REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO
PLANNING AND WORKS COMMITTEE
AGENDA

Tuesday, November 6, 2012
11:00 A.M.
(Time approximate; immediately following Administration and Finance Committee)
Regional Council Chamber
150 Frederick Street, Kitchener, Ontario

1. DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

2. DELEGATIONS AT 11:00 A.M.
   a) Cathy Richards re: P-12-103/E-12-112, Fairway Road Extension – Noise Mitigation (item 3g) page 112
   b) Report P-12-115, Approval of City of Waterloo’s Proposed New Official Plan (item 3d) page 46
      i) Wendell Schlumberger, Conserve Our Residential Environment (CORE)
      ii) Bruce Alexander, Waterloo Region District School Board

3. REPORTS – PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

   ADMINISTRATION
   a) P-12-112, Proposed Interim Planning Assistance to the Township of Wellesley 1

   COMMUNITY PLANNING
   b) P-12-113, Proposed Amendment to the Regional Official Policies Plan – Breslau Settlement Area, Township of Woolwich 3
   c) P-12-114, Approval of City of Cambridge’s Proposed New Official Plan 19
   d) P-12-115, Approval of City of Waterloo’s Proposed New Official Plan 46

   TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
   e) P-12-116, Contribution to GO Transit Rail Capital Costs 95
   f) P-12-117, Grand River Transit 2013 Service Improvement Plan Public Consultation Centres 97

   INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS
   g) P-12-103/E-12-112, Fairway Road Extension – Noise Mitigation 112
REPORTS – TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

h) CR-RS-12-071, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (2nd Report) known Municipally as 311 Weber Street West for Weber Street West Grade Separation and Road Improvements (College Street to Guelph Street), Phase 2, in the City of Kitchener

i) CR-RS-12-073, Surplus Declaration and Transfer of Lands to the City of Cambridge for Relocation of Riverbank Drive, South of the Fairway Road Extension (Regional Road 53), in the City of Cambridge

j) E-12-106, Class Environmental Assessment Study for Northfield Drive Improvements, King Street to University Avenue, City of Waterloo

k) E-12-108, Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant Phase 3 Upgrades – Engineering Consulting Services for Detailed Design and Services During Construction

l) E-12-109, Consultant Selection - Detailed Design and Services During Construction for the Mannheim Residuals Management Plant Upgrades, City of Kitchener

WATER

m) E-12-105.1, Project Outline - Water Efficiency Master Plan Update

n) Ayr Wastewater Servicing Master Plan – Information Package in Advance of Public Information Centre

o) Erb St. Water Supply System Study Class Environmental Assessment – Information Package in Advance of Public Information Centre

4. INFORMATION/CORRESPONDENCE

a) Memo re: King & Victoria Multimodal Hub Environmental Assessment Progress

b) Memo re: Region of Waterloo Community Environmental Fund – Call for Proposals

5. DELEGATIONS AT 1:00 P.M.

a) Duncan Class re: E-12-104, Manitou Drive Improvements, Fairway Road to Bleams Road, City of Kitchener - Recommended Design Concept (item 6a) page 216

6. REPORT

a) E-12-104, Manitou Drive Improvements, Fairway Road to Bleams Road, City of Kitchener - Recommended Design Concept (staff presentation)

7. OTHER BUSINESS

a) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List

8. NEXT MEETING – November 27, 2012

9. ADJOURN
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETINGS</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>November 27, 2012</td>
<td>1:00 P.M. Approx.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 11, 2012</td>
<td>1:00 P.M. Approx.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Housing and Community Services</td>
<td>Thu., November 15, 2012</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>2013 Proposed Transit Service Improvements Public Consultation Centres</td>
<td>Kitchener Waterloo Bilingual School Gymnasium 600 Erb Street West Waterloo, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tue., November 20, 2012</td>
<td>12:00 P.M. - 4:00 P.M.</td>
<td>2013 Proposed Transit Service Improvements Public Consultation Centres</td>
<td>University of Waterloo Room 1301, William G. Davis Computer Centre 200 University Ave. W. Waterloo, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tue., November 20, 2012</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.</td>
<td>King/Victoria Transit Hub Environmental Assessment Public Consultation Centre</td>
<td>Regional Administration Building - Lobby 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wed., November 21, 2012</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>2013 Proposed Transit Service Improvements Public Consultation Centres</td>
<td>Waterloo Mennonite Brethren Church Chapel 245 Lexington Road Waterloo, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thu., November 22, 2012</td>
<td>12:00 P.M. - 4:00 P.M.</td>
<td>2013 Proposed Transit Service Improvements Public Consultation Centres</td>
<td>Wilfrid Laurier University Concourse-Fred Nichols Campus Centre 75 University Ave. W. Waterloo, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tue., November 27, 2012</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Active Transportation Master Plan Public Consultation Centre</td>
<td>Knox Presbyterian Church - Hall 50 Erb Street West Waterloo, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wed., November 28, 2012</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Active Transportation Master Plan Public Consultation Centre</td>
<td>Calvary Assembly Church - Foyer 127 Hespeler Road Cambridge, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thu., November 29, 2012</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Active Transportation Master Plan Public Consultation Centre</td>
<td>Regional Administration Building - Lobby 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., November 7, 2012</td>
<td>6:00 P.M. 8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Ayr Wastewater Servicing Master Plan - Public Information Centre</td>
<td>North Dumfries Community Complex 2958 Greenfield Road Ayr, Ontario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., November 21, 2012</td>
<td>5:00 P.M. 7:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Erb St. Water Supply System Study Class Environmental Assessment - Public Information Centre</td>
<td>Waterloo Region Emergency Services Training &amp; Research Complex (WRESTRC) 1001 Erbs Road, Waterloo, Ontario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee  
DATE: November 6, 2012  
FILE CODE: D23-20  
SUBJECT: PROPOSED INTERIM PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO THE TOWNSHIP OF WELLESLEY  

RECOMMENDATION:  

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the following with regard to the request of the Township of Wellesley, as described in Report No. P-12-112, dated November 6, 2012:  

a) Agree to provide professional planning services to the Township of Wellesley for the purpose of updating its Official Plan to bring it into conformity with the Regional Official Plan and the Provincial Growth Plan;  

b) Agree to provide additional professional policy services, as described in this report;  

c) Provide the related services on the basis of a mutually satisfactory fee-for-services arrangement to be negotiated between the Township and the Region; and  

d) Authorize the Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services to execute any documentation required to implement these recommendations to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.  

SUMMARY:  

The Township of Wellesley has approached the Region of Waterloo for assistance in dealing with specific planning matters for a one year period. This report has been prepared to recommend assistance on a fee basis and to provide some additional background for Regional Council, including how the current workload will be managed over this period.  

On previous occasions, Regional staff has provided assistance of this type to Area Municipalities. This has included the preparation of the North Dumfries and Wellesley official plans and growth plans under similar contracts.  

REPORT:  

This request arose as a result of the retirement of the Township’s Planning Head in 2012, and the need for an interim arrangement until a more permanent planning approach is established by the Township. Currently, the Township has a junior-level planner on staff.  

The Region and the Township have arrived at an agreed upon planning framework with an associated fee to be determined. Under this framework, the Region would include the following tasks:  

- Completion of an amendment to the Township of Wellesley Official Plan to conform to both the Regional Official Plan and the Provincial Growth Plan;
• Assistance in completing a residential strategy, addressing the maintenance of an adequate supply residential land to promote future growth;

• Assistance in establishing basic planning processes and templates for specific types of development applications; and

• Assistance in dealing with more complex applications (e.g. official plan amendments, plans of subdivision and condominium).

The services to be provided by Regional staff would be in the form of assistance to Township staff only. Township staff would continue to write reports and make recommendations to Township Council. Costs for Ontario Municipal Board hearings would not be included under this contract.

On previous occasions, Regional staff has provided assistance of this type to Area Municipalities. This has included the preparation of the North Dumfries, Wellesley and Wilmot official plans and growth plans under similar contracts.

The fee to be paid by the Township to the Region (Planning, Housing and Community Services) is intended to be used to retain additional planning assistance at the Region, as the workload for Region-wide development application review remains high, and many reurbanization applications are complex.

Regional staff are pleased to be able to recommend this assistance to the Township of Wellesley during its' one-year transition period.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

Regional and Township of Wellesley staff have collaboratively developed this proposal.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

This report supports Strategic Plan 5.6.3 (opportunities for partnerships with area municipalities in order to improve services).

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The fees associated with this proposal would be used to fund additional planning support at the Region to ensure that the large and complex development applications workload can be properly managed.

**OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:**

NIL

**ATTACHMENTS:**

NIL

**PREPARED AND APPROVED BY:** Rob Horne, Commissioner Planning, Housing and Community Services
RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the following with regard to proposed amendment to the Regional Official Policies Plan as set out in Attachment B of Report P-12-113, dated November 6, 2012:

a) Adopt the proposed amendment to the Regional Official Policies Plan as set out in Attachment B to Report P-12-113, dated November 6, 2012, to:

i) Re-designate the Breslau Settlement Area from “Rural Settlement Area 35” and “Industrial/Commercial Area E. Industrial Area – Regional Road 17” to “Township Urban Area” on Map No. 6 – Settlement Pattern;

ii) Amend Table 7.3 to delete the references to “35. Breslau” and “E. Industrial Area – Regional Road 17”;

iii) Amend Policy 7.5.1.8 to delete the reference to “Breslau” under the heading “Township of Woolwich”;

iv) Delete Policy 7.5.1.10 in its entirety, to remove the current development cap in Breslau of 1,250 dwelling units;

v) Amend Map No. 2 – Provincially Significant Wetlands to add the “Breslau Provincially Significant Wetland Complex”; and

vi) Amend Map No. 3 – Agricultural Resource Areas, to delete the “Prime Agricultural Areas” designation from the Breslau Settlement Area, as identified in the Township of Woolwich Official Plan.

b) Direct staff to prepare the implementing by-law for the proposed amendment to the Regional Official Policies Plan, as set out in Attachment B to Report P-12-113, dated November 6, 2012 for enactment by Regional Council; and

AND THAT Regional Council enact the corresponding by-law to implement the proposed amendment, as drafted in Attachment B to Report No. P-12-113, dated November 6, 2012.
SUMMARY:

In March 2012, Thomasfield Homes Limited submitted an application to amend the 1995 Regional Official Policies Plan (ROPP). This ROPP remains legally in effect until the new Regional Official Plan (ROP) is approved by the Ontario Municipal Board, currently anticipated for late 2014.

The proposed amendment relates to the Breslau Settlement Area in the Township of Woolwich (see Attachment A for location map). Under the ROPP, Breslau is currently designated as a “Rural Settlement Area” and an “Industrial/Commercial Area.” Historically, these two settlement designations were planned to provide for a limited amount of residential and employment growth on private water and wastewater services. However, following the review of the ROPP in the early 1990s, a decision was made to extend municipal water and wastewater services to Breslau to accommodate a maximum of 1,250 units. This development cap was subsequently incorporated into the 1995 ROPP and has remained in place since then.

Extending municipal services to Breslau, together with other public infrastructure investments in the area, have enabled Breslau to transition from a small rural settlement to a growing urban area. Today, Breslau supports an estimated population of 3,300 people and 1,100 jobs, and there is potential to support additional growth in the future.

To better plan for growth in Breslau, Regional Council made a decision to include Breslau within the larger “Urban Area” designation when Council adopted the new ROP in 2009. This urban designation, which applies to most of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo, identifies areas where the majority of the Region’s future growth will occur on full municipal services. In designating Breslau as an “Urban Area,” Regional Council determined that Breslau would no longer be subject to the existing development cap, and that the area would ultimately be developed with higher densities and a broader mix of land uses. The Township of Woolwich has no concerns with the proposed ROPP amendment and is currently preparing a Secondary Plan to establish a detailed land use strategy for Breslau, which will be implemented through an amendment to the Township’s Official Plan.

In January 2011, various parties appealed the new ROP to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB). Despite numerous mediation sessions, pre-hearings, motions, and one formal phase of the hearing being completed, the new ROP has not yet come into effect. Without the new ROP in place, the Township cannot complete its Breslau Secondary Plan and related Official Plan Amendments, or consider Thomasfield Homes’ development applications. The resulting delays and uncertainty over when the new ROP will come into effect have prompted Thomasfield Homes to apply for the proposed ROPP amendment. Approval of the proposed amendment would:

1) Re-designate Breslau from a “Rural Settlement Area” and “Industrial/Commercial Area” to a “Township Urban Area”;

2) Delete the existing development cap for Breslau of 1,250 units; and

3) Revise other associated policies and mapping accordingly.

The above changes are intended to provide for the consideration of additional growth and development within the current limits of Breslau, including Thomasfield Homes’ lands east of Hopewell Creek. The proposed ROPP amendment will not change the Urban Area designation that currently applies to the lands in the Township of Woolwich official plan (i.e., no lands are being re-designated as Residential, Commercial or Industrial), and will not change the existing settlement boundaries. Specific land uses for Breslau will be considered through separate development applications submitted by the applicant to the Township of Woolwich.
The Region held a public meeting for the proposed amendment on May 29, 2012. One of the key concerns raised at the meeting was that the proposed amendment overlapped with issues currently before the OMB as part of the ROP appeals. As a result, representatives of various developers in the region argued that the proposed amendment is premature and should not be considered in advance of the ROP appeals.

Regional staff does not concur with this position. The amendment can be considered on its own merits outside the current ROP appeals. The Province’s Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan) designates the undeveloped parts of Breslau, including Thomasfield Homes’ lands, as “designated greenfield areas.” Under the Growth Plan, this designation must be planned to provide for a diverse mix of land uses and achieve a minimum density target of not less than 50 residents and jobs combined per hectare. The timing of this amendment is intended to allow the Township to move forward with its local planning process for Breslau, including consideration of Thomasfield Homes’ development applications. Anyone objecting to either this amendment, or to Thomasfield Homes’ development applications, would have the right to appeal them to the OMB as provided for in the Planning Act.

Regional staff has circulated the amendment to the Area Municipalities and various circulation agencies for review and comment. No objections to the amendment were received through this process.

Woolwich Township Council passed a resolution on October 16, 2012 indicating that it does not object to the proposed amendment, provided that: 1) future land uses for Breslau are determined through the Breslau Secondary Plan and the Township’s scoped Official Plan review; and 2) final consideration of Thomasfield Homes’ development applications within Breslau will not occur until the Breslau Secondary Plan process is substantially complete. The proposed ROPP amendment is the first step that precedes these two processes.

Regional staff recommends that Regional Council approve the proposed amendment because: 1) consistent with the policy framework established for Breslau in the new ROP, as adopted by Regional Council in June 2009 and subsequently approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing in December 2010; 2) conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe; and 3) is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

REPORT:

In March 2012, the Region of Waterloo received an application from Thomasfield Homes Limited (Thomasfield Homes) to amend to the Regional Official Policies Plan (ROPP). This ROPP was approved in 1995 and remains legally in effect until the new Regional Official Plan (ROP) is approved. Until then, Regional Council is obligated to consider any applications to amend the existing ROPP.

The proposed amendment relates to the Breslau Settlement Area in the Township of Woolwich (see Attachment A for location map). Under the ROPP, Breslau is currently designated as a “Rural Settlement Area” and an “Industrial/Commercial Area”. Historically, these settlement designations were planned to provide for a limited amount of population and employment growth on private services. Such settlements were intended to predominately serve the needs of rural residents and area businesses. Examples of other rural settlement areas in Woolwich would include Maryhill, Conestogo, Bloomingdale and Heidelberg.

As part of ROPP review in the early 1990s, the Region established a new servicing hierarchy that sought to phase-out the use of private water and wastewater services in new developments. During the transition period, the Region had draft approved two plans of subdivision (Mann and Khayami) in Breslau proposing a total 125 privately serviced lots on 65 hectares of land. The lands were
subsequently purchased by Thomasfield Homes, and the Region was then asked to reassess the servicing options for the lands to avoid the use of private services. Ultimately, an agreement was reached to extend municipal water and wastewater services to Breslau from the City of Kitchener. The initial agreement provided servicing capacity for a maximum of 1,250 units. This development cap was subsequently incorporated into the 1995 ROP and has remained in place since then.

In 2003, the Region, the City of Cambridge and Thomasfield Homes contributed towards the cost of extending Fountain Street (i.e., the Breslau By-pass) through Breslau from Woolwich Street South to Victoria Street North. The new road facilitated access to and from Breslau and was also designed to support additional development in the area. As a result of the new road, together with the previous investments in new water and wastewater infrastructure, Breslau has been transitioning from a small rural settlement to a growing urban area. Today, Breslau supports an estimated population of 3,300 people and 1,100 jobs, and has the infrastructure capacity to support additional growth in the future.

In recognition of the changes occurring in Breslau, and to better plan for Breslau’s growth, Regional Council included Breslau within the larger “Urban Area” designation when it had adopted the new ROP in 2009. This urban designation, which applies to most of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo, identifies areas where the majority of the Region’s future growth will occur on full municipal services. In making this decision, Regional Council also determined that Breslau would no longer be subject to the existing development cap, and that the area would ultimately be developed with higher densities and a broader mix of land uses.

In January 2011, various parties appealed the new ROP to the OMB. Despite numerous mediation sessions, pre-hearings, motions, and one formal phase of the hearing being completed, the new ROP has not yet come into effect. Without the new ROP in place, the Township of Woolwich cannot complete its Breslau Secondary Plan and associated Official Plan Amendments, or consider Thomasfield Homes’ development applications. The resulting delays, and uncertainty over when the Board will approve the new ROP, have prompted Thomasfield Homes to submit the proposed ROPP amendment.

**Purpose and Effect of Proposed Amendment**

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to:

a) Re-designate the Breslau Settlement Area from “Rural Settlement Area 35” and “Industrial/Commercial Area E. Industrial Area – Regional Road 17” to “Township Urban Area” on Map No. 6 – Settlement Pattern;

b) Amend Table 7.3 to delete the references to “35. Breslau” and “E. Industrial Area – Regional Road 17”;

c) Amend Policy 7.5.1.8 to delete the reference to “Breslau” under the heading “Township of Woolwich”;

d) Delete Policy 7.5.1.10 in its entirety, to remove the current development cap in Breslau of 1,250 dwelling units;

e) Amend Map No. 2 – Provincially Significant Wetlands to add the “Breslau Provincially Significant Wetland Complex”; and

f) Amend Map No. 3 – Agricultural Resource Areas to delete the “Prime Agricultural Areas” designation from the Breslau Settlement Area, as identified in the Township of Woolwich Official Plan.
The general effect of the amendment is to provide for the consideration of additional growth and development within the current limits of Breslau, including Thomasfield Homes’ lands east of Hopewell Creek. The proposed ROPP amendment will not change the Urban Area designation that currently applies to the lands in the Township of Woolwich official plan (i.e., no lands are being redesignated as Residential, Commercial or Industrial), and will not change the existing settlement boundaries. Specific land uses for Breslau will be considered through separate development applications submitted by the applicant in the form of proposed amendments to the Township’s Official Plan and Zoning By-law, and through a proposed plan of subdivision. The Township of Woolwich is currently preparing a Secondary Plan to establish a detailed land use strategy for Breslau, which will be implemented through an amendment to the Township’s Official Plan.

The addition of the “Breslau Wetland Complex” to Map 2 will incorporate the Province’s latest Provincially Significant Wetland mapping for Breslau. This change is intended to ensure that future development in the area will not adversely affect the Breslau Provincially Significant Wetland Complex.

**Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe**

The Province’s Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan) designates the undeveloped parts of Breslau, including Thomasfield Homes’ lands, as “designated greenfield areas.” This designation identifies lands located within approved settlement areas, but not yet built upon. Under the Growth Plan, municipalities must plan “designated greenfield areas” to provide for a diverse mix of land uses, and to achieve a minimum density target not less than 50 residents and jobs combined per hectare. The Greenfield density target in the new ROP is 55 persons and job per hectare. Under the current ROPP, this density of development is characteristic of a “City Urban Area” or a “Township Urban Area” and is not contemplated, or appropriate within a “Rural Settlement Area.” As a result, designating Breslau as a “Township Urban Area,” as proposed through this amendment, would conform to the Growth Plan.

**Regional Growth Management Strategy/Infrastructure Planning**

In 2003, Regional Council adopted its Regional Growth Management Strategy (RGMS) to provide a long-term framework for growth and development in Waterloo Region. Among other objectives, the RGMS sought to direct a greater share of the Region’s future growth towards the eastern side of Waterloo Region, generally between new Highway 7 and Maple Grove Road. Although the RGMS did not include specific recommendations for Breslau, it was understood that Breslau would continue to transition into an urban settlement with a broad mix of land uses and higher density development.

Since the adoption of the RGMS and the new ROP, Regional Council has initiated a number of infrastructure plans and servicing studies that identified potential infrastructure improvements to support additional growth and development on the eastern side of the Region, referred to as the East Side Lands. These plans and studies include:

- The completion of the Wastewater Treatment Master Plan and associated AECOM East Side Servicing Review, environmental monitoring of the East Side Sub-watersheds;

- The completion of the Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP), which identified a number of potential transportation improvements to facilitate additional growth and development in the East Side Lands. Among other road projects, the RTMP provides for the eastward extension of Ottawa Street across the Grand River to link with Fountain Street in Breslau. This corridor has been identified as a “Proposed Regional Corridor” in the new ROP for the purposes of corridor protection;

- The completion of the Tri-City Waterloo Distribution Master Plan; and
The initiative of the East Side Lands Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan. The first stage of this project is focusing on the lands designated in the new ROP as Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve. Subsequent stages will focus on the remaining East Side Lands, including lands surrounding Breslau.

Proposed Breslau GO Train Station

In December 2011, GO Transit initiated train service between Kitchener and Toronto’s Union Station. In the final Environmental Study Report approved a year earlier, the Province selected four new GO station sites along the rail corridor, one of which is located on the eastern side of Breslau on Greenhouse Road. When constructed, the new GO station could increase access to commuter rail services and provide an opportunity to develop Breslau with higher, more transit-supportive densities. By removing the existing development cap for Breslau, the proposed ROPP amendment would therefore help increase transit ridership, and the viability of GO service.

Public Meeting Comments

The Region held a public meeting for the proposed amendment on May 29, 2012. At the meeting, as well as through written submissions, the following two key questions emerged:

1. Is the proposed ROPP amendment premature in light of the appeals to the new ROP?

In separate letters dated March 29, 2012, the solicitors representing Activa Holdings Inc. and Mattamy Development Corporation, two of the appellants to the new ROP, requested the Region to refuse, or at least defer the proposed amendment until the appeals to the new ROP are resolved. In their opinions, the policy issues associated with the amendment overlap with the issues currently before the OMB as part of the ROP appeals. Therefore, it was their view that it would be premature for Regional Council to consider the proposed amendment in advance of the Board’s consideration of the current ROP appeals.

Regional staff does not concur with this position. The proposed amendment can be considered on its own merits outside the current ROP appeals. When the new ROP was appealed in January 2011, none of the appellants specifically objected to including Breslau within the “Urban Area” designation in the new ROP, or to the removal of the existing development cap in Breslau, in their written submissions to the Board. Although the new ROP has been appealed in its entirety, the undeveloped areas of Breslau are included within the “designated greenfield area” designation determined by the Growth Plan. This designation anticipates development with a diverse mix of land uses having a minimum density of 50 persons and jobs combined per hectare. As a result, there is no reason why Regional Council should not consider the proposed amendment at this time.

The timing of this amendment is intended to allow the Township of Woolwich to move forward with its local planning process for Breslau, including consideration of the various development applications that have been submitted by Thomasfield Homes. Anyone objecting to the Township’s decisions regarding Thomasfield Homes’ applications will have the right to appeal those applications to the OMB.

2. Will the proposed ROPP amendment result in the conversion of employment lands in Breslau?

Approval of the proposed ROPP amendment would designate Breslau as a “Township Urban Area”. In the context of the current ROPP, this designation represents the highest urban classification in the Townships, similar to Elmira or St. Jacobs. The purpose of this designation is to provide for the development of a broad range of land uses, including employment lands, on full municipal water and
waster services, and approval of this amendment will not predetermine specific land uses for properties in Breslau. Accordingly, the proposed ROPP amendment does not constitute an employment land conversion. As noted above, the Township of Woolwich is currently preparing a Secondary Plan to establish the land use strategy for Breslau.

Circulation Comments

In preparing this report, Regional staff has circulated the proposed amendment to the Area Municipalities and circulation agencies for review and comment. No objections to the amendment were received through this process.

Woolwich Township Council passed a resolution on October 16, 2012 indicating that it does not object to the proposed ROPP amendment, provided that:

1. the Breslau Secondary Plan and the Township's scoped Official Plan review, will continue to be planning processes by which the Township will develop and implement an appropriate land use strategy for Breslau; and

2. the final consideration of Thomasfield Homes’ development applications within Breslau by the Region and Township of Woolwich will not occur until after the Breslau Secondary Plan process is substantially complete.

City of Kitchener staff did not raise any objections to the proposed amendment, but remain interested in the land use changes, development potential and servicing issues affecting Breslau. City staff will provide additional comments on these matters to the Region and the Township of Woolwich as part of the Breslau Secondary Plan process, as well as the development applications that have been submitted by Thomasfield Homes.

The Grand River Conservation Authority has no objection to the proposed amendment, but notes that it will be reviewing the mapping of the Breslau Provincially Significant Wetland Complex as part of the Breslau Secondary Plan. This review may result in further refinements to the boundaries of wetland, which would be implemented through a future housekeeping amendment to the new ROP.

Next Steps

Following Regional Council’s decision on this amendment, the Region would issue a Notice of Decision in accordance with the Planning Act. Any person or public body who, before Regional Council considers the amendment, made oral submission at the public meeting or written submission to Regional Council, may appeal Regional Council’s decision to the OMB within the 20-day appeal period. The amendment would come into effect if there are no appeals within this period.

If Regional Council does not approve this amendment or it is appealed, the Township will not be able complete its planning process for Breslau and Thomasfield Homes’ development applications will not be considered.

Conclusion

Regional staff recommends that Regional Council approve the proposed ROPP for the following reasons:

1. The amendment is consistent with the policy framework established for Breslau in the new ROP, as adopted by Regional Council in June 2009 and subsequently approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing in December 2010;
2. The amendment conforms to the *Growth Plan*; and

3. The amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

The proposed amendment was circulated to each of the Area Municipalities for review and comment. As noted above, none of the Area Municipalities have raised any objections with this amendment. Township of Woolwich staff concurs with the recommendations of this report.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

Approval of this amendment will directly support Focus Area 2 (Growth Management and Prosperity), which seeks to foster thriving urban and rural communities while developing, optimizing and maintaining infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

*NIL*

**OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:**

Regional planning staff has consulted with staff from Legal Services and Transportation and Environmental Services during the review of this amendment.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Attachment A - Location Map.
Attachment B - ROPP Amendment No. 30, Designation of Breslau as a “Township Urban Area.”

**PREPARED BY:** John Lubczynski, Principal Planner
Kevin Curtis, Manager, Strategic Planning

**APPROVED BY:** Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
Regional Official Policies Plan

Amendment No. 30
Designation of Breslau as a “Township Urban Area”

Region of Waterloo

NOVEMBER 2012
AMENDMENT NO. 30 TO THE REGIONAL OFFICIAL POLICIES PLAN
DESIGNATION OF BRESLAU AS A “TOWNSHIP URBAN AREA”

PART I – PURPOSE OF THE AMENDMENT

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to:

a) Re-designate the Breslau Settlement Area from “Rural Settlement Area 35” and “Industrial/Commercial Area E Industrial Area – Regional Road 17” to “Township Urban Area” on Map No. 6 – Settlement Pattern;

b) Amend Table 7.3 to delete the references to “35. Breslau” and “E. Industrial Area – Regional Road 17”;

c) Amend Policy 7.5.1.8 to delete the reference to “Breslau” under the heading “Township of Woolwich”;

d) Delete Policy 7.5.1.10 in its entirety, to remove the current development cap in Breslau of 1,250 dwelling units;

e) Amend Map No. 2 – Provincially Significant Wetlands to add the “Breslau Provincially Significant Wetland Complex”; and

f) Amend Map No. 3 – Agricultural Resource Areas, to delete the “Prime Agricultural Areas” designation from the Breslau Settlement Area, as identified in the Township of Woolwich Official Plan.

The overall effect of this amendment is to provide for the consideration of additional growth development within the current limits of Breslau. The amendment will not designate any new land uses within Breslau, and will not change the existing settlement boundaries. Specific land uses for Breslau will be considered through separate development applications submitted to the Region of Waterloo and Township of Woolwich.

The addition of the “Breslau Wetland Complex” to Map 2 will incorporate the Province’s latest wetland mapping for Breslau. This change is intended to ensure that any future development in the area will not adversely affect the Breslau Wetland Complex.

PART II – BASIS OF THE AMENDMENT

The Regional Official Policies Plan (ROPP) currently designates Breslau as a “Rural Settlement Area” and an “Industrial/Commercial Area”. Historically, these two settlement designations were planned to provide for a limited amount of population and employment growth on private services. Such settlements were intended to predominately serve the needs of rural residents and area businesses. Examples of other rural settlements in Woolwich would include Maryhill, Conestogo, Bloomingdale and Heidelberg.

Following the review of the ROPP in the early 1990s, a decision was made to extend municipal water and wastewater services to Breslau to accommodate a maximum of 1,250 units. This development cap was subsequently incorporated into the ROPP, and has remained in place since then. Extending municipal services to Breslau, together with the other supporting public infrastructure investments in the area, have enabled Breslau to transition from a small rural settlement to a growing urban area. Today, Breslau supports an estimated population of 3,300 people and 1,100 jobs, and has the potential to support additional growth in the future.
In 2003, Regional Council adopted its Regional Growth Management Strategy (RGMS) to provide a long-term framework for growth and development in Waterloo Region. Among other objectives, the RGMS seeks to direct a greater share of the Region’s future growth towards the eastern side of Waterloo Region, generally between new Highway 7 and Maple Grove Road (i.e., referred to as the East Side Lands). Although the RGMS did not include any specific recommendations for Breslau, it was understood that Breslau would continue to transition into an urban settlement with a mix of land uses and higher density development. Since the adoption of the RGMS and the new ROP, Regional Council has initiated a number of infrastructure plans and servicing studies that identified potential infrastructure improvements to support additional growth and development on the East Side Lands.

