D.20 are applicable to urban designated greenfield areas. Once the Urban Area is designated, the lands will be identified by the ROP as urban designated greenfield area. Under Section 2.D.17 (b), these areas are to be developed to achieve at least 55 residents and jobs combined per hectare, which is to be measured on average over the various urban designated greenfield areas of the Region (exclusive of only provincially constrained environmental areas). Further, networks of sidewalks, community trails, bicycle pathways and linkages to transit and community facilities are to be created (2.D.17 (c)).

Policies 2.D.21 through 2.D.27 are applicable to Prime Industrial / Strategic Reserve (PISR) Areas. These policies are relevant since Section 2.B.3 (j) provides for reconfiguration of the PISR. The PISR areas are designated on Map 3a and are intended to accommodate fully serviced employment and ancillary uses that are generally developed as parcels greater than eight hectares in size (2.D.22). The PISR lands south of the Stage 2 Lands were addressed through the Stage 1 Lands MESP and Community Plan process, discussed in Section 2.6.4.

Section 2.G provides additional general policies for urban development. This includes policies regarding land use compatibility, such as policies for reviewing development applications in proximity to Regional roads, railways and other sources (2.G.13 – 2.G.14). Within the vicinity of the Region of Waterloo International Airport, development for residential uses or other sensitive land uses is not permitted above the 30 Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) (2.G.17 (a)). Noise attenuation or appropriate warning will be required for development within areas between 25 and 30 NEF (2.G.17 (b)). These policies are applicable to both the current NEF contours as well as future projections, as discussed in section 2.6.1 of this report.

Section 3 of the ROP identifies policies that support liveability in the Region, addressing a wide range of matters:

1. Facilitating an appropriate range of housing to satisfy current and future needs (3.A.2);
2. The provision of facilities to encourage walking and cycling (3.B.2 and 3.B.3);
3. Facilitating transportation demand management initiatives to reduce automobile dependency (3.C.1);
4. Promoting energy conservation through more compact development, alternative transportation modes, and other means (3.D.1);
5. Providing access to locally grown food, such as promoting farmers’ markets and community gardens (3.F.2 and 3.F.3);
6. Ensuring that cultural heritage resources are conserved in accordance with legislation (3.G.1) and through completion of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments as part of development, where appropriate (3.G.13); and

7. Ensuring that archaeological resources are considered by requiring archaeological assessments as part of development where appropriate (3.G.9).

Chapter 5 provides guidance for infrastructure. The policies of Section 5.A support some of the broad transportation planning objectives through more detailed mechanisms. Under Section 5.A.20, it is intended that planning near the Waterloo Region International Airport will ensure that the economic role of the Airport will be supported and the airport be protected from development that would preclude its expansion or continued operation including addressing compatibility and aviation hazards. The policies of Section 5.B and 5.C address wastewater and water servicing, and it is intended that the extension of municipal services are the priority for servicing new development.

Chapter 7 includes policies for the Region’s Greenlands Network, which consists of environmental features and linkages. This includes Landscape Level Systems, Core Environmental Features and Supporting Environmental Features, which are supported by detailed policies to ensure these features are protected or enhanced as appropriate. Watershed studies are required prior to adopting official plan amendments which permit significant areas of development (7.F.3), and the policies of Section 7.F.4 outlines the requirement for watershed studies. The Subwatershed Study completed as part of the Stage 2 Lands MESP and Secondary Plan process addresses these requirements.

Furthermore, Chapter 8 identifies policies to guide source water protection, which is important in Waterloo Region, since the Region relies almost exclusively on groundwater for drinking water. The Plan designates Source Water Protection Areas (8.A.1) and there are policies to guide land use and development applications within these areas.

2.4 CITY OF CAMBRIDGE OFFICIAL PLAN

The Official Plan for the City of Cambridge (City OP) was adopted in May 2012, and approved by the Region in November 2012, with modifications and deferrals. Portions of the Plan were appealed, with modifications made by the OMB in April 2014. However, certain portions continue to be under appeal.

The southern portion of the Stage 2 Lands are located within the City of Cambridge and subject to the City OP. Currently, the Stage 2 Lands in the City of Cambridge are designated principally for rural, rural residential and agricultural uses. Since the intent of this process is to designate a portion of the Stage 2 Lands as Urban Area, consideration must be made to the City’s current policy framework guiding the development of a Secondary Plan for these lands.

Policies regarding Designated Greenfield Areas will be applicable to the Stage 2 Lands once portions of the Stage 2 Lands are included in the Urban Area. The policies support
the creation of complete communities, natural heritage protection and restoration, integration with existing communities, active transportation, transit and a mix of land uses. Furthermore, new growth is to be directed where municipal services are available (Section 2.1.2).

It is the intent of the City OP that Community Plans or Secondary Plans be prepared for new communities within the Designated Greenfield Areas (Section 2.2.5). The policies of Section 10.2 outline considerations and content for Secondary Plans, including the need to address: land use pattern; population and employment projections; housing types and densities; development phasing; supportive commercial and institutional uses; provision of trails, parks and open space; natural features; cultural heritage; transportation network; and, opportunities for mixed use and higher density development.

The portion of the Stage 2 Lands within Cambridge contains various environmental features identified in the City OP. These lands contain Core Environmental Features and a watercourse which runs along the western boundary (Map 9), a Regulatory Storm Floodplain (Map 10, under appeal) and Wellhead Protection Areas and Surface Water Intake Protection Zones (Map 15). Buffer widths from Core Environmental Features are to be a minimum of 10 metres, or greater if warranted through an Environmental Impact Statement (Section 3.A.3.8). The Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains, which has been prepared through this MESP process, will inform the appropriate delineation of protected features and supportive policy.

Section 5.2.1 states that the design of the built environment will promote sustainable, healthy, active living through walkable neighbourhoods that offer a mix of uses and range and variety of housing types with convenient access to public transit. To promote walkability and active transportation, the City will support the integration of pedestrian and cycling facilities into existing and new development areas (Section 5.2.2). The Trails Master Plan and Bikeway Network Plan serve as the standard for the future planning and development of an integrated trail system, which shall further promote walkability (Section 7.1.5). In terms of transit, it should be noted that Section 2.5.4 requires consideration to be given to the early introduction of transit service within communities; however, there are no existing or planned transit corridors within the Stage 2 Lands (Map 7b). Consideration should be given to the available connections to the active transportation network outside of the Stage 2 Lands.

Development which would threaten the operation of the Waterloo Region International Airport is not permitted (Section 6.14.2). More specifically, new residential development or other sensitive land uses will not be permitted in areas above 30 Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF), including the existing 30 NEF and proposed 2035 30 NEF contours, and appropriate measures must be taken for areas between 25 – 30 NEF (Section 3.B.6.2.3.9). There is a need to ensure that development will be suitable and compatible where it is proposed near the Airport.

The City of Cambridge Official Plan recognizes the Grand River as a Canadian Heritage River and intends for the City to cooperate with the Region and GRCA to conserve,
manage and enhance the river’s natural, cultural, recreational, scenic and ecological features (Section 4.8.7). Development adjacent to the Grand River may require a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment to determine impact on views, vistas and cultural heritage significance (Section 4.8.8).

Section 4.14 provides policies regarding Scenic Heritage Roads. It is intended that the City will establish policies to protect scenic heritage roads. The City recognizes the need for appropriate design in proximity to scenic heritage roads (Section 6.2.2). The City’s Cultural Heritage Master Plan (June 2008) identifies Riverbank Drive as a Scenic Route, which offers a range of views of farmland, woods, creeks and historic buildings, as well as vistas of the river. The City’s Cultural Heritage Master Plan recognizes Riverbank Drive is under development pressure but states that the area “should be preserved.” The City’s Cultural Heritage Master Plan also states the routes are “to be considered for conservation.”

2.5 TOWNSHIP OF WOOLWICH OFFICIAL PLAN

The Township of Woolwich Official Plan (July 31, 2012 Office Consolidation) was adopted in October 2000 and approved by the Region in May 2002. The Township’s Official Plan (Township OP) establishes a vision for the Township (Section 4.1), referencing its distinct, rural and small town character, with a diverse, prosperous and thriving economy and healthy and sustainable environment. The majority of growth is to be concentrated within the Urban Areas.

Currently, the Stage 2 Lands are planned for rural/agricultural uses by the Township OP. Once the Regional Official Plan Amendment to designate the Urban Area is complete, it is anticipated the Township will integrate these lands within the Breslau Settlement Area through future amendment(s) to the Township’s Official Plan.

Section 4.1 of the Township OP outlines the Township’s values for settlement development, which includes a moderate rate of well-planned, compatible new development on appropriate services; the close proximity of communities to natural areas and parks; the ability to walk or cycle to daily destinations; a range of housing in terms of form and affordability; a balance between residential and industrial development; and, a range of services and retail available within the community to meet the daily needs of residents.

The nature and rate of residential growth within Settlement Areas is to take place in accordance with the policies within each Settlement Area, in this case Section 7.16 – Breslau Settlement Area, as well as being subject to other policies of the Township OP and the ROP. Chapter 9 provides policies for establishing a broad range of housing types to meet the needs of existing and future residents while protecting agricultural lands and natural resources. The Township’s policies encourage non-farm related residential development within established settlement areas to promote the efficient use of land, resources, infrastructure and public service facilities; avoid the need for unnecessary or uneconomical expansion of infrastructure; and encourage development
appropriate to the type of wastewater and water systems, which are planned or available.

Chapter 10 provides policies for open space, and recognizes the importance of parks, open space and other recreational facilities to create recreational opportunities for residents. The Township supports a linked network for green space, open space and trails. Parkland and open space is acquired and protected through various tools in accordance with Section 1.2.

Chapter 13 provides policies for environmental stewardship. The protection and stewardship of environmental features and functions is considered to be a high priority for the Township. Section 13.15 provides policies for watershed planning, and the Township’s participation in watershed studies. The policies of Chapter 16 for utility infrastructure further promote environmental stewardship. These policies address water, wastewater, waste management and storm water management, with their overall intent aiming to promote practices and technologies that protect the environment.

Chapter 15 provides policies for transportation. This section includes policies for the Airport (Section 15.3), which speak to monitoring further development of the Airport for impacts and protecting the operations of the Airport. The transportation policies also include direction for planning around railways, relevant to the CN/GO Rail Line along the northern boundary of the Stage 2 Lands. Section 15.2.2 requires berms, setbacks, screening or fencing, safety and noise attenuation features for development abutting the railway right-of-way, guided by policies of the ROP in this regard.

The Breslau Settlement Plan (approved in 2017), completed as an amendment to the Township’s OP (under Section 7.16), provides more detailed policy to guide development within the community of Breslau. The community of Breslau is the second largest settlement area in the Township. The Breslau Settlement Area is envisioned as a complete community, providing for a full range of housing types, land uses, focused around an established community centre. The Plan identifies detailed policy to guide land use and development, including a vision and principles; a strategy for staging and rate of growth and development; policies to support protection of the environment, source water, and cultural heritage resources; policies for sustainable design and community design; the provision of a mix of uses and housing types; policies to guide employment and economic development opportunities; policies for servicing and transportation; and policies to support the Plan’s implementation.

As noted, the ROP contemplates the designation of up to 55 hectares of Urban Area within the Stage 2 Lands located west of Fountain Street North and north of the Ottawa Street extension, adjacent to the Breslau Settlement Area. The intent of the Stage 2 Lands MESP process is to identify the Urban Area designation through a Regional Official Plan Amendment. It is anticipated that the Township will process Official Plan Amendment applications to implement the ROP Amendment once this process is complete, and incorporate the areas designated as Urban Area into the Breslau Settlement Plan.
2.6 OTHER RELEVANT STUDIES AND INITIATIVES

2.6.1 REGION OF WATERLOO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT MASTER PLAN, 2017

The Region of Waterloo International Airport is adjacent to portions of the Stage 2 Lands. The Airport is subject to federal regulation. Lands in proximity to the Airport are subject to requirements that ensure land uses are compatible with Airport operations and will not result in safety hazards. Sensitive land uses are not permitted to be located in close proximity to high noise exposure forecasts in accordance with the ROP. Additionally, as identified within previous Sections of this Report, the ROP, City OP, and Township OP contain policies to ensure that the Airport can continue to operate and expand as planned over the long term.

To ensure the protection of the Airport and identify future expansion opportunities, the Region approved a new Airport Master Plan for the Region of Waterloo International Airport in April 2017. The document identifies potential lands that are considered unsuitable for sensitive land uses (e.g. residential) due to airport noise. Lands included within the Airport Reserve Area, as illustrated in the Plan and shown in Figure 8, are intended to be developed for employment and airport supportive uses, to ensure land use compatibility and protect the long-term ability for the Airport to expand, as contemplated by the Airport Master Plan. The land use options considered within this report will need to consider the Airport Master Plan along with the applicable policies of the ROP and local Official Plans, which support compatibility with the Airport and also support the long-term protection of the Airport’s ability to expand over time.
To ensure land use compatibility between the Airport and future development, the Airport Master Plan identifies projected noise in areas close to the Airport. Figure 9 illustrates the 2035 Noise Exposure Projection (NEP) contours compared with the current 2000 NEP contours. Development for sensitive land uses including residential is not permitted above the 30 NEP contour, including the current 30 NEP contour and the proposed 2035 30 NEP contour. The land use options and preferred land uses and Urban Area designation will need to meet this requirement.

Further, to ensure that there are no obstacles that could obstruct airspace in the vicinity of the Airport, Transport Canada may develop and enact Airport Zoning Regulations. The current applicable Airport Zoning Regulation is registration number SOR/2006-78, which was established on April 30, 2003. The Airport Zoning Regulation, according to the Airport Master Plan, is limited to protecting airspace of the existing runway configuration at its existing runway lengths. The Airport Master Plan recommends that the Airport Zoning Regulations will need to be amended, which will require a federal process. There is a need to ensure that the Urban Area and planned building heights and built form are consistent with the Airport Zoning Regulations, and that proposed...
building heights will not inhibit or interfere with current and future operation of the Airport.

Figure 9: Region of Waterloo International Airport Master Plan – Noise Exposure Projection (NEP) Contours (2000 and 2035)

2.6.2 CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE COLLECTOR ROAD

A Municipal Class Environmental Assessment for a new collector road and related sanitary infrastructure in the North Cambridge Business Park was completed in June 2017, resulting in identification of a future planned collector road connecting Maple Grove Road to Middle Block Road. The alignment and improvements shown in Figure 10 are complete and now approved through the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process. As the proposed works are located south of the Stage 2 Lands, the preferred works represent an opportunity for water/wastewater infrastructure and transportation connectivity.
2.6.3 EAST SIDE LANDS SANITARY SERVICING CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, 2017

The Region initiated a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Schedule “B” process) in 2013 to investigate a preferred sanitary solution to support future servicing of the East Side Lands. This project involves consideration of a range of options to provide sanitary servicing capacity to support future development of the East Side Lands. The complete Environmental Study Report (ESR) was available for public review from December 18, 2017 to February 28, 2018.
Based on analysis of pipeline routes and conveyance methodologies, the proposed preferred alternative has been identified as gravity sewers without the need for a pumping station. The gravity sewer begins at a location north of Freeport Creek, is aligned through the Deer Ridge subdivision, and ends at the inlet of the Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant. A dedicated bridge for the sewer pipe is proposed to cross above the Grand River. Figure 11 illustrates the preferred alignment of the sanitary sewer. The connection will provide for access to long-term sanitary servicing treatment capacity for the East Side Lands, including the Stage 2 Lands.

Figure 11: Preferred Alternative for the East Side Lands Sanitary Servicing Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

2.6.4 STAGE 1 MESP AND COMMUNITY PLAN, 2014

The Stage 1 MESP and Community Plan process identified infrastructure to support future development of employment uses in the North Cambridge Business Park, located just south of the Stage 2 Lands (Figure 9). The Community Plan provided a framework for land use and community design and recommended implementation of an Official Plan Amendment.

The Stage 1 Lands are located within the City of Cambridge and City of Kitchener. All of the Stage 1 Lands located within the City of Cambridge are designated in the ROP as “Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve” (PISR). The PISR is located within the Urban Area of the ROP. The policies of Section 2.D.21 through 2.D.27 of the ROP apply to PISR.
areas. The purpose of this designation is to ensure an adequate supply of industrial land is available in the Region for new large-lot manufacturing or business park land uses serviced by municipal water and wastewater systems. As such, the purpose of the Community Plan was to plan for the development of large lot employment uses effectively and sensitively integrating with existing developments and the natural environment framework.