The Province’s Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan) designates the undeveloped parts of Breslau as “designated greenfield areas.” This designation identifies lands located within approved settlement areas, but not yet built upon. Under the Growth Plan, municipalities must plan “designated greenfield areas” to provide for a diverse mix of land uses, and to achieve a minimum density target not less than 50 residents and jobs combined per hectare. Under the ROPP, this density of development is characteristic of a “City Urban Area” or a “Township Urban Area” designation and is not contemplated, or appropriate within a “Rural Settlement Area.” Designating Breslau as a “Township Urban Area” would therefore be in conformity with the Growth Plan.

To better plan for growth within Breslau, Regional Council decided to include Breslau within the larger “Urban Area” designation when Council had adopted the new ROP in 2009. This urban designation, which applies to most of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo, identifies areas where the majority of the Region’s future growth will occur on full municipal services. The new ROP was subsequently appealed and remains before the Ontario Municipal Board at this time. Approval of this amendment will therefore reiterate Regional Council’s previous decision for Breslau in the new ROP.

In December 2011, GO Transit initiated train service between Kitchener and Toronto’s Union Station. In the final Environmental Study Report approved a year earlier, the Province identified four new GO station sites along the rail corridor, one of which is located on the eastern side of Breslau on Greenhouse Road. Discussions are now underway among the Region, the Township of Woolwich, Metrolinx and the affected land owner to implement the Breslau GO train station. Once constructed, the new station will increase access to commuter rail services and provide an opportunity to develop Breslau with higher, transit-supportive densities. By removing the existing development cap for Breslau, this amendment will therefore help to increase transit ridership and the viability of the GO train service.

**PART III – DETAILS OF THE AMENDMENT**

The following revisions to Section 7.5 and Map Nos. 2, 3 and 6 constitute the proposed amendment to the Regional Official Policies Plan.

1) **Section – 7.5 Rural Settlement Areas and Industrial/Commercial Areas**

   Section 7.5 is hereby amended by deleting from Table 7.3 “35. Breslau” and “E. Industrial Area – Reg. Rd. 17”;

   Section 7.5.1.8 is hereby amended by deleting “Breslau”;

   Section 7.5.1.10 is hereby amended by deleting it in its entirety; and

   Section 7.5.1.11 is renumbered as Section 7.5.1.10.
2) Map No. 2 – Provincially Significant Wetlands is hereby amended by adding the Provincially Significant Wetlands designation to portions of Breslau, as shown on the attached Schedule A.1.

3) Map No. 3 – Agricultural Resource Areas is hereby amended by deleting the “Prime Agricultural Areas” designation from the Breslau Settlement Area, as shown on the attached Schedule A.2., and to delete the symbols “35” and “E”.

4) Map No. 6 – Settlement Pattern is hereby amended by re-designating the Breslau Settlement Area, as shown on the attached Schedule A.3, from “Rural Settlement Areas” to “Township Urban Area,” and by deleting the symbols “35” and “E”.

PART IV – IMPLEMENTATION

This ROPP amendment will provide the basis for the Breslau Secondary Plan and the scoped review of the Township Official Plan currently underway. Once completed, these planning exercises will be implemented through an amendment to the Township of Woolwich Official Plan. The resulting land use strategy will then be incorporated into the Township’s Zoning By-law to provide the legal basis for managing land use and future development in Breslau.
REGION OF WATERLOO
PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
Community Planning

TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
DATE: November 6, 2012
FILE CODE: D25-01
SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF CITY OF CAMBRIDGE’S PROPOSED NEW OFFICIAL PLAN

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve, in part, with modifications, the Official Plan of the City of Cambridge, and that the Decision contained in Attachment A to Report No. P-12-114, dated November 6, 2012, be included in the approval document;

THAT the repeal of the City of Cambridge Official Plan, as adopted by City of Cambridge By-law 66-12 and all amendments thereto, is hereby approved in accordance with the provisions of Sections 17 and 21 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chap. P.13, as amended only insofar as it is replaced by the new Official Plan through this approval;

THAT no decision be made at this time with respect to:

a) Chapter 1: Introduction, second paragraph, second sentence; Section 2.2 a); Section 2.3.1; Section 2.5.2 a) Table 1; Section 2.6.1.1, second sentence; Section 2.6.2.2; Section 2.8.2.3 and Section 3.B.7 that collectively address aggregate policies; population and employment forecasts; reurbanization targets; and Designated Greenfield Area density targets pending resolution of the outstanding appeals of the Regional Official Plan affecting these sections;

b) Policy 8.10.29; Map 2; and Map 2a as they relate to the lands commonly known as the Hunt Club and Arriscraft International Inc. (Arriscraft) lands as illustrated in Attachment B in accordance with the memorandum of oral decision delivered on September 26, 2012, by the Ontario Municipal Board (PL080311);

c) Policy 8.10.24; Map 2; and Map 2a as they relate to the lands commonly known as the Creekside lands as illustrated in Attachment C; and

d) Policy 8.7.2.B; Map 2; Map 9; Map 15; and Figure 3 as they relate to the lands commonly known as the Community Node for Main and Dundas Street as illustrated in Attachment D, pending resolution of the outstanding appeals of the Regional Official Plan affecting these lands.

SUMMARY:

On May 7, 2012, Cambridge City Council passed By-law No. 66-12 to adopt a new Official Plan for the City of Cambridge. The new Official Plan provides the framework for guiding decisions on growth and change in the City of Cambridge over the next two decades. It is a forward-looking document based on extensive background work and significant public consultation. The Plan builds on and will help implement the Regional Official Plan, the Province’s Growth Plan for
the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan), the Provincial Policy Statement and other Provincial policies and legislation. Highlights of the City’s new Official Plan include:

- promoting intensification and a more compact urban form;
- planning to support rapid transit and more active forms of transportation;
- recognizing the Urban Growth Centre; and
- identifying and conserving the City’s valuable natural and cultural heritage resources.

Under the Planning Act, Regional Council is the approval authority for Area Municipal official plans, and is responsible for addressing Regional and Provincial interests. In exercising this authority, Regional Council may approve, modify and approve, or not make a decision with respect to all or part of an official plan to ensure it conforms to the Regional Official Plan and the Growth Plan and is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement. This process is carried out in collaboration with the Area Municipality, public agencies and other stakeholders including the Grand River Conservation Authority.

The currently in effect Regional Official Policies Plan was originally approved by the Province in 1995. Since that time, the Province has brought into force and effect the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement and the 2006 Growth Plan, which between them, provide a comprehensive policy framework that governs the development of municipal official plans within the Greater Golden Horseshoe. These documents also supersede the Regional Official Policies Plan to the extent of any conflict and provide the policy basis upon which an official plan needs to be tested. In June 2009, Regional Council adopted the new Regional Official Plan, which represents Regional Council’s interpretation of the appropriate implementation of the Provincial Policy Statement and the Growth Plan within the regional context. The Regional Official Plan was approved with modifications by the Province on December 22, 2010, and has subsequently been appealed in its entirety to the Ontario Municipal Board. Therefore, for the purposes of approval of the City of Cambridge Official Plan, conformity with the Regional Official Plan, as approved by the Province, is the test being used to establish consistency of the City of Cambridge Official Plan with the Provincial Policy Statement, and conformity with the Growth Plan.

On August 23, 2012, Regional staff issued a draft Decision on the City’s Official Plan for review and comment. The draft Decision included several proposed modifications, most of which were either minor or technical in nature. Other modifications were required to address matters of conformity to the Regional Official Plan and therefore establish conformity to the Growth Plan and consistency with the Provincial Policy Statement. Following the release of the draft Decision, Regional staff worked closely with the City to discuss and further refine the wording of the proposed modifications. At its meeting of September 24, 2012, Cambridge City Council endorsed the Region’s draft Decision subject to a series of modifications.

City and Regional staff worked through the modifications to resolve the outstanding issues. However, there were minor issues related to Regional Official Plan conformity and one minor issue related to the implementation of an Ontario Municipal Board decision where there are small differences in approach between Regional and City staff. Regional staff’s approach to these three issues has been consistent in the review of all new Area Municipal Official Plans and does not affect the ability of the City of Cambridge to implement its new official plan. The proposed modifications ensure that the Cambridge Official Plan is consistent with the Regional Official Plan and other Area Municipal Official Plans.

The proposed Decision also identifies several parts of the City’s Official Plan for which no decision will be made at this time. In general, these deferrals (areas of no decision) relate to matters currently before the Ontario Municipal Board or to issues requiring further review by the City of Cambridge. The deferrals are discussed below.
Overall, Regional staff is satisfied that the City of Cambridge Official Plan, as modified, conforms to the Regional Official Plan and the Growth Plan and is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement. We wish to acknowledge the City’s hard work in finalizing its new Official Plan, and for collaborating with Regional staff throughout the process. Cambridge Staff generally concur with the recommendations contained in this report.

REPORT:

On May 7, 2012, Cambridge City Council passed By-law No. 66-12 to adopt a new Official Plan for the City of Cambridge. The new Official Plan replaces the City’s previous Official Plan, which was approved in 1999 and has been amended several times since then.

The new Official Plan is grounded on the principles of sustainability, and provides the basis for guiding decisions on how Cambridge will grow and develop over the next two decades. It is a forward-looking document based on extensive background work and significant consultation with stakeholders and the broader community. The Official Plan also builds on and will help implement the Regional Official Plan and several Provincial initiatives, including the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan), the Provincial Policy Statement and other Provincial legislation and policies. Key elements of the City’s Official Plan include:

- promoting intensification and a more compact urban form;
- planning to support rapid transit and more active forms of transportation;
- recognizing Urban Growth Centres; and
- identifying and conserving the City’s valuable natural areas and cultural heritage resources.

The City developed its new Official Plan following a lengthy and comprehensive process. Between 2009 and 2011, the City issued a series of discussion papers and background reports on specific planning issues. Regional staff sat on a Cambridge Technical Staff Steering Committee that reviewed the discussion papers, background reports and proposed draft policies. The City released the first and second drafts of its Official Plan in June 2011 and February 2012, respectively. Each draft was followed by a further round of Open Houses to gain additional public input. This process culminated on May 7, 2012, when Cambridge City Council adopted its new Official Plan, and then forwarded it to the Region for approval.

Review Process

Under the Planning Act, Regional Council is the approval authority for Area Municipal official plans, and is responsible for addressing Regional and Provincial interests. In exercising this authority, Regional Council may approve, modify and approve, or not make a decision with respect to all or part of an official plan to ensure it conforms to the Regional Official Plan and the Growth Plan, and is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement. This process is carried out in close collaboration with the Area Municipality, public agencies and with key stakeholders including the Grand River Conservation Authority. The Planning Act also establishes 180-day time-frame for the approval authority to make a decision on an official plan. If the approval authority fails to make a decision within this period, any person or public body can appeal the official plan to the Ontario Municipal Board.

Regional staff met with and provided comments to the City of Cambridge at several points in the process. In May and June, 2012, staff circulated the adopted Official Plan to appropriate agencies, other Regional departments and each of the other Area Municipalities for review and comment. Based on the results of this circulation, staff released a draft Decision on the City’s Official Plan on August 23, 2012. The draft Decision included several proposed modifications, most of which were either minor or technical in nature. Other modifications were required to address matters of conformity to the Regional Official Plan.
Following the release of the draft Decision, City and Regional staff worked closely to refine the proposed modifications and to resolve any outstanding issues. At its meeting of September 24, 2012, Cambridge City Council endorsed the draft Decision subject to a series of minor modifications.

**Approach Issues**

City and Regional staff worked through the modifications to resolve the outstanding issues. However, there were two minor issues related to Regional Official Plan conformity and one minor issue related to the implementation of an Ontario Municipal Board decision where there were small differences in approach between Regional and City staff. Regional staff’s approach to these three issues has been consistent in the review of all new Area Municipal Official Plans and does not affect the ability of the City of Cambridge to implement its new official plan. The proposed modifications ensure that the Cambridge Official Plan is consistent with the Regional Official Plan and other Area Municipal Official Plans.

Cambridge Council has requested that Major Transit Station Areas be described as lands within approximately 500m of a rapid transit station. Major Transit Station Areas are defined in Regional Official Plan policy 2.D.6 as lands typically located within a 600-800m radius of a rapid transit station. This is a Regional Official Plan conformity requirement for all Area Municipal Official Plans. However, Regional staff notes that policy 2.D.7, which directs Area Municipalities to prepare Station Area Plans also provides them with the flexibility to define station area boundaries to reflect local circumstances. Cambridge Planning Staff has been involved in the Region’s Central Transit Corridor Community Building Strategy, which will help inform the development of Station Area Plans and has demonstrated the opportunity to Station Area Plan boundaries of approximately 500m.

Cambridge Council has requested flexibility in the use of the term rapid transit. Rapid transit is a defined term in the Regional Official Plan and this is a conformity requirement for all Area Municipal Official Plans.

Cambridge Council has requested that the Region not modify the Official Plan’s Planning Horizon from 2029 to 2031 until after the Regional Official Plan has been fully approved by the Ontario Municipal Board. An Ontario Municipal Board decision (PL110080) dated February 3, 2012, determined that the planning horizon for all official plans in the Greater Golden Horseshoe should be 2031. The Region and Area Municipalities are obligated to implement this decision and accordingly, the Region is modifying all the planning horizon reference in the Cambridge Official Plan from 2029 to 2031.

**Conformity with Regional Official Plan**

The currently in effect Regional Official Policies Plan was originally approved by the Province in 1995. Since that time, the Province has brought into force and effect the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement and the 2006 Growth Plan, which between them; provide a comprehensive policy framework that governs the development of municipal official plans within the Greater Golden Horseshoe. These documents also supersede the Regional Official Policies Plan to the extent of any conflict and provide the policy basis upon which an official plan needs to be tested. In June 2009, Regional Council adopted the new Regional Official Plan, which represents Regional Council’s interpretation of the appropriate implementation of the Provincial Policy Statement and the Growth Plan within the regional context. The Regional Official Plan was approved with modifications by the Province on December 22, 2010, and has subsequently been appealed in its entirety to the Ontario Municipal Board. Therefore, for the purposes of approval of the City of Cambridge Official Plan, conformity with the Regional Official Plan, as approved by the
Province, is the test being used to establish consistency of the City of Cambridge Official Plan with the Provincial Policy Statement, and conformity with the Growth Plan.

Deferrals (No decision being made at this time)

The proposed Decision identifies sections of the City’s Official Plan for which no decision is being made at this time pending further consideration. A deferral is essentially a “non-decision” with respect to a policy or a certain property. In the case of a property, the designations of the previous Official Plan continue to apply until the deferral is resolved. The resolution to each deferral will be considered by Cambridge City Council at a later date, and then brought forward to Regional Council for consideration. The areas being deferred at this time include:

1. Sections of the Official Plan relating to population and employment forecasts; reurbanization targets; and Designated Greenfield Area density targets.

The new Regional Official Plan was appealed in its entirety to the Ontario Municipal Board in January 2011, and remains under adjudication at this time. To date, Regional staff has participated in several pre-hearing conferences, mediation sessions and motion hearings in an effort to scope or resolve the outstanding appeals. Earlier this year, the Ontario Municipal Board determined that the Regional Official Plan should use a planning horizon of 2031 instead of 2029 for the population and employment forecast, and for estimating the Region’s future land requirements. The Ontario Municipal Board's decision required staff to revise the Regional Land Budget that was originally endorsed by Regional Council on April 30, 2009. Council subsequently endorsed the revised Land Budget on June 6, 2012 (see Report No. P-12-084).

This past summer, the Ontario Municipal Board held a five-week hearing to consider the revised Regional Land Budget, and to decide whether the Region needs an urban expansion to accommodate future growth. The Ontario Municipal Board is anticipated to provide its decision on these matters later this year. Depending on its decision, the Ontario Municipal Board may direct the Region to revise the reurbanization target and density target for Designated Greenfield Areas contained in the adopted Regional Official Plan. Since these targets were used as inputs in both the Regional Land Budget, they are among the key issues now before by the Ontario Municipal Board.

Another issue before the Ontario Municipal Board relates to the allocation of the Region’s population and employment forecasts to each of the Area Municipalities. Although the Ontario Municipal Board has directed the Region to use a planning horizon of 2031 instead of 2029, it still has to adjudicate how the additional population and employment growth will be allocated to each of the Area Municipalities. The Ontario Municipal Board is anticipated to consider this issue sometime next year.

In addition, the City’s Official Plan includes several new policies relating to the extraction of mineral aggregate resources. Some of these policies mirror the aggregate policies in the new Regional Official Plan that are currently before the Ontario Municipal Board, in part as a result of appeals filed by the Region. In an effort to resolve these appeals, several informal mediation sessions have been held between Regional staff and the affected parties.

In light of the Ontario Municipal Board processes described above, Regional staff recommends that Regional Council defer all sections of the City of Cambridge’s Official Plan relating to the mineral aggregate policies, reurbanization targets, density targets for Designated Greenfield Areas, and population and employment forecasts until such time as the Ontario Municipal Board has made a decision on these issues in the Regional Official Plan through either adjudication or negotiated settlement.
2. **Hunt Club and Arriscraft International Inc. (Arriscraft) Lands**

Matters related to the Hunt Club and Arriscraft International Inc. (Arriscraft) Lands have been before the Ontario Municipal Board for some years. In a memorandum of oral decision delivered on September 26, 2012, the Board advised that Hunt Club and Arriscraft International Inc. (Arriscraft) have reached an agreement to file new applications for an official plan amendment, zoning by-law amendment, and plan of subdivision that would apply to both Hunt Club and Arriscraft lands. These applications would replace the applications for official plan amendment and zoning by-law amendment that are currently before the Board and which apply only to Hunt Club lands. Accordingly, and with the concurrence of Cambridge staff, Regional staff recommends that Regional Council defer Policy 8.10.29; Map 2 and Map 2a as they relate to the lands commonly known as the Hunt Club and Arriscraft International Inc. (Arriscraft) lands as illustrated in Attachment B, until such time as new applications have been filed and processed.

3. **Creekside Lands**

In a resolution passed on Monday, October 1, 2012, Cambridge City Council requested the deferral of any decision pertaining to land use for Creekside Lands to allow for further discussion of uses for the property. Regional staff agrees with this request and recommends that Regional Council defer Policy 8.10.24; Map 2; and Map 2a as they relate to the lands commonly known as the Creekside lands as illustrated in Attachment C.

4. **Main Street and Dundas Street Node**

At the City of Cambridge General Committee Meeting on September 24, 2012, a motion was passed to amend the boundaries shown in Figure 3 - Community Node for Dundas Street and Main Street. Regional staff notes that the owners of these lands have appealed the following Sections of the Regional Official Plan, as approved by the Province, in their entirety:

- Map 3a – Urban Area
- Map 4 – Greenlands Network (as it relates to lands identified by the appellant)
- Map 6a – Urban Area Source Water Protection Areas
- Policy 2.D – Urban Area Development Policies
- Policy 2.G – General Policies for Urban Development
- Policy 4.A – Employment Areas
- Section 7 – The Greenlands Network
- Section 8 – Source Water Protection

Regional staff recommends that Regional Council defer making a decision on the City of Cambridge Council’s motion requesting the Region to modify Policy 8.7.2.B; Map 2; Map 9; Map 15; and Figure 3 as they relate to the lands commonly known as the Community Node for Main and Dundas Street, only affecting these lands as illustrated in Attachment D, until such time as the Regional Official Plan appeals affecting these lands have been resolved by the Ontario Municipal Board.

**Additional Request from Cambridge City Council**

In a resolution passed on October 1, 2012, Cambridge City Council requested the Region to modify the Official Plan to address the floodplain boundaries on the Hammer Farm. Regional staff is in receipt of a letter from the GRCA to the applicant that indicates the applicable floodplain boundaries should remain as is until:

- a permit application is submitted with the supporting information required to demonstrate how the proposal meets GRCA policies;
- the permit is supported by staff and approved by the GRCA; and
- the approved works are fully implemented

Regional staff has discussed the matter with GRCA and Cambridge staff and there is insufficient information to amend the floodplain boundaries at this time and that no action should be taken on the City’s modification request. Subject to the receipt and review of future development applications and associated studies, the City may incorporate revised floodplain mapping into the new Official Plan by means of a future official plan amendment.

**Ongoing Appeals to the Regional Official Plan**

The City’s new Official Plan contains several cross references to policies in the Regional Official Plan, which as noted above are still before the Ontario Municipal Board. The new Regional Official Plan is not anticipated to fully come into effect until 2014. Given this delay and the uncertainty over the Board’s decision on the Regional Official Plan, some of the cross referenced policies could be changed by the Ontario Municipal Board depending on the Board’s final decision. In consideration of this potential issue, Regional staff is recommending that Regional Council modify the City’s Official Plan to add the following two new policies in Chapter 9 (Implementation):

“9.5 This plan contains references to the Regional Official Plan. All such references shall be interpreted as referring to the text and mapping of the Regional Official Plan as approved by the Province on December 22, 2010;” and

9.6 Notwithstanding Policy 9.5, it is recognized that the Regional Official Plan may change through future approvals by the Ontario Municipal Board or through future adopted by Regional Council. In the event that changes are made to the Regional Official Plan through either the approval by the Ontario Municipal Board or by future amendment, this Plan will be brought into conformity with the Regional Official Plan by means of appropriate housekeeping amendments.”

**Summary**

Overall, Regional staff is satisfied that the City of Cambridge's Official Plan, as modified, conforms to the Regional Official Plan and the *Growth Plan* and is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement. Regional staff recommends that Regional Council approve the City’s Official Plan as outlined in this report.

**Next Steps**

Following Regional Council’s decision on the City of Cambridge Official Plan, the Region will issue a Notice of Decision in accordance with the *Planning Act*. Any person or public body that made an oral submission at the public meeting, or made a written submission to Cambridge City Council before its decision to adopt the official plan, may appeal the Region of Waterloo’s decision to the Ontario Municipal Board within the 20-day appeal period. The Official Plan will come into effect if there is no appeal within this period.
Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Regional staff has met with and provided comments to the City of Cambridge throughout the Official Plan review process. We wish to acknowledge the City's work in finalizing its new Official Plan, and for collaborating with Regional staff throughout the process.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Approval of the City of Cambridge Official Plan will support each of the Region’s five Focus Areas: (1) Environmental Sustainability; (2) Growth Management and Prosperity; (3) Sustainable Transportation; (4) Healthy and Inclusive Communities; and (5) Service Excellence. In particular, this approval will help implement Action Item 2.1.2, which is to work with Area Municipalities to develop and implement a comprehensive strategy to promote intensification and reurbanization within existing urban areas. The City’s new Official Plan will also play a major role in achieving Action Item 3.1.1, which is to develop an implementation plan for rapid transit including corridor and station area plans.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no direct financial implications arising from the recommendations of this report. However, there is the potential that all or part of the Region’s Decision may be appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board. Costs to the Region would depend on the nature of the appeals and the ability to reach a negotiated settlement with the appellants. Regional staff will report back to Regional Council in the event that Regional staff is required to participate in an Ontario Municipal Board hearing regarding the Region’s Decision on this Official Plan.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Regional planning staff has circulated the City of Cambridge's Official Plan to Public Health, Transportation and Environmental Services, and Legal Services for review and comment. All of the comments received through this process have been reviewed and, if necessary addressed through the modifications to the Official Plan.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A - Notice of Decision City of Cambridge Official Plan
Attachment B - Map 1: Hunt Club and Arriscraft International Inc. (Arriscraft) Lands
Attachment C - Map 2: Creekside Lands
Attachment D - Map 3: Community Node for Main and Dundas Street

PREPARED BY: Anne Fitzpatrick, Planner, Strategic Policy Development
Kevin Curtis, Manager, Strategic Policy Development

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
Cambridge OP FINAL NOTICE OF DECISION
With respect to the Official Plan of the City of Cambridge
Subsection 17(34) of the Planning Act
August 23, 2012

The Region of Waterloo hereby approves the Official Plan for the City of Cambridge, as adopted by By-law No. 66-12 on May 7, 2012, subject to the following modifications, as shown in Part A of this Decision.

Part A of this Decision constitutes additions and deletions to the text of the Official Plan. Additions are shown in red text (example), and deletions are illustrated in single strikethrough (example). Part B of this Decision identifies areas of the Official Plan for which no decision is being made at this time.

PART A: Regional Modifications to text of the Official Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mod. No.</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Details of the Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>On page 4, Policy 2.1.2 is modified as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“This Plan will guide land use planning in the City of Cambridge to the year 2029. New growth will be accommodated where municipal services are available within the urban area and a significant portion will be directed to the built-up area of the community. The urban structure of Cambridge is contained within the urban area boundary and consists of the built-up area, the Urban Growth Centre, Community Core Areas, Nodes, Regeneration Areas, Reurbanization Corridors, Major Transit Station Areas and the designated greenfield area. The urban structure is shown on Maps 1A, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of this Plan.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>On page 5, Objective 2.2.1.i) is modified as follows:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|          |         | “to encourage the development of a range of existing and proposed corridors in this Plan to serve as key transportation linkages with areas both within and outside the city, including roads, rail lines, rivers, and cycling and pedestrian routes. One of the corridors will delineate the general alignment of the rapid transit system linking Cambridge with Kitchener and Waterloo. Stage 1 of the rapid transit system within the portion of the corridor located between the Ainslie Street Terminal in Cambridge and Fairview Park Mall in Kitchener will use adapted bus rapid transit (aBRT) technology. Stage 2 provides the opportunity for the aBRT technology to be converted to light rapid transit (LRT) technology when funding is available and/or when warranted by ridership;
3. 2.3 On page 6, Policy 2.3.2 is modified as follows:

“Longer term forecasts, beyond the 2029 planning horizon, may be used for infrastructure planning studies undertaken by or for the City provided that they are prepared using the same methodology as the Region’s forecasts.”

4. 2.4 On page 6, the first paragraph of Section 2.4 is modified as follows:

“The urban area boundary is established by the Region through the Regional Official Plan and is identified on Map 1A. The forecasted population and employment growth will be accommodated within the urban area to the year 2029.”

5. 2.6.1 On page 9, Policy 2.6.1.8 is modified as follows:

“Infill, intensification and redevelopment within existing neighbourhoods will be minor in nature and will be designed to respect existing character and provide connections and linkages where possible.”

6. 2.6.2 On page 10, Policy 2.6.2.2 is modified as follows:

“The Urban Growth Centre will be planned to achieve a minimum gross density of 150 residents and jobs combined per hectare by the year 2029.”

7. 2.6.2 On page 10, Policy 2.6.2.3 is modified as follows:

“The Urban Growth Centre will be planned and designed:
   a) as the focal area for investment in institutional and region-wide public services, as well as commercial, recreational, cultural and entertainment uses;
   b) to accommodate and support major transit infrastructure and a Major Transit Station Area including a rapid transit station;
   c) to serve as a high density major employment centre that will attract significant employment uses, including major offices;
   d) to accommodate a significant share of population and employment growth; and as a pedestrian oriented, walkable centre with active streetscapes.”

8. 2.6.5 On page 14, Policy 2.6.5.1 is modified as follows:

“Reurbanization Corridors are recognized as areas located along an existing or planned transit corridor that link directly with rapid transit and have considerable potential for medium and higher density reurbanization. Reurbanization Corridors serve as connectors, between the Urban Growth Centre, Major Transit Station Areas and Nodes.”
| 9.  | 2.6.5 | On page 14, Policy 2.6.5.3 is modified as follows:

"Reurbanization Corridors will be planned and developed to:

- a) accommodate additional population and employment growth served by rapid transit \textit{rapid transit} and/or frequent transit service, which may or may not operate on an exclusive right-of-way"
- b) achieve higher \textit{development} densities to support and ensure the viability of existing and planned transit service levels; and
- c) provide a mix of residential, office, including \textit{major offices}, institutional and commercial \textit{development}, wherever appropriate."

| 10. | 2.6.6 | On page 15, Section 2.6.6, the policies related to Major Transit Station Areas are modified as follows:

"1. \textit{Major Transit Station Areas} include a transit station or a planned transit station area and the lands surrounding the station. \textit{Major Transit Station Areas} are lands typically located within a 600 to 800 metre radius of a \textit{rapid transit} station."

"2. The \textit{Region} will delineate the general alignment of the \textit{rapid transit} system and designate station areas conceptually through a future amendment to the Regional Official Plan. The \textit{City} will designate \textit{Major Transit Station Areas} will be designated on one or more Maps and establish associated policies through an amendment to this Plan in accordance with the Regional Official Plan."

3. A Station Area Plan will be prepared for each \textit{Major Transit Station Area} located outside of the \textit{Urban Growth Centre} in collaboration with the \textit{Region} and in accordance with the Regional Official Plan.

"4. \textit{Major Transit Station Areas} will be planned in consultation with the \textit{Region} to:

- a) achieve increased residential and employment densities to support and ensure the viability of existing and planned transit service levels;
- b) achieve a mix of residential, office, including \textit{major offices}, institutional and commercial \textit{development} where appropriate; and
- c) \textit{development} located within an existing or planned \textit{Major Transit Station Area} will be planned and designed based on the principles of \textit{transit oriented development} in accordance with Section 5.3 of this Plan."

5. \textit{Development} and \textit{redevelopment} within \textit{Major Transit Station Areas} is encouraged to redevelop in a manner consistent with Policy 2.6.6.4 of this Plan.
6. Until such time as such policies for Major Transit Station Areas are established, any application for development submitted within a Major Transit Station Area will be reviewed in accordance with the transit oriented development provisions described in Section 5.3 of this Plan and in Section 2.D.6 of the Regional Official Plan. Any such applications that do not fully meet the transit oriented development provisions may be permitted, provided the owner/applicant demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the Region and the City, that the proposed development is designed in such a way that subsequent phases or infilling would meet the transit oriented development provisions.

7. Non-transit supportive uses such as lower density office uses or commercial uses oriented to vehicular travel shall be discouraged from locating within Major Transit Station Areas.

11. 2.7.1 On page 15, Policy 2.7.1.1 is modified as follows:
“The City will plan to provide a sufficient supply of employment lands for a variety of employment uses to accommodate the forecasted employment growth to the year **2029 2031.**”

12. 2.7.1 On page 16, Policy 2.7.1.2.e) is modified as follows:
“permitting major office and major institutional development within the Urban Growth Centre, major transit station areas Major Transit Station Areas, Reurbanization Corridors or areas with existing frequent transit service and within the vicinity of Highway 401; and”

13. 3.A.3 On page 35, Policies 3.A.3.8 and 3.A.3.9 are modified as follows:
“8. The following buffer width guidelines will be evaluated and addressed through the Environmental Impact Statement:
   a) Significant Habitat of Endangered or Threatened Species—species specific;
   b) Provincially Significant Wetlands—30 metres (10 metres minimum);
   c) Environmentally Sensitive Policy Areas—10 metres minimum;
   d) Significant Woodlands—10 metres minimum (measured from the drip line); and
   e) Environmentally Significant Valley Features—10 metres minimum.

8. The buffer width for Core Environmental Features will be a minimum width of 10 metres in accordance with the Regional Official Plan. Based on the results of an Environmental Impact Statement these boundary widths may be greater, for instance Significant Habitat for endangered or threatened species will be species specific and Provincially Significant Wetlands may be 30 metres.

9. Buffer widths **wider** different than those in Policy 3.A.3.8 for Core Environmental Features may be required if warranted by the natural features and ecological functions, as determined through a review
of the *Environmental Impact Statement* demonstrates to the satisfaction of the approval agencies that a wider buffer is warranted because of... Modified buffer widths will be determined on a site-specific basis by considering the sensitivity of the natural features, their ecological functions, the potential impacts of the proposed contiguous development and/or land use, the intended function of the buffer and the physiography of the site.

| 14. | 3.B.6.1.1 | On page 49, Policy 3.B.6.1.1.4.b) is modified as follows: “institutional uses, such as hospitals, nursing homes, day care establishments, group homes and schools, which would pose a significant threat to the safety of the inhabitants if involved in an emergency evacuation situation as a result of flooding or failure of flood protection measures, except as provided in Policy 3.B.6.1.17.22 f) (flood fringe); and” |
| 15. | 3.B.6.1.2 | On page 56, Policy 3.B.6.1.2.2 is modified as follows: “The GRCA regulates areas that are river or stream valleys and watercourses.” |
| 16. | 3.B.6.1.2 | On page 56, Policy 3.B.6.1.2.4 is modified as follows: “The City’s Zoning By-law will indicate that any development, alteration to a watercourse or interference with a wetland within the regulated areas as described in Ontario Regulation 150/06 shall require the approval of the GRCA. The regulated area shall be generally shown on the City’s Zoning By-law maps and reference will be made to detailed mapping availability from the GRCA.” |
| 17. | 4.10 | On page 77, the first paragraph of Policy 4.10.1 is modified as follows: “A *Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment* shall be required when for a development proposal or Community Plan that includes or is adjacent to a designated property or cultural heritage landscape, or that includes a non-designated resource of cultural heritage value or interest listed on the Municipal Heritage Register, potentially impacts a cultural heritage resource. The potential impacts could be direct, such as demolishing or altering a structure on a designated property, or indirect such as changes to the streetscape of lands adjacent to a cultural heritage resource. A *Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment* may include the following elements: ...” |
| 18. | 4.13 | On page 79, the first paragraph of Policy 4.13.1 is modified as follows: “Upon receiving information that lands proposed for development or site alteration may constitute or include a resource of potential or acknowledged archaeological value, if an *archaeological assessment* has not been completed; the City will require the owner of such lands to submit an *archaeological assessment*, conducted by a licensed archaeologist, in accordance with the provisions of the Regional Archaeological Implementation Guideline, following the *Provincial* standards and guidelines, to the satisfaction of the Province, where
archaeological resources and/or area of archaeological potential have been identified in the Regional Archaeological Master Plan. The assessment will include the following information:

19. 5.1 On page 81, Objectives 5.1.e) and 5.1.i) are modified as follows:

"e) ensure compatibility in scale, form, massing and height transition between new development and existing buildings and adjacent neighbourhoods while being sensitive to the context;"

"i) Ensure that development is sensitive to and reflective respectful of the physical and functional identity and the heritage attributes of Cambridge;"

20. 5.3 On page 82, the first paragraph of Policy 5.3.1 is modified as follows:

“Development located within a Major Transit Station Area, 500 metre radius of an existing or planned rapid transit station or along a or within walking distance of one or more higher frequency transit route stops will be planned and designed based on the principles of transit oriented development and will address the following:"

21. 5.7 On page 84, Policy 5.7.4 is modified as follows:

“Building materials and architectural features for development of site/building improvements within the Community Core Areas will be reflective respectful of the local context.”

22. 6.2.1 On page 93, Table 4 in Policy 6.2.1 (the Road Type column) is modified as follows:

“Rapid Transit Rapid Transit Corridor (Regional roads)”

23. 6.2.1 On page 93, Table 4 in Policy 6.2.1 (the Function column) is modified as follows:

“-Serve inter-municipal and higher order transit demands
- Connect nodes the Galt City Centre, Preston Towne Centre, Regional Scale Node and the Can-Amera/Hespeler Road Community Node.”

24. 6.2.1 On page 93, Table 4 in Policy 6.2.1 (the Function column) is modified as follows:

“-R.o.W. width up to 50 m see ROP”

25. 6.2.1 On page 94, Section 6.2.1.c) is modified as follows:

“Arterial roads, consisting of two or multi-lane facilities as shown on Map 7A, which are under the jurisdiction of the Region, generally having a capacity for two to six lanes usually undivided, with access to the right-of-way anticipated to be restricted wherever possible to intersections at grade with other arterial or collector roads and, where not possible, to individual driveways where access, in the opinion of the Region can be safely provided, serving local and Regional transportation needs and bicycle lanes with appropriate landscaping will be
encouraged. These roads will have a maximum right-of-way width of 50 metres; The Right-of-Way widths for Regional roads are established in the Regional Official Plan.”

| 26. | 6.2 | On page 95, Policy 6.2.1.f) is modified as follows: Rapid transit corridors, consisting of a separate right-of-way or as part of an arterial road will accommodate higher order, inter-municipal transit service. will accommodate rapid transit service operating in mixed traffic or on an exclusive right-of-way on an arterial road or Provincial highway. Transit oriented development will be supported along these corridors along with transit priority measures and especially in proximity to within Major Transit Station Areas and Reurbanization Corridors;” |

| 27. | 6.4 | On page 96, Policy 6.4.2 is modified as follows: The Province shall be consulted where development is proposed adjacent to a Provincial highway and required permits, such as road entrance permits, shall be obtained prior to construction being undertaken. To assist in this process, any major development, which may generate a significant amount of traffic, or have a specific impact on traffic movements and safety, must submit as part of the development review process, a comprehensive traffic impact study. |

| 28. | 6.5 | On Page 97, Policy 6.5.4 is modified as follows: The Region will be consulted regarding any development application associated with a Regional road or Regional Transit System and the applicant may be required to undertake various measures, such as a transportation impact analysis and associated improvements as outlined in the Regional Official Plan, land dedication for various purposes, easements, noise attenuation, fencing, grading, associated transit and active transportation amenities and stormwater management, as well as obtain the necessary road entrance permits, from the City and the Region. |

| 29. | 6.10 | On page 98, the first paragraph of Policy 6.10.1 is modified as follows: The City supports a coordinated, multi-modal approach to transportation, which includes a strong public transit system. To this end the City will work with the Region, the Province and other partners to plan, improve and promote the public transit system as an alternative form of transportation within the city. Rapid transit service in Cambridge will operate in mixed traffic or on an exclusive right-of-way on an arterial road or Provincial highway. In addition, the City supports the addition of effective inter-municipal transit links including the extension of GO Transit services to Cambridge.” |

<p>| 30. | 6.10 | On page 99, the first paragraph of Policy 6.10.2 is modified as follows: In accordance with the approved Regional Official Plan, Regional Transportation Master Plan and Provincial initiatives the City will support transit supportive densities in appropriate the following areas, as shown on Map |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>31. 6.14</th>
<th>On page 101, Policy 6.14.1 is modified as follows: “The City encourages the development of the Airport, located adjacent to the city boundary, as a general aviation facility providing the people and businesses of Cambridge and surrounding area with a freight and passenger service and opportunities for flying instruction and recreational flying. The City encourages all levels of government and regulatory agencies to take the necessary actions required to ensure the appropriate development and maintenance of the Airport facilities and operations; supports the long term operation of the Region of Waterloo International Airport and recognizes the positive economic role and service to the public it provides.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32. 7.6</td>
<td>On page 110, Section 7.6 is modified as follows: “Major Urban Greenlands are relatively large, publicly accessible parklands or open spaces located within urban areas that are owned and maintained by the City, Region, or the GRCA and the City values these urban greenlands for their environmental, hydrological, recreational and public health benefits, as they are intended to help maintain a balance between the built and natural environment. The designation, protection and use of the Major Urban Greenlands will be in keeping with the policies contained in the Major Urban Greenlands policies of the Regional Official Plan.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33. 7.7</td>
<td>On page 110, Section 7.7 is modified as follows: “The City will collaborate with the Region, GRCA, and other stakeholders to develop an Urban Greenlands Strategy in accordance with the Major Urban Greenlands policies of the Regional Official Plan.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | 34. 8.1.5 | On page 116, Policy 8.1.5.5 is modified as follows: “The City will facilitate where possible the provision of group homes within the City and Council may pass by-laws to permit the use of a dwelling unit for a group home located within the Urban Growth Centre, Community Core Areas, Nodes, Regeneration Areas, Reurbanization Corridors, Major Transit Station Areas and all Residential Designations, for the purposes of providing: a) accommodation services for people with physical and/or mental disabilities; b) a residence to accommodate aging individuals who are no longer able to be cared for at home without supervision or assistance; c) a children’s residence to accommodate children usually under the age of 16 who, because of their special needs, cannot live with their parents or other relatives but would benefit from an alternative living arrangement; d) a home for patients of provincial psychiatric hospitals who can benefit from
a household-oriented living arrangement in the community;
e) a community resource centre for criminally sentenced individuals who can
benefit more from rehabilitation in a community residential program than in
a correctional institution;
f) a halfway house for ex-offenders (people on probation or parole from a
provincial correctional institution or federal penitentiary);
g) a crisis intervention home; and
h) a group home for other special purpose needs not described above.

| 35. 8.1.5 | On page 117, Policy 8.1.5.6.b) is deleted in its entirety as follows:
b) of any group home referred to in Policy 8.1.5.5 c), d), e), and f) only where the City’s Zoning By-law is
specifie to the site upon which the group home is proposed to be located, and Council or the proponent has
held one or more public meetings on the proposal to inform property owners in the
vicinity of the site of the proposal and to solicit their comments; and |

| 36. 8.1.5 | On page 116, Policy 8.1.5.6. c) is deleted in its entirety as follows:
c) "provided however, that where it is proposed to establish any new group home within 200 metres of an
existing group home registered in accordance with the provisions of Policy 8.1.5.7., such new group home shall
not be established except by site-specific amendment to the City’s Zoning By-law."

| 37. 8.4.2 | On page 123, Policy 8.4.2.2.e) is modified as follows:
"built form that reflects respects the façade details and materials of neighbouring housing, including garage
width, porches, screening and architectural details;"

| 38. 8.4.3 | On page 124, the first paragraph of Policy 8.4.3 is modified as follows:
"The City will encourage the use of lands in residential designations, Urban Growth Centre, Community Core
Areas, Nodes, Regeneration Areas, Reurbanization Corridors and Major Transit Station Areas to provide
sufficient units in a multi-unit residential development to meet the policies in Section 2.8.2 of this Plan. In these
circumstances, multi-unit residential development may occur without an amendment to this Plan provided will
be subject to the compatibility criteria in Section 8.4.2 are addressed…"

| 39. 8.4.6 | On page 155, Policy 8.4.6.16 is added:
Notwithstanding Policy 8.4.6.3 a) any property designated “Low/ Medium Density Residential”, which is located
within a “Regeneration Area” is permitted in the interim to develop for residential or mixed use purposes to a
maximum density of 75 units per hectare and deemed to be in conformity with this Plan, subject to the
compatibility criteria in Section 8.4.2.
<p>| 40. | 8.5.2.1 | On page 130, the first paragraph of Policy 8.5.2.1.1 is modified as follows: “The <em>City</em> will maintain an adequate supply of lands designated for employment purposes to accommodate employment growth to the year <strong>2031</strong>.” |
| 41. | 8.7.1 | On page 155, the first paragraph of Policy 8.7.1.1 is modified as follows: “The Regional Scale Node is located at the intersection of Hespeler Road and Eagle Street/Pinebush Road. This node benefits from its location along the Highway 401 corridor and is a service centre for the travelling public offering a range of retail and service uses that serves the broader region. The node is intended to evolve over the horizon of this Plan to include high density residential and additional employment uses in support of a major transit station <em>rapid transit station</em>.” |
| 42. | 8.7.1. | On page 155, of Policy 8.7.1.4.b) is modified as follows: “achieve a density and mix of uses that supports a major transit station <em>rapid transit station</em>; and” |
| 43. | 8.7.1 | On page 155, Policy 8.7.1.7 is added: Detailed land use policies and finalization of the Regional Scale Node boundaries will be established through a <em>Secondary Plan</em> and implemented through a further amendment to this Plan. Various background studies such as the Comprehensive City-wide Commercial Policy Review, Central Transit Corridor Community Building Strategy and Groff Mill Creek Flood Plain Study will be used as input to the <em>Secondary Plan</em>. |
| 44. | 8.7.2 | On page 157, Policy 8.7.2.7 is modified as follows: “There are three defined Community Nodes shown on Figures 2, 3 and 4, where the boundaries are approximate. More detailed land use policies along with finalization of the Community Node boundaries will be established through a <em>Secondary Plan</em> and implemented through a further amendment to this Plan. The establishment of new Community Nodes will only be considered through a <em>Secondary Plan</em> study and will require an amendment to this Plan. The following additional policies apply to the defined Community Nodes:” |
| 45. | 8.7.2.A | On page 157, Policy 8.7.2.A.2 is modified as follows: “This node is a proposed major transit station area <em>Major Transit Station Area</em> and as such will be developed at transit supportive densities and at a pedestrian scale.” |
| 46. | 8.7.2.A | On page 158, Policy 8.7.2.A.9 is added as follows: Detailed land use policies and finalization of the Can-Amera/Hespeler Road Community Node boundaries will be established through a <em>Secondary Plan</em> and implemented through a further amendment to this Plan. Various background studies such as the Comprehensive City-wide Commercial Policy Review, Central Transit Corridor Community Building Strategy and Groff Mill Creek Flood Plain Study, will be used as input to the <em>Secondary Plan</em>. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 47. | 8.7.2.B | On page 158, Policy 8.7.2.B.5 is added as follows:  
The conversion of approximately 36 hectares of land in the north east quadrant of Franklin Boulevard and Main Street from employment lands to other purposes has been justified in keeping with the provisions of the Provincial Growth Plan, based on the Council approved Hemson Growth Management Study. A Secondary Plan will be needed to provide detailed boundaries, land use and urban design policies for this Community Node to achieve a significant density increase. |
| 48. | 8.7.2.B | On page 158, Policy 8.7.2.B.6 is added as follows:  
The preparation of a Secondary Plan for this node will be required, which will take into consideration the results of additional City-wide studies, such as the Comprehensive Commercial Review and Sanitary Servicing Master Plan. The Secondary Plan will be based on achieving a significant level of intensification, which was the basis for conversion of employment lands in keeping with the Provincial Growth Plan. The final boundaries of this Community Node will be determined through the Secondary Plan process, and implemented through a further amendment to the Official Plan. In addition a Tertiary Plan may also be needed for those lands being converted from an employment designation as a component of the overall Secondary Plan for this Community Node. |
| 49. | 8.10 | On Page 148, Policy 8.10.14 is modified as follows:  
“Notwithstanding the permitted uses in this Plan, a maximum of 313 dwelling units may be provided in buildings located on those lands more particularly shown as the subject lands on Figure 18. The residential density and height provisions of Sections 2.6, 2.8.3 and 8.4.6 shall not apply to limit the number of dwelling units and building height to be located on the properties existing as of the date of approval of this Official Plan, known municipally as 237 & 255 King Street West, on any sub-parcel of land created by severance of, or the registration of a plan of condominium on the lands shown in Figure 18, provided that a total of not more than 313 dwelling units are located on the entire parcel of land shown on Figure 18.” |
| 50. | 8.10 | Policy 8.10.47 is added as follows:  
Notwithstanding the residential density provisions of Policy 8.4.6.3, the properties at 6 and 12 Poplar Drive, as shown on Figure 53, will be permitted to develop at a maximum density of 75 units per hectare. |
| 51. | 8.10 | Policy 8.10.48 is added as follows:  
Notwithstanding the permitted uses in this Plan, the lands located at 1512, 1526 and 1546 King Street East, designated on Map 2 as “Low/ Medium Density Residential”, and more particularly shown on Figure 54, may also be used for a single tenant retail commercial establishment having a maximum 1,600 m² of gross leasable commercial floor area. |
<p>| 52. | 8.10 | Policy 8.10.49 is added as follows: Notwithstanding the permitted uses in this Plan, the lands located at 360 Clyde Road, and more particularly shown on Figure 55 are designated “Low/ Medium Density Residential”. |
| 53. | 8.10 | Policy 8.10.50 is added as follows: Notwithstanding the provisions of this Plan, the lands located at 2283 Eagle Street North, and more particularly shown on Figure 56, may only be used for the retail sales and service of motor vehicles. |
| 54. | 9 | Policies 9.5 and 9.6 are added and preceded by a subtitle as follows: Regional Official Plan 9.5 This plan contains references to the Regional Official Plan. All such references shall be interpreted as referring to the text and mapping of the Regional Official Plan as approved by the Province on December 22, 2010;” and 9.6 Notwithstanding Policy 9.5, it is recognized that the Regional Official Plan may change through future approvals by the Ontario Municipal Board or through future adopted by Regional Council. In the event that changes are made to the Regional Official Plan through either the approval by the Ontario Municipal Board or by future amendment, this Plan will be brought into conformity with the Regional Official Plan by means of appropriate housekeeping amendments. |
| 55. | 9 | Renumber existing policies 9.5 to 9.12 as policies 9.7 to 9.14. |
| 56. | 10.11 | On Page 200, policy 10.11.2 is added as follows: “;or f) the development is part of a comprehensive transportation demand management plan in accordance with the provisions of Section 6.15.” |
| 57. | 10.16 | On Page 206, Policy 10.16.1. xi) is modified as follows: public parking over and above the regular requirements, which allows for the more efficient use of land, including parking structures and shared parking arrangements; |
| 58. | 10.16 | On Page 207, Policy 10.16.1. xviii) is modified as follows: parking demand reduction measures as part of an approved transportation demand management plan, such as measures proximity to increase access to public transit and/ or participation in a formal car share program. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 59. | Glossary | On Page 224, the definition of group home is modified as follows:  
“group home – residential special care accommodation for up to 10 people (exclusive of staff) with special needs beyond economic requirements, including physical, social and mental needs, which require support functions for daily living.” |
| 60. | Glossary | On Page 225, the definition of Institutional special care facilities is modified as follows:  
“Institutional special care facilities - residential special care accommodation for more than 10 people with special needs beyond economic requirements, including physical, social and mental needs, which require support functions for daily living, including retirement homes, nursing homes, crisis intervention home, halfway house and a private hospital.” |
| 61. | Glossary | On Page 226, the definition of Major Transit Station Areas is modified as follows:  
“Major Transit Station Area - lands typically located within a 600 to 800 metre radius of a rapid transit station. (ROP) the area including and around any existing or planned higher order transit station within a settlement area; or the area including and around a major bus depot in an urban core. Station areas generally are defined as the area within an approximate 500m radius of a transit station, representing a 10-minute walk. (Growth Plan)” |
| 62. | Glossary | On Page 226, the definition of minor addition or alteration is modified as follows:  
“minor addition or alteration – construction that is less than 50% of the foundation area of the existing structure or work to the maximum footprint as permitted by GRCA policy.” |
| 63. | Glossary | On Page 228, the following definition for the term ‘rapid transit’ is added:  
rapid transit – a public transportation system operating for its entire length primarily on an exclusive right-of-way. The definition includes systems operating at-grade and systems operating on elevated or underground facilities. (ROP) |
| 64. | Glossary | On Page 232, the definition of transit oriented development is modified as follows:  
transit oriented development – compact mixed use medium or high density development within a walking
distance of major transit stations, including *Major Transit Station Area* and \( \text{or walking distance of a high frequency transit stops.} \)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Maps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 66. | Maps | Map 7A of Major Transportation Facilities and Hydro Corridors is modified as illustrated in Report No.: P/12-47 to City of Cambridge General Committee on September 24, 2012. The effect of this modification is to:  
- Remove the Arterial Roads (Regional Roads) identification from Guelph Avenue and Grand Avenue North  
- Remove the portions of Main St. that are not Arterial Roads (Regional Roads)  
- The Franklin Blvd. Extension, which is designated as the South Boundary Proposed Road Corridor, should be changed to a Proposed Collector Road |
| 67. | Figure 1 | Figure No. 1 is revised to designate an area of land on either side of Hespeler Road between Langs Drive and the railway line and other lands on the east side of Industrial Road between the railway line and Eagle Street, as “Future Study Area for inclusion in node boundary” as illustrated in Report No.: P/12-47 to City of Cambridge General Committee on September 24, 2012. |
| 68. | Figure 2 | Figure No. 2 is revised to designate an area of land on either side of Hespeler Road between Langs Drive and Dunbar Road as “Future Study Area for inclusion in node boundary” as illustrated in Report No.: P/12-47 to City of Cambridge General Committee on September 24, 2012. |
| 69. | Figures 53-56 | Figures 53, 54, 55 and 56 are added to the Official Plan as illustrated in Report No.: P/12-47 to City of Cambridge General Committee on September 24, 2012. See modifications 50-53. |
| 70. | Entire Plan | All page, section, schedule and page reference numbers in the Official Plan, including the Table of Contents, are adjusted accordingly to accommodate all modifications made herein. |
PART B: Items Deferred for Further Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Def. No.</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Details of the Deferral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.       | Chapter 1: Introduction | On Page 1, in the Chapter 1: Introduction section, in the second paragraph, no decision is being made as it relates to Population and Employment Forecasts as follows:  
“The city is expected to grow to a population of 173,000 people by 2029 with a total employment forecast of 100,000 jobs” |
| 2.       | 2.2     | On page 4, Objective 2.2.a, no decision is being made as it relates to Population and Employment Forecasts as follows:  
“a) to plan for a moderate and environmentally sustainable level of growth in the City of Cambridge to a forecast population of 173,000 and employment of 100,000 jobs by the year 2029;” |
| 3.       | 2.3     | On page 6, Policy 2.3.1, no decision is being made as it relates to Population and Employment Forecasts as follows:  
“The City of Cambridge will plan to accommodate by the year 2029:  
a) a population forecast of 173,000 people; and  
b) a total employment forecast of 100,000 jobs.” |
| 4.       | 2.5     | On page 6, Policy 2.5.2.a no decision is being made with respect to density targets Designated Greenfield Areas as follows:  
“Development within the designated greenfield area will be planned and designed to:  
a) assist the Region in achieving or exceeding the following density targets in accordance with the urban designated greenfield policies in the Regional Official Plan;  
Table 1: Density Targets for the Designated Greenfield Area  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greenfield Area</th>
<th>Minimum Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Designation</td>
<td>55 residents and jobs per hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Designation</td>
<td>40 residents and jobs per hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (Serviced)</td>
<td>25 jobs per hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5. | 2.6.1 | On page 8, Policy 2.6.1.1, no decision is being made with respect to Intensification within the Built-up Area as follows:

“Future development within the City of Cambridge built-up area will contribute to meeting or exceeding the Regional reurbanization target. By the year 2015 and for each year thereafter, a minimum of 45% of all residential development will occur within the built-up area of the region as a whole. The City in collaboration with the Region will monitor development within the built-up area.” |
| 6. | 2.8.2 | On page 19, Policy 2.8.2.3, no decision is being made with respect to the creation of new housing units as follows:

“The City will ensure the creation of 45% of new housing units through infill, conversion, intensification and the redevelopment of built-up areas of the City, particularly in the Urban Growth Centre, Community Core Areas, Nodes, Regeneration Areas, Reurbanization Corridors and Major Transit Station Areas.” |
| 7. | 3.B.7 | No decision is being made with respect to the Mineral Aggregate policies in Section 3.B.7 pending resolution of the outstanding appeals of the ROP. |
| 8. | 8.10.29; Map 2; and Map 2a | No decision is being made with respect to Policy 8.10.29; Map 2; and Map 2a as they relate to the lands commonly known as the Hunt Club and Arriscraft International Inc. (Arriscraft) lands as illustrated in Attachment B in accordance with the memorandum of oral decision delivered on September 26, 2012, by the Ontario Municipal Board (PL080311). |
| 9. | Policy 8.10.24; Map 2; and Map 2a | No decision is being made with respect to Policy 8.10.24; Map 2; and Map 2a as they relate to Cambridge City Council’s motion of October 1, 2012, pertaining to the land uses applicable to the lands commonly known as the Creekside Lands, as illustrated in Attachment C and as agreed to by City and Regional staff. |
| 10. | Policy 8.7.2.B; Map 2; Map 9; Map 15; and Figure 3 | No decision is being made with respect to Policy 8.7.2.B; Map 2; Map 9; Map 15; and Figure 3 as they relate to Cambridge City Council’s motion of October 1, 2012 requesting the Region to modify policies and mapping with respect to the lands commonly known as the Community Node for Main and Dundas Street, only affecting lands as illustrated in Attachment D pending resolution of the outstanding appeals of the ROP affecting these lands. |
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Attachment D

COMMUNITY NODE FOR MAIN AND DUNDAS STREET
(20 VIC/TAYLOR LANDS)
CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
REPORT: P-12-115

REGION OF WATERLOO
PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
Community Planning

TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: November 6, 2012

FILE CODE: D17-20

SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF CITY OF WATERLOO’S PROPOSED NEW OFFICIAL PLAN

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve, in part, with modifications, the Official Plan of the City of Waterloo, and that the Decision contained in Attachment A to Report P-12-115, dated November 6, 2012, be included in the approval document;

THAT the repeal of the City of Waterloo Official Plan, as adopted by City of Waterloo By-law 88-70 and all amendments thereto, is hereby approved in accordance with the provisions of Sections 17 and 21 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chap. P.13, as amended, only insofar as it is replaced by the new Official Plan through this approval; and

THAT no decision be made at this time with respect to:

a) Chapter 9 (Mineral Aggregates), Section 3.2(1); Section 3.2(2); Section 3.5(2); Section 7.3.1(1); Section 10.1.1(8); Section 10.1.1(9); the first sentence on page 13; and the second paragraph under Section 3.3, that collectively address mineral aggregate policies; population and employment forecasts, reurbanization targets, and Designated Greenfield Area density targets, pending resolution of the outstanding appeals of the Regional Official Plan affecting these sections;

b) the entirety of the Official Plan as it relates to the lands municipally addressed as 525 and 565 Conestogo Road West (Kraus Carpet Mills Ltd.) as illustrated in Attachment B;

c) Schedule “A” (Land Use Plan); Schedule “A2” (Employment Areas); Schedule “B1” (Height and Density); Schedule “I” (Industrial Areas in Transition), and Section 11.1.5 as they relate to the lands municipally addressed as 443 and 446 Wismer Street (Piller’s Fine Foods) as illustrated in Attachment C;

d) Schedule “A” (Land Use Plan); Schedule “A6” (Specific Provision Areas); Schedule “A6a” (Specific Provision Area 20); Schedule “B” (City Structure); Schedule “B1” (Height and Density); Schedule “E” (Road Classification System); and Schedule “F” (Active Transportation Framework), as they relate to lands within the Northdale Neighbourhood as illustrated in Attachment D, and Section 11.1.45 and Section 11.2.20(13), pending the resolution of the outstanding Ontario Municipal Board appeals relating to the Northdale Neighbourhood;

e) Table 5-2 and Schedule “G” (Road Allowances) as they relate to: a) the section of Albert Street from University Avenue West to Columbia Street; and b) the section of Hazel Street from University Avenue West to Columbia Street West, pending the resolution of the outstanding Ontario Municipal Board appeals relating to the Northdale Neighbourhood; and

f) Waterloo City Council’s resolution of June 25, 2012 requesting the Region to modify certain policies and schedules in its new Official Plan to implement the land use strategy established in the Northdale Land Use and Community Improvement Plan Study.
SUMMARY:

On April 16, 2012, Waterloo City Council passed By-law No. 2012-035 to adopt a new Official Plan for the City of Waterloo. The new Official Plan provides the framework for guiding decisions on growth and change in the City of Waterloo over the next two decades. It is a forward-looking document based on extensive background work and significant public consultation. The Plan builds on and will help implement the Regional Official Plan, the Province’s Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan), the Provincial Policy Statement and other Provincial policies and legislation. Highlights of the City’s new Official Plan include:

- promoting intensification and a more compact urban form;
- planning to support rapid transit and more active forms of transportation;
- recognizing Uptown Waterloo as an Urban Growth Centre; and
- identifying and conserving the City’s valuable natural and cultural heritage resources.

Under the Planning Act, Regional Council is the approval authority for Area Municipal official plans, and is responsible for addressing Regional and Provincial interests. In exercising this authority, Regional Council may approve, modify and approve, or make no decision with respect to all or part of an official plan to ensure it conforms to the Regional Official Plan and the Growth Plan, and is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement. This process is carried out in close collaboration with the Area Municipality, public agencies and other stakeholders including the Grand River Conservation Authority.