The community plan concept identifies approximately 300 hectares of potentially developable land to accommodate approximately 7,700 employees (Figure 12). Permitted land uses within these developable areas allow for a range of large-lot employment uses. Transition zones were identified in areas of land use sensitivity to ensure compatibility between the community plan concept and existing adjacent residential land uses.

![Figure 12: Community Concept Plan for the Stage 1 Lands](image)

It is noted that in accordance with Section 2.B.3(j) of the ROP, consideration may be made to reconfigure the 300 hectares of PISR lands to better integrate future development of the Stage 2 Lands through this study process. Where such reconfiguration of the PISR lands is undertaken, it must not result in an increase in either PISR lands or the amount of Urban Area permitted through the policies of ROP Section 2.B.3 (j).

### 2.6.5 SUBWATERSHED STUDY FOR THE RANDALL AND BRESLAU DRAINS

The Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains have been prepared in conjunction with this overall study process. As noted, a subwatershed study is required
as contemplated under Section 2.B.3 of the ROP. The Subwatershed Study, as referred throughout this report, is inclusive of an Addendum, which addresses some additional lands (west of Riverbank Drive) which were not initially included in the initial main Subwatershed Study Report.

The key purpose of the Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains is to identify constraints to development within the Stage 2 Lands. This includes natural heritage features, such as woodlands, wetlands, wildlife and fish habitat, valleylands and other features. The Subwatershed Study also recommends development setbacks and buffers to support protection of these features. The Subwatershed Study further identifies hazardous lands which are not suitable for development, such as floodplains and erosion hazards. The Subwatershed Study inventories and assesses the relationships between ground water, surface water and natural features and their functions. It is intended that any constraints identified as part of the Subwatershed Study may be further refined through more specific Environmental Impact Studies as will be required in support of any future development applications. Figure 13 illustrates the constraints recommended in the Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains (which would be subject to confirmation through more detailed assessments):

- Figure 13A illustrates constraints within the Stage 2 Lands, per the Subwatershed Study; and
- Figure 13B illustrates constraints within the Stage 2 Addendum Area Lands, per the Subwatershed Study Addendum.

The Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains provides an important consideration for identifying and evaluating land use options. The recommended constraints and setbacks inform the identification of suitable development blocks as well as the feasibility of some areas of the Stage 2 Lands to be developed. The range of options should also be evaluated in part from an environmental perspective, to help achieve a development pattern that best supports a natural heritage system. This report identifies evaluation criteria to ensure that the recommendations of the Subwatershed Study will be achieved. Further analysis and policy guidance may also be identified as part of the Secondary Plan in Cambridge and the future Official Plan Amendment(s) in Woolwich.

Furthermore, it is anticipated that an outcome of the Subwatershed Study will be an update to the Grand River Conservation Authority’s mapping for its regulation limit. The Grand River Conservation Authority, incorporated under the Conservation Authorities Act, has authority to regulate development within and near watercourses, wetlands, steep slopes and other areas (under Ontario Regulation 150/06). Where lands are located within the regulation limit, there may be a need for landowners and developers to obtain a permit to proceed, and this process represents a key means of implementing the recommendations and mitigation measures outlined in the Subwatershed Study. GRCA also maintains other policy documents to guide its review of development, such as a Wetlands Policy, Environmental Impact Study Guidelines and Submission Standards for Wetlands, and Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines for Urban Construction.
Figure 13A: Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains - Recommended Development Constraints (Figure 6-4 in the Subwatershed Study)
Figure 13B: Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains - Recommended Development Constraints (Figure A6-4 in the Addendum)
3. OPTIONS FOR THE URBAN AREA DESIGNATION AND LAND USE

3.1 OVERVIEW AND SCOPING OF SUITABLE OPTIONS

Section 2.B.3 establishes the basis for the final designation of the Urban Area and consideration for certain land uses within portions of the Stage 2 Lands. Additionally, other considerations, such as the Airport Master Plan and the Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains, has further constrained the range of potential options that can be considered. This section reviews these minimum requirements to scope the range of potential options that should be considered.

3.1.1 BRESLAU

Regarding the Urban Area designation for the lands in Woolwich Township, adjacent to Breslau, Section 2.B.3 (i) of the Regional Official Plan states that:

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 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 (emphasis added), 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 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.
These policies of the ROP are limiting with respect to the range of options for land use and Urban Area designation that can be considered. The ROP intends for the designation of up to 55 hectares of principally residential uses west of Fountain Street and north of the future Ottawa Street extension. There is therefore only one concept that can achieve the maximum of 55 hectares, which is the designation of the Stage 2 Lands adjacent to Breslau, which comprises a net land area of up to 55 hectares. This single option also is appropriate in terms of achieving the intent of other guiding policies and plans. The lands are located outside of the Airport Reserve Area and the 30 NEF contours (both the existing 30 NEF contours and the proposed 2035 30 NEF contours), and therefore does not conflict with the Airport Master Plan. Some of the lands, like other portions of Breslau, will be subject to federal airport zoning regulations, which will limit height but will not be restrictive to sensitive land use such as residential. Since the lands are adjacent to the existing Breslau Settlement Area, they also represent a logical and contiguous expansion of the community and the required roads, services and infrastructure. The designation of these lands will not consume nor impact significant agricultural operations. The proposed lands are located west of Fountain Street North and north of the future Ottawa Street extension in accordance with the ROP.

3.1.2 CAMBRIDGE

Regarding lands in Cambridge, the ROP directs in Section 2.B.3 (j) that:

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 (emphasis added), 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 of Middle Block Road and south of Fairway Road 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).

There are a range of options that can be considered. The ROP intends for the designation of up to 115 hectares in the northerly portion of Cambridge between Speedsville Road and the Grand River. Furthermore, the policies provide for conversion of the PISR lands to the south in the interest of better integrating the community. At first reading, the policies of the ROP appear to be flexible with respect to where the Urban Area may be located and how it can be configured; however, the following is noted with respect to the intent of the ROP policies and other constraints and guiding policy:

1. The priority is on establishing a residential community which builds upon the existing rural residential cluster, located north of Middle Block, west of Fountain Street, and south of Fairway Road North. Through work on the Subwatershed Study and preliminary analysis of existing infrastructure constraints and opportunities, there do not appear to be any particular constraints that preclude the area northwest of Fountain Street North/Middle Block Road from being the priority consideration for the Urban Area designation. Since this priority can be achieved with no foreseeable constraint, the range of potential options should initially focus on this general area as a starting point. Should there be a need to identify other lands to achieve a maximum of 115 hectares of Urban Area, then other lands may can be considered which are contiguous with this priority area.

2. Further to the point above, one of the intentions of the ROP is to build upon the existing rural residential area west of Fountain Street North, north of Middle Block Road and south of Fairway Road North to begin to form a mixed use community. Since this area represents a feasible contiguous development area as described
above, the focus of the options should be upon building on the rural residential cluster located west of Fountain Street North and north of Middle Block Road. There is opportunity for this area to function as a mixed use community, consisting of new residential and commercial uses in close proximity to the employment area south of Middle Block Road, enabling residents to live near their workplace, as envisaged by the ROP.

3. It is a desirable planning principle to ensure that the new community, comprising 115 hectares, is developed as a contiguous community, in the interest of meeting Provincial, Regional and local policies, such as providing for efficient development patterns; creating a compact built form; facilitating a mix of uses and transportation modes; and efficiently extending and utilizing infrastructure. The option of providing various disparate blocks of development which do not assist in forming a complete community which builds on existing clusters of rural residential uses is undesirable and inconsistent with policy guidance, particularly since there are available opportunities to develop the 115 hectares of land contiguously, beginning with lands northwest of Middle Block Road and Fountain Street.

4. The Airport Master Plan’s Airport Reserve Area (see Figure 5) and the 30 NEF Contour (both the existing 30 NEF contour and the proposed 2035 30 NEF contour) limits consideration for where residential uses may be located. In particular, lands north of Fairway Road North and further east of Fountain Street North (excluding those lands directly abutting the east side Fountain Street North) are not suitable for residential uses. While the Airport Reserve Area is not identified in the ROP, the Airport Reserve Area represents a Council-approved direction and intention to help bring about land use compatibility with the Airport and to protect its further expansion and development of complementary uses over time. Furthermore, consistency with the Airport Reserve Area and Airport Master Plan would achieve relevant policies of the ROP, which requires that planning for land uses within the vicinity of the Airport support the long-term operation and prosperity of the Airport and ensure development does not preclude or hinder expansion (5.A.20). As such, only those options that avoid identification of sensitive land uses (including residential) within the Airport Reserve Area should be considered.

Based on these matters, the options for development of up to 115 hectares of urban uses in Cambridge have been scoped to those options which best achieve the policy considerations and other development constraints described above.

### 3.1.3 CALCULATION OF URBAN AREA DESIGNATION

Consideration must also be given to the methodology used for calculating and mapping the Urban Area designation. The policies of the ROP do not provide explicit guidance on what environmental features or other features would be included or excluded within the
calculation of the Urban Area designation of up to 170 hectares (including both Woolwich and Cambridge lands). The methodology used reflects the approach used through the development of the ROP policies as approved by the OMB. This methodology calculated a required Urban Area designation of 170 hectares that was based upon an assumed density of 55 persons and jobs per hectare. Maintaining this methodology in the development of Urban Area designation options and the preferred concept is important to ensure that the intent of the ROP is being maintained and that an appropriate amount of greenfield development is being planned for as intended by the outcome of the Municipal Comprehensive Review of the Regional Official Plan. The exclusions and inclusions are briefly indicated as follows:

1. Provincially significant environmental features are the only features excluded from the calculation as defined by the PPS and identified through the Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains. Any development setbacks from these features as recommended in the Subwatershed Study are included in the calculation as they do not form a part of the actual feature.

2. Other non-Provincially significant environmental features are included in the calculation of Urban Area. It is recognized that some of these features are not developable, such as floodplains, steep slopes, wetlands and some natural heritage features. Further, any recommended setbacks from these features are included. As such, the actual developable land will be less than is shown in the options.

3. It is noted that where lands abut an existing public right-of-way, half of the right-of-way width is included within the calculation of the potential Urban Area designation, as may be applicable to each adjacent development area.

3.2 BRESLAU URBAN AREA DESIGNATION AND LAND USE CONCEPT

Figure 14 illustrates the proposed land use concept and Urban Area designation for lands adjacent to the Breslau Settlement Area. This scenario was presented to the public at Public Consultation Centre #3, held on November 2, 2017. As described in Section 3.1, this is the only feasible land use concept that achieves the intent of the ROP with respect to the designation of up to 55 hectares of Urban Area adjacent to Breslau. The Urban Area delineation proposes residential and related land uses. The area is located entirely north of the future Ottawa Street extension (the alignment is to be confirmed through a subsequent Class Environmental Assessment process), and east of Fountain Street North.

The southerly boundary is intended to follow a future Regional Road Corridor alignment, known as the Ottawa Street extension. This corridor has not been subject to an Environmental Assessment or other process, and its location or width is not yet known. Per the policies of the ROP (2.B.3.(i)(iii)), the boundary of the Urban Area designation cannot extend south of this boundary, and the final alignment of the boundary will be subject to the Environmental Assessment process and will not require a further
amendment to the Official Plan. There will be a need for the Region to address this requirement in the policies once the Urban Area is designated.

Through separate planning process(es), the Township of Woolwich will integrate these lands into the Breslau Settlement Plan (part of the Woolwich Official Plan) by way of Official Plan Amendment(s).
Figure 14: Breslau Proposed Land Use Concept
3.3 CAMBRIDGE LAND USE OPTIONS

This report proposes and evaluates different alternatives to satisfy the policies of the ROP. The evaluation process is intended to select a preferred concept which could represent a hybrid amongst the most desirable elements of each option, contributing to an overall community plan. Figures 12 through 15 illustrate the land use options for Cambridge. These options were presented to the public at Public Consultation Centre #3, held on November 2, 2017.

The land use options are designed to represent the most feasible options that conform to the policies of the ROP, and remain consistent with other policy and planning considerations, as discussed previously. The options are conceptual in nature and will be subject to refinement through the development of the Secondary Plan. Therefore, high-level land uses were identified. Furthermore, the intent of the various options is to present the range of feasible configurations under consideration.

3.3.1 CAMBRIDGE OPTION #1

Cambridge Option #1 is identified on Figure 15. Option #1 proposes a new residential community. A new commercial area is identified west of Fountain Street North, and north of Fairway Road North. A block that is currently part of the PISR on the east side of Fountain Street North is proposed to be reconfigured to residential uses. In total, the option identifies approximately 111 hectares of new residential and commercial uses, plus 9 hectares of relocated employment land.

3.3.2 CAMBRIDGE OPTION #2

Cambridge Option #2 is identified on Figure 16. Similar to Option #1, Cambridge Option #2 proposed a new residential and mixed use community, building on the rural residential area. In this Option, a mixed use area is identified west of Fountain Street North and south of Fairway Road. Furthermore, Option #2 also proposes reconfiguration of the PISR north of Middle Block Road and east of Fountain Street North to residential uses. Option 2 includes expansion relocation of this PISR to east of Speedsville Road. This Option also proposes new residential uses east of Riverbank Drive and south of Allendale Road. This Option identifies a total of 114 ha of new residential and mixed uses, along with 6 ha of relocated employment uses.

3.3.3 CAMBRIDGE OPTION #3

Similar to the other Options, Option #3 (Figure 17) proposes a new residential community between Riverbank Drive and Fountain Street North, south of Kossuth Road. The Option also proposes residential uses between Riverbank Drive and the Grand River. Furthermore, this Option proposes a commercial block north of Fairway Road. Option #3 does not propose any adjustments to the PISR. In total, the option identifies 115 ha of new residential and commercial uses.
3.3.4 CAMBRIDGE OPTION #4

Option #4, illustrated in Figure 18, proposes a new residential and mixed use community between Riverbank Drive and Fountain Street North, with 16 ha of residential area east of Fountain Street North and south of Kossuth Road. Furthermore, Option #4 proposed residential uses south of Middle Block Road, on either side of Riverbank Drive. Option #4 identifies a mixed use area southwest of Fairway Road and Fountain Street North. This option does not propose any modifications to the PISR, and therefore no additional or adjusted employment areas are identified. A total of 112 ha of new residential and mixed uses are identified.
Figure 15: Cambridge Land Use Concept Option #1
Figure 16: Cambridge Land Use Concept Option #2
Figure 17: Cambridge Land Use Concept Option #3
Figure 18: Cambridge Land Use Concept Option #4
4. ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF LAND USE OPTIONS

To establish a preferred land use option, the Options outlined in Section 3 of this report have been evaluated. This analysis and evaluation has been led by WSP, in consultation with the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, City of Cambridge, Township of Woolwich, and the Grand River Conservation Authority.

4.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation of land use and Urban Area designation options requires identification of evaluation criteria, to assist in assessing the potential options to produce one preferred solution that best represents the most desirable development concept, balancing the needs of the public, landowners, and local residents.

Evaluation criteria for infrastructure were identified conceptually as part of the materials produced for Public Consultation Centre #3 (PCC3), held on November 2, 2017. These criteria form the basis for the evaluation criteria for the land use options. Following PCC3 additional land use planning criteria were developed. Table 1 presents the recommended evaluation criteria, which are organized into four key themes: natural environment and hazardous lands; land use and development pattern, socio-economic considerations, cost and sustainability, and transportation. These criteria, which build upon the policies of the ROP, local Official Plans and Provincial policy including the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement and the 2017 Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, were introduced at PCC3.