The currently in effect Regional Official Policies Plan was originally approved by the Province in 1995. Since that time, the Province has brought into force and effect the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement and the 2006 Growth Plan, which between them, provide a comprehensive policy framework that governs the development of municipal official plans within the Greater Golden Horseshoe. These documents also supersede the Regional Official Policies Plan to the extent of any conflict, and provide the policy basis upon which an official plan needs to be tested. In June 2009, Regional Council adopted the new Regional Official Plan, which represents Regional Council’s interpretation of the appropriate implementation of the Provincial Policy Statement and the Growth Plan within the regional context. The Regional Official Plan was approved with modifications by the Province on December 22, 2010, and has subsequently been appealed in its entirety to the Ontario Municipal Board. Therefore, for the purposes of approval of the City of Waterloo Official Plan, conformity with the Regional Official Plan, as approved by the Province, is the test being used to establish consistency of the City of Waterloo Official Plan with the Provincial Policy Statement, and conformity with the Growth Plan.

On August 21, 2012, Regional staff issued a draft Decision on the City’s Official Plan for review and comment. The draft Decision included several proposed modifications, most of which were either minor or technical in nature. Other modifications were required to address matters of conformity to the Regional Official Plan. Following the release of the draft Decision, Regional staff worked closely with City staff to discuss and further refine the wording of the proposed modifications. Ultimately, City and Regional staff reached mutual agreement on the proposed modifications and resolved any outstanding issues.

At its meeting on October 1, 2012, Waterloo’s Committee of the Whole endorsed the Region’s draft Decision subject to a series of minor changes. Regional staff supports these changes and has incorporated them into the proposed Decision included in Attachment A to this report. City of Waterloo Council will be considering the recommendations from the Committee of the Whole on November 5, 2012.
The proposed Decision also identifies several parts of the City’s Official Plan where no decision is being made at this time. In general, these deferrals (areas of no decision) relate to matters currently before the Ontario Municipal Board or to issues requiring further review by the City of Waterloo. The deferrals are discussed below.

Overall, Regional staff is satisfied that the City of Waterloo’s Official Plan, as modified, conforms to the Regional Official Plan and the Growth Plan, and is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement. City of Waterloo staff has indicated that the modifications contained in the proposed Decision are acceptable.

REPORT:

On April 16, 2012, Waterloo City Council passed By-law No. 2012-035 to adopt a new Official Plan for the City of Waterloo. The new Official Plan replaces the City’s previous Official Plan, which was approved in 1990 and has been amended from time-to-time.

The new Official Plan is grounded in the principles of sustainability and provides the basis for guiding decisions on how Waterloo will grow and develop over the next two decades. It is a forward-looking document based on extensive background work and significant consultation with stakeholders and the broader community. The Official Plan also builds on and will help implement the Regional Official Plan and several Provincial initiatives, including the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan), the Provincial Policy Statement and other Provincial legislation and policies. Key elements of the City’s Official Plan include:

- promoting intensification and a more compact urban form;
- planning to support rapid transit and more active forms of transportation;
- recognizing Uptown Waterloo as an Urban Growth Centre; and
- identifying and conserving the City’s valuable natural areas and cultural heritage resources.

The City developed its new Official Plan following a lengthy and comprehensive review process. Between 2006 and 2010, the City issued a series of discussion papers and background reports on various planning topics. The City released the first and second drafts of its Official Plan in June 2010 and June 2011, respectively. Each draft was followed by a further round of Open Houses to gain additional public input. This process culminated on April 16, 2012 when City Council adopted its new Official Plan, and then forwarded it to the Region for approval.

Review Process

Under the Planning Act, Regional Council is the approval authority for Area Municipal official plans, and is responsible for addressing Regional and Provincial interests. In exercising this authority, Regional Council may approve, modify and approve, or make no decision with respect to all or part of an official plan to ensure it conforms to the Regional Official Plan and the Growth Plan, and is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement. This process is carried out in close collaboration with the Area Municipality, public agencies and with key stakeholders including the Grand River Conservation Authority. The Planning Act also establishes a 180-day time-frame for the approval authority to make a decision on an official plan. If the approval authority fails to make a decision within this period, any person or public body can appeal the official plan to the Ontario Municipal Board.

Regional staff met with and provided comments to the City of Waterloo at several points in the approval process. In May 2012, staff circulated the adopted Official Plan to appropriate agencies, other Regional departments and each of the other Area Municipalities for review and comment. Based on the results of this circulation, staff then released a draft Decision on the City’s Official Plan.
on August 21, 2012. The draft Decision included several proposed modifications, most of which were either minor or technical in nature. Other modifications were required to address matters of conformity to the Regional Official Plan.

Following the release of the draft Decision, City and Regional staff worked closely to refine the proposed modifications and to resolve any outstanding issues. At the end of this process, City and Regional staff reached mutual agreement on the wording of the proposed modifications. At its meeting of October 1, 2012, Waterloo’s Committee of the Whole endorsed the draft Decision subject to a series of minor changes. Regional staff is in agreement with these changes and has incorporated them into the proposed Decision included in Attachment A to this report. City of Waterloo Council will be considering the recommendations from the Committee of the Whole on November 5, 2012.

Conformity with Regional Official Plan

The currently in effect Regional Official Policies Plan was originally approved by the Province in 1995. Since that time, the Province has brought into force and effect the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement and the 2006 Growth Plan, which between them, provide a comprehensive policy framework that governs the development of municipal official plans within the Greater Golden Horseshoe. These documents also supersede the Regional Official Policies Plan to the extent of any conflict, and provide the policy basis upon which an official plan needs to be tested. In June 2009, Regional Council adopted the new Regional Official Plan which represents Regional Council’s interpretation of the appropriate implementation of the Provincial Policy Statement and the Growth Plan within the regional context. The Regional Official Plan was approved with modifications by the Province on December 22, 2010 and has subsequently been appealed in its entirety to the Ontario Municipal Board. Therefore, for the purposes of approval of the City of Waterloo Official Plan, conformity with the Regional Official Plan, as approved by the Province, is the test being used to establish consistency of the City of Waterloo Official Plan with the Provincial Policy Statement, and conformity with the Growth Plan.

Proposed Deferrals (no decision being made at this time)

The proposed Decision identifies sections of the City’s Official Plan for which no decision is being made at this time pending further consideration. A deferral, as they are referred to in the remainder of this report, is essentially a “non-decision” with respect to a policy or a certain property. In the case of a property, the designations of the previous Official Plan continue to apply until the deferral is resolved. The resolution to each deferral will be considered by Waterloo City Council at a later date, and then brought forward to Regional Council for consideration. The areas being deferred at this time include:

1. Sections of the Official Plan relating to mineral aggregate policies, population and employment forecasts, reurbanization targets, and Designated Greenfield Area density targets

The new Regional Official Plan was appealed in its entirety to the Ontario Municipal Board in January 2011, and remains under adjudication at this time. To date, Regional staff has participated in several pre-hearing conferences, mediation sessions, motion hearings and one formal phase of the hearing in an effort to scope or resolve the outstanding appeals. Earlier this year, the Ontario Municipal Board determined that the Regional Official Plan should use a planning horizon of 2031 instead of 2029 for the population and employment forecast, and for estimating the Region’s future land requirements. The Board’s decision required staff to revise the Regional Land Budget that was originally endorsed by Regional Council on April 30, 2009. Council subsequently endorsed the revised Land Budget on June 6, 2012 (see Report No. P-12-084).
This past summer, the Ontario Municipal Board held a five-week hearing to consider the revised Regional Land Budget, and to decide whether the Region needs an urban expansion to accommodate future growth. The Board is anticipated to provide its decision on these matters later this year. Depending on its decision, the Board may direct the Region to revise the reurbanization target and density target for Designated Greenfield Areas contained in the adopted Regional Official Plan. Since these targets were used as inputs in both the Regional Land Budget, they are among the key issues now before the Board.

Another issue before the Ontario Municipal Board relates to the allocation of the Region’s population and employment forecasts to each of the Area Municipalities. Although the Board has directed the Region to use a planning horizon of 2031 instead of 2029, it still has to adjudicate how the additional population and employment growth will be allocated to each of the Area Municipalities. The Board is anticipated to consider this issue sometime next year.

In addition, the City’s Official Plan includes several new policies relating to the extraction of mineral aggregate resources. Some of these policies mirror the aggregate policies in the new Regional Official Plan that are currently before the Ontario Municipal Board, in part, as a result of appeals filed by the Region. In an effort to resolve these appeals, several informal mediation sessions have been held between Regional staff and the affected parties.

In light of the Ontario Municipal Board processes described above, Regional staff recommends that Regional Council defer all sections of the City of Waterloo’s Official Plan relating to the mineral aggregate policies, reurbanization targets, density targets for Designated Greenfield Areas, and population and employment forecasts until such time as the Board has made a decision on these issues in the Regional Official Plan, through either adjudication or negotiated settlement.

2. Lands municipally addressed 525 and 565 Conestogo Road West

In a resolution passed on April 2, 2012, Waterloo City Council requested the Region to defer its decision on the entirety of the new Official Plan as it relates to a 10.7 hectare property located at 525 and 565 Conestogo Road West. This property is currently the site of the Kraus carpet and fiber manufacturing facility near Northfield Drive and the Conestoga Expressway. The site is unique because of its large size and proximity to the rapid transit stations proposed at Conestoga Mall, and at Northfield Drive near Parkside Drive. These features may provide an opportunity to redevelop all or part of the site with transit supportive uses. To assess this potential, the City has requested the Region to defer the City’s Official Plan as it relates to the subject lands, recognizing that the site is intended to be used primarily for employment purposes. City staff anticipates that this deferral will be resolved through a master planning exercise undertaken by the landowner in consultation with the City and the Region. The landowner’s planning consultant supports this deferral. The lands affected by this deferral are illustrated as shown in Attachment B.

3. 443 and 446 Wismer Street (Piller’s Fine Foods)

On October 1, 2012, Waterloo’s Committee of the Whole passed a resolution requesting Regional Council to defer its decision regarding the land use designation at 443 and 446 Wismer Street. This property is currently the site of the Piller’s Fine Food processing facility, and is designated Industrial in the City’s existing Official Plan. The newly adopted City Official Plan redesignated the site to Low Density Residential with special policies to recognize the existing industrial use. The new designation was intended to provide for the transition of the property to a residential use over the extended long-term. Piller’s has expressed a concern with this land use change, and has requested the City to re-designate the lands as Employment (Industrial) in the new Official Plan. To address this issue, Waterloo City Council has requested the Region to defer Schedule “A” (Land Use Plan), Schedule “A2” (Employment Areas) and Schedule “I” (Industrial Transition Areas) as they relate to
443 and 446 Wismer Street, and to defer the policies in Section 11.1.5. These deferrals will remain in place until the City of Waterloo has determined an appropriate land use framework for the site. The landowner’s planning consultant supports these deferrals. The lands affected by these deferrals are illustrated as shown in Attachment C. Waterloo City Council will be considering the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole on November 5, 2012.

4. Northdale Neighbourhood

In June 2012, the City of Waterloo completed a comprehensive land use study and Community Improvement Plan for the Northdale Neighbourhood. This study, which was intended to address a wide range of planning issues, led to the development of a new vision and planning framework to transition Northdale from a predominantly low-density area to a more intensive, mixed-use community. The City finalized the Northdale study shortly after it had adopted its new Official Plan in April 2012. As a result of this timing, City Council decided to implement the new land use strategy for Northdale in two parts:

a) Adopt amendments to the City’s current Official Plan and Zoning By-law to incorporate the Northdale policies into the current City Official Plan; and

b) Request Regional Council to modify the new City Official Plan to incorporate the Northdale policies, as part of Regional Council’s approval of the new City Official Plan.

On June 25, 2012, Waterloo City Council adopted OPA No. 84 and passed Zoning By-law Amendment 2012-070 to implement item a) above. City Council also passed a resolution requesting Regional Council to modify the new City Official Plan as described in item b) above.

The Regional Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services, on behalf of Regional Council, subsequently approved OPA No. 84 on October 16, 2012. The last day for filing an appeal to OPA No. 84 is November 5, 2012. Various parties have already appealed Zoning By-law Amendment 2012-070 to the Ontario Municipal Board, and it is anticipated that all or parts of OPA 84 will also be appealed. In light of the appeals to the Zoning By-law, Regional staff is recommending that Regional Council not make a decision with respect to:

1) Waterloo City Council’s resolution of June 25, 2012 as described in item b) above; and

2) Schedule “A” (Land Use Plan); Schedule “A6” (Specific Provision Areas); Schedule “A6a” (Specific Provision Area 20); Schedule “B” (City Structure); Schedule “B1” (Height and Density); Schedule “E” (Road Classification System); and Schedule “F” (Active Transportation Framework), as they relate to lands within the Northdale Neighbourhood as illustrated in Attachment D, and Section 11.1.45 and Section 11.2.20(13), of the adopted Official Plan.

The above deferrals will remain in place pending the resolution of the outstanding appeals by the Ontario Municipal Board.

Ongoing Appeals to the Regional Official Plan

The City’s new Official Plan contains several cross references to policies in the Regional Official Plan, which as noted above, are still before the Ontario Municipal Board. The new Regional Official Plan is not anticipated to fully come into effect until 2014. Given this delay and the uncertainty over the Board’s decision on the Regional Official Plan, some of the cross referenced policies could be changed by the Board depending on its final decision. In consideration of this potential issue, Regional staff is recommending that Regional Council modify the City’s Official Plan to add the following two new policies in Chapter 12 (Implementation):
“12.5(5) This plan contains references to the Regional Official Plan. All such references shall be interpreted as referring to the text and mapping of the Regional Official Plan as approved by the Province on December 22, 2010;” and

12.5(6) Notwithstanding Policy 12.5(5), it is recognized that the Regional Official Plan may change through future approvals by the Ontario Municipal Board or through future amendments adopted by Regional Council. In the event that changes are made to the Regional Official Plan through either the approval by the Ontario Municipal Board or by future amendment, this Plan will be brought into conformity with the Regional Official Plan by means of appropriate housekeeping amendments.”

Conclusion

Regional staff is satisfied that the City of Waterloo’s Official Plan, as modified, conforms to the Regional Official Plan and the Growth Plan, and is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement. Consequently, Regional staff recommends that Regional Council approve the City’s Official Plan as outlined in this report.

Next Steps

Following Regional Council’s decision on the City of Waterloo’s Official Plan, the Region is required to issue a Notice of Decision in accordance with the Planning Act. Any person or public body that made an oral submission at the public meeting, or made a written submission to Waterloo City Council before its decision to adopt the Official Plan, may appeal the Region of Waterloo’s decision to the Ontario Municipal Board within the 20-day appeal period. The Official Plan will come into effect if there is no appeal within this period.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Regional staff has met with and provided comments to the City of Waterloo several times throughout the process. City of Waterloo staff has indicated that the modifications contained in the proposed Decision are acceptable. We also wish to acknowledge the City’s work in finalizing its new Official Plan, and for collaborating with Regional staff throughout the process.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Approval of the City of Waterloo’s Official Plan will support each of the Region’s five Focus Areas: (1) Environmental Sustainability; (2) Growth Management and Prosperity; (3) Sustainable Transportation; (4) Healthy and Inclusive Communities; and (5) Service Excellence. This approval will help implement Action Item 2.1.2, which is to work with Area Municipalities to develop and implement a comprehensive strategy to promote intensification and reurbanization within existing urban areas. The City’s new Official Plan will also play a key role in achieving Action Item 3.1.1, which is to develop an implementation plan for rapid transit including corridor and station area plans.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no direct financial implications arising from the recommendations in this report. However, there is the potential that all or part of the Region’s Decision may be appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board. Costs to the Region would depend on the nature of the appeals and the ability to reach a negotiated settlement with the appellants. Regional staff will report back to Regional Council in the event that Regional staff is required to participate in an Ontario Municipal Board hearing regarding the Region’s Decision on this Official Plan.
OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Regional planning staff has circulated the City of Waterloo’s Official Plan to Public Health, Transportation and Environmental Services, and Legal Services for review and comment. All of the comments received through this process have been reviewed and, if necessary addressed through the modifications to the Official Plan.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A – Decision City of Waterloo Official Plan
Attachment B – Map 1: 525 and 565 Conestogo Road West (Kraus Carpet Mill’s Ltd)
Attachment C – Map 2: 443 and 446 Wismer Street (Piller’s Fine Foods)
Attachment D – Map 3: Northdale Neighbourhood

PREPARED BY:  John Lubczynski, Principal Planner
                Kevin Curtis, Manager, Strategic Policy Development

APPROVED BY:  Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
DECISION
With respect to the Official Plan of the City of Waterloo
Subsection 17(34) of the Planning Act

The Region of Waterloo hereby approves the Official Plan for the City of Waterloo, as adopted by By-law No. 2012-035 on April 16, 2012, subject to the following modifications, as shown in Part A and Part B of this Decision.

Part A of this Decision constitutes additions and deletions to the text of the Official Plan. Additions are shown in red text (example), and deletions are in illustrated single strikethrough (example). Part B includes modifications to the Schedules, Tables and the Table of Contents. Part C identifies areas of the Official Plan for which no decision is being made at this time.

PART A: Regional Modifications to text of the Official Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mod. No.</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Details of the Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Section 1.1</td>
<td>On page 2, the second paragraph of Section 1.1 (Purpose and Review) is modified as follows: “This Official Plan contains principles, objectives, and policies designed to direct the form, extent, nature and rate of growth and change within the municipality to the year 2029 2031.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Section 2.1</td>
<td>On page 7, the second paragraph of Section 2.1 (City of Waterloo Community Vision Statement) is modified as follows: “In 2029 2031, the City of Waterloo has enhanced its friendly feel, welcoming and accommodating a diversity of people.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Chapter 3</td>
<td>On page 13, the fifth sentence of paragraph two relating to Chapter 3 (City Form) is modified as follows: “This Plan provides opportunities for the suburban Planning Districts to evolve into more complete complete communities over time, through context-sensitive intensification, where appropriate.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Objective 3.1**  
On page 14, Objective 3.1(1)(a) is modified as follows:

“(1) Plan for growth that:
(a) Accommodates future growth within the existing City boundary *Urban Area Boundary* through *intensification* primarily within designated Nodes and Corridors, Uptown Waterloo Urban Growth Centre, *Major Transit Station Areas* and through the development of appropriate vacant lands, including *Designated Greenfield Areas*;”

5. **Section 3.2**  
On pages 16 and 17, subsections (3), (4) and (5) of Section 3.2 relating to the population and employment growth are modified as follows:

“(3) The population and employment growth of the City will be monitored on a yearly basis. The City will plan for and approve appropriate levels of population and employment growth that is in keeping with the City’s financial and physical ability to provide all necessary *infrastructure*, facilities, services and amenities, and is consistent with the methodology associated with the population forecast outlined in policy 3.2 (1).

(4) Longer term forecasts beyond the 2029 2031 planning horizon may be used for *infrastructure* planning studies undertaken by or for the City, provided they are consistent with the methodology associated with the population forecast outlined in policy 3.2 (1).”

“(5) Where the Urban Area Boundary coincides with the *protected countryside* *Protected Countryside* as shown on Map 7 of the Regional Official Plan and/or the City boundary as shown on Schedule ‘A’ – *Land Use Plan*, Schedule ‘B’ *City Structure*, the Urban Area Boundary will be considered a permanent boundary.”

6. **Section 3.3**  
On page 17, the first paragraph under Section 3.3 relating to Residential Intensification is modified as follows:

“As Waterloo’s supply of land within *Designated Greenfield Areas* diminishes, it is anticipated that a greater proportion of overall growth will be accommodated through *intensification*. *Intensification* will be concentrated within the Built-up Area which, as illustrated on Map 3a of the Regional Official Plan Schedule B3 – *Designated Greenfield Areas*, includes all lands within the *built boundary* of the City of Waterloo as of June 16, 2006. Within the Built-up Area, *intensification* will occur, for the most part, in a series of designated Nodes and Corridors described further in policy 3.6 of this chapter and referred to throughout this Plan.”
7. **Section 3.3**

On page 18, subsection (6) of Section 3.3 relating to Residential Intensification is modified as follows:

“(6) Monitor growth within the Built-up Area and Designated Greenfield Areas and, if necessary, stage the development of Designated Greenfield Areas to ensure that growth within the Built-up Area appropriately supports the achievement of the Region-wide intensification target of this Plan.”

8. **Section 3.7**

On page 25, subsection (5) of Section 3.7 relating to the Uptown Waterloo Urban Growth Centre is modified as follows:

“(5) Achieve a minimum gross density target of 200 persons and jobs combined per hectare by 2029 or earlier. To achieve this target, intensification of properties will occur over time in a manner that is compatible with, and appropriate within, the context of the surrounding neighbourhood. To support achievement of this target:"

9. **Section 3.8**

On pages 31 and 32, Section 3.8 relating to Major Transit Station Areas is modified as follows:

“**Major Transit Station Areas** are the areas including and around planned rapid transit stations within the City of Waterloo. Station Area Plans will further define the limits of each station area, and will identify each transit station as being within a Major Node on Schedule ‘B’ – City Structure. Lands within Major Transit Station Areas may be located within Nodes and/or Corridors and/or outside of a designated Node or Corridor, depending on the local context of each station. **Major Transit Station Areas** will be planned to accommodate a mix of transit supportive land uses that create both origins and destinations for transit users. Major Transit Station Areas will also be planned to be focal points for active transportation networks, with reliable connections to other destinations.

After the Region has designated **Major Transit Station Areas** conceptually on Map 3a of the Regional Official Plan, the City will initiate an amendment to this Plan to designate **Major Transit Station Areas** on Schedule ‘B’ – City Structure, and to establish additional policies for these areas, as required. Planned land uses for **Major Transit Station Areas** are intended to be shown on Schedule ‘A’ – Land Use Plan, pending future Amendments to this Plan in order to fully implement the policies set out in this Section.

(1) Transit supportive uses such as medium to high density residential, commercial and employment uses shall be encouraged to locate within **Major Transit Station Areas**, to generate significant transit ridership, provide for good pedestrian and cycling access and a variety of services and amenities that
foster a vibrant station area community.

(2) Non-transit supportive uses such as lower density office uses or commercial uses oriented to vehicular travel shall generally be discouraged from locating within Major Transit Station Areas.

(3) In addition to planning for uses that support rapid transit, active transportation will also be strongly encouraged within Major Transit Station Areas.

(4) Development applications and site plan applications (where applicable) within Major Transit Station Areas shall adhere to Regional Official Plan policy 2.D.2. and, in addition, shall:
   (a) demonstrate compatibility and integration with surrounding planned land uses;
   (b) contribute to an animated streetscape through the utilization of appropriate height, mixing of uses, massing, architectural design, setbacks, siting and landscaping, parking, public spaces and the conservation of cultural heritage resources; and,
   (c) demonstrate strong linkages to active transportation networks that abut property boundaries. The City shall also encourage landowners within Major Transit Station Areas to work collaboratively to create linkages to active transportation networks that allow movement across property boundaries, where feasible.

(5) Any portions of Major Transit Station Areas located within the boundaries of the Uptown Waterloo Urban Growth Centre will be planned as part of the Urban Growth Centre. Policies in Section 3.7 of this chapter shall apply to any Major Transit Station Areas located within the Uptown Waterloo Urban Growth Centre.

(6) For clarity, Section 3.11.2 and policy 6.5.2 (1) of this Plan shall apply when reviewing development applications that are located within a Major Transit Station Area. Section 3.6 shall also apply to any development application, excluding applications for site plan approval that are within a Major Transit Station Area and a designated Node or Corridor.”
### 10. Section 3.8.2

On pages 33 and 34, section 3.8.2 relating to Future Planning Studies for Major Transit Station Areas is modified as follows:

**“3.8.2 Future Planning Studies for Major Transit Station Areas” Station Area Plans**

(1) The City will, in consultation with the Region, undertake planning studies Station Area Plans for all Major Transit Station Areas located outside the Uptown Waterloo Urban Growth Centre. Such studies will, where appropriate, be implemented by way of an Official Plan Amendment and/or District Plan Amendment, and will include, but not be limited to:

- (a) A comprehensive land use plan that defines Major Transit Station Area boundaries, the planned development concept, unique characteristics and any associated minimum density requirements to support the desired form and function of the Major Transit Station Area;
- (b) Design guidelines and development standards, as necessary, to implement Transit Oriented Development;
- (2) (c) A parking management strategy that seeks to maximize intensification and infill opportunities; and
- (3) (d) Identification of implementation requirements to achieve desired goals for Major Transit Station Areas.

(2) Station Area Plans will be implemented by way of an Official Plan Amendment and/or District Plan Amendment and will include, but not be limited to the following:

- (a) Appropriate minimum density and/or minimum height requirements;
- (b) Appropriate requirements for mixed-use development on a site-specific, or area-specific basis;
- (c) Appropriate policies that seek to implement studies identified in policy 3.8.2 of this Plan; and,
- (d) Other policies that are appropriate in order to implement the planned function of Major Transit Station Areas.”

### 11. Section 3.8.3

On page 33, section 3.8.3 relating to Transitional Policies for Major Transit Station Areas is modified as follows:
### 3.8.3 Transitional Policies for Major Transit Station Areas

As of the date that this Plan is being considered for approval by City of Waterloo Council, the Rapid Transit Environmental Assessment being undertaken by the Region is on-going. Following completion of the Environmental Assessment, the Region will delineate the alignment of the rapid transit system and designate station areas conceptually through a future amendment to the Regional Official Plan.

(1) Subsequent to the Regional Official Plan Amendment referred to above, an Amendment to this Plan will be required to designate Major Transit Station Areas and establish associated policies for the areas in conformity with the Regional Official Plan. This Amendment may include the following:

- Appropriate minimum density and/or minimum height requirements;
- Appropriate requirements for mixed-use development on a site-specific basis;
- Appropriate policies that seek to implement studies identified in policy 3.8.2 of this Plan; and,
- Other policies that are appropriate in order to implement the planned function of Major Transit Station Areas.

(2) Until such time as this Plan includes policies for Major Transit Station Areas in accordance with policy 3.8.3(1) 3.8.2(2), any development application submitted within a Major Transit Station Area will be reviewed in accordance with the transit-oriented development principles included in policy 6.5.2(1) policies of this Plan and in Section 2.D.2 of the Regional Official Plan. Any such applications that do not fully meet the transit-oriented development policies may be permitted, provided the owner/applicant demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the City and the Region, that the proposed development is designed in such a way that subsequent phases or infilling would meet the transit-oriented development policies.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Section 3.9.2</th>
<th>On page 36, new subsections “j” and “k” are added to Section 3.9.2(2) relating to Neighbourhoods as follows:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“(j) Ensuring that the design of the road network provides for direct and efficient transit routes within and between communities; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(k) Locating land uses such that the distances to a transit stop are generally within a 450 metre walking distance.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Section 3.9.2  On page 36, subsection (3) of section 3.9.2 relating to Neighbourhoods is modified as follows:

“(3) The City will plan for the provision of an appropriate range and mix of housing types, sizes, costs and tenure within neighbourhoods by:
(a) Encouraging intensification and infill within designated Nodes and Corridors, and Major Transit Station Areas;
(b) Generally maintaining the land use intensity of existing low density residential neighbourhoods located outside of designated Nodes and Corridors, while permitting context-sensitive intensification in low density residential areas where it is appropriate;
(c) Supporting the Regional Municipality of Waterloo in its Affordable Housing Strategy, Regional Community Action Plan for Housing;
(d) Promoting the provision of accessible and affordable housing to be located near transit, commercial land uses, as well as parks and other community infrastructure in order to meet the needs of lower income residents; and,
(e) Encouraging accessible and visitable housing in order to facilitate ease of living and aging in place.”

14. Section 3.11  On page 42, subsection (24)(c) of Section 3.11.1 relating to Urban Design is modified as follows:

“(c) incorporation and integration of trees, shrubs, hedges planting or other ground cover, permeable paving materials, permeable paving materials, street furniture, curb ramps, waste and recycling containers and bicycle parking in the public and private realm;”

15. New Section 3.12  On page 47, a new Section 3.12 relating to the Protected Countryside is added as follows:

“3.12 Protected Countryside

The Protected Countryside identifies a continuous band of natural features and agricultural lands surrounding the north, west and south sides of the Region of Waterloo’s Urban Areas that is to be permanently protected. Lands within the Protected Countryside contain a large concentration of prime agricultural lands, woodlands, watercourses, portions of the Grand River valley, wetlands, Environmentally Sensitive Landscapes, Regional Recharge Areas, and portions of the Waterloo and Paris-Galt Moraines. The Protected Countryside is intended to permanently protect these valuable areas from urban development, while providing for the continued use of the lands for agriculture, environmental and other appropriate rural uses in conformity with the policies in this
Plan.

3.12.1 The Protected Countryside is designated by the Region of Waterloo as shown on Map 7 of the Regional Official Plan. A portion of the Protected Countryside is located in the City of Waterloo and is shown on Schedule ‘B’ – City Structure.

3.12.2 Land uses within the Protected Countryside will be regulated in accordance with the underlying land use policies of the Rural or Landscape Level Systems designations in this Plan.

3.12.3 Expansions of the City’s Urban Area Boundary will not be permitted into the Protected Countryside.

3.12.4 The designation of lands as Protected Countryside will not affect agricultural uses and associated normal farm practices as defined in applicable Provincial legislation and regulations in conformity with this Official Plan and the Zoning By-laws, and statutes, policies and regulations of other government agencies.

3.12.5 Nothing in this Plan shall prevent the owner of a legal lot of record located within the Protected Countryside from obtaining a building permit to construct or enlarge a single detached dwelling, accessory building or farm structure, provided it is in conformity with all other City, Regional, and Grand River Conservation Authority policies and regulations.”

16. Section 4.7.5 On page 58, subsection (3) of Section 4.7.5 relating to Cultural Heritage Landscapes is modified as follows:

“(3) The City shall require the conservation of cultural heritage landscapes that are characteristic of the City or Region through the review of applications for development and/or site alteration.”

17. Section 5.2.2 On page 65, subsection (3) of Section 5.2.2 relating to General Servicing Policies is modified as follows:

“(3) City approval of a development application does not necessarily indicate or guarantee adequate servicing capacity at the time an application is made for a Building Permit.”
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Section 5.2.8</td>
<td>On page 69, subsection (8) of Section 5.2.8 relating to Utilities is modified as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“(8) The construction or creation of any new or additional major utility, communication/telecommunication or service facilities/corridors, rights-of-way or installations such as hydro electric power facilities, oil pipelines, gas pipelines, or pipelines conveying other materials, inter-regional and/or inter-provincial communication lines located within or traversing the City above or below ground, shall be in conformity with the policies set out in this Plan and the Regional Official Plan.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Section 5.2.9</td>
<td>On page 70, subsection (1) of Section 5.2.9 relating to Site Dewatering is modified as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“(1) Development that requires site dewatering to facilitate construction of below-grade structures, foundations and parking garages will be subject to the approval requirements of the Ministry of the Environment, the Region, the Grand River Conservation Authority and the City, as appropriate, concerning pumping, well head protection, discharge, sewer use, treatment and other parameters as may be defined on a site-specific basis.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Section 5.4.7</td>
<td>On page 79, subsections (1) and (4) of Section 5.4.7 relating to Designated Road Allowance Policy - Widenings is modified as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“(1) Council, as empowered by the Planning Act, shall require the dedication of land to the City to provide for the widening of roads as a condition of development approval.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“(4) In conjunction with development, where a municipally accepted Transportation Impact Study or other assessment indicates that additional land beyond that set out in Column ‘D’ of Table 5-2 is required to implement transportation improvements such as turn-lanes, the road allowance width as set out in Column ‘E’ of Table 5-2, being the designated road allowance with warranted transportation improvement, shall apply. The dimensions and configuration of the widening to achieve the ultimate road allowance as set out in Column ‘E’ of Table 5-2 shall be as set out in the municipally accepted Transportation Impact Study or other assessment, which shall constitute the extent of the required widening under the Planning Act.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td><strong>Section 6.12</strong></td>
<td>On page 88, subsection (3) of Section 6.1.2 relating to Integrating Transportation and Land Use is modified as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“(3) When reviewing development applications, excluding applications for site plan approval, Council will assess the transportation demands, impacts and opportunities associated with the development.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td><strong>Section 6.4</strong></td>
<td>On page 92, a new subsection (3) is added to Section 6.4 relating to Transportation Impact Studies as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“(3) Applications for site plan involving property that abuts a Regional road and are likely to generate significant traffic, may require submission of a Transportation Assessment, Functional Design Study or similar study if requested by the Region at the time of a site plan application pre-consultation meeting. The scope of such studies will be jointly determined by the Region of Waterloo and City of Waterloo. Any such studies will be consistent with the authority granted under Section 41 of the Planning Act, with the intent of addressing potentially required site-related road and transit improvements, including but not limited to access design, road widening, traffic direction signs and public transit rights-of-way.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td><strong>Section 6.5.2</strong></td>
<td>On page 94, subsection (1) Section 6.5.2 relating to Transit Travel is modified as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“(a) Plan for a road layout and active transportation network that facilitates transit routing and provides for reasonable walking or cycling distances to transit stops, encourages walking, cycling and the use of transit, and supports mixed-use development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Support a more compact urban form that locates the majority of transit-supportive uses within a reasonable walking distance of the transit stop or Major Transit Station Area;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Provide an appropriate mix of land uses, including a range of food destinations that provide for a variety of services, amenities and employment, thereby fostering vibrant, transit-supportive neighbourhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Promote medium and higher density land uses as close as possible to transit stops to support higher frequency transit service and optimize transit rider convenience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Plan for environments that allow walking and cycling to be safe, comfortable, barrier-free,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
convenient and relatively direct forms of urban travel;

(e) (f) Plan for public spaces that provide the opportunity for social interaction and community participation;

and,

(f) (g) Provide access from various transportation modes to the transit facility, including consideration of pedestrian movement, bicycle parking, and where applicable, passenger transfer and commuter pick-up/drop-off areas.”

24. Section 7.3

On page 102, subsection (3) of Section 7.3 relating to Employment Areas is modified as follows:

“(3) Employment areas are critical to the local economy, and are anticipated to accommodate a significant share of employment growth to 2029-2031. Policies 10.3.1(4) through 10.3.1(7) of this Plan address the protection of employment areas from conversion to non-employment uses.”

25. Section 8.2.2

On page 114, subsection (10) of Section 8.2.2 relating to General Natural Heritage Policies is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

“(10) Where the construction of a building or structure on a legal lot of record within the Natural System is not subject to the development review process or site alteration permit process, landowners are encouraged to maintain appropriate buffers from natural features, implement suitable mitigative measures, and to maintain, enhance or, where feasible, restore ecological functions.”

26. Section 8.2.2

On page 116, subsection (22) of Section 8.2.2 relating to the Natural Heritage General Policies is modified as follows:

“(22) Areas within the Natural System may be regulated by the Grand River Conservation Authority. Such areas include river or stream valleys, watercourses, wetlands and adjacent lands where development (as defined under the Conservation Authorities Act) could interfere with the hydrologic function of a wetland, hazardous lands, and hazardous sites. Development, alteration to a watercourse or interference with a wetland (as defined under the Conservation Authorities Act) within regulated areas will require written permission from the Grand River Conservation Authority in accordance with the applicable regulation approved under the Conservation Authorities Act.”
| 27. | Section 8.2.3 | On page 117, subsection (6) of Section 8.2.3 relating to Landscape Level Systems is deleted and replaced with the following:

>“(6) Lands within the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape are designated Rural as shown on Schedule ‘A’ – Land Use Plan. The policies for the Rural designation are outlined in Chapter 10 of this Plan. The elements of the Natural System within and including the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape are further identified on Schedule ‘A4’ – Natural System. In the event of a conflict between the Rural land use policies and the Environmentally Sensitive Landscape policies, the most restrictive policies will prevail.”

| 28. | Section 8.3 | On page 117, subsection (11) of Section 8.2.3 relating to Landscape Level Systems is modified as follows:

>“(11) Any development or site alteration proposed in accordance with policy 8.2.3(8) will only be permitted within or contiguous to the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape where it is demonstrated through an Environmental Impact Statement or other appropriate study accepted by the City and the other public agencies having jurisdiction that there will be no adverse environmental impacts on the natural features and ecological functions of the Environmentally Sensitive Landscape. The Environmental Impact Statement will address landscape level impacts in addition to any other requirements in accordance with Section 8.2.11.”

| 29. | Section 8.2.4 | On page 120, subsection (4) of Section 8.2.4 relating to Core Natural Features is modified as follows:

>“(4) Any development or site alteration proposed in accordance with policy 8.2.4(3) will require the submission of an Environmental Impact Statement or other appropriate study accepted by the City and the other public agencies having jurisdiction, in accordance with Section 8.2.11, to determine the mitigation measures to be implemented, as appropriate, through the development application review process.”
30. **Section 8.2.4**

On pages 120 and 121, subsections (7) and (8) of Section 8.2.4 relating to Core Natural Features are modified as follows:

“(7) The following buffer width guidelines for Core Natural Features will be evaluated through an Environmental Impact Statement:
   (a) Significant Habitat of Endangered or Threatened Species — species specific
   (b) Provincially Significant Wetlands — 30 metres
   (c) Environmentally Sensitive Policy Areas — 10 metres
   (d) Regionally Significant Woodlands — 10 metres (measured from the drip line)
   (e) Environmentally Significant Valley Features — 10 metres

(7) Notwithstanding policy 8.2.4(6), the buffer width for Core Natural Features will be a minimum width of 10 metres in accordance with the Regional Official Plan.

(8) Buffer widths different from those suggested in policy 8.2.4(7) for Core Natural Features wider than 10 metres may be required if the features and ecological functions warrant it, as determined through the Environmental Impact Statement. Modified wider buffer widths will be determined on a site-specific basis by considering the sensitivity of the natural features, their ecological functions, the potential impacts of the proposed development and/or land use, the intended function of the buffer, and the physiography of the site.”

31. **Section 8.2.5**

On page 122, subsection (1) of Section 8.2.5 relating to Supporting Environmental Features is modified by adding the following new paragraph immediately following the first paragraph:

“For the purposes of reviewing development proposals, this Plan provides a different set of policies for Supporting “A” Natural Features and for Supporting “B” Natural Features. The application of these policies will be determined on a site-by-site basis in accordance with the criteria outlined in this Section and all other applicable policies in this Plan.”

32. **Section 8.2.5**

On page 123, subsection (4) of Section 8.2.5 relating to Supporting Natural Features is modified as follows:

“(4) Development or site alteration proposed in accordance with policy 8.2.5(3) will only be permitted within Supporting “A” Natural Features if it is demonstrated through an Environmental Impact Statement or other appropriate study accepted by the City and the other public agencies having
jurisdiction, in accordance with Section 8.2.11, that there will be no adverse environmental impacts on the feature or its ecological functions.”

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Section 8.2.6</td>
<td>On page 129, subsection (2) of Section 8.2.6 relating to Restoration Areas is modified as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“(2) Restoration Areas will be identified through technical studies undertaken or accepted by the City, through the conservation and land securement programs of other public agencies, through private land stewardship, or through the development application review process. Where Restoration Areas are identified through the development application review process, excluding site plan applications, the lands will be protected through zoning.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 34. | Section 8.2.7 | On page 129, subsection (2) of Section 8.2.7 relating to Linkages is modified as follows: |
|   |   | “(2) Linkages will be identified through technical studies undertaken or accepted by the City, through the conservation and land securement programs of other public agencies, through private land stewardship, or through the development application review process, with the intent of maximizing functionality. Where Linkages are identified through the development application review process, excluding site plan applications, the lands will be protected through zoning.” |

| 35. | Section 8.2.10 | On page 132, subsection (6) of Section 8.2.10 relating to Watershed Planning is modified as follows: |
|   |   | “(6) Prior to an amendment to this Plan or the adoption of a District Plan which would have the effect of permitting significant areas of development, the City will require the completion and acceptance of a watershed study. The resulting recommendations for environmental protection, enhancement, restoration, management, and monitoring will be incorporated into the District Plan and implemented through the development application review process.” |

| 36. | Section 8.2.12 | On page 135, the first sentence of subsection (3) of Section 8.2.12 relating to Urban Greenlands is modified as follows: |
|   |   | “(3) Subsequent to the identification of Major Urban Greenlands through the Urban Greenlands Strategy identified in policy 8.2.12(2), the City will, through the policies of this Plan designate Urban Greenlands and develop associated policies for these areas in this Plan to:” |

| 37. | Section 8.3.3 | On page 138, the following new subsection (7) is added to Section 8.3.3 relating to Source Water Protection: |
“(7) Development applications, excluding site plan applications, within Source Water Protection Areas will be reviewed and considered in accordance with the source water protection policies in the Regional Official Plan.”

| 38. | Section 8.4.2 | On page 139, subsections (1) and (2) of Section 8.4.2 relating to Natural Hazards are modified as follows:

“(1) To reduce the threat to life and property posed by natural hazards, as well as lessen the risk of social disruption and potential for public cost, development will generally be directed to areas outside of known hazardous lands and hazardous sites. Where development is permitted near or on known hazardous lands and hazardous sites, potential adverse impacts will be recognized and mitigated.”

“(2) Hazardous lands and hazardous sites are identified, mapped, and regulated by the Grand River Conservation Authority. Known hazardous Hazardous lands and hazardous sites are shown on Schedule ‘A5’ – Natural Hazards. Amendments to this Plan will not be required for minor revisions to the limits of hazardous lands and hazardous sites, where such revisions are supported by technical studies approved by the Grand River Conservation Authority.”

| 39. | Section 8.4.2 | On page 141, subsection (8) of Section 8.4.2 relating to Natural Hazards is modified as follows:

“(8) Surface parking and surface parking facilities associated with residential uses may be permitted in hazardous lands impacted by flooding hazards in accordance with the Zoning By-Law except where the Grand River Conservation Authority determines that sites are subject to severe flow velocities of sufficient magnitude to displace vehicles or where the parking is deemed by the Grand River Conservation Authority to create an obstruction to flood flows.”

“(8) Except as provided through policy 8.4.2 (4), parking lots, elevated parking structures and underground parking structures associated with residential uses and underground parking structures associated with non-residential uses will not be permitted in hazardous lands impacted by flooding hazards.”
40. Section 8.4.2  | On page 141, subsection (10) of Section 8.4.2 relating to Natural Hazards is deleted and replaced with the following:

“(10) Prior to development on lands occasioned by groundwater discharge or high water tables, detailed hydrogeological and/or geotechnical studies will be required to assess potential risks to persons, buildings, structures, or infrastructure.”

41. Section 8.4.4  | On page 153, subsection (7) of Section 8.4.4 relating to Noise and Vibration from Transportation Sources is modified as follows:

“(7) Where a development application, excluding site plan applications, for a sensitive land use is submitted in the vicinity of an existing or planned City Arterial or Regional Arterial road, provincial highway or railway, the Regional rapid transit system, or a transit terminal, a noise study may be required. Any required noise mitigation measures will be implemented through the development application review process.”

42. Section 8.5.3  | On pages 157 and 158, Section 8.5.4 relating to Energy Production and Distribution is modified as follows:

“8.5.4 Energy Production and Distribution

(1) The City recognizes that a stable, efficient energy supply system is necessary for a strong, sustainable economy.

(2) Increased energy supply in the City is encouraged by providing opportunities for on-site energy production and commercial energy production facilities, alternative energy systems, and renewable energy systems to accommodate current and projected needs. Commercial energy production which is an alternative energy system or renewable energy system will generally be preferred over conventional forms of energy production, subject to potential impacts being mitigated to provincial and federal requirements.

(3) Notwithstanding any federal or provincial requirements regarding energy production facilities, the City encourages proponents to undertake sufficient public notice and consultation so as to ensure members of the community and the City have sufficient opportunity to provide comment on proposed facilities to the
proponent and/or approval authority.

(4) In addition to the policies of this Plan, geothermal facilities will be subject to the Source Water Protection policies of the Regional Official Plan.

(5) As per policy 5.2.8(5), the City will, in conjunction with development, require the transition of existing above-ground hydro lines and plant to underground locations, where technically feasible and where funding opportunities become available. It is recognized further that the Uptown Waterloo Urban Growth Centre represents a priority area for such transition. Where financially feasible, the City will support and participate in cost-sharing arrangements for the burial of hydro between Waterloo North Hydro Inc., landowners/developers and the Region.

(6) The City may support or actively participate in the development of energy production facilities which may include municipal ownership and/or operation of such facilities.

Commercial Energy Production Facilities

(7) The City will endeavour to ensure that new or proposed expansions to existing commercial energy production facilities will be planned and designed in conformity with applicable legislation and regulation, including separation requirements from sensitive land uses.

(8) (7) Commercial energy production facilities that are owned and/or operated by the City, public utilities, Ontario Power Generation Inc., or Hydro One Networks Inc. and are subject to the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act will be permitted in any land use designation of this Plan, with preference given to facilities locating in areas designated Flexible Industrial.

(9) (8) Commercial energy production facilities that are privately owned and managed and are not an alternative energy system or renewable energy system regulated by the Green Energy Act will require an amendment to this Plan as well as the Zoning By-Law may be permitted in the Zoning By-law in areas designated Flexible Industrial, subject to appropriate regulations. Commercial energy production facilities are encouraged to locate in areas designated Flexible Industrial. Amendments will only be considered where the City is satisfied that Zoning By-law Amendments to permit such energy production facilities in other areas of the City will only be considered where the City is satisfied that there will be no adverse effects from the development as related to economic,
environmental, social, transportation, safety, and other concerns, as determined by the City.

(10) **Commercial energy production** facilities that are privately owned and managed and are an **alternative energy system or renewable energy system**. **Alternative energy systems and renewable energy systems**, will be permitted in all land use designations in this Plan, but are encouraged to locate in areas designated Flexible Industrial. Such energy systems will be developed in accordance with **provincial and federal** requirements including appropriate separation distances to address land use compatibility.

(11) The City will actively participate with the responsible **approval** authorities in planning for the location and/or expansion of **commercial energy production alternative energy systems and renewable energy systems** within the City, whether or not the facilities require an amendment to this Plan.

(12) This Plan recognizes **district energy** systems as an efficient method of supplying heating, cooling and electricity to buildings and as a means to reduce the vulnerability of the energy system.

**On-Site Energy Production Facilities**

(13) **On-site energy production** facilities that are an **alternative energy system or renewable energy system** will be permitted in all land use designations in this Plan. **On-site energy production facilities that are not an alternative energy system or renewable energy system** will be subject to performance standards applied through the **Zoning By-Law**.

43. **Section 10.1**

On page 167, the third paragraph of the Vision statement relating to residential land use is modified as follows:

“Medium to high density residential land uses are generally directed to designated Nodes and Corridors. The Nodes and Corridors are planned to have convenient access to transit, be pedestrian supportive through design, and are anticipated to accommodate a significant portion of Waterloo’s growth to **2029 – 2031**.”
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Section 10.1.1</td>
<td>On page 169, subsection (10) of Section 10.1.1 relating to General Policies for Residential Densities is modified as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“(10) This Plan is intended to guide development in terms of character, scale and intensity of use and built form. In addition, this Plan provides a framework for the City to plan for infrastructure requirements over the long-term, ensure properties develop at appropriate densities for the property size, and foster land use compatibility. To achieve the foregoing, density calculations for any residential use shall be measured using a net density calculation of bedrooms per hectare. The City will prepare a guideline document outlining how the bedrooms per hectare density methodology will be used to monitor and implement the density targets of this Plan for the Uptown Waterloo Urban Growth Centre and the Designated Greenfield Areas.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Section 10.1.2</td>
<td>On page 171, subsection (2) of Section 10.1.2 relating to Supporting a Range of Housing is modified as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“(2) This Plan supports the efforts of senior levels of government, and private sector, and not-for-profit agencies to provide housing geared to the needs of economically, socially, mentally and physically disadvantaged persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Where possible, housing geared to low income households, senior citizens, people with special needs, and community housing should be located within walking distance of schools, public transit, lands designated commercial, parks and recreational facilities and have convenient access to other community infrastructure.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Section 10.1.2</td>
<td>On page 171, subsection (3) of Section 10.1.2 relating to Second Residential Units is modified as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“(3) The City will permit the addition of one self-contained residential dwelling unit (i.e. second unit), either within single-detached, semi-detached and row houses, or within ancillary structures on the same lot, in both existing and newly developing residential neighbourhoods, where desirable and appropriate.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 47. Section 10.3.2.2

On page 219, subsection (5) of Section 10.3.2.2 relating to the Business Employment designation is modified as follows:

“(5) Where lands designated Business Employment are recognized on Schedule ‘B1’ ‘B’—City Structure as being within a **Major Transit Station Area** or within a Major Node, the Zoning By-law may permit the following additional **ancillary** uses:

- **Convenience retail** and personal service uses intended to serve local business needs and their employees.”

### 48. Section 10.5

On page 226, subsections (3) and (4) of Section 10.5.1 relating to Open Space Land Use Policies are modified as follows:

“(3) Within the Open Space land use designation, the predominant use of land is open space and the designation envisions a broad range of uses including municipal parks and other green spaces, active and passive recreation uses, municipal facilities, community gardens, **rural uses**, elements of the natural system, cemeteries, golf courses and the regional landfill, subject to policy 10.5.1 (4) below.

(4) It is not the intent of this Plan to permit all uses listed in policy 10.5.1 (3) in every Open Space designation. Permitted uses and policies related to individual Open Space designations will be further defined in section 10.5.2 of this Plan in the following five **four** Open Space designations:

- **Parks and other Green Spaces** (Includes elements of the Natural System as shown on Schedule ‘A4’—Natural System);
- **Rural**;
- **Cemeteries**;
- **Golf Course**; and,
- **Landfill**.”

### 49. Section 10.5.2.2

On page 232, Section 10.5.2.2 relating to Rural uses within the Open Space land use designation is deleted in its entirety as follows:

**10.5.2.2 Rural**

(1) The **Rural** designation as shown on Schedule ‘A3’—Open Space Land Uses identifies areas outside the Urban Area Boundary and within the Laurel Creek Headwaters **Environmentally Sensitive Landscape**.
(2) The Rural designation in this Plan is intended to permanently protect the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape from inappropriate land uses.

**Land Use**

(3) The land uses permitted within the Rural designation are regulated in accordance with the underlying Environmentally Sensitive Landscape policies outlined in Chapter 8 of this Plan. In an event of a conflict between the Rural land use policies and the Environmentally Sensitive Landscape policies, the more restrictive policies will prevail.

(4) The division of land designated Rural for the creation of a new lot or lot adjustment may only be permitted in accordance with the Regional Official Plan.

(5) The use of private wells and individual wastewater treatment systems within the Rural land use designation is permitted.

50. **Section 10.5.2.3**
On pages 233 to 236, section headings 10.5.2.3 Cemeteries, 10.5.2.4 Golf Course, 10.5.2.5 Landfill and 10.5.2.6 Natural System are renumbered as Sections 10.5.2.2, 10.5.2.3, 10.5.2.4 and 10.5.2.5, respectively.

51. **Section 10.5.2.4**
On page 236, section (9) of Section 10.5.2.4 relating to Landfill is modified as follows:

“(9) Appropriate separation distances between areas used for waste disposal purposes and lands zoned for residential purposes or other sensitive land uses shall be established in District Plans and the Zoning By-Law where appropriate.”

52. **Section 10.6**
On page 237, Section 10.6 relating to Land Uses in Transition is renumbered as Sections “10.7”, and the first paragraph of this policy is modified as follows:

“This Plan recognizes that several properties in the City do not currently conform to the land use designations set out in the Plan. Examples include certain agricultural uses and agricultural-related agriculture-related uses as well as some older industrial areas located throughout the City’s Urban Area Boundary. It is the intent of this Plan that over time, these land uses will gradually evolve and transition to new uses, including a range of commercial, residential, office employment or other uses in accordance with the policies of this Plan. It is
recognized, however, that land use change often involves dealing with challenges relating to land use compatibility, potential soil contamination and other planning issues. As a result, this Plan seeks to promote land use change in a timely and flexible manner while effectively addressing any physical, economic, environmental or public health and safety matters.”

| 53. | New Section 10.6 | A new Section 10.6 relating to the Rural land use designation is added as follows:

**“10.6 Rural Land Use Policies**

**Land Use**

(1) The Rural Land Use designation as shown on Schedule ‘A’ – Land Use Plan identifies areas where Canada Land Inventory Class 4 to 7 soils predominate and which are typically characterized by one or more steep slopes, *natural features* and/or existing non-farm lots. The predominant land uses within this designation shall include *agricultural uses*, *agriculture-related uses* and *secondary uses*.

(2) Land uses within the Rural designation will conform to the Rural policies contained in the Regional Official Plan, the policies within Section 10.7.1, and the *Environmentally Sensitive Landscape* policies outlined in Chapter 8 of this Plan. In the event of a conflict between the Rural land use policies and the *Environmentally Sensitive Landscape* policies, the more restrictive policies will prevail.

(3) The division of land designated Rural for the creation of a new lot or lot adjustment may only be permitted in accordance with the policies of the Regional Official Plan.

(4) Farming operations are encouraged to utilize sustainable agricultural techniques and best management practices which conserve and enhance the natural environment, protect surface and ground water quality and quantity and minimize impacts on adjacent land uses.”
On page 237, Section 10.6.1 relating to Agricultural Uses and Agricultural-Related Uses is renumbered as Section 10.7.1 and modified as follows:

**10.6.1 10.7.1 Agricultural Uses and Agricultural-Related Agriculture-Related Uses**

“(1) This Plan recognizes the existence of past *agricultural uses* and *agricultural-related agriculture-related uses* within the City.

(a) Where such uses are located within the Urban Area Boundary as shown on Schedule ‘A’ – Land Use Plan, it is the intent of this Plan that such uses will be gradually be replaced by urban uses with the extension of full municipal services in conjunction with the orderly development of neighbouring lands.

(b) Where *agricultural uses* or *agricultural-related agriculture-related uses* are located within the Rural land use designation on Schedule ‘A3’ – Open Space Land Uses Schedule ‘A’ Land Use Plan, it is the intent of this Plan that such uses will be permitted for the long term.

(i) The permitted uses for lands designated Rural are further defined in the Rural land use designation found in Chapter 10 of the Plan Section 10.6.

(2) The establishment of new, or the expansion of existing *agricultural uses* or *agricultural-related agriculture-related uses* or *secondary uses* will not be permitted to locate within the Urban Area Boundary.

(3) Farming operations are encouraged to utilize sustainable agricultural techniques and best management practices which conserve and enhance the natural environment, protect surface and ground water quality and quantity and minimize impacts on adjacent land uses.

(a) Council may establish additional regulations in the Zoning By-law to minimize the impact of *agricultural uses* or *agricultural-related uses* on adjacent uses and the environment.

(3) Council may establish additional regulations in the Zoning By-law to minimize the impact of *agricultural uses* or *agriculture-related uses* located within the Urban Area Boundary on adjacent uses and the environment.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.1.46</td>
<td>On page 285, Section 11.1.46 relating to Specific Provision Area 46 (255 Northfield Dr E) is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the policies set out in Appendix A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2.13</td>
<td>On page 302, subsection (5)(b) of Section 12.2.13 relating to Staging of Development is modified as follows: “(b) Servicing improvements necessary to accommodate household growth to 2029-2031;”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2.15</td>
<td>On pages 305 and 306, subsections (1) and (2) of Section 12.2.15 relating to Development Permit System are modified as follows: “(1) The City may utilize adopt a development permit by-law under Section 70.2 of the Planning Act to establish a Development Permit System. Any Development Permit System will support one or all of the following Official Plan objectives: (a) Supporting a compact urban form within the Built-up Area; (b) Facilitating a high standard of urban design; (c) Supporting the protection of the environment; (d) Streamlining the development review process. (2) Prior to adopting a development permit by-law, the City will identify one or more areas as Development Permit Areas by way of an amendment to this Plan. Such areas will be designated as Development Permit Areas in a Development Permit By-law.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4.4</td>
<td>On page 316, subsection (4) of Section 12.4.4 relating to Formal Public Meeting is modified as follows: “(4) Where City staff has directed that no Informal Public Meeting be held, the Formal Public Meeting shall be held not sooner than 30 days after the requirements for the giving of notice, as set out in Section 12.4.3 (1) of this chapter, have been complied with.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>On page 316, new subsections (5) and (6) are added to Section 12.5 relating to Review, Amendments and Consolidations, as follows: “(5) This Plan contains references to the Regional Official Plan. All such references shall be interpreted as referring to text and mapping of the Regional Official Plan as approved by the Province on December 22, 2010.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>Notwithstanding policy 12.5(5), it is recognized that the Regional Official Plan may change through future approvals by the Ontario Municipal Board or through future amendments adopted by Regional Council. In the event that changes are made to the Regional Official Plan through either the approval by the Ontario Municipal Board or by future amendment, this Plan will be brought into conformity with the Regional Official Plan by means of appropriate housekeeping amendments.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Section 12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(“2) Specific monitoring will be undertaken in order to ensure conformity with the Regional Official Plan and Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. At a minimum, the City shall monitor the following trends:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Monitor development within the Built-up Area to determine the City of Waterloo’s contribution toward progress in achieving the intensification target of this Plan, to be calculated on an annual basis and measured at the Regional level;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Achievement of the density target for the Uptown Waterloo Urban Growth Centre, to be calculated at least once every five years; and,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Monitor development within the Designated Greenfield Area to determine the City of Waterloo’s contribution toward progress in achieving the minimum density target to be measured at the Regional level, as set out in this Plan.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Glossary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“<strong>Provincial and Federal requirements</strong> – In relation to energy production and distribution, legislation and policies administered by Federal or Provincial governments for the purpose of protecting the environment from potential impacts associated with energy facilities and ensuring that the necessary approvals are obtained.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“<strong>Transit stops</strong> – include conventional bus transit terminals and stops and iXpress stops.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following terms and definitions are deleted from the Glossary:

“Commercial Energy Production” — The production of energy generally for use off the property on which it is produced.

“On-Site Energy Production” — The small-scale production of energy primarily intended for use on the property on which it is produced.