Table 1: Land Use and Urban Designation Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Proposed Land Use and Urban Designation Evaluation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural environment and hazardous lands</td>
<td>Avoid and minimize impacts to sensitive environmental features</td>
<td>In accordance with Provincial, Regional and local policy, development will be required to avoid certain protected environmental features and to avoid hazardous lands, and there will be setbacks and other mitigation measures required and implemented through development application processes. Generally, development areas with relatively lower interface/proximity to existing natural heritage features (wetlands, wooded areas) are preferred over other areas with more interface/proximity. Where this is unavoidable, there will need to be suitable setbacks and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Proposed Land Use and Urban Designation Evaluation Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mitigation measures to help minimize impact from urbanization. Additionally, the Subwatershed Study identifies supporting features, which are not part of the core environmental features or Greenlands Network but are considered to have value. While these features will be studied in more detail through a development application process, the preferred concept should support the potential for these features to be maintained or enhanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize watercourse crossings</td>
<td>Potential development areas where no watercourse/drain crossings are required to provide road access are generally preferred over potential development areas that will require crossing(s). Where crossings are required there should be opportunity to suitably design and mitigate the impact of the crossing in accordance with the Subwatershed study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support identified linkages</td>
<td>The Subwatershed Study identifies linkages to assist in restoring natural features and create connections between features. The preferred concept should maintain, support or enhance these linkages where possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use and development pattern</td>
<td>Maximize development opportunity</td>
<td>Development areas should represent feasible development opportunities, in consideration of parcel size, environmental constraints, and opportunities for development integration with adjacent areas including access opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compact development form</td>
<td>The preferred concept should achieve an overall compact development form which can be efficiently serviced and provides opportunity for residents to walk, cycle and take transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mix of uses</td>
<td>The preferred concept should include a mix of uses, to provide for development of a complete community in which residents are able to live, recreate and meet their day-to-day shopping needs, with opportunity to walk, cycle or take transit to nearby employment uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Proposed Land Use and Urban Designation Evaluation Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use compatibility</td>
<td>Land uses should be compatible with the Airport, and sensitive uses should be located outside the Airport Reserve Area; further, land uses should be compatible with planned employment uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>The preferred concept should best achieve a mix of potential housing types and an overall minimum density of 55 persons/jobs per hectare, while providing for transition and compatibility with nearby rural residential areas and employment areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic considerations</td>
<td>There is need to consider the interface and impact of new urban development on Riverbank Drive (e.g., views), and impact to the Grand River from a cultural heritage perspective, as well as integration or impact to existing heritage properties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize impacts to existing community, businesses and agricultural operations</td>
<td>The preferred concept should best minimize impacts and disruption to existing residents, businesses (including agricultural uses and fragmentation of agricultural operations) and traffic. Consideration is to be made to ensure compatibility with nearby agricultural uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost and sustainability</td>
<td>The designation of new Urban Area should capitalize on existing infrastructure and currently planned infrastructure improvements, such as the planned North-South collector road associated with the North Cambridge Business Park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient servicing</td>
<td>Ensure that the preferred option maintains an efficient, compact development pattern that best enables extension of existing and future services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>The preferred concept and development pattern should consider opportunities for active transportation and alternative modes of transportation through identification of trails, a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 EVALUATION OF BRESLAU PROPOSED CONCEPT

With respect to Breslau, only one feasible conceptual option achieves the policies of the ROP and the evaluation criteria described in Section 4.1. It is estimated that the extent of the Urban Area will be nearly 55 hectares. In no case will the amount of designated Urban Area exceed 55 hectares. These lands will be used for principally residential uses, and other ancillary uses may be considered. It is anticipated that specific land uses will be determined by the Township through individual development applications once the lands are included in the Urban Area.

The proposed concept for Breslau (see Figure 11) achieves the evaluation criteria, meets the intent of the ROP and also supports the policies of the Township of Woolwich Official Plan. The concept involves a logical expansion of the existing Breslau Settlement Area, providing efficiency with respect to servicing extensions, is compatible with surrounding land uses, protects significant environmental core features and provides appropriate opportunity for transportation connectivity. The lands are located outside of the Airport Reserve Area and the 30 NEF contours (both the existing 30 NEF contours and the proposed 2035 30 NEF contours), and therefore do not conflict with the Airport Master Plan and achieve local, Regional and Provincial policy regarding Airport compatibility.

Since the future Ottawa Street alignment is subject to future study and determination, the Regional OPA will not be able to clearly define the limit of the urban expansion, and will need to identify it conceptually. As noted previously, the policy language in the Official Plan should be retained to indicate that the extent of the urban boundary is intended to follow this future alignment. To be consistent with the methodology outlined in this report, since the future Proposed Regional Corridor (Ottawa Street extension) will form the southerly boundary of the Urban Area designation, half of the width of the future right-of-way should be included in the calculation of up to 55 hectares of Urban
Area. This will need to be considered through the future amendment(s) to the Township of Woolwich Official Plan and can be addressed in the amendment to the ROP.

**4.3 EVALUATION OF CAMBRIDGE OPTIONS**

As noted, four land use and Urban Area designation options for Cambridge have been identified, and there is a need to evaluate the options and identify a preferred concept. The evaluation of options is not intended to occur as a selection of one of the four options, but is intended as an exercise in compiling a preferred concept that best fulfills the evaluation criteria and creates a unified concept for the new community.

**4.3.1 ANALYSIS OF THE FOUR OPTIONS**

Each of the four options proposes different configurations of land use and development areas. While the four options have common areas included, there are also some distinguishing areas. There are accordingly many possible configurations of these different areas. As it is not the intent to simply select one of the four options, Table 2 breaks down the various potential Urban Area designation and land use elements into distinctive areas. Table 2 identifies some distinguishing aspects of each of these elements, to inform the evaluation in subsequent sections. This includes whether each potential component of a preferred concept conforms to the intent of the ROP; how the component relates to the Airport Master Plan; notable environmental features and constraints; and other relatively distinguishing aspects of each component.
### Table 2: Review of Cambridge Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Area Option</th>
<th>Potential Urban Area</th>
<th>Summary of Context and Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Proposed commercial area north and east of Fairway Road North and west of Fountain Street North (refer to Options 1 and 3) | Up to 18 hectares    | 1. As this land is located in the Airport Reserve Area, it should not be used for sensitive land uses. Thus, only a commercial option was presented. However, employment uses may also be suitable and consistent with the intent of the Airport Reserve Lands.  
2. A commercial block would help to provide commercial uses to serve the day-to-day local shopping needs.  
3. Access to the southerly portion of this area could be constrained due to the roundabout at Fairway Road North/Fountain Street North and the Randall Drain, which divides the area. Accordingly, it may be necessary to have a crossing over the Randall Drain to provide access to the southerly portion.  
4. It is noted the Randall Drain is identified as an Ecological Linkage corridor with opportunity for enhancement per the Subwatershed Study.  
5. The northerly portion of this area is currently used for agricultural purposes and is farmed, along with an associated residence and farm buildings. The southerly portion is occupied by a residence which does not appear to be occupied.  
6. Developable area in the northerly portion of these lands could potentially be constrained by required setbacks from the Grand River. This would need to be confirmed through a geotechnical study as part of a development application process.  
7. There is an intent of the ROP to prioritize the new community west of Fountain Street North and south of Fairway Road North. While this does not necessarily preclude this option as the policies provide some flexibility, the block becomes relatively lower priority compared with other options. |
| Mixed use area west of Fountain Street North and north of Middle Block Road (refer to Options 2 and 4) | Up to 12 hectares    | 1. This area is within the ‘priority’ area as contemplated by the ROP, which is to build up on the existing rural residential area north of Middle Block Road, south of Fairway Road, and west of Fountain Street North.  
2. This area is outside of the Airport Reserve Lands, so sensitive land uses are consistent with the intent of the Airport Master Plan.  
3. A mixed use block provides a central point for the new community, and can help to fulfil local shopping needs. |
Community Area Option | Potential Urban Area | Summary of Context and Considerations
--- | --- | ---
Residential community north of Middle Block Road, east of Riverbank Drive, west of Fountain Street, south of Randall Drain (Varied configurations in Options 1, 2, 3 and 4) | Up to 79 hectares | 4. The extent and location of the mixed use area as presented in these options is conceptual in nature. Other configurations may also be appropriate or more desirable.  
1. This area is also within the ‘priority’ area as contemplated by the ROP.  
2. This area represents a large, contiguous potential development block which would represent a logical starting point and focus for the community. There are some environmental features as identified through the Subwatershed Study, including several supporting environmental features, a component of the Greenlands Network at the northwest, as well as regulated watercourses in the northeasterly portion of the area, but the area generally consists of large tracts of farmed land.  
3. The block consists of a variety of uses, principally agricultural. There are commercial businesses, as well as some residences. The northwesterly portion includes rural residences, including a Bed and Breakfast use.  
4. As a portion of this area abuts Riverbank Drive, there is a need to consider implications on Riverbank Drive as a ‘Scenic Route.’ This should include consideration about what uses are suitable to be located adjacent to the road; how the new uses will interface and address Riverbank Drive; the character/density of new uses abutting Riverbank Drive; whether any access or improvements to Riverbank Drive will be required or considered; consideration for maintaining or enhancing views; etc.  
5. There is a listed heritage property located in these lands.  
6. The area is not included in the Airport Reserve Area and may be developed for sensitive uses.

Residential neighbourhood north of Randall Drain, south of Riverbank Drive, west of Fairway Road North (Option 2) | Up to 11 hectares | 1. Due to proximity to the Grand River, there may be some impact to development opportunity in the northerly portion of this area. This would need to be confirmed through a geotechnical study completed as part of the development application process.  
2. The Randall Drain is identified by the Subwatershed Study as an Ecological Linkage corridor that may be enhanced (refer to Figure 6-2 of the Subwatershed Study).  
3. As this area abuts Riverbank Drive, there is a need to consider implications on Riverbank Drive as a ‘Scenic Route,’ as described above in relation to the lands just to the south.
### Community Area Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Urban Area</th>
<th>Summary of Context and Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Residential neighbourhood east of Fountain Street North, north of Middle Block Road (Options 1 and 2)** | 4. The area is not included in the Airport Reserve Area and may be developed for sensitive uses.  
5. This area is located within the priority area contemplated by the ROP, and would be contiguous with the large area described above. |
| Up to 12 hectares | 1. This area is currently located in the Urban Area by the ROP and is designated Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (PISR) for future employment uses. This area has been proposed for conversion from PISR to residential uses in the options presented previously.  
2. The ROP contemplates conversion of the PISR in order to better integrate the overall new community with other employment areas (2.B.3 (j) (iv)).  
3. This area is outside but adjacent to the ‘priority area’ as contemplated by the ROP, which is considered west of Fountain Street North. However, this does not preclude opportunity for consideration, particularly since the ROP also contemplates conversion of PISR, all of which are located outside the ROP’s ‘priority area.’  
4. The lands are adjacent to various contiguous and linked features which are identified as a component of the Greenlands Network. In some cases, this partly constrains developable area when recommended setbacks are considered.  
5. Existing land uses include farmed lands, as well as two residences on the east side of Fountain Street North, one of which may be associated with a business and outdoor storage in the rear portion of the lot. On the north side of Middle Block Road, existing land uses include farmed lands and two residences in the vicinity of the natural features.  
6. Note these lands were included in the Subwatershed Study completed as part of the Stage 1 MESP and Community Plan process.  
7. The area is located outside of the Airport Reserve Lands and may be contemplated for sensitive land uses. |
| **Residential neighbourhood south of Kossuth Road and east of Fountain Street North (Option 4)** | Up to 16 hectares | 1. This area is not within the ‘priority area’ of the ROP, as it is located on the east side of Fountain Street North. The area is adjacent to the priority area.  
2. This area is just outside of the Airport Reserve Area and may be contemplated for sensitive uses, including residential.  
3. The southwesterly portion of the area includes a component of the Greenlands Network which will limit |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Area Option</th>
<th>Potential Urban Area</th>
<th>Summary of Context and Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Residential neighbourhood with access onto Riverbank Drive and west of Riverbank Drive, extending towards the Grand River Valley (Option 3) | Up to 13 hectares | 1. The development of this area may require improvements to Riverbank Drive. There would be a need to consider implications on the road as a Scenic Route and impacts on existing rural residential areas which utilize Riverbank Drive. Access and servicing extensions could be provided via a collector road from the lands east of Riverbank Drive. However, there may be a traffic impact on Riverbank Drive as generated by new development. This would need to be determined through more detailed assessment.  
2. Since the lands are located behind/adjacent to existing rural residences on the west side of Riverbank Drive, there will be a need to consider compatibility with these residences, such as setbacks, screening or appropriate density and unit types. Accordingly, there is likely a limitation to the range of densities and unit types that can be considered in this area, which may reduce the ability to achieve the ROP’s density requirements.  
3. There are significant valleylands, a component of the Greenlands Network, abutting the westerly portion of this area.  
4. Due to proximity to the Grand River, there would be a need to confirm development constraints relating to hazardous lands as part of a geotechnical study.  
5. The area is located outside of the Airport Reserve Lands and may be contemplated for sensitive land uses.  
6. Note these lands were included in the Subwatershed Study, completed as part of the Stage 1 Lands MESP and Community Plan. |
| Residential neighbourhood fronting on east side of Riverbank Drive, just south of Middle Block Road (Option 4) | Up to 3 hectares | 1. These lands are not considered within the ‘priority area’ as contemplated by the ROP, since the lands are located south of Middle Block Road. The lands are not designated rural residential in the City of Cambridge Official Plan.  
2. These lands were not included in the Stage 2 Lands or in the Project Study Area, but have been identified by the project team as a possible opportunity.  
3. This area is outside of the Airport Reserve Area and may be contemplated for sensitive uses, including residential.  
4. The site is bound by natural heritage features on the easterly side, which are considered an Ecological Linkage by the Subwatershed Study, connecting the |
### Community Area Option
- **Residential neighbourhood fronting on east side of Riverbank Drive, south of Allendale Road (Option 2)**

### Potential Urban Area
- **Up to 3 hectares**

### Summary of Context and Considerations

- Supportive Environmental Feature to the north with other features in the Stage 1 Lands as well as the Grand River Significant Valleyland area. However, the features are not part of the Greenlands Network, so further evaluation would be required.

5. Development options in this constrained area would likely be limited to a strip of residential uses fronting onto Riverbank Drive. Services would need to be extended southerly on Riverbank Drive. Accordingly, impacts to Riverbank Drive would need to be considered in terms of traffic generation and construction impacts, as well as impact on the notion of Riverbank Drive as a Scenic Route.

6. It is noted the future Cambridge Business Park Collector Road is located just to the east of these lands, and there could be opportunity to provide access or linkage, however, this collector road is principally intended to support future employment uses to the east.

7. Note these lands were included in the Subwatershed Study completed as part of the Stage 1 MESP and Community Plan process.

- **1.** This area is located well outside of the ‘priority area’ considered by the ROP.
- **2.** This area is outside of the Airport Reserve Area, so sensitive land uses may be contemplated.
- **3.** These lands were not included in the Stage 2 Lands or in the Project Study Area, but have been identified by the project team as a possible residential opportunity.
- **4.** Access and servicing could be extended via Riverbank Drive or from the future North-South Collector Road to the east.
- **5.** Consideration for compatibility with adjacent low-density rural residences in terms of density and relationship to adjacent lots would be required. Further, compatibility with the uses and their relationship to employment lands to the east would be required. Accordingly, there is likely a limitation to the range of densities and unit types that can be contemplated.
- **6.** Traffic impacts to Riverbank Drive would require consideration.
- **7.** Note these lands were included in the Subwatershed Study completed as part of the Stage 1 MESP and Community Plan process.
### Community Area Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Urban Area</th>
<th>Summary of Context and Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Employment area on the east side of Riverbank Drive (Option 1) | Up to 9 hectares | 1. An expansion of the PISR can only occur where other lands are converted from PISR to residential or other uses. Thus, this area can only be identified where a PISR conversion occurs. The area northeast of Fountain Street North and Middle Block Road was the only such option presented.  
2. These lands were not included in the Stage 2 Lands or in the Project Study Area, but have been identified by the project team as a possible employment opportunity.  
3. This area is located outside of the Airport Reserve Lands.  
4. The proposed new employment area would effectively represent an extension of the planned employment uses to the east, up to Riverbank Drive. However, this strip of land provides a buffer between Riverbank Drive and employment uses to the east.  
5. Some of these lands are constrained by natural heritage features. Though they do not represent a component of the Greenlands Network, there is opportunity to maintain and enhance linkages as identified in the Subwatershed Study. Accordingly, development within this strip will be constrained.  
6. There would similarly be a need to consider the implications on Riverbank Drive, and its intent as a Scenic Route.  
7. Note these lands were included in the Subwatershed Study completed as part of the Stage 1 MESP and Community Plan process. |
| Employment Area east of Speedsville Road and south of Middle Block Road (Option 2) | Up to 6 hectares | 1. As noted, an expansion of the PISR can only occur where other lands are converted from PISR to residential or other uses. Such a conversion has been previously proposed as an option with respect to the PISR located east of Fountain Street North and north of Middle Block Road, as identified previously.  
2. These lands are located outside the Stage 2 Lands, but are located in the Project Study Area. However, as these lands are contemplated as an employment land expansion, they are not intended to be subject to the ROP policy which contemplates a new community west of Speedsville Road and east of the Grand River.  
3. These lands were not included in the Stage 2 Lands, but have been identified by the project team as a possible employment opportunity.  
4. This area is located outside of the Airport Reserve Lands. |
Community Area Option | Potential Urban Area | Summary of Context and Considerations
--- | --- | ---

5. Cambridge City Council endorsed recommendations from City staff to consider these lands within the PISR (City of Cambridge Staff Report No. 14-019-PLN). This was considered an appropriate Urban Area rationalization relating to efficiency of servicing, and due to the natural drainage of these lands to the East and Middle Creeks. This may be effected through the Stage 2 Lands study, provided there is a PISR conversion as noted above.