Part B: Modifications to Schedules and Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mod. No.</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Details of the Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Schedule “A”</td>
<td>Schedule “A” (Land Use Plan) is modified as shown on the attached Schedule “A,” dated November 2012, to redesignate the lands located outside the Urban Area in the northwest corner of the City of Waterloo from “Open Space” to “Rural” as designated on Map 7 (The Countryside) of the Regional Official Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Schedule “A”</td>
<td>Schedule “A” (Land Use Plan) is modified as shown on the attached Schedule “A,” dated November 2012, to revise the legend to add symbols for the “Rural” designation, and to make different the symbols shown for the “Uptown Waterloo Urban Growth Centre” and the “Urban Area Boundary”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Schedule “A”</td>
<td>Schedule “A” (Land Use Plan) is modified as shown on the attached Schedule “A,” dated November 2012, to redesignate the lands municipally addressed as 255 Northfield Drive East from “Mixed-Use Medium Density Residential” to “Commercial.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Schedule “A1”</td>
<td>Schedule “A1” (Commercial Land Uses) is modified as shown on the attached Schedule “A1,” dated November 2012, to designate the lands municipally addressed at 255 Northfield Drive E as “Mixed-Use Neighbourhood Commercial.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Schedule “A3”</td>
<td>Schedule “A3” (Open Space Land Uses) is modified as shown on the attached Schedule “A3,” dated November 2012, to delete “Rural” land use designation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule “A4”</td>
<td>Schedule “A4” (Natural System) is modified as shown on the attached Schedule “A4,” dated November 2012, to delete the light gray hatching (i.e., Other Open Space Land Uses) from the lands within the Environmentally Sensitive Landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule “B”</td>
<td>Schedule “B” (City Structure) is modified as shown on the attached Schedule “B,” dated November 2012, to redesignate the lands municipally addressed as 255 Northfield Drive E from “Minor Corridor” to “Minor Node.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule “B”</td>
<td>Schedule “B” (City Structure) is modified as shown on the attached Schedule “B,” dated November 2012, to designate the lands located outside the Urban Area in the northwest corner of the City of Waterloo as “Protected Countryside” as designated on Map 7 (The Countryside) of the Regional Official Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule “B3”</td>
<td>Schedule “B3” (Designated Greenfield Areas) is modified as shown on the attached Schedule “B3,” dated November 2012, to delete the “Core Natural Features” land use category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule “B3”</td>
<td>Schedule “B3” (Designated Greenfield Areas) is modified as shown on the attached Schedule “B3,” dated November 2012, to add the Built-Up Area as designated on Map 3a of the Regional Official Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule “E”</td>
<td>Schedule “E” (Road Classification System) is modified as shown on the attached Schedule “E,” dated November 2012, to reclassify the segment of Erb Street West from Erbsville Road/Ira Needles Boulevard to the City of Waterloo-Township of Wilmot boundary from a “Local Road” to a “Regional Arterial”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | Table 5-1 | On page 76, the third row (Regional Arterial Roads), second column (Function) of Table 5-1 relating to the Road Classification System is modified so that the second bullet reads as follows:  

- In accordance with the Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines, Regional Transportation Master Plan, Regional Road Access By-law, Regional Pedestrian Master Plan, Regional Road Access Guideline, Regional Active Master Transportation Plan, Transportation Impact Study Guidelines and Area Municipal design guidelines.” |
<p>|   | Entire Plan | All page, section, and page reference numbers in the Official Plan, including the Table of Contents, are adjusted accordingly to accommodate the modifications herein. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Def. No.</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Details of the Deferral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Entire Plan</td>
<td>No decision is being made with respect to this Plan, in its entirety, as it relates to lands municipally addressed as 525 and 565 Conestogo Road West (Kraus Carpet Mills Ltd.), as illustrated on the attached Map 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Chapter 3</td>
<td>On page 13, no decision is being as it relates to the first paragraph of the preamble to Chapter 3 (City Form), as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The City of Waterloo will be planned to accommodate a population of 138,000 (excluding post-secondary students who reside temporarily in the Region) and employment of 88,000 jobs by the year 2029.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Section 3.2</td>
<td>On page 16, no decision is being made to subsection (1) of Section 3.2 relating to Population and Employment Growth as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“(1) The City of Waterloo shall plan to accommodate a population of 137,000 people (excluding post-secondary students who reside temporarily in the Region) and employment of 88,000 jobs by the year 2029, as outlined in the Regional Official Plan. The City will continue to cooperate with the Region to generate population and employment estimates in the future based on changing trends and the City’s unique growth characteristics.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Section 3.2</td>
<td>On page 16, no decision is being made to subsection (2) of Section 3.2 relating to Population and Employment Growth as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“(2) It is anticipated that university and college students who reside temporarily in the Region will be in addition to the population forecast noted by in Table 1 of the Regional Official Plan. The estimated number of off-campus students will continue to be monitored and evaluated to ensure that this population is accounted for in planning processes.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | Section 3.3  | On page 17, no decision is being made with respect to the second paragraph of Section 3.3 relating to Residential Intensification as follows:

> “Consistent with Regional Official Plan policy 2.C.2, the City will plan for, beginning in 2015, a minimum of 45 percent of residential development to occur within the City’s Built-up Area. This target will be measured every five years by the City. To achieve the intended level of residential intensification, the City will:”

|   | Section 3.5  | On page 19, no decision is being made with respect subsection (2) of Section 3.5 relating to Designated Greenfield Areas as follows:

> “(2) The City of Waterloo will plan for development within its Designated Greenfield Areas that contributes toward the achievement of a Region-wide density target of not less than 55 persons and jobs combined per hectare. In accordance with the Regional Official Plan, this density will be measured over the entire Designated Greenfield Area of the Region and shall include both employment-serving and residential-serving areas. To contribute to the achievement of the Region-wide density targets set out in 2.D.17 of the Regional Official Plan, the following policies shall apply:

(a) The City will require Plans of Subdivision for residential lands submitted after January 1, 2011 for Designated Greenfield Areas to cumulatively achieve a density target of 55 persons and jobs per hectare.

(b) The City will contribute to achieving a Region-wide employment Designated Greenfield Area density target of 40 residents and jobs combined per hectare.”

|   | Section 7.3  | On page 102, no decision is being made with respect to subsection (1) of Section 7.3 relating to Employment Areas as follows:

> “(1) The City will plan for an adequate supply of lands that is sufficient to accommodate an employment forecast of 23,930 additional jobs from 2006 to 2029.”
8. **Section 10.1.1**  
On page 169, no decision is being made to subsection (8) of Section 10.1.1 relating to General Policies for Residential Density as follows:

“(8) Council recognizes the importance of achieving sufficient minimum levels of density in **Designated Greenfield Areas** to economically provide municipal services and contribute toward the achievement of **Designated Greenfield Area** density targets set out in Policy 3.5(2) of this Plan.”

9. **Section 10.1.1**  
On page 169, no decision is being made to subsection (9) of Section 10.1.1 relating to General Policies for Residential Density as follows:

“(9) Densities referred to within specific residential land use designations shall be interpreted as net density calculations. All portions of the site that are designated Residential shall be used to calculate adherence to such net density regulations, provided further that:

(a) Development within **Designated Greenfield Areas** shall also adhere to minimum gross density targets set out in policy 3.5(2) of this Plan.

(b) To implement policy 3.5.(2)(a) of this Plan, the City will apply minimum density requirements, through appropriate planning mechanisms, to all residential **Designated Greenfield Areas** that are subject to a Plan of Subdivision after January 1, 2011.”

10. **Chapter 9**  
Beginning on page 163, no decision is being made with respect to Chapter 9 (Mineral Aggregates) in its entirety.

11. **Schedule “A”**  
No decision is being made with respect to Schedule “A” (Land Use Plan) as it relates to lands municipally addressed 443 and 446 Wismer Street, as illustrated on the attached Map 2, until such time as the City of Waterloo has determined the appropriate land use framework for the site.

12. **Schedule “A2”**  
No decision is being made with respect to Schedule “A2” (Employment Areas) as it relates to lands municipally addressed 443 and 446 Wismer Street, as illustrated on the attached Map 2, until such time as the City of Waterloo has determined the appropriate land use framework for the site.

13. **Schedule “B1”**  
No decision is being made with respect to Schedule “B1” (Height and Density) as it relates to lands municipally addressed 443 and 446 Wismer Street, as illustrated on the attached Map 2, until such time as the City of Waterloo has determined the appropriate land use framework for the site.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Schedule “I”</td>
<td>No decision is being made with respect to Schedule “I” (Industrial Transition Areas) as it relates to lands municipally addressed 443 and 446 Wismer Street, as illustrated on the attached Map 2, until such time as the City of Waterloo has determined the appropriate land use framework for the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Section 11.1.5</td>
<td>On page 241, no decision is being made with respect to Section 11.1.5 relating to Specific Provision Area 5 (443 Wismer Street) until such time as the City of Waterloo has determined the appropriate land use framework for the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Schedule “A”</td>
<td>No decision is being made with respect to Schedule “A” (Land Use Plan) as it relates to the Northdale Neighbourhood, as illustrated on the attached Map 3, until such time as the appeals related to this area have been resolved by the Ontario Municipal Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Schedule “A6”</td>
<td>No decision is being made with respect to Schedule “A6” (Specific Provision Areas) as it relates to the Northdale Neighbourhood, as illustrated on the attached Map 3, until such time as the appeals related to this area have been resolved by the Ontario Municipal Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Schedule “A6a”</td>
<td>No decision is being made with respect to Schedule “A6a” (Land Use Plan) as it relates to the Northdale Neighbourhood, as illustrated on the attached Map 3, until such time as the appeals related to this area have been resolved by the Ontario Municipal Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Schedule “B”</td>
<td>No decision is being made with respect to Schedule “B” (City Structure) as it relates to the Northdale Neighbourhood, as illustrated on the attached Map 3, until such time as the appeals related to this area have been resolved by the Ontario Municipal Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Schedule “B1”</td>
<td>No decision is being made with respect to Schedule “B1” (Height and Density) as it relates to the Northdale Neighbourhood, as illustrated on the attached Map 3, until such time as the appeals related to this area have been resolved by the Ontario Municipal Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Schedule “E”</td>
<td>No decision is being made with respect to Schedule “E” (Road Classification System) as it relates to the Northdale Neighbourhood, as illustrated on the attached Map 3, until such time as the appeals related to this area have been resolved by the Ontario Municipal Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Schedule “F”</td>
<td>No decision is being made with respect to Schedule “F” (Active Transportation Framework) as it relates to the Northdale Neighbourhood, as illustrated on the attached Map 3, until such time as the appeals related to this area have been resolved by the Ontario Municipal Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 23. | Schedule “G” | No decision is being made with respect to Schedule “G” (Road Allowances) as it relates to:
a) the section of Albert Street from University Avenue West to Columbia Street; and
b) the section of Hazel Street from University Avenue West to Columbia Street West.

until such time as the appeals related to Northdale Neighbourhood, as illustrated on the attached Map 1, have been resolved by the Ontario Municipal Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Section 11.1.45</td>
<td>On page 284, no decision is being made with respect to Section 11.1.45 relating to Specific Provision Area 45 (Northdale Neighbourhood) until such time as the appeals related to the Northdale Neighbourhood, as illustrated on the attached Map 3, have been resolved by the Ontario Municipal Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Section 11.2.20 (13)</td>
<td>On page 255, no decision is being made with respect to subsection (13) of Section 11.2.20 relating to Specific Provision Area 20 (Lands around Wilfrid Laurier University) until such time as the appeals related to the Northdale Neighbourhood, as illustrated on the attached Map 3, have been resolved by the Ontario Municipal Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 26. | Table 5-2 | No decision is being made with respect to Table 5-2 (Road Allowances) as it relates to:

a) the section of Albert Street from University Avenue West to Columbia Street; and
b) the section of Hazel Street from University Avenue West to Columbia Street West.

until such time as the appeals related to Northdale Neighbourhood, as illustrated on the attached Map 1, have been resolved by the Ontario Municipal Board. |
“11.1.46 Specific Provision Area 46 (255 Northfield Drive) applies to 255 Northfield Dr E as shown on Map 4 – Proposed Official Plan Amendment (Schedule “A” Land Use Plan adopted Official Plan);

(1) Lands within Specific Provision Area 46 shall be subject to the following site specific policies:

(a) It shall be a policy of Council that notwithstanding the policies regarding maximum gross leasable retail commercial space for Mixed-Use Neighbourhood Commercial centres, the following shall apply:

(i) The maximum gross leasable commercial space shall be 5,900 sq m. Any request for additional gross leasable commercial space shall require an Official Plan Amendment with appropriate justification;

(ii) The maximum gross leasable commercial space for a food store shall be 4,535 sq m. Any expansion of the food store shall require an Official Plan Amendment, with appropriate justification and a review of impacts on other food stores (existing and planned) in accordance with applicable Official Plan policies;

(iii) The development of the subject lands shall include an apartment building with a minimum of 110 residential units. Commercial uses, which shall be determined through the implementing zoning by-law, shall be permitted on the ground floor of the apartment building. The maximum permitted density on the subject lands for residential uses shall be 450 bedrooms per hectare;

(v) The remainder of the gross leasable commercial space shall be divided between two buildings. The first building shall be permitted a maximum of 929 sq m of gross leasable retail commercial space on the ground floor (first storey). Residential units shall be permitted above the first storey. The second building (the apartment building containing a minimum of 110 units) shall be permitted a maximum of 436 sq m of gross leasable retail commercial space on the main floor of a 6 storey mixed use building;

(vi) The additional 929 sq m of gross leasable commercial space noted in Section 11.1.45(1)(a)(iv) shall be in a single, multi-tenant commercial building. Said building shall be encouraged to be a minimum of two storeys and shall be required to contain design elements intended to achieve the appearance of two storeys;

(b) It shall be a policy of Council that notwithstanding the maximum height within the “Medium Density 20 Metres” designation, the subject lands shall be permitted a single building with a maximum height of 23 metres. All other buildings shall be permitted a maximum height of 20 metres;

(c) In accordance with the City of Waterloo Official Plan and the Urban Design Guidelines, the following design elements shall be required for the proposal:

(i) The Lighting Plan submitted with the Site Plan application shall demonstrate that all lighting be maintained on site (no glare on surrounding properties) and directed towards the ground rather than towards the sky;
(ii) That, in addition to a right-in and left-in from Bridge St, the site be designed with a right-out only at the Bridge St entrance/exit, with the geometrics of the exit lane such that a tractor trailer truck cannot exit the site onto Bridge St;

(iii) That the loading area for the food store be located at the south end of the food store building, closest to the hydro corridor;

(iv) That the loading area for the food store be fully enclosed, including a roof and roll up automatic doors;

(v) That the food store contain design features on the north (facing Northfield Dr) and east (facing Bridge St) façades to create visual interest along these key streets and pedestrian avenues, including windows (open to the interior of the store) on the Northfield façade. Both façades shall be designed with exteriors that match the façade of the building facing the parking lot;

(vi) That a second storey (floor) community room be strongly encouraged within the food store, with design elements, including windows, directed towards the intersection of Northfield Dr and Bridge St;

(vii) That clear and direct pedestrian linkages be provided from both Northfield Dr and Bridge St into the site at key entry points, for both the residential and commercial components of the development;

(viii) The requirement for a direct pedestrian connection from the site to the transit stop on Northfield Dr;

(ix) That the design of the site include a multi-use pathway on the north side of the berm along the rear of the property, connecting Bridge St, the site and Deer Run Park. The pathway shall:
be a minimum of 2.0 metres wide;
connect with the existing pathway in Deer Run Park; and
be paved with asphalt

(x) That a landscape buffer be provided between the parking/multi-use pathway and the side lot line. The average depth of the buffer shall be determined in accordance with the site specific by-law. The landscape buffer shall include berms. The berms shall be planted with a mix of species, satisfactory to the City of Waterloo. The objective of the berms and landscaping shall be to provide a visual barrier between the rear yards of the homes on Deer Run Dr and the parking area on the subject lands.

(d) The Owner shall submit a detailed Noise Study as part of their site plan application submission to the satisfaction of the City and Regional Municipality of Waterloo. The Noise Study shall be conducted when grading plans, elevations and floor plans are available to specify the glazing requirements for the residential building. The Noise Study shall assess the impacts of road and stationary noise (on- and off-site) on the proposed residential use as well as the impacts of on-site stationary noise on adjacent residential uses, review the location of any proposed outdoor amenity areas; and provide recommendations for any mitigation measures that may be required. The Owner shall implement any required recommendations and shall enter into an agreement (with the City and/or Region, as required) under the provisions of the Planning Act.”
ATTACHMENT B
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Transportation Planning

TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of Planning and Works Committee

DATE: November 6, 2012

FILE CODE: D10-40/GO

SUBJECT: CONTRIBUTION TO GO TRANSIT RAIL CAPITAL COSTS

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a $1.39 million contribution to GO Transit, payable in five equal instalments from 2013 to 2017 inclusive, as the Region’s share of GO Transit capital investments relating to service extension to Waterloo Region, as described in Report No. P-12-116, dated November 6, 2012, and

THAT the contribution to GO Transit be included in the Region’s 2013-2022 Capital Budget and Forecast.

SUMMARY:

The Province of Ontario is requesting a contribution from benefiting municipalities towards the capital cost of the recently implemented GO train service to Waterloo Region. The total capital cost for this project was approximately $18 million and the Waterloo Region contribution is $1.39 million. The Ministry of Transportation has agreed that this cost can be paid over a five year period with equal payments of $278,000. This request is consistent with GO Transit’s funding model across the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area.

REPORT:

On December 19, 2011, inaugural GO train service was extended to Guelph and Waterloo Region from Georgetown. The inaugural service included two AM peak and two PM peak hour trains and three new stops: Kitchener, Guelph, and Acton. Investments for the inaugural service included station improvements and a temporary layover facility in Kitchener. Current ridership is holding steady at about 100 morning trips from the Kitchener Station to the Greater Toronto Area. This ridership meets GO Transit’s expectations.

The Province covers the operating subsidy for GO rail service. The municipalities that have GO rail service are expected to contribute one third of the GO expansion capital costs. Previous reports to Planning and Works Committee (P-09-068 and P-09-077) advised that there would be an expectation of a capital cost contribution from benefiting municipalities. Ministry of Transportation staff approached City of Guelph and Region of Waterloo staff on April 25, 2012 with a proposed cost sharing.

Inaugural service consisting of two trains in each direction per day is a good start to improving passenger rail service between Waterloo Region and the Greater Toronto Area. However, an ideal initial service would consist of four trains in each direction per day. It is anticipated that the next phase of the GO rail expansion would be operation of these four trains.
Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

A copy of this report will be circulated to the Area Municipalities for their information.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The provision of GO Transit rail service is consistent with Strategic Plan Focus Area 3: Sustainable Transportation, Encourage improvements to intercity transportation services to and from Waterloo Region.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The cost to implement inaugural service to Waterloo Region and Guelph was approximately $18 million. The municipal contribution for implementing the service is approximately $6 million. Guelph and Waterloo Region contributions are comprised of: station costs attributed to each municipality and the cost of the Kitchener layover facility divided equally, including a share attributed to the GTHA (Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area) municipalities for Acton. Waterloo Region’s share is $740,000 for the Kitchener station and $650,000 for the layover facility for a total of $1.39 million. The province is amenable to equal payments of $278,000 per year for 5 years, starting in 2013.

This request is consistent with GO Transit’s funding model across the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA). Municipalities within the GTHA contribute an annual amount that equals one third of the total GO Transit capital expenditures.

The $1.39 million capital contribution to GO Transit, along with the necessary sources of financing, will be included in the Region’s 2013 – 2022 Capital Budget and Forecast.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Finance was consulted with respect to financial implications.

ATTACHMENTS:

NIL

PREPARED BY: Graham Vincent, Director of Transportation Planning

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: November 6, 2012

FILE CODE: D28-50

SUBJECT: GRAND RIVER TRANSIT 2013 SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRES

RECOMMENDATION:

For information.

SUMMARY:

The approved Grand River Transit 2011-2014 Business Plan recommends annual service improvement priorities that would contribute to the achievement of the Regional Transportation Master Plan ridership targets and to the integration of the conventional transit network with rapid transit. Subject to Regional Council budget approval, various transit service improvements are being proposed for September 2013, including:

- An extension of the existing 201 Fischer-Hallman iXpress to Conestoga Mall and the employment node at University Avenue East and Northfield Drive
- Implementation of a new University “iXpress” route between the commercial centre at Ira Needles Boulevard and the employment node at University Avenue and Northfield Drive via Erb Street, Westmount Road and University Avenue
- Realignment of local routes in west and east Waterloo to reduce duplication with the new University iXpress route, provide more direct service, and greater access to destinations. Other improvements include increased frequency and hours of service.

Public consultation centres (PCCs) for the 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan are scheduled for November 15, 20, 21, and 22. Alternative scenarios for transit service changes on both the west side and east side of Waterloo will be displayed for public review. Public feedback from these PCCs will be used to update the 2013 Service Improvement Plan. A recommended plan will be presented at consultation centres in early 2013.

If approved by Regional Council, implementation of the final 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan would be implemented in September 2013 and provide some 48,200 hours of additional service annually and would require the purchase of 15 new buses.

Area Municipalities are being consulted through representation on Steering Committees and have been circulated material related to service improvement proposals. After considering feedback from the public consultation centres, detailed route recommendations will be presented to Regional Council for consideration.

REPORT:

Based on the Grand River Transit 2011-2014 Business Plan a Transit Service Improvement Plan has been developed for 2013 anchored on the introduction of a new University Avenue iXpress route.
Subject to public consultation and Regional Council budget approval, service improvements would be implemented in September 2013.

Public Consultation Centres are scheduled for November 2012. Public feedback from the initial round of PCCs will be used to further refine service plan options that will be presented at PCCs in early 2013.

**Proposed 2013 Service Improvements**

Recent transit service improvements have focused on increasing transit service coverage in Cambridge and Kitchener, and increasing the span of hours, frequency and directness of travel on routes across the system. In 2011, GRT experienced its largest expansion of service hours. The 201 iXpress was introduced along the Fischer-Hallman corridor, the hours of operation and frequency of service on the 200 Mainline iXpress were expanded, frequency of service on Route 52 Ainslie Street was increased, additional service was added to the Cambridge Business Park, and routes in Hespeler were altered to expand service hours and reduce travel times in this area. In 2012, a new BusPLUS route was implemented in the Doon South neighbourhood in Kitchener, Route 67 was modified to extend service coverage in the L.G. Lovell Industrial Park, and Sunday service hours were extended in Cambridge and on the 200 Mainline iXpress in 2012.

For 2013, service improvements would focus on an extension of the existing Fischer-Hallman iXpress to Conestoga Mall and employment node at University Avenue East and Northfield Drive East, the implementation of a new “iXpress” route along the University Avenue corridor, and realignment and improved frequency and hours of service for local routes in Waterloo.

Alternative options for transit service improvements in both east and west Waterloo will be displayed for public review. The proposed improvement options are briefly described below and are illustrated and further explained in Appendix A:

- **East Waterloo Option 1:** An extension of the existing Fischer-Hallman iXpress, and implementation of a new University Avenue iXpress route that would travel via Bridge Street.
- **East Waterloo Option 2:** An extension of the Fischer-Hallman iXpress, implementation of a new University Avenue iXpress route that would travel via University Avenue East, extended evening service on Route 35 EASTBRIDGE, and route alignment changes to routes 6 BRIDGEPORT, 12 CONESTOGA MALL, 31 LEXINGTON, 35 EASTBRIDGE, and introduction of a local route in the Lincoln Road neighbourhood.
- **East Waterloo Option 3:** An extension of the existing Fischer-Hallman iXpress, implementation of a new University Avenue iXpress route that would travel via University Avenue East in the east side of Waterloo, extended evening service and Saturday service on Route 31 LEXINGTON, extended evening service and Sunday service on Route 35 EASTBRIDGE, and route alignment changes to local routes 6 BRIDGEPORT, 12 CONESTOGA MALL, 31 LEXINGTON, 35 EASTBRIDGE.
- **West Waterloo Option 1:** Redesign Route 5 ERB WEST as a two-way route travelling to the commercial centre at Ira Needles Boulevard and University Avenue West.
- **West Waterloo Option 2:** Redesign Route 5 ERB WEST as a two-way route to the Erbsville Road / Erb Street West intersection, and alter Route 29 KEATS WAY to provide service into the Westvale Neighbourhood.
- **West Waterloo Option 3:** Provide two-way service on Route 5 ERB WEST, alter Route 29 KEATS WAY to provide service into the Westvale Neighbourhood, redesign Route 13 LAURELWOOD as a two-way route and extend service along Ira Needles Boulevard, and extend Route 31 LEXINGTON to the Columbia Street West / Erbsville Road intersection.
Implementation of the final proposed service improvement plan would involve the reallocation of approximately 5,000 service hours and 1 bus, and would provide some 48,200 hours of additional service annually, requiring the purchase of 15 new buses.

The 2014 GRT service improvement plan would focus on local service improvements that increase hours of operation and frequency of weekday evening routes and improves Sunday service frequency in Cambridge, resulting in an additional 5,670 annual service hours. Implementation of aBRT from Ainslie Street Terminal in Cambridge to Fairview Mall in Kitchener is also planned for 2014.

The proposed 2013 service improvements would be implemented in September 2013, subject to Regional Council approval.

**Public Consultation Centres**

Four PCC locations are planned for the initial round of consultations to target affected study areas. Responses gathered from the initial round of consultations will be used to further define service planning options for 2013. Revised service plans will then be presented at a second set of consultations in early 2013. Information packages detailing service plan options and comment forms will be distributed at the consultation centres. Attendees will also have the opportunity to sketch new potential transit service options on maps that will be provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time of PCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, November 15, 2012</td>
<td>Kitchener Waterloo Bilingual School Gymnasium</td>
<td>4:00 - 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600 Erb St West, Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, November 20, 2012</td>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
<td>Noon - 4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room 1301 (DC 1301)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William G. Davis Computer Research Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 21, 2012</td>
<td>Waterloo Mennonite Brethren Church</td>
<td>4:00 - 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>245 Lexington Road, Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, November 22, 2012</td>
<td>Wilfrid Laurier University</td>
<td>Noon - 4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fred Nichols Campus Centre in the Concourse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Notification and Advertising**

In advance of the Public Consultation Centres, notification will be sent out via various means including:

- Roadside signs will be erected at major intersections in the study areas;
- Direct mail will be sent to all households on streets where transit service would be introduced. All households will receive a letter describing how service changes may benefit their neighbourhood;
- An unaddressed mailer will be sent to households in the significant study areas inviting them to the PCC’s;
- Signs will be posted at selected bus stops that show proposed service changes and provide dates and times of Public Consultation Centres;
- Notices will be posted in the local newspapers;
- Posters informing transit riders of proposed changes and Public Consultation Centre dates will be posted at terminals and on buses;
- Notices of proposed service improvements and changes will be posted on the GRT website: [www.grt.ca](http://www.grt.ca);
- Comment forms will be available online and at the PCC’s;
- Mass emailing will be sent to those who subscribe to our rider e-alerts; and,
- Information will be sent out via social media including Twitter.
At all times when internet based comments are invited, provision will also be made for comments to be submitted by telephone, fax or conventional mail.

Next Steps

Public feedback at the PCCs will be taken into consideration when finalizing the 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan. Further opportunities for public feedback will be provided with additional PCC’s planned for early 2013. The final 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan will be present to Regional Planning and Works Committee in May 2013.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Area Municipalities are being consulted through representation on Steering Committees and have been circulated material related to service improvement proposals.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan supports the implementation of Council’s Strategic Focus, identified under Focus Area 3: Sustainable Transportation: Develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices. The plan will contribute to Strategic Objective 3.1.2. Expand the bus network and begin to integrate it with the future Light Rail Transit System.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Costs of planning and operating public consultation for transit service planning are included in the 2012 GRT operating budget, approval by Regional Council.

Annual operating costs associated with the proposed 2013 service improvements are approximately $4,204,000, and would be funded through the RTMP Reserve Fund.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from Planning, Housing and Community Services and Transportation and Environmental Services worked together to develop these transit service improvement plans.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A - Proposals for 2013 Service Plan Options
Appendix B - Draft Text for Public Brochure

PREPARED BY: Erica Springate, Principal Planner

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
Appendix A: Proposals for 2013 Service Plan Options

- ROUTE 5 ERB WEST: Redesign Route 5 as a two-way route connecting Uptown Waterloo with The Boardwalk commercial centre at Ira Needles Boulevard.
West Waterloo Option 2

- ROUTE 5 ERB WEST: Redesign Route 5 as a two-way route connecting Uptown Waterloo to the Erbsville Road / Erb Street West intersection.
- ROUTE 29 KEATS WAY: Alter Route 29 to provide service into the Westvale Neighbourhood.
West Waterloo Option 3

- ROUTE 5 ERB WEST: Redesign Route 5 as a two-way route connecting Uptown Waterloo to the Erbsville Road / Erb Street West intersection.
- ROUTE 29 KEATS WAY: Alter Route 29 to provide service into the Westvale Neighbourhood.
- ROUTE 13 LAURELWOOD: Redesign Route 13 as a two-way route connecting the Laurelwood neighbourhood to the commercial centre at Ira Needles Boulevard and University Avenue and the University of Waterloo.
- ROUTE 31 LEXINGTON: Extend Route 31 to the Columbia Street West / Erbsville Road intersection to provide service along the section of Columbia Street no longer serviced by Route 13.
East Waterloo Option 1

- 201 FISCHER-HALLMAN iXpress: Extend the 201 iXpress to Conestoga Mall and the employment node at University Avenue East and Northfield Drive East.
- New University iXpress: Provide limited-stop express service between east and west Waterloo via: Ira Needles Boulevard, Erb Street West, Westmount Road, University Avenue and Bridge Street.
- ROUTE 12 CONESTOGA MALL: Slightly modify Route 12 to travel via Marshall Road or Lincoln Road instead of Carter Avenue.
201 FISCHER-HALLMAN iXpress: Extend the 201 iXpress to Conestoga Mall and the employment node at University Avenue East and Northfield Drive East.

New University iXpress: Provide limited-stop express service between east and west Waterloo via: Ira Needles Boulevard, Erb Street West, Westmount Road, and University Avenue.

New Local Route: Introduce a new route from the Lincoln Road neighbourhood that would travel between Conestoga Mall and Uptown Waterloo.

ROUTE 12 CONESTOGA MALL: Realign the north portion of Route 12 so that service to Conestoga Mall is provided along Lexington Road and Davenport Road, or end Route 12 service at the intersection of King Street and University Avenue.

ROUTE 31 LEXINGTON: Realign service to travel via Bridge Street.

ROUTE 35 EASTBRIDGE: Remove service from Dansbury Road to provide more direct service. Extend evening service hours.
East Waterloo Option 3

- 201 FISCHER-HALLMAN iXpress: Extend the 201 iXpress to Conestoga Mall and the employment node at University Avenue East and Northfield Drive East.
- New University iXpress: Provide limited-stop express service between east and west Waterloo via: Ira Needles Boulevard, Erb Street West, Westmount Road, and University Avenue.
- ROUTE 12 CONESTOGA MALL: Alter Route 12 so that service from Fairview Mall ends at University Avenue and Lincoln Road, with a possible extension to Bridge Street.
- ROUTE 31 LEXINGTON: Realign Route 31 to travel along Chesapeake Drive and Eastbridge Drive. Extend evening service hours and provide Saturday service.
- ROUTE 35 EASTBRIDGE: Remove service from Dansbury Road to provide more direct service. Extend evening service hours and provide Sunday service.
Appendix B - Draft Text for Public Brochure

**Proposed 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan**

**We Need Your Input**

Thank you for attending today’s public consultation centre for the Proposed 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan. Subject to Regional Council budget approval, service changes would be implemented in September 2013. We are planning improvements that would introduce a new University iXpress route that will connect east and west Waterloo, extend the existing 201 Fischer-Hallman iXpress to Conestoga Mall and the employment node at University Avenue and Northfield Drive, and modify local routes in Waterloo and Kitchener. We hope to hear your thoughts on the improvements proposed for 2013.

**Transportation Choice**

An important goal of the Transportation Master Plan is to provide better transportation choices by creating more opportunities to take transit, walk and cycle. Transit is an important part of active transportation since it is compatible with cycling, walking, rideshare, and auto-sharing. The proposed transit service improvements included in the Grand River Transit (GRT) Business Plan would increase the attractiveness of GRT and encourage greater transit use; supporting the Region’s goal of being a thriving and sustainable community.

**Thanks for Riding With Us!**

More and more people are choosing transit as a travel option. Since the Regional transit system, GRT, was established in 2000, transit ridership continues to grow. Annual ridership has more than doubled from 9.4 million riders to an estimated 21.1 million by the end of 2012. All of these new riders have benefited from taking transit by:

- Saving money on gasoline, parking, and other car expenses,
- Improving their health through walking, and
- Making better use of their time while not driving.

Every one of these riders has helped improve the quality of life in this community by:

- Reducing traffic congestion,
- Improving local air quality and reducing the impact of transportation on the environment,
- Promoting a more sustainable region.

To help continue this success, the GRT 2011-2014 Business Plan outlines additional proposed service improvements. For details, please see the report to Regional Council on the GRT website at [www.grt.ca](http://www.grt.ca) under the “Doing Business” link.

**Proposed 2013 Transit Service Improvements**

The Proposed 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan will be focused on:

- Extending the existing 201 Fischer-Hallman iXpress to provide direct connections to Conestoga Mall and the employment node at University Avenue East and Northfield Drive East.
Implementing a University iXpress route along the Erb Street West and University Avenue corridors, operating 7 days a week with 15 minute service during weekday a.m. and p.m. rush hour periods, and 30 minute service during off-peak periods. This route would connect The Boardwalk commercial centre at Ira Needles Boulevard in West Waterloo to employment at University Avenue East and Northfield Drive East in East Waterloo. Stations would also be located at the University of Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier University, Conestoga College Waterloo Campus, and various neighbourhood shopping centres.

Potential changes to routes 5 ERB WEST, 6 BRIDGEPORT, 12 CONESTOGA MALL, 29 KEATS WAY, 31 LEXINGTON, and 35 EASTBRIDGE to reduce redundancy with the new University express route, provide more direct service, and create connections to additional locations within the Region.

Transit service improvement options for west and east Waterloo have been developed for your review. Please see the related maps and text descriptions of the service improvement options.

West Waterloo Service Improvements

Common to the Three West Waterloo Service Options:

- New University iXpress: Provide limited-stop express service between east and west Waterloo via Ira Needles Boulevard, Erb Street West, Westmount Road, and University Avenue.

West Waterloo Option 1:

- ROUTE 5 ERB WEST: Redesign Route 5 as a two-way route connecting Uptown Waterloo with The Boardwalk commercial centre at Ira Needles Boulevard.

West Waterloo Option 2:

- ROUTE 5 ERB WEST: Redesign Route 5 as a two-way route connecting Uptown Waterloo to the Ira Needles Boulevard / Erb Street West intersection.
- ROUTE 29 KEATS WAY: Alter Route 29 to provide service into the Westvale Neighbourhood with service terminating at The Boardwalk commercial centre at Ira Needles Boulevard.

West Waterloo Option 3:

- ROUTE 5 ERB WEST: Redesign Route 5 as a two-way route connecting Uptown Waterloo to the Ira Needles Boulevard / Erb Street West intersection.
- ROUTE 29 KEATS WAY: Alter Route 29 to provide service into the Westvale Neighbourhood with service terminating at The Boardwalk commercial centre at Ira Needles Boulevard.
- ROUTE 13 LAURELWOOD: Redesign Route 13 as a two-way route connecting the Laurelwood neighbourhood to The Boardwalk commercial centre at Ira Needles Boulevard.
- ROUTE 31 LEXINGTON: Extend Route 31 to the Columbia Street West / Erbsville Road intersection to provide service along the section of Columbia Street no longer serviced by Route 13.
East Waterloo Service Improvements

Common to the Three East Waterloo Service Options Are:

- 201 FISCHER-HALLMAN iXpress: Extend the existing 201 iXpress to Conestoga Mall and the employment node at University Avenue East and Northfield Drive East.
- ROUTE 35 EASTBRIDGE and ROUTE 6 BRIDGEPORT: Examine altering the route alignments of Route 6 and Route 35. Service along Bridgeport Road East and Erb Street East, currently serviced by Route 35, would instead be serviced by Route 6 with connections to Uptown Waterloo and the Bridgeport Neighbourhood. With this change, service along Lancaster Street West and Wellington Street North, currently serviced by Route 6, would be served by Route 35 with connections to Downtown Kitchener and Conestoga Mall.
- New University iXpress: Provide limited-stop express service between east and west Waterloo via: Ira Needles Boulevard, Erb Street West, Westmount Road, and University Avenue. The final route alignment to the intersection of University Avenue East and Northfield Drive East would travel via Bridge Street or would remain on University Avenue East.

East Waterloo Option 1:

- New University iXpress: via Bridge Street.
- ROUTE 12 CONESTOGA MALL: Slightly modify Route 12 to travel via Marshall Road instead of Carter Avenue.

East Waterloo Option 2:

- New University iXpress: via University Avenue.
- New Local Route: Introduce a new route from the Lincoln Road neighbourhood that would travel between Conestoga Mall and Uptown Waterloo.
- ROUTE 12 CONESTOGA MALL: Realign the north portion of Route 12 so that service to Conestoga Mall is provided along Lexington Road and Davenport Road, or end Route 12 service at the intersection of King Street and University Avenue.
- ROUTE 31 LEXINGTON: Realign service to travel via Bridge Street.
- ROUTE 35 EASTBRIDGE: Remove service from Dansbury Road to provide more direct service. Extend evening service hours.

East Waterloo Option 3:

- New University iXpress: via University Avenue.
- ROUTE 12 CONESTOGA MALL: Alter Route 12 so that service from Fairview Mall ends at University Avenue and Lincoln Road.
- ROUTE 31 LEXINGTON: Realign Route 31 to travel along Chesapeake Drive and Eastbridge Drive. Extend evening service hours and provide Saturday service.
- ROUTE 35 EASTBRIDGE: Remove service from Dansbury Road to provide more direct service. Extend evening service hours and provide Sunday service.

What happens next?

Your feedback will be used to further define service planning options for 2013. Revised service plans will then be presented at a second set of consultations in early 2013. Public
input from both rounds of consultation centres will be used to develop the final Proposed 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan. This final 2013 Service Improvement Plan will be recommended to Regional Planning and Works Committee in Spring 2013.

If approved by Regional Planning and Works Committee, 2013 Service Improvements would be recommended to Regional Council.

If approved by Regional Council, 2013 Service Improvements would take effect on September 3, 2013.

We appreciate your input

We would appreciate your comments on the proposed service improvements. Please submit your comments using one of the following methods:

- Filling in the comment form at today’s public meeting;
- Taking your comment sheet home and mailing or faxing it to the address below;
- Visiting www.grt.ca and using our online public comment which you can link to from our homepage.

Anyone indicating interest on the sign-in sheet or making a submission will be emailed or mailed project information, an update on the second round of Public Consultation Centres, and will be notified of Regional Planning and Works Committee meetings, where 2013 Service Improvements will be discussed.

Grand River Transit, 250 Strasburg Road Kitchener, ON N2E 3M6
Phone: 519-585-7555 Fax: 519-585-1060
## Public Consultation Centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, November 15, 2012</td>
<td>Kitchener Waterloo Bilingual School Gymnasium&lt;br&gt;600 Erb St West&lt;br&gt;Waterloo, Ontario  N2J 3Z4</td>
<td>4:00 - 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, November 20, 2012</td>
<td>University of Waterloo&lt;br&gt;Room 1301 (DC 1301)&lt;br&gt;William G. Davis Computer Research Centre&lt;br&gt;200 University Avenue West&lt;br&gt;Waterloo, Ontario  N2L 3G1</td>
<td>Noon - 4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 21, 2012</td>
<td>Waterloo Mennonite Brethren Church&lt;br&gt;Chapel&lt;br&gt;245 Lexington Road&lt;br&gt;Waterloo, Ontario  N2K 2E1</td>
<td>4:00 - 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, November 22, 2012</td>
<td>Wilfrid Laurier University&lt;br&gt;Concourse - Fred Nichols Campus Centre&lt;br&gt;75 University Avenue West&lt;br&gt;Waterloo, Ontario  N2L 3C5</td>
<td>Noon - 4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of Planning and Works Committee  
DATE: November 6, 2012  
FILE CODE: T04-20  
SUBJECT: FAIRWAY ROAD EXTENSION – NOISE MITIGATION

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the construction of noise barriers as part of the Fairway Road Extension, for properties backing onto Fairway Road from #2 to #48 Colton Circle (inclusive) and from #501 to #541 Landgren Court (inclusive) in 2013, subject to Council approval of the 2013 Transportation Capital Program, as described in Report No. P-12-103/E-12-112, dated November 6, 2012.

SUMMARY:

In 2004, the Region of Waterloo constructed the first phase of the Fairway Road Extension from Lackner Boulevard to Pebble Creek Drive / Upper Mercer Street. This first phase of the Fairway Road Extension permitted commencement of construction of the Lyndale Estates subdivision on the north side of the Fairway Road Extension at Pebble Creek Drive (refer to Appendix A for a Key Plan of the area). The second stage of the Fairway Road Extension project, from Pebble Creek Drive / Upper Mercer Street to Fountain Street, is planned to be completed by the end of 2012.

In August 2010, the Fairway Road Extension Project, from Pebble Creek Drive / Upper Mercer Street to Fountain Street did not include the construction of noise barriers because they were not warranted at the time of the Lyndale Estates subdivision approval. Lyndale Estates was constructed with specific setbacks from Fairway Road and noise warning clauses were placed on title. Coincidental with the start of the Fairway Road Extension Project, staff received inquiries from several residents of Landgren Court and Colton Circle about the potential for the installation of noise barriers in conjunction with the road construction. At that time, staff indicated that the originally approved Lyndale Estate noise study would be reviewed to check the validity of the assumptions that resulted in noise barriers not being required.

In April 2012, Report E-12-030 was presented and approved by Regional Council to increase the posted speeds on Fairway Road from 50 km/h to 60 km/h. The speed limit change, along with the public requests required that an updated noise analysis be undertaken. The results of this noise study showed that for parts of the Lyndale Estate subdivision, noise barriers are now warranted.

Staff is recommending that Council approve, as part of the Fairway Road Extension, construction of a noise barrier for properties backing onto Fairway Road from #2 to #48 Colton Circle (inclusive) and from #501 to #541 Landgren Court (inclusive). Noise mitigation is not warranted beyond #48 Colton Circle; however, an extension of the noise barrier beyond #48 Colton Circle is required to prevent sound infiltration from the side. Refer to Appendix B for a drawing of the proposed location of the noise barrier. In 2013, subject to Council approval, the noise barrier can be constructed. The estimated construction cost for this noise barrier is $975,000.
City of Kitchener Planning staff is supportive of the proposed noise barrier along Fairway Road.

Letters advising property owners abutting Fairway Road adjacent to and in the vicinity of the recommended noise barriers included in Report No. P-12-103/E-12-112, were delivered on October 24, 2012.

REPORT:

In 1999, the Region completed the Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) for the first phase of the Fairway Road Extension, from Lackner Boulevard to Zeller Drive (approximately one kilometre east of Lackner Boulevard) to replace the City of Kitchener’s Woolner Drive.

In 2004, the Region constructed the first phase of the Fairway Road Extension from Lackner Boulevard to Pebble Creek Drive / Upper Mercer Street intersection.

In 2007, the Region completed the Class EA for the remaining second phase of the Fairway Road Extension from Pebble Creek Drive / Upper Mercer Street to Fountain Street, (Appendix “A”).

In August 2010, the construction of the Fairway Road Extension began (four lanes from Pebble Creek Drive / Upper Mercer Street to Fountain Street). This construction also included the widening of the existing two lane section of Fairway Road 200 metres west of Pebble Creek Drive / Upper Mercer Street in order to provide continuity of lanes when the road drops from four to two lanes. The Fairway Road Extension is planned to be opened to traffic by the end of 2012.

There were no residential developments along either the then-existing Woolner Drive or the future Fairway Road Extension when the Region filed the Class EA in 1999. Subsequent to approval of the Class EA in 1999, area developers obtained approval for several residential developments along the future Fairway Road Extension.

There are three subdivisions in the area, Lyndale Estates, Chicopee Trail and the Chicopee Forest, locations as shown in Appendix B. Each subdivision completed a noise study prior to approval. At the beginning of the Fairway Road Extension project, staff received inquiries from several residents of Landgren Court and Colton Circle about the potential for noise barrier construction in conjunction with the road construction. At that time, staff indicated that the originally approved noise study would be reviewed to see if assumptions had changed since the original Lyndale Estates approved noise study that recommended noise barriers were not warranted.

In April 2012, Report No. E-12-030 was presented and approved by Regional Council to increase the posted speeds on Fairway Road from 50 km/h to 60 km/h. The speed limit change, along with the public requests required that an updated noise analysis be undertaken.

An updated noise analysis was completed under Section 4.2 Part B, Existing Development Impacted by Proposed Regional Road Undertakings because of the increase in the posted speed limit to 60 km/h and the widening of the road from two to four lanes.

Section 4.2 of Part B of the Implementation Guidelines for Noise Policy states:

4.2 In the event that non-barrier alternatives are not sufficient, construction of a noise barrier will be recommended for consideration by residents, Area Municipal Council and Regional Council in the following situations:

- Where the projected noise level exceeds 65 dBA; or
- Where the projected noise level exceeds 60 dBA and the difference between the existing and projected noise levels is 5 dBA or more.
The following criterion was used for the different noise studies completed in the area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)</strong></td>
<td>25,900 (forecast to 2014, Without Highway 7, no change to transit and active transportation modes shares)</td>
<td>25,000 (forecast to 2022, with Highway 7 and RTMP increased transit and active transportation modes shares)</td>
<td>28,300 (forecast to 2017 Without Highway 7, no change to transit and active transportation modes shares)</td>
<td>25,000 (forecast to 2022, with Highway 7 and RTMP increased transit and active transportation modes shares)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Trucks</strong></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heavy Trucks</strong></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speed Limit</strong></td>
<td>50 km/hr</td>
<td>60 km/hr</td>
<td>50 km/hr</td>
<td>60 km/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>No Noise Barrier Required (Set backs and noise warning clauses implemented)</td>
<td>Noise Barrier Required (proposed to be built by Region in 2013)</td>
<td>Noise Barrier Required (existing in field today)</td>
<td>Noise Barrier Required (to be built in future by developer)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Updated by the Region per public request through Fairway Road Project

The detailed results of the 2012 Lyndale Estates updated noise study completed by the Region are listed in the table below. In order to meet warrants for the installation of a noise barrier under the policy noted above, the unattenuated outdoor road noise level must be greater than 60 dBA and the difference between existing and future noise levels must be greater than five dBA. The warrants have been met for the locations listed below and staff are recommending noise barriers be constructed. Refer to Appendix B for a drawing of the proposed location of the noise barrier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>(A) Unattenuated Existing Noise (dBA)*</th>
<th>(B) Unattenuated Projected Outdoor Road Noise Level (dBA)</th>
<th>(B) - (A) dBA Difference</th>
<th>(C) Attenuated Outdoor Road Noise Level (dB)</th>
<th>(C) - (B) dBA Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Colton Circle</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Colton Circle</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Colton Circle</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Colton Circle</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Colton Circle</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Colton Circle</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Colton Circle</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 Landgren Court</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505 Landgren Court</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521 Landgren Court</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541 Landgren Court</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* The unattenuated existing noise level was determined to be 54 dBA based on 2010 AADT and a 50km/hr posted speed limit. Colton Circle unattenuated existing noise level was assumed similar to the Landgren Court levels in lieu of no existing traffic data in the area.)

The recommended noise mitigation would consist of absorptive noise barriers for #501 - #541 Landgren Court and #2 - #48 (Colton Circle). Noise mitigation is not warranted beyond #48 Colton.
Circle; however, an extension of the noise barrier beyond #48 Colton Circle is required to prevent sound infiltration from the side. This noise barrier could be constructed in 2013, approximately 0.6 metres (2 feet) from the property line, on the Region’s property. The height of the concrete noise barrier would range from 1.8 m to 3.2 m. The noise barriers would be similar in appearance to the other existing noise barriers in this neighbourhood.

Letters advising property owners abutting Fairway Road near the recommended noise barriers included in this Planning and Works Committee Report No. P-12-103/E-12-112 was delivered on October 24, 2012.

Subject to Council approval, further notice would be provided to abutting property owners in advance of noise barrier construction in 2013 informing them of the noise barrier to be constructed, the preliminary construction time line and Region contact person.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

City of Kitchener Planning is supportive of the proposed noise barriers as described to them with the understanding that the Region will use appropriate construction and landscaping materials to make the barrier as attractive as possible. The Region will endeavour to ensure compatibility with the noise barrier being constructed by the private developer of the Landgren Court extension (Chicopee Trail subdivision).

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Construction of the Fairway Road Extension supports Strategic Focus Area 2 (Growth Management and Prosperity) of the Corporate Strategic Plan to manage growth to foster thriving and productive urban and rural communities, and specifically Strategic Focus Area 2.2 to develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Based on an assessment of the preliminary design, staff estimates that the cost for the proposed noise barrier (including administration, engineering, surveying, utility locates, construction, inspection, materials testing, site restoration and other required activities) will be approximately $975,000.

The $975,000 required for the construction of this noise barrier has been included in the draft 2013 Transportation Capital Program. Subject to Council approval of the 2013 Transportation Capital Program, this noise barrier could be constructed in 2013 and would be funded from the Development Charge Reserve Fund.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A - Key Plan of Fairway Road and Adjacent Streets
Appendix B - Plan showing Fairway Road at Landgren Court and Colton Circle

PREPARED BY: Bruce Erb, Supervisor, Corridor Management, Transportation Planning
Robert Gallivan, Manager, Transportation Program Development

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services
REGION OF WATERLOO
CORPORATE RESOURCES
Legal Services

TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: November 6, 2012

FILE CODE: L07-90

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZATION TO EXPROPRIATE LANDS (2ND REPORT) KNOWN MUNICIPALLY AS 311 WEBER STREET WEST FOR WEBER STREET WEST GRADE SEPARATION AND ROAD IMPROVEMENTS (COLLEGE STREET TO GUELPH STREET) PHASE 2, IN THE CITY OF KITCHENER

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT Council of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, after consideration of the Report of the Inquiry Officer received September 5, 2012 reporting on a Hearing of Necessity conducted under the Expropriations Act (the “Inquiry”) attached as Schedule “A” to Report CR-RS-12-071 dated November 6, 2012, approve the expropriation of the following lands for the purposes of reconstruction of Weber Street West, as detailed in Report CR-RS-12-071, described as follows:

Partial Taking:

Part Lot 8, Plan 373, being Part 10, on Reference Plan 58R-17416, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22326-0175 (LT) (311 Weber Street West).

Hereinafter referred to as the “Subject Lands” and shown on Schedule “B” to Report CR-RS-12-071, for the following reasons:

(a) The Region of Waterloo seeks to achieve the following objectives in the taking of the Subject Lands:
   a. to widen Weber Street West from 2 lanes to 4 lanes to provide north/south capacity improvements to accommodate future growth and reduce delays for vehicles and transit;
   b. to construct a grade separation at the crossing of the CN Rail corridor, which will provide improvements to accommodate increases in rail traffic movements and reduce traffic delays and conflicts at the existing level railway crossing; and
   c. to enhance facilities for pedestrians, transit and cyclists and to reduce traffic collisions;

(b) The reconstruction of Weber Street (College Street to Guelph Street) including a grade separation at the CN Rail crossing, and widening of Weber Street from 2 lanes to 4 lanes (the “Weber Street Improvements”) in accordance with the Recommended Design Concept determined through the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment undertaken by Regional staff was approved by Council of the Region of Waterloo at its meeting on June 29, 2011;

(c) It is fair, sound and reasonably necessary to acquire the Subject Lands in order to:
   a. Provide an alignment that results in property impacts primarily on one side of Weber Street, being the west side; and
   b. To provide the minimum recommended widths for the vehicle lane, boulevard and sidewalk to address pedestrian safety, surface and underground utilities, snow and garbage storage, street lighting and transit stops;
AND THAT Regional Council cause its decision to approve the expropriation of the Subject Lands and its reasons therefore to be served upon the parties to the Inquiry, together with a copy to the Inquiry Officer;

AND THAT the Region pay costs in the amount of $200.00 to Ronald McCarthy, an owner of 311 Weber Street West and party to the Hearing of Necessity;

AND THAT the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk be authorized to certify the said approval of expropriation of the Subject Lands in accordance with the Expropriations Act;

AND FURTHER THAT the Regional Solicitor be instructed to:
   (a) Register a plan of expropriation in the proper land registry office pertaining to the Subject Lands;
   (b) Serve the appropriate parties with a Notice of Expropriation, an Offer of Compensation and Appraisal, and a Notice of Possession in respect of the Subject Lands; and
   (c) Do all other things necessary and proper to be done in order to complete the expropriation of the Subject Lands or acquire the interest through negotiated settlement and report to Regional Council in due course.

SUMMARY:
Nil.

REPORT:

In connection with the construction of improvements to Weber Street West (College Street to Guelph Street) and a grade separation at the CN Rail crossing, the Region proposes to expropriate the Subject Lands being a partial taking along the frontage of single-family residential property at 311 Weber Street West, Kitchener. A site map depicting the Subject Lands is attached as Schedule “B” to this Report. Under the Expropriations Act, an owner of lands (which is defined to include a tenant) may request that a hearing be held by a provincially-appointed Inquiry Officer to consider whether the proposed expropriation is “fair, sound and reasonably necessary in the achievement of the objectives of the expropriating authority.” The owners of 311 Weber Street West (referred to as the “owners”) made such a request and the Inquiry was held on August 15, 2012. The Report of the Inquiry Officer received September 5, 2012, is attached as Schedule “A” to this Report for consideration by Regional Council.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Expropriations Act, Regional Council must consider the Report of the Inquiry Officer and approve, not approve or approve with modifications the proposed expropriation of the Subject Lands. The decision of Regional Council and written reasons for its decision must be served on all parties and the Inquiry Officer within 90 days of receipt of the Report of the Inquiry Officer. To meet this time requirement, Regional Council must make a decision before December 4, 2012.

At the Inquiry, Regional staff presented evidence that the proposed partial taking of the Subject Lands was required to implement the preferred design concept (Design Concept B-Modified) recommended through the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment undertaken for this project and approved by Regional Council on June 28, 2011. The evidence included a summary of the Region’s objectives and Regional official plan policies to be achieved through the acquisition of the Subject Lands for the Weber Street Improvements, a description of the Municipal Class Environmental Process that was undertaken to determine the preferred design concept, and the
evaluation of alternative design concepts. The Inquiry Officer heard the evidence given by Regional staff and by one of the owners, Mr. Ron McCarthy and conducted a site visit with the parties immediately following the hearing.

The owners agreed that the widening of Weber Street to 4 lanes was necessary. The Inquiry Officer summarized the objections of the owners as follows:

1. The owners preferred that the widening be on both sides of Weber Street or the east side only rather than the west;  
2. That if the widening is to be on the west side, the owners objected to the inclusion of a boulevard because of the impact on vehicle parking in front of the owners’ residence;  
3. The owners object to the location of the front boundary of their property as determined by the Region’s surveyors; and  
4. The owners were concerned about the loss of mature spruce trees planted by their family many years ago.

With respect to the owners’ first objection, the Inquiry Officer found that there was more than adequate study of the proposed widening culminating in the approval of the Environmental Study Report in 2011 which recommended preferred Design Concept B-Modified providing for widening on the west side only. The owners did not provide any engineering evidence to support their preferred alternative of widening on the east side. The Inquiry Officer accepted the Region’s evidence that the selected design concept in the Environmental Study Report is preferable from almost all perspectives.

The Region presented evidence that the existing sidewalks do not meet current design standards which is compounded by the fact that there are no boulevards leaving sidewalks abutting curbs and compromising safety. The Inquiry Officer accepted that there should be a boulevard where proposed for the reasons of providing for pedestrian safety, transit stops, street lighting, surface and underground utilities and snow and garbage storage.

With respect to the owners’ third objection the Inquiry Officer noted that if there was a surveying error, which was not likely, it could be resolved prior to registration of the plan.

Finally, respecting the loss of the existing mature spruce trees the Inquiry Officer acknowledged the evidence that they are actually located on part of the existing Weber Street road allowance already owned by the Region. The trees will be removed for the widening but will be replaced to the extent possible.

The Inquiry Officer concluded that the proposed expropriation of the Subject Lands is reasonably defensible in the achievement of the Region’s objective of construction of road improvements to part of Weber Street West, City of Kitchener. Pursuant to the provisions of the *Expropriations Act* the Inquiry Officer recommended that costs of the inquiry in the amount of $200.00 be paid to Mr. Ron McCarthy.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

One of the focus areas of the Corporate Strategic Plan is to develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Transportation and Environmental Services staff advises that the 2012 Transportation Capital Program includes $11,135,000 in 2012 for this project to be funded from the Development Charge and Roads Capital Levy Reserve Funds. There is sufficient allowance in the current budget for this property acquisition.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Transportation and Environmental Services staff have been consulted in the preparation of this Report

ATTACHMENTS

Schedule “B” – Sketch of the Subject Lands

PREPARED BY: Fiona M. McCrea, Solicitor, Property

APPROVED BY: Gary Sosnoski, Commissioner Corporate Resources
Schedule “A”

Expropriations Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. E.26 (as amended)

IN THE MATTER OF the proposed expropriation by the Regional Municipality of Waterloo of Part of Lot 8, Plan 373, being Part 10 on Reference Plan 58R-17416, City of Kitchener, PIN 22326-0175 (LT), known municipally as 311 Weber Street West, Kitchener, for the purpose of construction of a grade separation and road improvements to part of Weber Street West, City of Kitchener.

Date of Hearing  August 15, 2012

Appearances:

Regional Municipality of Waterloo   Fiona M. McCrea
Ronald and Marie McCarthy          Ronald McCarthy in person

REPORT

This inquiry was held pursuant to section 7 of the Expropriations Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. E.26 (as amended) (the "Act") to determine whether the proposed taking by the Regional Municipality of Waterloo of a portion of the property owned by the requesters is "fair, sound and reasonably necessary in the achievement of the objectives of the expropriating authority" as the Act states, or is "reasonably defensible" as the courts have interpreted this test.

PARTIES

Ms. McCrea appeared for the Region, and Mr. McCarthy provided testimony for his wife and himself.

THE PROPERTY

The McCarthys own a rectangular parcel on the west side of Weber Street West (which runs in a southeast to northwest direction in this area) in the City of Kitchener. The land is located between Blucher Street to the south and Guelph Street to the north, and their residence is located there. It is a largely residential but heavily trafficked area of the downtown. Weber Street is one of the two major north/south arterial roads running through Kitchener to Waterloo and St. Jacobs, the other being King Street. The parcel frontage is 14.359 metres. The proposed taking would be at the front of the parcel, being 1.557 m. wide at the south end and 1.383 m. at the north end of the segment. There are two mature spruce trees virtually within this portion of the property.

THE OBJECTIVE OF THE EXPROPRIATING AUTHORITY

The Region proposes to reconstruct the segment of Weber Street in this area from College Street to Guelph Street to increase its width from 2 to 4 lanes. This will accommodate rising traffic levels, and users of all types, and also future growth. It undertook the requisite Class Environmental Assessment study, resulting in a July 2011 Environmental Study Report (ESR). This also addressed earlier studies recommending a grade separation of Weber and the CNR tracks south of the property in question. The project was approved at all levels. The study area had been expanded somewhat to include a resurfacing only, north of Guelph Street to Union Street (north of the McCarthys' property.)
SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE

The Exhibits filed at the hearing are listed in Appendix A of this Report.

Regional Municipality of Waterloo

The Region’s evidence was provided by Mr. Peter Linn, Senior Project Manager for the Region. He is an extremely experienced design and development engineer. Especially relevant for this application is his prior work in environmental assessments for road and underpass projects (Exhibit 1, pp. 3 and 5). He provided testimony of the need for the redesign and reconstruction, the history of the project, and the proposed detailed design.

This section of Weber Street has long been identified as a top short-term priority for reconstruction (Regional Transportation Master Plan, 1999 [Ex. 3, Exhibit E.2]; Regional Transportation Master Plan, 2011 [Ex. 4, Exhibit 7-14, p. 7-22]).

Mr. Linn testified that the principal reason for the redesign and reconstruction of Weber, [designated as a Regional Road in the Region’s Official Plan, and classified as a Neighbourhood Collector – Avenue (Ex. 2a, p. 1.5)], is the increasing traffic in sections to the north and south of this immediate area. This level of use results in constraints and slowdowns in this two-lane segment, leading to an overflow of traffic into surrounding residential neighbourhoods. There will be even more traffic diverted as a result of the future rapid transitway on King Street, where one lane of traffic will be removed permanently. The secondary impetus for reconstructing Weber here is the need to create a grade separation at the existing CNR mainline south of the property in question.

An environmental assessment was conducted under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process, including the required Environmental Study Report (ESR), by Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Ex. 2a to 2e, dated July 2011). This procedure involved the usual identification of alternatives, design concepts, and resulted in the preferred design being carried forward (Ex. 2a, pp. 5.1, 6.1, and 7.1). There was extensive notice and consultation throughout with the landowners to be affected, including the McCarrhys. Following the usual consideration and evaluation of the alternatives and minor alterations (Ex. 2c, Appendices E and F), the proposed redesign was given final approval by Regional Council in August 2011. The preferred location for the widening is entirely on the west side of the street, for the reasons set out in Ex. 2a, p. 6.1. These include the fact that fewer properties would be affected (48, valued at $17 million; versus 54 on the east, valued at $24 million.)