### 4.3.2 APPLICATION OF EVALUATION CRITERIA

The identification of a preferred option, which may consist of a hybrid amongst various options presented, has been conducted as an evaluation of how well the various areas and land uses meet each of the evaluation criteria presented in Section 3, Provincial policy, the policies of the ROP and City of Cambridge Official Plan. The intent of this evaluation is to result in a preferred, priority Urban Area designation and a preferred concept for land use.

#### 4.3.2.1 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND HAZARDOUS LANDS

The first evaluation theme is related to the natural environmental and hazardous lands, to ensure that the preferred Urban Area designation and land uses will contribute to a healthy natural heritage system and to ensure development avoids hazardous areas, in accordance with the Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains and other policy.

1. **Avoid and minimize impacts to sensitive environmental features and avoid hazardous lands**

Most of the areas under consideration for the designation of Urban Area or land use changes have some degree of interface with environmental features, including portions of the Greenlands Network and other supportive features which would be subject to further evaluation. However, there are some potential development areas that are more substantially bound by environmental features, as follows:

1. The existing PISR lands east of Fountain Street North (proposed as residential in the four options) are bounded by lands within the Greenlands Network, including wooded areas and wetlands. However, it is noted that these lands are already included in the Urban Area, and are designated for employment uses. The conversion of this area to other uses (such as residential) would represent a potentially less impactful land use than the currently planned employment use, depending on the specific employment uses that would have been ultimately developed. Employment uses will likely have higher impervious surface areas, which will be associated with
increased stormwater discharge. Increased stormwater discharge has the potential to impact erosion, stream warming, increased contaminant and salt loading. However, this can be mitigated through appropriate stormwater management controls and practices (refer to Section 9.2.6 of the Subwatershed Study).

2. Similarly, lands southeast of Kossuth Road and Fountain Street North are bound to the south and constrained within the southwest by features and setbacks associated with the recommended Greenlands Network.

3. Lands west of Riverbank Drive will be bound principally to the west by significant valleyland and associated woodlands.

4. The large area contemplated for development northwest of Middle Block Road and Fountain Street North include some supportive environmental features, Randall Drain, watercourses, as well as features recommended to be incorporated into the Greenlands Network in the northwesterly portion.

While impacts of development on these features can largely be mitigated by the implementation of buffers/setbacks and other mitigation measures, a change in use will likely have some degree of impact and effect on the feature, as discussed in the Subwatershed study (refer to Chapter 9). As such, areas with larger adjacent natural heritage features are somewhat less preferred over other areas in terms of achieving this criterion. In particular, wetlands are considered the more sensitive feature that requires mitigation.

In terms of avoiding hazardous lands, it will be a requirement for all development to avoid floodplains and other hazards and this will be implemented in more detail in the Secondary Plan and through development application review. Other erosion or slope hazards associated with the Grand River may need to be confirmed through geotechnical analysis which is would be conducted through development application review. Lands west of Riverbank Drive, lands north and east of Fairway Road, and lands north of the Randall Drain could potentially be required to implement additional setbacks or other measures in consideration of geotechnical constraints.

In conclusion, all of the options are able to achieve this criterion and Provincial, Regional and local policy, subject to the appropriate designation (Secondary Plan) and zoning of natural features and hazardous lands to restrict development, and the implementation of appropriate setbacks, mitigation measures and other monitoring activities as recommended in the Subwatershed Study. However, the areas west of Riverbank Drive and the area southeast of Kossuth Road/Fountain Street North may be considered a lower priority compared with other options. While the lands east of Fountain Street North are also adjacent to various features, these lands are already located in the Urban Area (PISR), and their proposed conversion from employment to residential represents a potential improvement to impacts on the features as a result of development, such as increased stormwater discharge associated with higher impervious surfaces. However, there will be further opportunity to mitigate impacts through guiding policy and development review processes.
The guiding policy established in the Secondary Plan as well as review of development applications will need to integrate and consider the detailed policy requirements for protecting and enhancing natural heritage and hazards as contained in the PPS (Section 2), the Growth Plan (Section 4.2), the ROP (Chapter 7) and the local Official Plans.

2. **Minimize watercourse crossings**

   Generally, it is desirable to minimize road crossings over watercourse and drains, to ensure that the features retain their ecological integrity and hydrologic function as much as possible. However, in some cases, crossings may be unavoidable and there are opportunities to design and implement crossings to mitigate potential impacts. Within the options presented, there are three potential crossings:

   1. Development of lands north of Randall Drain and west of Fairway Road may require a road crossing over Randall Drain to provide access and/or integration with any development to the south. It is noted that there is an existing crossing with three culverts. The design and development of a crossing as part of development of these lands could represent an opportunity to redesign the crossing to better support the water quality and quantity functions of the Randall Drain.

   2. Development of lands east of Fairway Road North may require a road crossing over Randall Drain to provide access to the southerly portion of the site. However, this would not be necessary if access is provided via Fountain Street North.

   3. Development within the large area northwest of Middle Block/Fountain Street North could require road crossing(s) over the watercourse extending from Randall Drain southward towards Fountain Street North. There could be opportunity to minimize the impact (or avoid the crossing) through roadway design given the large size of the parcel.

   Based on the foregoing, all of the options presented represent appropriate options which can meet this criterion. However, the lands east of Fairway Road North may be considered a relatively lower priority, as a crossing may be necessary, depending on access requirements and land use for the southerly portion of the site. While a crossing over Randall Drain west of Fairway Road North may also be required for access, as noted, there will be opportunity to utilize and improve the existing crossing and better contribute to the intent of the Breslau and Randall Drain Subwatershed Study for enhancing the ecological linkage.

3. **Support identified ecological linkages**

   The Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains identifies ecological linkages that, if supported, can help to improve connectivity between natural features (see Figure 6-2 of the Subwatershed Study). There are two such linkages shown within the Urban Area options:
1. Randall Drain is considered an ecological linkage extending west-east and connecting the significant valleyland associated with the Grand River and the Greenlands Network feature on the east side of Riverbank Drive with Greenland Network features east of Fountain Street North and north of Kossuth Road. The ecological linkage shown across Randall Drain may be appropriately maintained and enhanced through development and appropriate setbacks and other measures, as well as an improved crossing over Randall Drain west of Fairway Road North which (discussed above). For lands east of Fairway Road North, there does not appear to be an existing crossing, and the development of land in this area may have more impact on the potential linkage. However, this can be mitigated through appropriate setbacks and crossing design.

2. A north-south linkage is shown east of Riverbank Drive, south of Middle Block Road, to provide connectivity between features in the Stage 1 Lands and the supporting environmental feature identified northeast of Middle Block Road and Riverbank Drive.

Provincial, Regional and local policy support the notion of creating ecological linkages. Section 2.1.2 of the PPS promotes linkages to support diversity and connectivity of features. It is intended that linkages will form a component of the Region’s Greenland’s Network (7.A.1 of the ROP) and municipalities are encouraged to identify and designate both supporting features and linkages and establish supporting policies in the official plan (7.A.3 of the ROP). These features have been identified in the Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains and there is opportunity to implement supporting policy in the Secondary Plan.

All of the options are able to achieve this criterion. A crossing may be required over Randall Drain, east of Fairway Road, to provide the area with road access; however, there may be opportunity to appropriately mitigate impacts. While a crossing is similarly required over the Randall Drain linkage on the west side of Fairway Road North, there is an opportunity to improve the existing crossing. New employment lands east of Riverbank Drive are also considered a lower priority, as the expansion of employment areas may be impactful to the existing features in this area, although it is recognized this can be minimized through appropriate setbacks and other measures.

4.3.2.2 LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT PATTERN

The second evaluation theme relates to land use and development pattern, in order to achieve an efficient, appropriate built form which meets Regional and local requirements.

1. Compact development form

The majority of options presented illustrate a contiguous and compact development pattern. This is desirable from the perspective of contributing to more efficient servicing,
community walkability and supporting alternative transportation modes. Generally, all four of the options identify the large tracts of land northwest of Middle Block Road and Fountain Street North as the logical beginning of the new community, and this is consistent with the ROP’s intent of identifying this area as the priority. Some portions of the options represent relatively lower priorities from the perspective of creating a compact development form, as follows:

1. Lands shown south of Allendale Road and east of Riverbank Drive are considered a lower priority as they are not contiguous with the new community, which is centered northwest Middle Block Road and Fountain Street North as envisaged by the ROP as the priority. Although this area is contiguous with the existing adjacent rural residential area, this area is not considered the priority for new community development in accordance with the ROP.

2. The commercial area shown east of Fairway Road North is considered a lower priority. Although it is contiguous with other areas, the approach of identifying more integrated mixed use blocks within the priority area northwest of Fountain Street North and Middle Block Road provides a more compact development format and approach for accommodating commercial uses. Lands east of Fairway Road North are included in the Airport Reserve Lands and are not intended to have residential uses.

It is noted that the various employment land options shown represent extensions of the existing employment lands, and would thus contribute to a compact development form with respect to the employment areas.

The options are consistent with the 2014 PPS, which strongly supports compact development forms and densities that achieve efficient use of land, (Section 1.1.3.2) and have a compact form (Section 1.1.3.6). The options conform to or do not conflict with the 2017 Growth Plan, which intends for planning to achieve complete communities with a high quality compact built form, attractive public realm and open space (2.2.1.4 e)). The ROP similarly intends for more compact, vibrant and complete communities to be built (Section 2) and supports these principles with policies throughout the Plan (2.D.1 (c)). Further guidance in the Secondary Plan will establish more detailed policy to ensure supportive densities and development patterns that are consistent with these policies.

2. Mix of Uses

All of the options identify both residential and commercial uses. It is desirable for the preferred land use plan to accommodate commercial uses to support the day to day needs of existing and future residents, as well as to accommodate the needs of travelers. Options 1 and 3, which identify commercial areas rather than integrated mixed use blocks, are considered less desirable for meeting this criterion. The mixed use format provides for a more integrated land use approach and an opportunity to create a mixed use core or node to anchor the new community. The commercial area just north
of Fairway Road North, while contiguous with other areas, would be relatively less central to the community and disconnected by Fairway Road North.

While all options can be designed to generally support Provincial, Regional and local policy for ensuring a mix of uses, the mixed use concept best achieves the intent of Provincial policy, which is to provide for a mix of uses that allow for efficient use of land and infrastructure (PPS policy 1.1.3.6) and to achieve a mix of land uses and convenient access to local stores, services and public facilities (Growth Plan policy 2.2.1.4 c). The ROP similarly intends for complete communities and a mix of land uses (2.D.17 (a) and 2.D.1 (c)). This concept best enables a more compact form that will provide for more efficient use of land and infrastructure with a centrally located mixed use area that integrates the residential community with nearby planned employment uses.

Provincial and Regional policy promote more walkable, transit-accessible and less auto-dependent employment areas which are appropriately integrated with nearby residential and mixed use areas. The 2017 Growth Plan intends for surface parking to be minimized and for active transportation networks and transit-supportive built form in employment areas (2.2.5.4). The ROP intends for the Region to plan to enhance transit service to key employment areas (4.B.7). A key intent of the ROP for this planning exercise is to “form the beginning of a mixed use community that will permit future residents with the opportunity to live close to where they work” (2.B.3 (j) (iii)). The mixed use concept best achieves these policies. By locating the mixed use core as the centre of the new residential community and near the existing Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve Lands, the concept is promoting opportunity for future residents to walk to nearby employment uses, forming a logical community centre and focal point for the broader area.

Provincial policy also speaks to the need to accommodate public service facilities and community hubs, which are to be strategically located and co-located in community hubs (Section 1.6.4 of the PPS and Section 3.2.8 of the 2017 Growth Plan). The concept of a mixed use community centered on Fountain Street North provides opportunity to establish appropriate space for public service facilities that will be required and opportunity for a community hub. This will be examined further as part of the Secondary Plan.

3. Land use compatibility

The preferred concept should represent the development of a new community that will be compatible with adjacent existing and future surrounding uses. There are three key compatibility considerations:

1. Compatibility with the Waterloo Region International Airport;
2. Integration with adjacent rural residential areas; and
3. Compatibility with adjacent employment / prime industrial strategic reserve areas.
**Airport Compatibility**

With regard to Airport compatibility, all of the options are considered suitably compatible with the Airport, as no options identify any sensitive (residential) uses within the Airport Reserve Lands. Airport-related height restrictions have been reviewed, and there will be a need to ensure that any development forms are consistent with federal height restrictions. However, this is not anticipated to create significant constraints in any portion of the preferred Urban Area designation. The options are consistent with the 2014 PPS requirement to prohibit new residential development and sensitive land uses in areas near airports above the 30 NEF/NEP contour (Section 1.6.9.2) and the related Regional and local policy. This requirement is applicable to both the current NEF contour as well as the 2035 projected NEF contour as discussed in Section 2.6.1 of this report.

**Compatibility with Adjacent Rural Residential Areas**

Development west of Riverbank Drive and on lands south of Allendale Road are a lower priority, as these areas will have a great deal of interface with adjacent rural residential uses. However, these new areas can be designed to be integrated and compatible with adjacent rural residences, but this would likely limit the densities, unit mix and/or require setbacks. The City of Cambridge Official Plan contains guidance about compatibility of new development near existing areas. It is intended that new development will be compatible in terms of scale, form, massing and height when proposed near existing buildings and adjacent neighbourhoods, while being sensitive to the context (5.1 (e) and the policies of Section 5.7.1).

Some of the options are inclusive of four existing rural residences including a residence/Bed and Breakfast use on the east / south side of Riverbank Drive, and north of Middle Block Road. These lands were excluded from Option 1, included in their entirety in Option 2, and portions were included in Options 3 and 4. Within these areas, there may be limited development opportunity due to the existing lots and natural heritage constraints. This area is a relatively lower priority in comparison with the remainder of this broad potential development area, due to limited development opportunity and potential impact to these existing residences. However, as these lands are immediately adjacent to the other adjacent contemplated development areas to the south and to the east, it is desirable to ensure new immediately adjacent development will be compatible and appropriately integrated. It is appropriate to identify these lands as Urban Area and address them in the Secondary Plan should the lands to the south and east also be integrated.

**Compatibility with Employment Areas**

With respect to compatibility with employment uses, the areas north of Middle Block Road will in part be buffered from employment uses to the south via the separation created by Middle Block Road. There may be a further need to contemplate appropriate setbacks and treatment of Middle Block Road, to ensure future compatibility and to create a desirable streetscape.
Further, a mixed use area located north of Middle Block Road at Fountain Street North is desirable for providing transition between adjacent residential neighbourhoods and the employment uses on the south side of Middle Block Road, functioning as a community centre for both residents and nearby future employees. It is the intent of the ROP to integrate the new community with surrounding employment uses to form a mixed use community (2.B.3 (j) (iii)). To facilitate this transition and create a community centre or hub, it is recommended that the mixed use area be identified on the north side of Middle Block Road, on either side of Fountain Street North. The conversion of PISR on the east side of Fountain Street North to mixed uses will support this concept and best achieve this criterion. In particular, the ability for lands northeast of Fountain Street North and Middle Block Road to accommodate large lot employment uses, as is currently contemplated, is constrained, and the lands will be better utilized for mixed uses. This was not shown specifically in the four options presented (the Mixed Use Option was located southwest of Fairway Road North and Fountain Street North), but this is considered to be the most appropriate approach for facilitating transition between residential and employment uses.

4. Maximize development opportunity

   It is not desirable to identify lands for development which cannot feasibly be developed. All of the areas shown in the options appear to represent feasible development areas based on the findings of the Subwatershed Study, with some potential constraints, as follows:

   1. As noted previously, lands on the east and south sides of Riverbank Drive (north of Middle Block Road) will have some constraints with respect to development opportunity, due to natural heritage features and the four existing rural residential uses. Development opportunity may be increased where the rural residences redevelop, or where the rear of lots become available for development. However, as has been noted, should adjacent areas be designated Urban Area, it will be desirable to ensure compatibility and integration with these uses specifically.

   2. Lands in the southwesterly portion of the large tract of land north of Middle Block Road and west of Fountain Street North (i.e., the northeast corner of Middle Block Road and Riverbank Drive) may be constrained due to the supportive environmental feature. However, as this feature is subject to study, there will be opportunity to incorporate these lands into an appropriate development concept which is integrated with the development of adjacent lands to the east and north.

5. Density

   All of the options should be able to achieve the ROP’s minimum greenfield density requirement of 55 people and jobs per hectare. While this target is a Region-wide target, the evaluation criteria proposes that this target also represent the minimum density target for the new communities being proposed, since it should be achievable and is desirable to do so in order to help achieve overall Regional target. This will
require that new development consist of a mix of different unit types, ranging from singles, semis, townhouses, up to apartments.

The concept of providing a mixed use area near Fountain Street North (Options 2 and 4) is preferred over the commercial area north and east of Fairway Road (Options 1 and 3) from the perspective of achieving the Region’s minimum greenfield area density target. The mixed use concept provides opportunity for commercial uses to be integrated with residential uses, contributing to more efficient use of land and higher densities.

Lands west of Riverbank Drive, lands east of Riverbank Drive and south of Middle Block Road, and the lands southeast of Riverbank Drive and south of Allendale Road, are considered a lower priority for achieving this criterion. These areas would likely need to achieve relatively lower densities to ensure compatibility with adjacent rural residential areas. While the density target is community-wide and can still be achieved by providing higher densities in other areas, the inclusion of these lands will have relatively reduced ability to achieve a range of unit types and densities than other areas, and are therefore considered a lower priority.

The Region has set out a framework for ensuring that development will achieve denser built forms and contribute to density targets (Section 2.D.17 (b) of the ROP). It is intended that the urban designated greenfield areas of the Region will achieve a minimum density of 55 residents and jobs per hectare. Areas intended to be employment are required to achieve a minimum density of 40 jobs per hectare while the Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve areas are to achieve a minimum density of 25 jobs per hectare. It is intended that these targets are measured over the entire Regional greenfield areas.

4.3.2.3 SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

The third evaluation theme is intended to ensure that the preferred Urban Area designation and land use structure appropriately considers socio-economic impacts.

1. **Consider the Riverbank Drive scenic route, the Grand River Canadian Heritage River and other heritage properties**

There is one listed heritage property included within the options (1035 Riverbank Drive). A listed heritage property is not subject to specific constraints, but may be a candidate for future designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. While Option 2 contemplates these lands for urban development, the building may continue to be utilized and integrated with any future development plans. The site is also constrained by adjacent environmental features and rural residences, so there will not likely be development immediately adjacent to the property. It is noted there are two other adjacent listed heritage properties, but since they are not included in any of the options, there will be no direct impact.

Riverbank Drive has been noted as a ‘scenic route’ in the City of Cambridge Heritage Master Plan (2008), although there is no specific guiding policy or requirements. The
road is considered the one remaining scenic drive in Cambridge, but recognizes it is under development pressure. It is characterized by views of farmland, woods, creeks, historic farmhouses and vistas across the river along with views of more recent rural development.

Section 4.14 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan intends for the City to establish policies to protect scenic heritage roads, which consist of the road and any associated views to heritage buildings and to natural landscape features. The Riverbank Drive scenic route, as identified in the Heritage Master Plan, is not specifically referenced in the Official Plan. It is unclear if the intent of the ‘scenic route’ identification is consistent with the Official Plan criteria for a ‘scenic heritage road.’ Scenic heritage roads are identified by unique structural, topographic and visual characteristics, as well as abutting vegetation, built environment and cultural landscape, historical significance or location in a heritage conservation district. This is largely consistent with the characteristics described by the Heritage Master Plan for Riverbank Drive.

Generally, all of the options presented would result in some degree of ‘change’ to the existing character of Riverbank Drive, as this broad area is now contemplated for urban development:

1. The development of lands on the east side of Riverbank Drive, north of Middle Block Road, will affect the character of the road and affect or reduce views to existing farmland and some vegetation, depending on how the features are retained or enhanced. This area is a key location for new development and is considered by the ROP as the priority area for development. To minimize impact to these views, consideration may be made to seek retention and restoration of the supporting environmental feature at the northeast corner of Riverbank Drive/Middle Block Road; to consider lower density development in the vicinity of Riverbank Drive; and/or to locate parks, storm water management facilities and other features rather which will minimize change to the rural views.

2. Development of the areas with frontage on Riverbank Drive (south of Middle Block Road) may also affect the character by reducing potential views of the Grand River and farmland and potentially introducing different character of development, since new development would take place on full municipal services and would not likely have consistently large setbacks and lot sizes. To maintain the rural character and scenic nature of the road, consideration would need to be made to identify and maintain significant views from the road (e.g., the Grand River) and to ensure that development is appropriate for the rural nature of the street.

3. Development west of Riverbank Drive, particularly those lands north of Middle Block Road, may impact views to the river, depending on the ultimate grading of the site, density and elevations of buildings.

4. Any works or improvements to Riverbank Drive, as may be required to provide vehicle access or accommodate increased vehicular traffic in association with adjacent development, or to extend services, will change the rural character of
the road. However, there could be opportunity to design any such improvements to be sensitive to this consideration.

There is an intent by the Heritage Master Plan and the Cambridge Official Plan to maintain and conserve the character of Riverbank Drive. This will need to be balanced by the ROP, which contemplates urban development in this vicinity. However, as noted, the character of the community is evolving. There are opportunities to help retain some elements of the scenic route, as described above, which can be contemplated in the Secondary Plan. In the interest of maintaining rural scenic views, the development of blocks with frontage on Riverbank Drive, particularly west of Riverbank Drive, are less preferred. However, it must be recognized that the views and character will evolve to some degree.

2. Minimize impacts to existing community, businesses and agricultural operations

The socio-economic impact and changes to the community, residences and business operations must also be considered. All of the options focus development in the priority area northwest of Fountain Street North and Middle Block Road. Within this area, some of these lands are held by developers for the purposes of development. Other agricultural uses will be able to continue to operate until such time as the owner wishes to proceed with development.

There are some existing operational businesses included within the various options, including several rural industrial businesses fronting onto Fountain Street North, as well as the Bed and Breakfast use on the east side of Riverbank Drive, north of Middle Block Road. Again, these uses will be able to continue until there is a desire to redevelop where applicable. The provision of commercial or mixed use areas in the new community will provide some opportunity for new businesses to be established.

Impacts and integration with residences within and near the proposed options must also be considered. Some of these matters have been discussed previously. The key consideration is with respect to the integration of future urban development in the vicinity of rural residences fronting onto Riverbank Drive. There will be a need to ensure that any future development is compatible with these uses, in terms of transition in height, setbacks or buffers, unit types and density. These considerations will be explored further as part of the Secondary Plan. There is opportunity to ensure that the preferred concept will be compatible with adjacent residences.

Construction impacts on existing residences and businesses should also be considered. All of the options will be associated with substantial construction activities, including potential road works on existing roads and construction on private property. Some of these road improvements have already been contemplated by the Region’s Transportation Master Plan. Any recommended major infrastructure works will proceed through the subsequent phases of the Class Environmental Assessment process, which will provide more opportunity to consider construction impacts and mitigation.
Additionally, the Region of Waterloo conducted an Agricultural Review, in collaboration with City of Cambridge and Township of Woolwich staff. The Agricultural Review is attached as Appendix B. This included a review of agricultural lands within the Project Study Area and the area located within 1,500 metres of the Project Study Area. The Review was intended to ensure that the proposed Urban Area is not impactful to agricultural operations, and that alternatives have been considered. The outcomes of this Review is summarized in the final evaluation of the Urban Area in Section 5.2 of this report.

Therefore, it is concluded that all of the options are able to achieve this evaluation criterion subject to establishing appropriate policies in the Secondary Plan and further studies.

4.3.2.4 COST AND SUSTAINABILITY

The fourth evaluation theme is intended to ensure that the preferred option will represent an efficiently serviced, cost-effective solution from the perspective of water/wastewater, utilities and transportation. Note that this analysis has considered ongoing work in relation to the Water and Wastewater Servicing and Utilities Assessment, the Master Drainage Plan and Transportation Assessment being prepared as part of the Stage 2 Lands MESP process.

1. Capitalize on existing and planned infrastructure

Since all of the options are located within the vicinity of Fountain Street North and Middle Block Road, they will capitalize on existing planned infrastructure, inclusive of the planned North-South Business Park Collector Road. As indicated in the technical assessments by WSP, the main proposed trunk sewer which will function as the main sewer to service the southerly Stage 2 Lands is proposed along this corridor, extending along Middle Block Road and Fountain Street North. Most of the options are located within the vicinity of this trunk sewer and have the opportunity for efficient and direct connectivity. Similarly, most of the options will capitalize upon watermains which are planned along Middle Block Road, Fountain Street North and the existing Fairway Road North Watermain.

The North-South Collector Road proposed south of Middle Block Road provides an important opportunity for this new community to connect south with King Street and Highway 8. Accordingly, the focusing the large area located northwest of Middle Block Road and Fountain Street North as the starting point for the community (as shown commonly amongst all options) is a preferred approach for best utilizing the opportunity provided by this new North-South Collector Road for broader community connectivity. Similarly, the options also capitalize upon the recently completed Fairway Road North and bridge. Generally, the community is well-connected with the broader transportation network and there are planned improvements to enhance this connectivity.

There are areas that are considered not feasible to service directly from proposed sewage trunk infrastructure due to their location, including lands just east of Riverbank Drive (south of Middle Block Road) and the lands shown on the southeast bend of
Riverbank Drive, south of Allendale Road. These lands will likely require an extension of local sewers which would connect to the trunk sewer that has been proposed on the North South Collector Road. Furthermore, lands west of Riverbank Drive would require an extension of services from lands on the east side of Riverbank Drive and would extend across Riverbank Drive. Thus, these areas could therefore have a relatively higher servicing cost compared with lands that are in closer proximity and more directly associated with the proposed trunk sewers, and are considered a lower priority in terms of achieving this evaluation objective. The subsequent Fiscal Impact Assessment, prepared as part of the final Master Environmental Servicing Plan, will explore costs and financing mechanisms for the preferred Urban Area.

2. Efficient servicing

It is desirable to ensure that the preferred Urban Area can be efficiently and logically serviced, providing for feasible capital and operating costs over the life cycle of infrastructure. This is a policy objective of the Province and the Region. Section 1.6.6.1 (a) and (b) of the PPS promotes efficient use and optimization of existing municipal sewage and water services and ensures that these systems can be sustained, are feasible, financially viable, complies with regulatory requirements and protects human health. The 2017 Growth Plan similarly promotes optimization of infrastructure (3.2.6.2 a)). The MESP process being undertaken concurrently with this planning process provides opportunity to ensure these policies are being achieved and that the recommended infrastructure alternatives achieve these policies. There is opportunity to address servicing policies in the Secondary Plan to further support these principles.

The priority area located in proximity of Fountain Street North and Middle Block Road represents an efficiently serviced area. The anticipated proposed trunk sewer which is anticipated to service the Stage 2 Lands and the East Side Lands more broadly is intended to follow Fountain Street North southward to Middle Block Road, and westward toward the North-South Collector Road. This provides an opportunity for lands in this vicinity to more easily connect to services.

It is anticipated that the majority of the options can be serviced by gravity-based sanitary sewers, based on technical work conducted to date in relation to the Stage 2 Lands Master Environmental Servicing Plan. However, there are some low lying lands, particularly lands close to the Grand River, that could require local pumping facilities, which would need to be confirmed at the time of development and through further assessment of the recommended trunk sewer on Fountain Street North. This would likely include areas along the northern portion of Riverbank Drive, lands west of Riverbank Drive (north of Middle Block Road) as well as lands north of the Randall Drain and lands east of Fairway Road North. However, the need for local pumping facilities could be minimized or eliminated depending on the depth and design of the ultimate trunk sewer on Fountain Street North. This would be confirmed through a subsequent EA process and/or detailed design of the trunk sewer.

With respect to efficiencies regarding transportation and road network, all of the options would in large part be supported by the existing arterial road network. Fountain Street
North and Middle Block Road would appropriately function as the source of access for the priority lands northwest of Middle Block Road and Fountain Street North and for other options. There are some options that would require some degree of access or connectivity via Riverbank Drive and would precipitate potential improvements to Riverbank Drive (e.g., lands west of Riverbank Drive, and lands more directly fronting onto Riverbank Drive). From an efficiency perspective, these areas are less preferred. While all of the options will precipitate improvements to Middle Block Road and Fountain Street North (as already planned by the Region in the Transportation Master Plan), there are only a few areas that would require access from Riverbank Drive. The introduction of urban uses onto Riverbank Drive would likely precipitate some degree of needed improvements to Riverbank Drive to address increased vehicular traffic on the road.

Provincial policy also emphasizes the need to integrate infrastructure and land use planning (e.g., Sections 1.1.6.1 d., 1.6.7.5 of the PPS and 3.2.1.1 of the 2017 Growth Plan). The Stage 2 Lands MESP process has represented an integrated approach to land use planning and infrastructure planning, following the Master Plan process as outlined in the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment. This report has been developed in consideration of ongoing work related to technical assessments for water, wastewater, transportation and storm water management. An outcome of the MESP process is a fiscal impact assessment which will be used to ensure financial viability and cost effectiveness.

4.3.2.5 TRANSPORTATION

The fifth evaluation theme focuses on ensuring that the preferred solution provides for an efficient, safe and supportive transportation network that facilitates multiple modes of transportation.

1. **Support active transportation**

The identification of a land use structure, provision of mixed uses, and compact form will help to support active transportation, and encourage residents to walk or cycle to their destination.

1. The inclusion of the commercial area north and east of Fairway Road North is less preferred over a mixed use area from the perspective of encouraging active transportation within the community. The mixed use area would be more central and connected with the surrounding neighbourhood.

2. A mixed use block centered at Fairway Road North and Middle Block Road would also best achieve this criterion as it would also provide a walking destination for future employment lands to the south as well as residents in the new community, helping to provide transition and integration.

3. Development located south of Middle Block Road and development west of Riverbank Drive is less preferred. These lands are located further from the proposed mixed use community centre. While these options could be designed to
support active transportation in other ways (e.g., hiking trails), walking to shopping areas would be relatively limited compared with other options.

All of the options will have ability to support active transportation in some ways, such as providing hiking trails and sidewalks within the developments. However, some areas are less preferred because they are relatively distant from the proposed commercial or mixed use areas. Lands west of Riverbank Drive, and blocks fronting onto Riverbank Drive are less preferred from the perspective of promoting active transportation and encouraging residents to walk to the new mixed use node.

The promotion of active transportation is a key policy objective of the Province and the Region. Development within designated greenfield areas are to support active transportation (Section 2.2.7.1 b) of the 2017 Growth Plan) and land uses, densities and housing mix are to support active transportation (Sections 1.1.3.2. a.4., 1.4.3. d., 1.5.1. a., 1.6.7.4 and 1.8.1 b. of the 2014 PPS). The options are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and conform to or do not conflict with the 2017 Growth Plan as they provide for appropriate active transportation opportunities. Further work will be conducted as part of the Secondary Plan to identify active transportation supportive policies and opportunities.

Similarly the ROP promotes active transportation. Within Urban Designated Greenfield Areas, it is intended that a network of trails, linkages, sidewalks and bicycle pathways will be established in these new communities (2.D.17 (c)). Map 5c of the ROP identifies Fountain Street North, Kossuth Road/Fairway Road North and Allendale Road as planned or existing cycling routes. The development of the Urban Area in this vicinity can support the implementation of this network as part of future road improvements.

2. Support transit

All of the options have the potential to be supportive of transit, but further analysis would be required to identify potential transit routes in support of development. Development that is more closely centered around the proposed mixed use area as discussed above would be a relatively higher priority, as the mixed use area will represent a key transit service destination and the density will help support the viability of the transit service. The identification of mixed uses in proximity of Fountain Street North, north of Middle Block Road, creates opportunity for a denser, more transit-supportive node. Similarly, the options will be consistent with or conform to Provincial policy, which emphasizes the importance of providing densities and land use patterns that support transit. Section 1.6.7.4 of the PPS promotes land uses, density and uses that support current and future use of transit and Section 1.1.3.2 a) 5) of the PPS intends for land use patterns and densities to be transit supportive. The 2017 Growth Plan similarly intends for a balance of transportation choices and promotes transit and active transportation (3.2.2.1).

The ROP also intends for land uses to be configured such that new uses are generally within a 450 m walking distance of a transit stop (2.D.17. (f)). The future identification of transit recommendations will be integrated within the MESP and supportive policy in the Secondary Plan as appropriate.
3. Provide efficient/safe transport network

All of the options will be able to contribute to an efficient and safe transport network. This may be achieved through more guiding policy in the Secondary Plan, such as providing for sidewalks, crossings, appropriate road widths, and appropriately managing access, as well as through subsequent environmental assessment processes and determination of the future transportation network. However, some of the existing road network will require significant improvements to enable safe pedestrian access, as the roads currently do not have sidewalks or crossings. Some of these roads have already been identified for future improvements, such as Fountain Street North and Middle Block Road.

The PPS intends for transportation systems which are safe, efficient and utilize transportation demand strategies (1.6.7.1 – 1.6.7.2). Similarly, the 2017 Growth Plan intends for transportation demand management policies and programs (3.2.2.4). Opportunities for transportation demand management has been considered in the Transportation Assessment and will be integrated through subsequent initiatives and as part of Secondary Plan policies as appropriate.

Provincial and Regional policy also speaks to major goods movement facilities and corridors, which are to be protected for the long term (1.6.8.2 of the 2014 PPS) and are further supported by the policies of the 2017 Growth Plan. The ROP does not currently utilize the term major goods movement facilities, as it was approved prior to the 2014 PPS. There is opportunity for the various options to support major goods movement facilities (such as the Airport) and related transportation corridors through further Secondary Plan policies and planned improvements to Fountain Street North.
5. PREFERRED CONCEPT PLANS

5.1 BRESLAU

The preferred concept plan for Breslau is illustrated in Figure 19. This concept plan was presented at the Public Consultation Centre held in March 2018. The requirements of the ROP and meets all evaluation criteria. The option conforms to the policies of the ROP, relevant polices of the Township of Woolwich Official Plan, is consistent with the 2014 PPS and conforms to or does not conflict with the 2017 Growth Plan. Some of the key aspects of this planning rationale are summarized as follows:

1. The preferred concept achieves the requirements of the ROP, with respect to designating up to 55 hectares to be located west of Fountain Street North and north of the future Ottawa Street extension (2.B.3 (i)). There were no other reasonable lands to achieve this policy requirement.

2. The designation has achieved the requirement of 2.B.3 (i) (ii) which requires completion of a watershed study and a planning process to determine appropriate land use and densities, as described by policies 2.B.3 (g) and 2.B.3 (h). The Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drain, the process conducted in association with the development of this report, and the overall Stage 2 Lands MESP process has fulfilled these requirements. The Subwatershed Study informed environmental constraints while the planning process has ensured the recommendations achieve public interests.

3. The proposed Urban Area designation represents a logical and contiguous expansion of the existing Breslau Settlement Area, provides for appropriate efficiencies in the extension of infrastructure and will facilitate planned transportation connections.

4. The Region conducted an Agricultural Review (Appendix B) to confirm that the proposed Urban Area is not impactful to the agricultural system and that alternatives have been considered. It was determined that:
   a. The agricultural system has historically been considered through the delineation of the Countryside Line. It has been intended that the Countryside Line represents a long-term boundary and growth can only occur between the Urban Area and Countryside Line, providing certainty regarding the protection of the agricultural land base. This line therefore ensures that potential adverse impacts on agricultural operations from changes to the Urban Area are minimized. The proposed Urban Area is located within the Countryside Line.
   b. There were no other opportunities identified to utilize lower priority agricultural lands.
c. The proposed Urban Area is in compliance with Minimum Separation Distance Formulae, based on a thorough identification of structures that could house livestock.

d. The Region has reviewed elements of the agricultural food network and no elements were identified in the Project Study Area or general vicinity.

5. The intent will be for the Township to process Official Plan Amendment applications once the Urban Area is designated.

6. The concept is in conformity with the policies for Airport compatibility. No sensitive uses (residential) are proposed within or above the 30 NEF/NEP contour (either the existing 30 NEF contour or the proposed 2035 30 NEF contour) nor are they proposed within lands identified as Airport Reserve Lands by the Airport Master Plan. A portion of the lands will fall within the projected 25 NEF/NEP contour. Residential uses are not prohibited in these lands, and there were no other alternatives for achieving the policies of the ROP. There will be opportunity to address and mitigate airport noise impacts in this area through development application processes.

5.2 CAMBRIDGE

On the basis of the foregoing assessment in Section 4.3, a preferred concept plan for Cambridge is presented in Figure 20. The preferred concept plan best achieves the evaluation criteria that has been presented and is considered the priority Urban Area designation and land use concept. The preferred Urban Area designation and land use concept is consistent with / conforms to, or does not conflict with, Provincial policy, as well as Regional and local policy.

The preferred concept plan ultimately did not represent a selection of one of the Options that were presented in Section 3, but is a concept that has emerged through the evaluation process as the most desirable plan for this new community. Following is a summary of the key elements of the planning rationale:

1. The proposed Urban Area designation and land use concept achieves the key guiding policies of Section 2.B.3 (j) of the ROP:
   a. The proposed Urban Area designation, inclusive of lands reconfigured from PISR to residential/mixed use, is calculated to be approximately 114.5 hectares, slightly less than the maximum of 115 ha as required by 2.B.3 (j) and 2.B.3 (j) (v).
   b. The location of the new community (residential/mixed uses) is contained between Speedsville Road and the Grand River in the northern part of Cambridge as contemplated by 2.B.3 (j) of the ROP.
   c. Further, the new community is largely located at the northwest part of Fountain Street and Middle Block Road, considered to be the “priority area” by 2.B.3 (j) (iii) of the ROP.
d. The recommended Urban Area has included a conversion of Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve lands for the purposes of better integrating the new community to ensure compatibility. This conversion better facilitates creation of a community core, focused upon Fountain Street North, which helps to integrate residential uses and future employment uses to the south of Middle Block Road.

e. The conversion of PISR to mixed use has been balanced by the identification of logical locations for new employment uses, including employment uses located north of Fairway Road North and west of Fountain Street North, and an extension of employment uses on the east side of Speedsville Road. These proposed employment areas achieve the evaluation criteria presented in this Report.

f. The concept best achieves policy 2.B.3 (j) (iii) which contemplates the creation of a mixed use community where future residents will be able to live close to their workplace. The mixed use concept at Fountain Street North helps to integrate future employment areas to the south of Middle Block Road with future Residential uses, creating a common community core that ties these areas together.

2. As in Breslau, the process has achieved the requirement of completing a watershed study (the Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains) and undertaking a planning process as contemplated by 2.B.3 (g) and (h). The Subwatershed Study has appropriately informed development constraints and helped to shape the ultimately recommended Urban Area. Further, the planning process that has been conducted has benefitted the recommendations and ensued the recommendations achieve public interests.

3. The concept meets the policies of the Province, ROP and local policies for maintaining Airport compatibility. No proposed sensitive uses are located within the Airport Reserve Lands, and no residential uses are located within the 30 NEF/NEP contour (either the existing 30 NEF contour or the proposed 2035 30 NEF contour), where residential uses are prohibited by the PPS, ROP and local Official Plans. Employment uses are located within the Airport Reserve Lands, located north of Fairway Road North and west of Fountain Street North. This land use is consistent with the intent of the Airport Master Plan and will complement the Airport use.

4. The Region conducted an Agricultural Review (Appendix B) to confirm that the proposed Urban Area is not impactful to the agricultural system and that alternatives have been considered. It was determined that:

   a. The agricultural system has historically been considered through the delineation of the Countryside Line. It has been intended that the Countryside Line represents a long-term boundary and growth can only occur between the Urban Area and Countryside Line, providing certainty regarding the protection of the agricultural land base. The Countryside Line therefore ensures that potential adverse impacts on agricultural
operations from changes to the Urban Area are minimized. The proposed Urban Area is located within the Countryside Line.

b. There were no other opportunities identified to utilize lower priority agricultural lands.

c. The proposed Urban Area is in compliance with Minimum Separation Distance Formulae, based on a thorough identification of structures that could house livestock.

d. The Region has reviewed elements of the agricultural food network and no elements were identified in the Project Study Area or general vicinity.

5. The concept provides for an efficient, feasible and appropriate expansion of infrastructure. The contiguous and compact nature of the proposed Urban Area will be serviced by the adjacent proposed infrastructure and road network. Since the Urban Area is contained east of Riverbank Drive, there will be no need to obtain access from Riverbank Drive. The majority of the Urban Area will be serviced by gravity sewers; further technical analysis will be conducted as part of the future Class EA for the trunk sewer on Fountain Street North, and as part of future development application review, to identify other efficiencies and confirm servicing requirements.

6. The concept best achieves policies for Urban Designated Greenfield Areas. The contiguous, compact nature of the proposed new community will facilitate the greatest potential range of mixed uses, housing and development typologies and best contribute to achieving the minimum density requirements set out by the Region and the Province. The community will best support active transportation, efficient and safe transportation. The mixed use concept provides the best opportunity to create appropriate support for improved transit service.

There are some matters that will require further consideration as part of the Secondary Plan, subsequent work as part of the Master Environmental Servicing Plan or future development application review. The Secondary Plan will be required to identify address a range of matters, including:

1. More detailed land uses, including specific permitted uses;
2. Guidance for the range of unit types, densities, appropriate locations and transitional considerations to ensure compatibility with adjacent areas;
3. Urban design guidance and policies and a design vision which is appropriate for this new community;
4. Policies to guide the provision of a safe, efficient transportation network and to provide opportunity for transit and active transportation;
5. Policies to ensure the provision and logical development of water, wastewater and public utilities in a manner that is efficient and well-coordinated with planning processes;
6. Guidance for the appropriate integration of development with Riverbank Drive and other heritage resources;
7. Policies to ensure the maintenance and enhancement of a natural heritage system as envisaged by the Subwatershed Study; and
8. Policies to ensure that development is directed away from any hazardous lands including floodplains and potential erosion/slope constraints near the Grand River.

Furthermore, the completion of the Master Environmental Servicing Plan will identify recommendations for water/wastewater/utilities, transportation, stormwater management to support implementation of the Urban Area and land uses in an efficient and sustainable manner.
Figure 19: Preferred Breslau Land Use Concept and Urban Area Designation
Figure 20: Preferred Cambridge Land Use Concept and Urban Area Designation
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The preferred Urban Area designation of up to 55 hectares near Breslau best achieves the policies of the ROP and the Township of Woolwich Official Plan. The proposed Urban Area represents a logical extension of the community, which provides for an appropriate extension of new residential and accessory uses as intended by the ROP. The recommendations are consistent with the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement and conforms to or do not conflict with the policies of the 2017 Growth Plan.

The preferred Urban Area designation for lands in Cambridge best achieves the policies of the ROP, is consistent with the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement, and conforms to or does not conflict with the policies of the 2017 Growth Plan. The proposal also supports the policies of the City of Cambridge Official Plan. The proposed designation intends for a new mixed use node centered at Fountain Street North, north of Middle Block Road, with the provision of residential and other related uses generally northwest of Fountain Street North and Middle Block Road. The proposed community best achieves an appropriate transition between the new residential community and adjacent future employment areas, contributing to a mixed use community in which residents will be able to live, shop and work in the same community, while ensuring compatibility with existing rural residential uses.

It is recommended that the preferred Urban Area be designated by the Region of Waterloo in its Official Plan as described in this report, to advance implementation of Sections 2.B.3 (i) and (j) of the Regional Official Plan, and that subsequent work related to the Secondary Plan for the designated Urban Area in Cambridge be advanced for the recommended Urban Area.
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### Appendix A: Responses to Comments Received – Proposed Urban Area Designation Regional Official Plan Amendment and Land Use Rationale Report

This Appendix addresses a response to comments received in relation to the Statutory Public Meeting for the presentation of the Urban Area. This Appendix does not address all comments received throughout the Stage 2 Lands Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Secondary Plan Process to date, but is focused on comments directly relevant to the identification of the recommended Urban Area. This Appendix should be read in conjunction with the Planning Rationale Report which provides the more fulsome analysis of the Urban Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</th>
<th>Summary of Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | Lindsay Campbell Undated written comments (submitted using the questionnaire provided at a previous public consultation event) | • Supports preferred option in Cambridge, as it provides good balance; supports mixed use  
• Waiting to see other details  
• Want bike lanes/sidewalk connections for Riverbank | • Further details and guiding policy will be addressed as part of the Secondary Plan. A public consultation centre will be held to present draft Secondary Plan policies, which are developed to guide development in the preferred Urban Area in more detail. This will include detailed land use designations, guidance for road network and access, servicing and storm water management policies, open space/trails/parks, urban design, compatibility and other considerations.  
• Active transportation recommendations are explored in the Master Environmental Servicing Plan (Transportation Assessment), and will also be addressed in the Secondary Plan, including |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</th>
<th>Summary of Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gary Adam Email to Jane Gurney, March 21, 2018</td>
<td>• Support preliminary preferred Urban Area presented at public meeting, March 20/2018</td>
<td>• Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dayle Buller-Power Email to Jane Gurney, March 22, 2018</td>
<td>• Support preferred Urban Area presented at public meeting</td>
<td>• Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4   | Brian and Cathy Murphy Email to Jane Gurney, March 22, 2018 | • The preferred option only contemplates 111 ha and there is room for 4 additional ha  
• Own property at northeast corner of Fountain St. N./Middle Block Rd. and the property is bisected in the Urban Area (3 ha not included)  
• Engineering report prepared indicates lands are developable, but are shown as flood plain due to undersized culvert which can be rectified  
• Request 3 ha be allocated as residential | • We have reviewed this request and agree with the rationale to incorporate the requested lands in the Urban Area designation. This is included in the Final version of the Planning Rationale Report. The Planning Rationale Report has been updated to address this consideration and the analysis.  
• In particular, we agree that the remainder of the lands being left out is not desirable. It is preferable for the Urban Area designation to follow lot boundaries. Further, we recognize the lands being requested for incorporation could have limited potential for employment uses, particularly if the adjacent lands are reconfigured to Mixed Use as has been proposed.  
• While the lands represent a development constraint (per the Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains), we recognize there is opportunity to resolve the flooding issues on |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</th>
<th>Summary of Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jitna Vok Email to Jane Gurney, March 24, 2018</td>
<td>Support preferred Urban Area designation</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>John Hammer and Cheryl Ann Hammer Email to Jane Gurney, April 4, 2018</td>
<td>The comments echo the statements summarized in Comment #4 above</td>
<td>Please refer to the response to comment #4 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Doug Hammer Email to Jane Gurney, March 26, 2018</td>
<td>Comments echo some of the statement made in Comment #4 above; request 7.5 acres of land be shown as mixed use</td>
<td>Please refer to the response to comment #4 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gráinne Aitken</td>
<td>Support preferred Urban Area</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lands in the future by improving the Kossuth Road culvert as part of future widening or reconstruction of the road. The Secondary Plan may incorporate supportive policies to ensure that development will not occur until there is a suitable resolution to this situation.

- We have added these lands to the recommended Urban Area, as Mixed Use. The specific permitted uses will be further evaluated and defined through the Secondary Plan process. As a result of the increased employment lands reconfiguration, we have identified modifications to the recommended new areas to be designated employment, including lands north of Fairway Road North and west of Fountain Street North.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</th>
<th>Summary of Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Email to Jane Gurney, April 2, 2018</td>
<td>• Would like to ensure development east of Riverbank Drive will ensure sensitive interface with rural/urban communities</td>
<td>• The Secondary Plan will provide detailed guiding policies to address how development will interface with the east side of Riverbank Drive. This could include consideration for a focus on open space/park and storm water management facilities immediately on the east side of Riverbank Drive to help maintain compatibility and provide for transition. The policies will also address transition in built form and ensure sensitivity to the existing rural residential uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9   | Christine Rier Email to Jane Gurney, April 2, 2018 | • Overall support the recommendation  
• Concerned about development to the east of Riverbank Drive which would only ensure preservation of one side. This is not recommended in Cambridge’s Heritage Master Plan.  
• Would like to see a transition zone on the east side of Riverbank Drive; would not want to see sidewalks, lighting, road widening to Riverbank Drive  
• Expresses concern about opportunities of developers to | • Please refer to the response in comment #8 above regarding Secondary Plan policies.  
• The focus of the Cambridge Heritage Master Plan is on maintaining scenic views. This principally relates to the views between Riverbank Drive and the Grand River. These views will be unaffected by the recommended Urban Area designation. However, there is also value placed on the rural/countryside views from Riverbank Drive, looking east. The character of lands on the east side of Riverbank Drive will change in light of the recommended Urban Area. The City of Cambridge Heritage Master Plan recognizes increased development pressure in this area. Accordingly, we suggest the recommended Urban Area strikes the best possible balance with respect to managing growth and maintaining the character of |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</th>
<th>Summary of Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alter the recommendations and that the process favours developers</td>
<td>Riverbank Drive. As noted, there will also be opportunity to provide more detailed guidance for development on the east side of Riverbank Drive. This may include focusing open space uses, storm water management facilities and/or parks and trails on the east side of Riverbank Drive, and also restricting any access, in accordance with the recommendations of the Transportation Assessment being undertaken for the Stage 2 Lands Master Environmental Servicing Plan. These considerations will be addressed further through the development of the Secondary Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encourages a transparent process</td>
<td>The Secondary Plan will identify the detailed direction to guide development applications. The Secondary Plan will be a policy document that sets out a wide range of policies upon which development applications will be reviewed and evaluated. The Secondary Plan will address the matters noted in the comment, such as interface with Riverbank Drive, compatibility with heritage buildings, the character of development, location of parks, open space, schools and other community facilities, mix of uses, transition in built form, roads and access, water/wastewater/storm water management principles and policies, and other matters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Would like to see more about the proposed development, heritage considerations, streetscapes, and ensuring clear parameters for planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</td>
<td>Summary of Comment</td>
<td>Response to Comment and Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10  | Stuart Hough, McCarter Grespan Lawyers  
Letter to Jane Gurney, April 2, 2018  
McCarter Grespan Lawyers  
Letter to Chair Tom Galloway and Planning & Works Committee, April 30, 2018 | • Writing on behalf of Forwell Lands, located south of future Ottawa Street Extension, east of the Grand River and built up area to the east  
• Recognize the justification relates to the previous 2031B Growth Forecasts  
• The letter suggests the 2017 Growth Plan applies to the expansion, particularly Section 2.2.8. The policies note that Prime Agricultural Lands are to be avoided when considering Urban Area expansions; and the subject lands are denoted as Rural Areas.  
• Concerned the lands are prejudiced by the identification of the Stage 2 lands at the outset of the process and request consideration for inclusion in the Urban Area as part of this process, as well as consideration through servicing strategy. | • All planning decisions must conform to or not conflict with the 2017 Growth Plan, in accordance with the Planning Act.  
• The focus of this exercise is on implementing the policies of the Regional Official Plan (2.B.3 i. and j.). The Urban Area expansion occurred through the previous municipal comprehensive review of the Regional Official Plan, resulting in these policies that indicate the location of the proposed Urban Area is to occur north of the Ottawa Street extension in Breslau. We are seeking to implement these policies through this exercise, which is effectively an exercise in refining the location of the Urban Area, within the policy framework set out through the prior municipal comprehensive review of the Official Plan. The policies of the Growth Plan and PPS regarding municipal comprehensive reviews are not applicable to this exercise. The analysis of Provincial policy is detailed further in the Planning Rationale Report.  
• There would be no opportunity to consider locations to designate Urban Area outside of the areas defined by the Regional Official Plan, except through a comprehensive review of the Official Plan.  
• We note the ongoing servicing assessments conducted as part of the MESP process has accounted for potential contribution to sanitary |
### No.  | Comment (Name, Date, Type) | Summary of Comment | Response to Comment and Recommendations
--- | --- | --- | ---
| 11 | Gordon Aitken  
Email to Jane Gurney, April 3, 2018 | • Supports the preferred Urban Area including the mixed use area at Fountain St. N./ Middle Block Rd.  
• Would like development east of Riverbank Dr. to be complementary with further input from residents | • Noted  
• Please refer to the response to comments #8 and #9. | flows and water needs from the Forwell Lands, but it is not the scope of the MESP to address specific servicing options for these lands.  
• Accordingly, the proposed Urban Area designation is in conformity with the Regional Official Plan and conforms to or does not conflict with Provincial policy, as applicable. |
| 12 | George and Lori Roussakis  
Email to Jane Gurney, April 5, 2018 | • Oppose preliminary preferred option  
• Feels there is lack of transparency in decision making  
• Would like to receive urban residential zoning to develop lands further in conjunction with Puopolo and Zaja family lands  
• Indicates that there is no scenic route between Middle Block Rd. and their lands and | • The rationale for the selection of the Urban Area is described in the Planning Rationale Report.  
• With respect to decision making and process, this process has included several opportunities for consultation and all information has been posted online to the project website at www.regionofwaterloo.ca/eastside. The refinement of the Urban Area designation has progressed through an appropriate process with opportunities for public and landowner input at each step. This included public and landowner meetings in relation to each of the following key milestones: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</th>
<th>Summary of Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|     |                          | that individuals trespass onto their land to seek access to the Grand River. Development would create opportunity for access.  
  • Clarifies that lands are not in the flood plain as their neighbours have suggested  
  • Requests clarity about whether servicing would be available to all of Riverbank Drive.  
  • Requests clarity about how a heritage home was included in the Urban Area.  
  • Requests clarity about access to Riverbank Drive from their home.  
  • Request clarity about policy decisions around the scenic route. |  
  o Introduction of the project;  
  o Development of the Subwatershed Study to identify environmental constraints;  
  o Identification of potential Urban Area designation options, based on those constraints and based on other guiding policy, such as the Region’s Official Plan, applicable Provincial policy, and local policy, as well as presentation of preliminary evaluation criteria;  
  o Presentation of the preferred Urban Area including commentary on the evaluation and rationale; and  
  o Presentation of the preferred Urban Area at a Statutory Public Meeting with Regional Council. |

The Project Team (led by the Region, with involvement by other individuals as required) has accommodated requests for individual meetings with landowners throughout the process.

• The Subwatershed Study identifies the development constraints including floodplains. The Subwatershed Study has been made available for public review since December 2016 at the public meetings and is available on the project website.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</th>
<th>Summary of Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The expectation at this time is that full municipal servicing would not be extended along Riverbank Drive from the proposed Urban Area, since the lands would continue to be located outside the Urban Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consideration of the scenic route in the determination of the Urban Area is detailed in the Planning Rationale Report (refer to Section 4.3.2.3). We recommend the Urban Area appropriately maintains the intent of the Cambridge Heritage Master Plan while providing for development and growth in accordance with the Region’s Official Plan. However, the evaluation of the Urban Area has also considered many other criteria as outlined in the Planning Rationale Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The east side of the Urban Area includes a designated heritage building, used as a bed and breakfast. It is recognized that this site may not necessary be developed, and the Secondary Plan will address compatibility with the heritage building. It is desirable to include this use in the Urban Area insofar as it provides opportunity to address Secondary Plan policies for the use and for adjacent uses, ensuring compatibility with future development and consideration for opportunities to support the long-term conservation of valued historic structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</td>
<td>Summary of Comment</td>
<td>Response to Comment and Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 13  | James Boudreau Email to Jane Gurney, April 6, 2018 | - Opposes the preferred Urban Area designation (which excludes lands west of Riverbank Drive in the Urban Area) because both sides of Riverbank Drive should be planned concurrently  
- Requests clarity about how the lands were selected (process and criteria) and has concern about transparency in the process. Indicates that the decision criteria contradicts the ultimate selection of lands.  
- Worried there was a bias towards consideration of land west of Riverbank Drive since these lands were not initially included in the study area.  
- Requests clarity about whether servicing will be provided since lands being developed across the road (east of Riverbank Drive).  
- Requests clarity about relationship to the servicing plan, timing and how it was considered. | - Please refer to the response to comment #12 with respect to process.  
- The evaluation of the Urban Area options has been conducted as an unbiased process led by the consulting team with input from the overall Project Team (Region, City of Cambridge, Township of Woolwich and the Grand River Conservation Authority). This process included initial identification of options, followed by evaluation and selection of the preferred option. There are elements of the preferred option that have been further refined through subsequent work and analysis after the options were presented.  
- The lands were added to the study area before the Urban Area designation options were developed and presented. The addition of the lands resulted only in the need to produce the Subwatershed Study Addendum Report, to address environmental constraints for these lands and ensure that identification of options were consistent with the Subwatershed Study’s recommendations. Lands west of Riverbank Drive were included in the Urban Area designation options presented in 2017.  
- The expectation at this time is that fully municipal servicing would not be extended to lands outside the Urban Area. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</th>
<th>Summary of Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|     |                            | • Requests clarity about exits from Riverbank Drive and impact from headlights.  
     |                            | • Requests clarity about criteria for including some land on Riverbank Drive and not others. | • The development of a Water/Water Assessment, Transportation Assessment and Master Drainage Plan has been concurrent with the development and evaluation of the Urban Area designation options. The analysis has been informed by the concurrent technical analyses. The recommended Urban Area represents a feasibly and efficiently serviced Urban Area as outlined in the Planning Rationale Report. A subsequent Public Consultation Centre will be held to consult on the Draft Master Environmental Servicing Plan and the Draft Secondary Plan once Regional Council decides on the Urban Area. |
|     |                            |                    | • There are opportunities to address access from Riverbank Drive and vehicular traffic as part of the Secondary Plan, based upon the recommendations of the Transportation Assessment. |
|     |                            |                    | • The selection of the Urban Area in Cambridge was limited to a maximum of 115 ha in accordance with the Region’s Official Plan. Accordingly, there was a need in this process to prioritize some lands, and for other lands that were identified in the options to be excluded. The selection of the preferred Urban Area consists of what is considered to be the priority Urban Area that best achieves all of the evaluation criteria, as detailed in the Planning |
Rationale Report. In summary, lands west of Riverbank Drive and other lands that would require frontage from Riverbank Drive are less preferred compared with other areas for two key reasons:

- Development requiring frontage on Riverbank Drive will precipitate upgrades to Riverbank Drive, such as roadway improvements, potential addition of sidewalks, and other works to ensure pedestrian safety and efficient vehicle flow. Since the preferred Urban Area is located entirely east of Riverbank Drive and north of Middle Block, there is no need to upgrade Riverbank Drive, which provides a cost efficiency and helps maintain the character of the roadway, as expressed by some members of the public and indicated in the Cambridge Heritage Master Plan.

- Developing in these areas would likely need to be lower density in order to maintain compatibility and transition with adjacent rural residential uses. It is a key local, Regional and Provincial policy objective to achieve more compact, dense communities. The preferred Urban Area is better...
positioned to advance the intent of these policies and ensure that development will contribute to the Region’s overall minimum greenfield density requirement of 55 persons and jobs per hectare.

14 Joseph Puopolo Letter to Stage 2 MESP team, dated April 9, 2018

- Proposes justification and a revised concept plan, which includes lands west of Riverbank Drive (north Middle Block Road as well as south of Middle Block Road), lands east of Riverbank Drive (south of Middle Block Road), and excludes lands north of Randall Drain
  - The justification is summarized in the letter, consisting of a wide range of points:
    - The lands are within the priority consideration area
    - Preferred approach should integrate “orphan lands” to create a complete community
    - Suggests that servicing could be provided more imminently to the Polocorp

- The justification and analysis for limiting the Urban Area to the east side of Riverbank Drive is detailed in the Planning Rationale Report, and some key points are summarized in the response to Comment #13 above.
- With respect to lands on the north side of Randall Drain, which were included in the Urban Area, we have concluded that these lands represent a higher priority for inclusion compared with other options reviewed. The lands are contiguous to the remainder of the proposed Urban Area and will be within walking distance of the proposed mixed use core at Fountain Street North and Middle Block Road, supporting the concept of a walkable, compact, mixed use community. We have reviewed water/wastewater servicing constraints for these lands, and note that a local pumping station may be required to service the lands. However, this will need to be specifically confirmed through the evaluation and ultimate design of the trunk sewer on Fountain Street North that is proposed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</th>
<th>Summary of Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lands whereas the lands north of Randall Drain would not be expected for 5+ years</td>
<td>to provide servicing to the Urban Area, as outlined in the Water and Wastewater Assessment. Further, this would be subject to further study in association with a development application. We note that lands to the west of Riverbank Drive and lands at the northeasterly corner of Riverbank Drive/Middle Block Road may also require a pumping station. While the provision of a localized pumping station represents an additional cost to development, it is a normal part of development and there is opportunity for costs to be recovered by the Region/City, as will be examined in the Fiscal Impact Assessment produced for the Master Environmental Servicing Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Lands north of Randall Drain would require a pumping station due to topography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Proposal will provide larger homes to maintain character of Riverbank Drive community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Proposal is compact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Indicates that traffic from lands north of Randall Drain will be impactful to Riverbank Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Significant buffers would be required to integrate lands north of Randall Drain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Proposal results in an integrated trail system with Grand River interface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o The letter requests clarity regarding a few items:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Calculations of the Urban Area and Provincially significant wetlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lands north of Randall Drain would require a pumping station due to topography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal will provide larger homes to maintain character of Riverbank Drive community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal is compact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indicates that traffic from lands north of Randall Drain will be impactful to Riverbank Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant buffers would be required to integrate lands north of Randall Drain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal results in an integrated trail system with Grand River interface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The letter requests clarity regarding a few items:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calculations of the Urban Area and Provincially significant wetlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We further note that there are other opportunities for access to these lands besides access from Riverbank Drive, so the development of lands north of Randall Drain will not impact Riverbank Drive. Access from Riverbank Drive to support development of lands north of Randall Drain is not preferred for reasons described in the response to comment #13, and there is opportunity for a Randall Drain crossing. Specific policies to guide servicing and access will be addressed in the Secondary Plan. Ultimately, we find that lands north of Randall Drain represent a higher priority for inclusion in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</th>
<th>Summary of Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Polocorp Email to Planning and Works committee and Regional/City staff, April 25, 2018</td>
<td>- The letter requests consideration for the preliminary preferred plan as described in Comment #14.</td>
<td>• Please refer to the response to comments #13 and #14 above and the Planning Rationale Report for more information about the evaluation of the preferred Urban Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Blair Capling Letter to Planning and Works Committee, April 25, 2018</td>
<td>- Author of the letter is a member of Shiry family who operates a farm in the study area, located on the west and</td>
<td>• As outlined in the Planning Rationale Report, inclusion of lands east of Fairway Road for commercial purposes was a lower priority compared with the identification of a mixed use area adjacent to Riverbank Drive due to the higher density development constraints in the lands west of Riverbank Drive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Planning Rationale Report outlines the methodology for calculating Urban Area and development constraints (Section 3.1.3). Upon completion of the Urban Area designation, work on the Draft Secondary Plan will be advanced, with a target of releasing the Secondary Plan for consultation in summer or fall of 2018. With respect to the servicing studies, the Draft Technical Assessments have been released for public review, and were developed concurrently with the evaluation of the preferred Urban Area. Upon Regional Council’s decision on the Urban Area designation, we will finalize the technical assessments in conjunction with developing the Draft Secondary Plan over Summer/Fall 2018.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</th>
<th>Summary of Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>east sides of Fairway Road North, west of Fountain Street North</td>
<td>area. Since the lands east of Fairway Road are located in the Airport Reserve Area, there is a limitation on the types of uses that can be considered and meet the intent of the Airport Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The letter expresses support for the preferred Urban Area.</td>
<td>• With respect to fragmenting the agricultural use, this is a consideration that has been identified and is discussed in the Planning Rationale Report. The owners may continue to farm the lands until such time as they are ready to develop for urban uses. Inclusion in the Urban Area will mean that the existing agricultural uses will continue to be permitted. The lands located west of Fairway Road/Fountain Street North were considered to be a high priority for inclusion in the Urban Area, as outlined in the Planning Rationale Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Note the submission attaches a previous letter from Brandon Flewwelling, GSP Group, to Jane Gurney, Nov. 29, 2017, which summarizes a response to the various urban designation and land use options presented publicly at the November 2, 2017 public consultation centre. Generally the letter supports the directions and submits that inclusion of the lands north of Randall Drain (residential uses) and lands on the east side of Fairway Road North (commercial uses) were desirable for inclusion and that fragmentation of the farm was undesirable.</td>
<td>• The proposed Urban Area has been revised as discussed in Comment #4. An additional portion of the subject lands are proposed for inclusion in the Urban Area as an employment area. The rationale is described further in the Planning Rationale Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Concerned about fragmentation of their farm operation but still generally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</th>
<th>Summary of Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Brandon Flewwelling, GSP Group Letter to Jane Gurney, April 10, 2018</td>
<td>agree with the preferred scenario.</td>
<td>Please refer to the response to comment #16 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• GSP represents the Shiry family whose lands are described above in Comment #16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The letter submits that fragmentation of the farm located on the west side of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairway Road North (currently bisected by Fairway Road North) is undesirable and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the agricultural operation would not be viable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The letter supports the residential designation shown on the west/south sides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of Fairway Road North (west of Fountain Street North).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• However, the exclusion of lands on the east/north sides of Fairway Road North</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(west of Fountain Street North) is a concern. The parcel would not be viable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>from an agricultural perspective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The letter references Section 6.E.3 (farm lot severances) of the Regional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</td>
<td>Summary of Comment</td>
<td>Response to Comment and Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 18  | Ivan Zaja Email to Jane Gurney, April 11, 2018 | - The letter suggests the lands would be appropriate for employment uses as an alternative to commercial uses. It is recognized these lands are not suitable for sensitive uses due to the airport-related constraints.  
- The letter requests inclusion of the individual's lands located west of Riverbank Drive. They would like to be included in association with the Puopolo and Roussakis family lands.  
- Does not support the preferred Urban Area and feels they have not been listened to in this process. They would like to understand how their input has been considered.  
- The property is close to future services so it would be logical to include their lands in the Urban Area.  
- They would be proposing 5-6 new properties on the west side of Riverbank and feel this | - Please refer to the responses for comments #12, #13 and #14 above, which describe the rationale for including lands northeast of Riverbank Drive and not including lands west of Riverbank Drive and lands on the east side of Riverbank Drive, south of Middle Block Road. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</th>
<th>Summary of Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Judy Sauder Email to Jane Gurney, April 12, 2018</td>
<td>• Supports the preferred Urban Area</td>
<td>• Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 20  | Doug Wilson, Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory Letter to Jane Gurney, April 12, 2018 | • Notes that Fairway Road extension / Kossuth Road corridor has economic potential but is not included in the preferred scenario  
  • Given the cost of servicing, it is important to seek alternatives | • We note that the initial Urban Area options presented in 2017 indicated the location of the mixed use area in the vicinity of Fairway Road North and Fountain Street North. However, the evaluation process ultimately resulted in the identification of a mixed use block centered at Fountain Street North on the north side of Middle Block Road. This was principally |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</th>
<th>Summary of Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Dan Currie, MHBC Letter to Michelle Sergi (Region of)</td>
<td>MHBC represents Intermarket, with landholdings located on the east side of Riverbank</td>
<td>Please refer to the responses for comments #12, #13 and #14 above, which describe the rationale for including lands northeast of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Request the Fairway Road Extension / Kossuth Road corridor be included in the study for various proposed land uses
- Reserve right to make further comments in the future

intended to help integrate all of the different uses in this area (planned employment uses to the south and the new residential community). This is a key element of the plan as it helps to achieve the policies of the Regional Official Plan, which contemplates a well-integrated new community, where residents will be able to walk to local employment uses. Accordingly, the recommended land use structure best achieves the policies of the ROP.

- With respect to servicing, the intent of the associated Master Environmental Servicing Plan will be to identify various high-level approaches to efficiently and sustainably servicing the Urban Area. There is opportunity for to occur through subsequent processes and as part of development application review.

- The preferred option should not preclude future opportunity for growth and development of Kossuth Road and Fairway Road. There is opportunity in the Secondary Plan to address how the future residential uses on the south side of Fairway Road North and west of Fountain Street will look, and to refine the location and extent of the mixed use block.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</th>
<th>Summary of Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|     | Waterloo), Elaine Brunn Shaw (City of Cambridge), April 13, 2018 | Drive, south of Middle Block Road  
• The letter requests inclusion of some of these lands in the Urban Area (totaling 4.5 ha)  
• The letter summarizes the applicable policies in the Region’s Official Plan and City’s Official Plan  
• The rationale consists of several points:  
  o There is limited agricultural capability of the lands  
  o Inclusion will ensure the lands are used in a manner compatible with surrounding land uses  
  o Full municipal services are available via the North Cambridge Business Park lands  
  o The proposal would be in keeping with the policies  
  o Development of the subject lands would be in keeping with the notion of Riverbank Drive as a scenic route and would | Riverbank Drive and not including lands west of Riverbank Drive and lands on the east side of Riverbank Drive, south of Middle Block Road.  
• In particular, inclusion of the subject lands being described was considered a lower priority for achieving certain aspects of the evaluation criteria. The frontage of these lands onto Riverbank Drive would require these lands to be developed at a lower density to maintain compatibility with the character of Riverbank Drive. Other lands included in the Urban Area will have more opportunity to accommodate a range of densities and contribute to a mix of unit types and the Region’s overall minimum greenfield density target, which is a key planning principle and evaluation criteria. Further, the subject lands are located further from the proposed mixed use core, and the preferred Urban Area better maintains the principle of creating a compact community where residents will be able to walk to the mixed use core area. Additionally, development of lands fronting onto Riverbank Drive would likely precipitate upgrades to Riverbank Drive, whereas the preferred Urban Area will not trigger any such upgrades to Riverbank Drive, resulting in cost efficiency and better maintaining the rural character of the road. For these reasons, these |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</th>
<th>Summary of Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jerry Cybalski Email to Jane Gurney, dated April 16, 2018</td>
<td>• The letter supports the proposed Urban Area designation and land uses and notes observations about wildlife in this area</td>
<td>• Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 23  | Kunle Oluwojure Email to Jane Gurney, dated April 16, 2018                                   | • The email requests consideration for mixed use zoning through the review process and allow for a zone change for their land, which has been deferred.  
• The email discusses works by Metrolinx to potentially expropriate their land to build a road. | • The subject lands, which are located east of Fountain Street North in Breslau, are not contemplated as an option for inclusion in the Urban Area. The ROP requires that the Urban Area designation consist only of lands west of Fountain Street North and north of the future Ottawa Street extension. Accordingly, these lands were not contemplated for inclusion as it would not meet the intent of the ROP. |
| 24  | Tom and LeeAnne Kid Email to Jane Gurney, April 23, 2018                                     | • Expresses support for the preferred option as presented at the public meeting  | • Noted                                                                                                  |
| 25  | John Rose, Breslau Properties Limited Letter to Planning and Works Committee, April 23, 2018 | • The letter expresses general support for the ROPA and speaks to a logical expansion of the community of Breslau  
• The letter requests that the environmental constraints | • We note that the map showing the environmental constraints is not a part of the Regional Official Plan Amendment. Further, since these identified constraints were not considered Provincially Significant they have been included in the calculation of the Urban |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</th>
<th>Summary of Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory Letter to Regional Council, April 25, 2018</td>
<td>• The letter expresses concern about the Fairway Road / Kossuth Road corridor not being included in either Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve / Urban Designated Greenfield Area as it would represent an important east-west link and economic corridor. It jeopardizes the plans of the Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory and could impact their business.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The letter provides background information about</td>
<td>• Please refer to the response to comment #20 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</td>
<td>Summary of Comment</td>
<td>Response to Comment and Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory and its history. • The letter summarizes comments regarding the Region's investment in the Fairway Road North/Kossuth Road Corridor and identifies that the Ottawa Street extension is now being emphasized. • The letter expresses that removal of the Conservatory lands and Fairway Road/Kossuth Road corridor is not consistent with Regional Council direction thus far. They request inclusion of these areas in the Urban Area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ryan Mino-Leahan, KLM Planning Partners Inc. Letter to Planning and Works Committee, April 25, 2018</td>
<td>• KLM Planning represents Madison, who owns lands in the Cambridge portion of the Stage 2 Lands. • The letter expresses support for the ROPA and notes it is in conformity with applicable policy.</td>
<td>• The comments are noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</td>
<td>Summary of Comment</td>
<td>Response to Comment and Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>White Water Holdings Inc., Letter to Regional Chair and Planning and Works committee, April 29, 2018</td>
<td>• Supports the OPA.</td>
<td>• Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Lorne Kumer Letter to Chair Tom Galloway and Planning and Works Committee, April 30, 2018</td>
<td>• Supports the OPA.</td>
<td>• Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</td>
<td>Summary of Comment</td>
<td>Response to Comment and Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1   | Delegation by Ryan Mino-Leahan, Partner at KLM (representing Madison Group) | • Represents Madison, a landowner in Cambridge  
• Supports the ROPA | • Noted |
| 2   | Delegation by Blair Capling (resident) | • Represents lands located north and south of Fairway Road North, on the west side of Fountain Street North  
• Agricultural lands will be orphaned as a result of only including a portion of the farm use in the Urban Area.  
• Supports the ROPA | • Please refer to the response to written comment #16 above. |
| 3   | Delegation by Joseph Puopolo (Polocorp Inc.) | • Owns lands west of Riverbank Drive  
• Summarizes aspects of the rationale as presented in correspondence (see written comment #14 above) | • Please refer to the response to written comment #14 above. |
| 4   | Delegation by Mr. Kindrachuck (Intermarket Inc.) | • Suggests the process is rushed  
• Would like to see more comprehensive planning | • Please refer to the response to written comment #21 above. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</th>
<th>Summary of Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5   | Delegation by Frank, Tommy and Glory Zaja | • Lands are not included  
• Has noted that lands are not constrained by flooding as residents have suggested  
• Would propose 5-6 lots and conform to streetscape and scenic route  
• Inclusion of lands would create opportunity for trails/access to Grand River | • Please refer to the response to written comments #12, 13 and 14 above which describe the rationale for not including lands west of Riverbank Drive. |
| 6   | Delegation by George Roussakis | • Expressed that he wished to see lands west of Riverbank Drive included in the Urban Area  
• Would like to see services  
• Would like to see both sides of Riverbank Drive included | • Please refer to the response to written comments #12, 13 and 14 above which describe the rationale for not including lands west of Riverbank Drive. |
| 7   | Delegation by James Boudreau | • Supports the delegation and rationale of including lands west of Riverbank Drive  
• Would like to see extension of services and supports trails in this area  
• The area should be planned comprehensively | • Please refer to the response to written comments #12, 13 and 14 above which describe the rationale for not including lands west of Riverbank Drive. |
| 8   | Delegation by Cathy Murphy | • Overall supports the directions  
• Notes that the field of the subject property northeast of | • Please refer to the response to comment #4 in the response to written comments above. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</th>
<th>Summary of Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Delegation by Grainne Aitken</td>
<td>• Provided a presentation and supports the recommended approach.</td>
<td>• Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Delegation by John Rose</td>
<td>• Supports the recommendation and would like to see this move forward</td>
<td>• Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11  | Delegation by Christine Rier | • Supports the recommendation  
• Provided a presentation  
• Would like to see Riverbank Drive function as a scenic route to support wildlife  
• Need to see transition between | • Noted                                  |
<p>| 12  | Delegation by Christopher Young | • Supports the recommendations                                                  | • Noted                                  |
| 13  | Delegation by Jane Fridich   | • Supports the recommendations                                                  | • Noted                                  |
| 14  | Delegation by Judy Sauder    | • Supports the recommendations                                                  | • Noted                                  |
| 15  | Delegation by Tom Kidd       | • Supports the recommendations                                                  | • Noted                                  |
| 16  | Delegation by Gordon Aitken  | • Supports the recommendations                                                  | • Noted                                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment (Name, Date, Type)</th>
<th>Summary of Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Delegation by Adriana Vazanova</td>
<td>• Supports the recommendation</td>
<td>• Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Delegation by Mike Puopolo (Polocorp Inc.)</td>
<td>• Clarified that development west of Riverbank would be above the floodline and any previously made comments regarding hedge removal was undertaken with full approval/permits</td>
<td>• Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Delegation by Doug Wilson (Butterfly Conservatory)</td>
<td>• Expressed the Kossuth Road corridor remain as a major corridor to capitalize on the investment made on the Fairway Road North bridge</td>
<td>• Please refer to the response to written comment #20 above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B (Prepared by Region of Waterloo)

AGRICULTURAL REVIEW

Regional Official Plan - Countryside Line

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. The intent of the Countryside Line is to identify a long-term boundary that provides direction for future growth in order to maximize infrastructure investments and limit speculation. The policies in the ROP direct that future growth can only occur between the Urban Area and the Countryside Line. Therefore, the establishment of the Countryside Line provides direction regarding the location of future growth which then allows for investment in farm infrastructure premised on a greater degree of certainty that the agricultural land base outside of the Countryside Line is to be protected over the long term for agriculture. As a result, the delineation of the Countryside Line ensures that any potential for adverse impacts on agricultural operations from changes to the urban area boundary are minimized. The areas proposed to be designated Urban Area in Cambridge and Breslau are located within the Countryside Line.

Review of Agricultural Lands

A review of the agricultural lands within the East Side Lands – Stage 2 Project Area (Study Area), and the area within 1500 metres of the Study Area was undertaken by Regional staff in collaboration with Township of Woolwich and City of Cambridge staff. A summary of the review findings are provided herein.

Prime Agricultural Areas and Canada Land Inventory Classification

The ROP designates almost all of the lands within the detailed study area as Prime Agricultural Area, with the exception of an area south of Breslau in the Township of Woolwich. However, it is to be noted that the study area comprises only a portion of the land within the Countryside Line and that most of the lands outside the study area are within a Prime Agricultural Area. Approximately 10 hectares of land outside of the Prime Agricultural Area has been included in the proposed Urban Area in the Township of Woolwich, and based on the locational criteria for the Urban Area in the Regional Official Plan, there are no reasonable alternatives for the delineation of the Urban Area that completely avoid Prime Agricultural Areas. The majority of the lands within the study area are classified in a similar manner, Class 1 and Class 2 lands (per the Province’s Agricultural System Portal mapping). The proposed Urban Area delineations include primarily Class 1 and Class 2 lands, with some Class 4 lands and some Organic Soils. Any alternatives within the study area would have similarly resulted in the Urban Area designation being applied to Class 1 or Class 2 lands. The candidate areas to be designated as Urban Area through the proposed ROP Amendment do not include any specialty crop areas. There were no opportunities to utilize lower priority agricultural lands.
Minimum Distance Separation (MDS)

Regional staff undertook visual assessments of the Study Area and the lands within 1500 metres of the Project Study Area to identify existing or potential livestock facilities. All properties in this area were also cross-referenced with the most recent Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC) data in order to identify any properties which include assessment information to indicate an Agricultural use occurs on the property but which may not have been identified through the visual assessment.

An initial review of the area revealed 37 structures that that could potentially house livestock including 21 in Woolwich Township and 16 in the City of Cambridge. The 37 potential structures include seven structures which are currently within the Urban Area where MDS does not apply. More detailed review of the remaining 30 structures was undertaken, and it was determined that none of the structures that currently house livestock or which have the ability to house livestock are within an area that will be impacted by the proposed Urban Area designations. The primary reason for this determination was that the operations are already impacted by the existing Urban Area. The proposed land to be designated Urban Area will be no closer to the operations than the current Urban Area.

Agricultural Food Network

A review of the elements of the agricultural food network within and around the Project Study Area was completed through the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture Food and Rural Affairs “Agricultural System Portal”. No elements of the agricultural food network are identified in the Study Area or the general vicinity by the Agricultural System Portal.