The redesign shows a four-lane cross section. The rationale for the final design is set out in Ex. 2a, Appendix H. The Region’s 2006 Official Plan policy on efficient road development requires that, in any such reconstruction, a variety of transportation modes be considered (Ex. 5, p. 139.) Policy 11.1.7 of the Plan directs that not only automobile, truck and transit, but also bicycle and pedestrian routes linking core areas be considered when “c) constructing new road sections and widening existing road sections....” [Ex. 5, p. 141]. All such modes have been addressed and incorporated, where possible, in the redesign of this segment of Weber Street from two to four lanes (see Ex. 2a, p. 32 et seq.) The detailed design is based on the 2010 Corridor Design Guidelines, from which the minimum recommended widths for lane width and sidewalk were chosen. The cross section includes a 1 m. boulevard beside the road, and a sidewalk 1.8 m. wide behind the boulevard, on both sides of the road in this location. Mr. Linn’s evidence was that a boulevard is essential to the design of this Neighbourhood Connector street, and will
serve many uses: transit stops, street lighting, surface and underground utilities, and snow and garbage storage. It is just the minimum width set out in the Design Guidelines, and meets the Official Plan’s requirement to consider the pedestrian environment in any redesign. The sidewalk and boulevard designs were approved by the Pedestrian Charter Steering Committee, as appropriate to address pedestrian safety (see Ex. 2a, p. 8.6.)

Mr. Linn outlined the effect of the proposed alignment on the subject property in Exhibit 6. This illustrates the block from Buecher Street to the south, to Guelph Street to the north. The existing road is shown in grey, and the current sidewalk is beside it. The reconstructed and widened section is shown in pink, the 1 m. boulevard in green, and the new sidewalk next to it in yellow. The extent of the proposed taking from the McCarthy property is illustrated by a dashed red line – its width varies from 1.557 m. at the south to 1.383 m. to the north (Ex. 6a). Mr. Linn emphasized that it is the minimum needed to accommodate the proposed cross section.

He then addressed the concerns Mr. McCarthy had expressed during negotiations. He now utilizes a parking pad created to the right of the existing driveway, partly in front of the residence, to park the pickup truck containing his trade tools. A passenger car is parked in the driveway itself. The length of the parking pad is 15 feet from the existing front lot line (as measured by the Stantec surveyors). Thus the truck presently encroaches on the existing municipally owned right of way. Following the proposed taking the depth would be only 11 feet, insufficient to accommodate the truck. Mr. Linn’s suggested solution was that two vehicles could be parked one behind the other in the driveway proper, or a small car could use the reduced parking pad. In redirect, Mr. Linn again supported the inclusion of the proposed boulevard in front of the property, clarifying that it is now a necessary part of the design, even if one had not been included when past resurfacing had been done as Mr. McCarthy had pointed out.

The second major concern for the McCathys is the inevitable loss of the large and attractive trees close to the front of the lot, should the expropriation proceed. They presently enjoy what appears to be a large front yard, including the land where the trees are located. Unfortunately these are located on land already belonging to the municipality (see Exhibit 7 for the current front lot line). They would be removed for the widening, and replaced to the extent possible (see Ex 2a, p 7.21).

In her summation Ms. McCrae emphasized the need to upgrade the existing sidewalks to meet Regional policies, especially those relating to pedestrian safety. She stressed that the boulevard is also required, for all of the reasons outlined in Mr. Linn’s evidence, and that its removal from this property would adversely affect the rest of the design. The new cross section, as approved, was sized to meet minimum standards, and must be uniform throughout the reconstructed section. Despite the seeming expanse of the McCarthy’s front lawn, in reality the property line is already further back than it appears. Compensation would be provided for the taking, and new trees planted.

The landowner

Mr. McCarthy provided the history of his family’s use of the property. Although he agrees that the widening to four lanes is necessary, he prefers that it be widened on both sides or on the east side only, rather than on the west. If the west is inevitable, he objects to the inclusion of a boulevard. If it were not part of the design, he would still be able to park his work vehicle where it is parked at present. He said that because there will be no
residences between Union Street to College Street, there will be little pedestrian traffic and thus no need for a boulevard as well as a sidewalk.

He also objects to the location of the front property boundary as determined by Stantec, saying his survey stake is located closer to the existing right of way. He is especially concerned about the loss of mature spruce trees, planted by his family many years ago. He stated that there were errors created on his driveway when the last resurfacing was conducted, and he wondered why no boulevard was contemplated at that time.

His alternate proposal is that a taking from both sides of the road, without boulevards, is more appropriate for this widening. In this way he would lose less land and still be able to park where he does now.

**FINDINGS AND OPINION**

I am satisfied that there was a more than adequate study of this proposal, culminating in approval of the ESR in 2011. In this process there was ample opportunity for information to and input from the landowners (Ex. 2b, Appendix C.) The road reconstruction is necessary, in the professional opinion of Mr. Linn and the Stantec consultants. In their opinion Alternative B Modified (expansion on the west side only) is the most appropriate of the choices identified. Mr. Linn stressed that there were no reasonable alternatives found for the proposed location and the construction. The alternative selected in the ESR is preferable from almost all perspectives.

Respecting pedestrian safety, the ESR pointed out that the existing sidewalks do not meet current design standards, and compounding this is the fact that boulevards do not exist. The result is that substandard sidewalks abut the curbs, compromising safety. Thus it proposed that boulevards and standard sidewalks be included (Ex. 2a, p. 6.27.) Considerations of utility location and pedestrian safety mean that there cannot be a break in the boulevard along this block (see Ex. 2a, p. 9.6 for a rationale for the only exception to this.) I accept that there should be a boulevard where proposed, for the reasons given by Mr. Linn. As for sidewalks, the ESR backs up Mr. McCarthy's contention that pedestrian traffic is lighter, but only to the north of the study area (Ex. 2b, Appendix C, Planning and Works Committee Report, section 2.3.) However, it concludes that sidewalks and boulevards should be included in this section (ibid., sections 6.1 and 6.1.) If there was a surveying error, which is not likely, it can be resolved prior to registration of the plan.

Mr. McCarthy's preferred alternative of widening on the east side does not appear to offer any advantage, primarily because of the acquisition costs. I can see how the Region's renderings of the future roadscape may have led to confusion about the boulevards, as it appears that the last, Looking South at Wilhelm Street and Looking North at Guelph Street, show a boulevard only on the east side, if at all. However, none illustrates the property in question (Ex. 2b, Appendix C.)

The owner did not introduce evidence of an alternative that had not already been rejected as less satisfactory from a public cost or safety perspective. Without any engineering evidence to support the owners' alternative, I accept that the selected alternative is the preferable one. The Regional Council and its professional staff have approved it.
Respecting the loss of the trees, which the parties viewed in a site visit, I note that this will be rectified as adequately as possible. The only issue that I have power to consider is whether the Region needs this land in order to complete the redesign of Weber as it has been approved. I conclude that it does.

I am satisfied from the evidence in this case that the choice is sound and reasonably defensible. In balancing the owner’s desire to retain as much of the parcel as possible with the public interest in safe and effective public transportation (as I must do in deciding whether the proposed taking is fair, sound and reasonably necessary as the Act requires), in this case the private should be subordinate to the public interest. Compensation for adverse effects is provided for under the Act.

CONCLUSION

After considering all of the evidence and arguments, I conclude that the proposal meets the test in the Expropriations Act and the summation of it as set out by the courts. As mentioned, the test in subsection 7(5) of the Act is whether the proposed taking is “fair, sound and reasonably necessary in the achievement of the objectives of the expropriating authority”. Decisions such as Re Parks and the Queen (1977), 13 L.C.R. 327 (O.C.A.) conclude that the test that the inquiry officer must apply can be expressed as whether the proposal is “reasonably defensible in the achievement of the authority’s objectives.”

For the reasons given above, I find that the proposed taking by the Regional Municipality of Waterloo is reasonably defensible in the achievement of the Region’s objective of construction of road improvements to part of Weber Street West, City of Kitchener. I would also recommend that the Region provide Mr. McCarthy with his costs of the inquiry of $200 as provided for in subsection 7(1) of the Act.

-Original signed by-

Gillian M. Burton
Inquiry Officer

Date: September 5, 2012

APPENDIX A

LIST OF EXHIBITS

1. Curriculum Vitae, Peter Linn
2a-d – Environmental Study Report and Appendices
2 Excerpt, Regional Transportation Master Plan, 1999
3 Excerpt, Regional Transportation Master Plan, 2011
4 Excerpt, Regional Official Policies Plan, 2006
5 Recommended Preferred Design Concept, “B Modified”
6 Aerial Photo of existing – 311 Weber Street West
6a Plan 58R-17416
7 Reference Plan 36R-12797
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THIS IS NOT A PLAN OF SURVEY
REGION OF WATERLOO
CORPORATE RESOURCES
Legal Services

TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
DATE: November 6, 2012
FILE CODE: L07-40
SUBJECT: SURPLUS DECLARATION AND TRANSFER OF LANDS TO THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE FOR RELOCATION OF RIVERBANK DRIVE, SOUTH OF THE FAIRWAY ROAD EXTENSION (REGIONAL ROAD 53), IN THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:

(a) Declare surplus the lands described as Part of Lot 116, German Company Tract, Parts 3 and 4 on Reference Plan 58R-17596, (Part of PIN 22736-0133 (LT)) and Part 13 on Reference Plan 58R-16369. (Part of PIN 22736-0010 (LT)), City of Cambridge, Regional Municipality of Waterloo, and provide the standard public notification as required by the Region’s property disposition by-law; and

(b) Approve a transfer to the Corporation of the City of Cambridge for dedication as Riverbank Court, north of the proposed Fairway Road Extension (Regional Road 53), at a price of $174,400 being the Region of Waterloo’s cost of acquisition of said lands.

SUMMARY: NIL

REPORT:

Pursuant to report CR-RS-09-023, in June 2009 Committee approved the acquisition of lands from a number of owners for the construction of the proposed Fairway Road Extension. Included in these purchases were lands acquired at the request of City of Cambridge staff for the relocation of portions of Riverbank Drive on both sides of the proposed Fairway Road. It was agreed at that time that the City of Cambridge would financially reimburse the Region based on the total cost (to include land cost, closing, legal and taxes) to acquire the lands on a per acre basis. The City of Cambridge subsequently confirmed its budget commitment for the full cost of the Riverbank Drive realignments (including construction, land, and all other related project costs) in 2010.

The portion of the relocated Riverbank Road which is situated on west side of the Fairway Road extension is now ready to be dedicated and used as a public roadway and, as such, City and Regional staff are working together to facilitate the transfer of those lands.

The subject lands are approximately 3.27 acres in area and the amount of total compensation has been estimated at $174,400, in accordance with report CR-RS-09-023. As compensation is to be based on cost at time of acquisition in 2009, an appraisal of the current value of the subject lands has not been undertaken. The Region’s Property Disposition By-Law 95-034 allows for exemption from the requirement for an appraisal when the sale is to other public bodies such as municipalities.

Given that the future intended use of these lands was specifically identified at the time of their
acquisitions, as being specifically for the use by the City of Cambridge as the relocated Riverbank Drive, as outlined in Report CR-RS-09-023, a formal surplus circulation has been not been undertaken for the subject property.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Construction of the Fairway Road Extension and Riverbank Drive realignment achieves Strategic Focus Area #3 (“Sustainable Transportation”) to develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices, specifically Strategic Objective 3.3 to optimize existing road capacity to safely manage traffic throughout Waterloo Region and further, under 3.3.1, to identify and address priority transportation bottlenecks to reduce road congestion and improve safety.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The cost of project efforts being undertaken by the Region of Waterloo on behalf of the City of Cambridge represents approximately 1.4% of the total $52 million Fairway Road Extension project value. City of Cambridge staff has confirmed that there are sufficient funds allocated for this work being undertaken on behalf of the City of Cambridge. There are sufficient funds in the Region’s approved 2012 10-Year Transportation Capital Program (TCP) to cover the costs associated with the work being undertaken on behalf of the City of Cambridge, with recovery of funds from the City of Cambridge anticipated for 2013.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Transportation and Environmental Services staff has been consulted in the preparation of this report

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix “A” – Map and Reference Area of Subject Lands

PREPARED BY: Tom Penwarden, Manager of Real Estate Services

APPROVED BY: Gary Sosnoski, Commissioner, Corporate Resources
Appendix “A”
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: November 6, 2012

FILE CODE: CO4-20, 7257

SUBJECT: CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STUDY FOR NORTHFIELD DRIVE IMPROVEMENTS, KING STREET TO UNIVERSITY AVENUE, CITY OF WATERLOO

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Class Environmental Assessment Study for proposed improvements on Northfield Drive (Regional Road No. 22) from King Street to University Avenue in the City of Waterloo:

a) Approve the Recommended Design Alternative for Northfield Drive as outlined in Report E-12-106; and,

b) Direct staff to file the Notice of Completion for this Class Environmental Assessment Study by means of advertisements in local newspapers and mailings to adjacent property owners, tenants and agencies, and place the Environmental Study Report on the public record for a period of 30 days; and,

c) Amend the Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, upon completion of construction of the Recommended Design Alternative to add to Schedule 1, No Parking Anytime on both sides of Northfield Drive (Regional Road 22) from King Street (Regional Road 15) to University Avenue and to add to Schedule 24, Reserved Bicycle Lanes Anytime on both sides of Northfield Drive (Regional Road No. 22) from King Street (Regional Road 15) to University Avenue.

SUMMARY:

The Region of Waterloo is currently undertaking a Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) Study to consider improvements to Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue in the City of Waterloo. As part of this Class EA Study, the Region is also assessing the need for improvements to the Bridge Street/University Avenue corridor from Northfield Drive to King Street. (Please refer to Appendix ‘A’ for a Key Plan of the project location).

This Class EA Study is being directed by a “Project Team” consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo, the City of Waterloo, the Township of Woolwich, Regional Councillor Sean Strickland and City of Waterloo Councillor Diane Freeman. The consulting engineering firm HDR Corporation has been retained by the Region of Waterloo to assist with this Class EA Study.

A Public Consultation Centre was held on June 28, 2012 to receive public input. Comments received at the Public Consultation Centre are included in Appendix ‘D’ and the Project Team’s
response to the comments received is included in Appendix ‘F’ of this Report E-12-106. Based on a review of the technical information gathered for this project as well as a review of all public comments received from the June 28th, 2012 Public Consultation Centre, the Project Team is recommending that Regional Council approve the following improvements for Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue in the City of Waterloo:

- Reconstruct Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue to address the deteriorated pavement condition;

- Widen Northfield Drive from Davenport Road to University Avenue to provide for two (2) 3.35 metre wide through lanes in each direction complete with curb and gutter;

- Install new storm sewers on Northfield Drive from Wissler Road to University Avenue;

- Construct dual left-turn lanes on westbound Northfield Drive at King Street;

- Construct 1.25 to 1.80 metre wide reserved on-road cycling lanes on Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue;

- Construct a new 3.0 metre wide concrete multi-use trail on the south side of Northfield Drive from Davenport Road to University Avenue;

- Maintain the existing 1.50 metre wide sidewalks on each side of Northfield Drive from King Street to Davenport Road; however, if the road construction requires the removal of the existing sidewalk, reinstate 1.80 metre wide concrete sidewalks;

- Construct a new 1.80 metre wide concrete sidewalk on the north side of Northfield Drive from Davenport Road to University Avenue;

- Provide increased storage capacity at all existing designated left-turn lanes on Northfield Drive at Kraus Drive, Davenport Road, Wissler Road, Bridge Street, Toman Drive and University Avenue;

- Remove the existing eastbound dedicated right-turn lane on Northfield Drive at Davenport Road;

- Remove the existing northbound dedicated right-turn lane on King Street at Northfield Drive;

- Provide increased storage capacity for the existing eastbound dedicated right-turn lane on Northfield Drive at Bridge Street;

- Provide improved signal timing at all intersections within the project limits currently controlled by traffic control signals;

- Provide underground plant for new traffic control signals at the intersection of Toman Drive and Northfield Drive when recommended in the future;

- Provide streetlights on each side of Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue;
- Provide new boulevard landscaping on Northfield Drive in conjunction with the road improvements consisting of small trees and shrubs where space permits; and,

- Re-assess the need for capacity improvements to the existing Bridge Street/University Avenue corridor from Northfield Drive to King Street as part of the next Regional Transportation Master Plan update, expected to occur within five (5) years.

Staff is now also recommending that Regional Council direct staff to file the Notice of Completion for this Class Environmental Assessment Study by means of advertisements in local newspapers and mailings to adjacent property owners, tenants and agencies, and place the Environmental Study Report on public record for a period of 30 days.

The construction of reserved on-road cycling lanes on each side of Northfield Drive will require that Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, be amended to provide Reserved Lanes for bicycles on each side of Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue and “No Parking” at anytime on each side of Regional Road No. 22 (Northfield Drive) from King Street to University Avenue. Parking is not currently permitted on this section of University Avenue.

The Region’s Draft 2013 10-Year Transportation Capital Program includes funds of $10,065,000 in years 2013 to 2016 inclusive in order to complete construction of the improvements to Northfield Drive from King Street to University in 2015, subject to acquisition of the required property and utility relocations, to be funded from the Development Charges Fund and the Roads Capital Levy.

The City of Waterloo will confirm that it has funds budgeted for their share of the project costs estimated to be $158,000 and has asked that the Region proceed on its behalf.

Letters advising of the recommendations contained in this Report E-12-106 were mailed to all agencies and those who attended the June 28, 2012 Public Consultation Centre, and hand-delivered to all owners/residents abutting the Northfield Drive project limits on October 19, 2012.

REPORT:

1.0 Background

The Region of Waterloo is currently undertaking a Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) Study to consider improvements to Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue in the City of Waterloo. As part of this Class EA Study, the Region is also assessing the need for improvements to the Bridge Street/University Avenue corridor from Northfield Drive to King Street. (Please refer to Appendix ‘A’ for a Key Plan of the project location). This Class EA Study has been initiated by the Region to address several needs on Northfield Drive. The Region’s 2010 Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) identified the need to widen Northfield Drive from Davenport Road to University Avenue within the five (5) to ten (10) year timeframe in order to provide adequate capacity for forecasted traffic volumes along this corridor. The Region’s RTMP also identified the potential need for capacity improvements to the Bridge Street/University Avenue corridor from Northfield Drive to King Street in the ten (10) to twenty (20) year timeframe. Additionally, there is a need for enhanced pedestrian and cycling facilities on the section of Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue. The existing roadway asphalt on Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue is in fair to poor condition and in need of rehabilitation or replacement. The planning of the roadway improvements is being undertaken in accordance with the Region’s RTMP, the Regional Context Sensitive Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines, the Region’s current Cycling Master Plan, the
Region’s Draft Active Transportation Master Plan, and other relevant Regional policies, practices and guidelines.

This Class EA Study is being directed by a “Project Team” consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo, the City of Waterloo, the Township of Woolwich, Regional Councillor Sean Strickland and City of Waterloo Councillor Diane Freeman. The consulting engineering firm HDR Corporation has been retained by the Region of Waterloo to assist with this Class EA Study.

Within the Study Area, Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue is under the jurisdiction of the Region of Waterloo. Bridge Street from King Street to University Avenue and University Avenue from Bridge Street to Northfield Drive are local boundary roads under the joint jurisdiction of the City of Waterloo and the Township of Woolwich. Bridge Street from Northfield Drive to University Avenue is under the jurisdiction of the City of Waterloo. Properties abutting Northfield Drive are a mixture of commercial, industrial and high density residential uses. Northfield Drive from King Street to approximately 100 metres east of Davenport Road is a four lane urbanized road with dedicated left-turn lanes on Northfield Drive at King Street, Kraus Drive, and Davenport Road and a dedicated right-turn lane on eastbound Northfield Drive at Davenport Road. The section of Northfield Drive from approximately 100 metres east of Davenport Road to University Avenue is a two (2) lane rural road with dedicated left-turn lanes on all approaches of the intersections of Wissler Road and Northfield Drive, Bridge Street and Northfield Drive, Toman Drive and Northfield Drive, and University Avenue and Northfield Drive and a dedicated right-turn lane on eastbound Northfield Drive at Bridge Street. No sidewalks currently exist on the south side of Northfield Drive from Wissler Road to University Avenue or on the north side of Northfield Drive from Davenport Road to University Avenue. There are existing 1.5 metre wide sidewalks on the south side of Northfield Drive from King Street to Wissler Road and on the north side of Northfield Drive from King Street to Davenport Road.

2.0 Transportation Study

A detailed Transportation Study has been completed as part of the Class EA Study. The purpose of the Transportation Study was to examine existing traffic operations within the study area, forecast future traffic volumes to the year 2027, and identify and evaluate alternative transportation solutions for accommodating forecasted traffic volumes and improving traffic operations. Current and forecasted traffic volumes on Northfield Drive and on the Bridge Street/University Avenue corridor are summarized in Appendix ‘B’.

The Transportation Study assessed a number of alternative solutions including intersection improvements on Northfield Drive, widening Northfield Drive from two (2) to four (4) lanes, improving the Bridge Street/University Avenue corridor to connect to the Highway 85 interchange and establishing a new University Avenue alignment from Northfield Drive to the Highway 85 interchange.

The Transportation Study provided the following recommendations to improve roadway capacity, traffic operations and safety within the Study Area:

- Provide two (2) through lanes in each direction on Northfield Drive from Davenport Road to University Avenue;
- Provide dual left-turn lanes westbound on Northfield Drive at King Street;
- Provide designated left-turn lanes on Northfield Drive at Kraus Drive, Davenport Road, Wissler Road, Bridge Street, Toman Drive and University Avenue;
- Remove the existing dedicated right-turn lane eastbound on Northfield Drive at Davenport Road;

- Remove the existing dedicated right-turn lane northbound on King Street at Northfield Drive;

- Provide new traffic control signals at the intersection of Toman Drive and Northfield Drive when recommended in the future;

- Provide pedestrian, cycling facilities and transit stop facilities on Northfield Drive to encourage alternative modes of transportation; and,

- Recommend to the City of Waterloo and Township of Woolwich that consideration be given to improving the existing road surface on the Bridge Street/University Avenue corridor from King Street to Northfield Drive.

The implementation of modern roundabouts was considered by the Project Team to replace the existing traffic control signals on Northfield Drive at its intersections with King Street, Kraus Drive, Davenport Road, Wissler Road, Bridge Street and University Avenue as well as the intersection of Northfield Drive and Toman Drive where traffic control signals are expected to be recommended in the future. The Project Team’s completed evaluation found that taking into account the estimated capital, operating and societal costs of traffic control signals and roundabouts, collision histories at each intersection and property constraints, roundabouts were not recommended over traffic control signals at these intersections.

3.0 Alternative Transportation Planning Solutions

Based on the results of the Transportation Study, the Project Team developed and considered nine (9) alternative transportation planning solutions in advance of the Public Consultation Centre. These nine (9) solutions are described as follows:

**Northfield Drive Improvements Only:**

**Alternative 1A** - ‘Do Nothing’ – Rehabilitation of Northfield Drive in its current configuration.

**Alternative 1B** - Reconstruction of Northfield Drive to its current lane configuration including the following intersection improvements:
- Install underground traffic control plant for traffic control signals at the intersection of Toman Drive and Northfield Drive with the traffic control signals being installed when warranted in the future;
- Construction of new westbound dual left-turn lanes on Northfield Drive at King Street; and,
- Extension of the existing left-turn and right-turn lanes on Northfield Drive at Kraus Drive, Davenport Road, Wissler Road, Bridge Street, Toman Drive and University Avenue to accommodate forecasted traffic volumes.

**Alternative 1C** - Reconstruc and widen Northfield Drive to provide for two (2) through lanes of traffic in each direction, construct intersection improvements as per Alternative 1B, provide enhanced pedestrian and cycling facilities, provide transit stop improvements and plant new boulevard trees where feasible.
Bridge Street/University Avenue Corridor Improvements Only

**Alternative 2A** - Rehabilitate the existing Bridge Street/University Avenue corridor in its current configuration and construct new turn lanes at the intersection of King Street and Bridge Street.

**Alternative 2B** - Construct a minor realignment of a section of Bridge Street (King Street to University Avenue) to connect to the Highway 85/Regional Road No. 15 interchange and rehabilitate the remaining sections of Bridge Street/University Avenue.

**Alternative 2C** - Construct a new University Avenue alignment from the Highway 85/Regional Road No. 15 interchange to the intersection of University Avenue and Northfield Drive.

Improvements to both Northfield Drive and the Bridge Street/University Avenue Corridor

**Alternative 3A** - Reconstruct and widen Northfield Drive as per Alternative 1C and Rehabilitate the existing Bridge Street/University Avenue corridor as per Alternative 2A.

**Alternative 3B** - Reconstruct and widen Northfield Drive as per Alternative 1C and Construct a minor realignment of Bridge Street as per Alternative 2B.

**Alternative 3C** - Reconstruct and widen Northfield Drive as per Alternative 1C and Construct a new University Avenue road alignment as per Alternative 2C.

Please refer to Appendix ‘C’ for drawings of all Alternative Solutions listed above.

4.0 June 28, 2012 Public Consultation Centre

A Public Consultation Centre (PCC) was held at St. Luke Catholic School, 550 Chesapeake Drive in the City of Waterloo on Thursday, June 28th, 2012 from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Plans showing the Project Team’s proposed alternative solutions were on display and Project Team representatives were present to answer questions and to receive feedback from members of the public. Approximately fifty (50) members of the public attended the PCC and forty-seven (47) members of the public formally signed in. Thirteen (13) comment sheets were received and four (4) emails and two (2) letters were sent to the Region with comments after the PCC. Please refer to Appendix ‘D’ for a summary of the written comments received.

Prior to the Public Consultation Centre, the alternative solutions were evaluated by the Project Team according the following criteria:

**Transportation:** How does the alternative serve the expected vehicular, transit operations, pedestrian and cycling traffic in terms of corridor capacity, level of service, traffic safety, transportation, transit network and movement of emergency vehicles?

**Socio-Economic:** How does the alternative affect the residential and commercial properties abutting the road (driveway access, land fragmentation, property impacts, noise, neighbourhood impacts, archaeological and cultural heritage)?
Natural Environment: How does the alternative affect watercourse impacts, existing trees, stormwater management, floodplain impacts, aquatic species and habitat, vegetation and wildlife?

Cost: What is the total capital cost of the alternative including the cost for road construction, utility and streetlighting, property acquisitions, intersection control improvements and landscaping?

Please refer to Appendix ‘E’ for the Project Team’s evaluation of the Alternative Solutions presented at the Public Consultation Centre on June 28th, 2012.

Based on this preliminary evaluation of the Alternatives Solutions using the above noted criteria, the following Alternative Solution was presented by the Project Team as being preliminarily preferred by the Project Team at this Public Consultation Centre:

Alternative 1C - Reconstruct and widen Northfield Drive to provide for two (2) through lanes of traffic in each direction, construct intersection improvements on Northfield Drive as per Alternative 1B, provide enhanced pedestrian and cycling facilities on Northfield Drive, provide transit stop improvements and plant new boulevard trees where feasible on Northfield Drive.

The Project Team did not present any specific Design Alternatives at this PCC based on the rationale that it was premature to develop design alternatives for specific pedestrian and cycling facility configurations until the Preferred Alternative Solution was confirmed. However, the Project Team presented drawings of options for potential pedestrian and cycling facilities, such as on-road cycling lanes, boulevard multi-use trails and sidewalks to the public at the PCC in order to receive input to assist in the future development of Design Alternatives.

The Project Team received many positive comments regarding the proposed improvements at the PCC. The main issues raised by the public are summarized as follows:

- The majority of comments were in support of the Project Team’s Recommended Alternative Solution No. 1C to widen Northfield Drive to provide two (2) through lanes in each direction including intersection improvements;

- Several comments were received indicating support for construction of proposed on-road cycling lanes on Northfield Drive in combination with a multi-use trail on the south side of Northfield Drive and a sidewalk on the north side of Northfield Drive;

- One comment suggested that improvements to the Bridge Street/University Avenue corridor should be completed sooner than ten (10) years and should include enhanced pedestrian and cycling facilities;

- One comment indicated opposition to the extension of an existing raised island on Northfield Drive east of King Street;

- One comment suggested the projected traffic volumes for Northfield Drive are high and that a 3-lane cross-section with a two-way centre left-turn lane is all that is needed;
- One comment suggested that more traffic will travel through the village of Conestogo if Northfield Drive is widened to two (2) lanes in each direction;

- One comment expressed concern for trucking delays for a local meat distribution centre during construction;

- One comment expressed concern that improvements to the Bridge Street corridor may require the purchase of property in the vicinity of the intersection of King Street and Bridge Street in order to widen King Street; and,

- One comment requested that the existing 80 km/h posted speed limit on Northfield Drive be reduced east of University Avenue to beyond the Conestogo River bridge.

The Project Team’s response to these comments is included in Appendix ‘F’.

5.0 Design Alternatives

Based on the input received at the June 28, 2012 PCC, the Project Team confirmed that the Preferred Alternative Solution for this Class EA Study is Alternative 1(C) – Reconstruct and widen Northfield Drive to provide for two (2) through lanes of traffic in each direction, construct intersection improvements on Northfield Drive as per Alternative 1B, provide enhanced pedestrian and cycling facilities, provide transit stop improvements and plant new boulevard trees where feasible.

Following the PCC, the Project Team developed a number of Design Alternatives for improvements to Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue, in order to consider and assess various configurations for providing enhanced pedestrian and cycling facilities along Northfield Drive. Input received from the public at the PCC was considered in the development of the Design Alternatives. The Project Team also consulted with the Region’s Active Transportation Advisory Committee (ATAC) to obtain their comments for incorporating enhanced pedestrian and cycling facility options into the design alternatives. The four (4) Design Alternatives for Northfield Drive developed and evaluated by the Project Team are described as follows:

Design Alternative 1 - ‘Do Nothing’ – Reconstruct the road in its current configuration.

Design Alternative 2 - Provide two (2) 3.35 metre wide through lanes in each direction, a 1.25 to 1.80 metre wide reserved on-road cycling lanes on each side of Northfield Drive, 1.8 metre wide concrete sidewalk on the north side of Northfield Drive from Davenport Road to University Avenue and 3.0 metre wide concrete multi-use trail on the south side of Northfield Drive from Davenport Road to University Avenue and maintain the existing 1.50 metre wide concrete sidewalk on each side of Northfield Drive from King Street to Davenport Road.

Design Alternative 3 - Provide two (2) 3.35 metre wide through lanes in each direction on Northfield Drive, 1.25 metre wide reserved on-road cycling lanes in each direction on Northfield Drive and 1.80 metre wide concrete sidewalks on each side of Northfield Drive.
Design Alternative 4 - Provide one (1) 3.35 metre wide centre lane and one (1) 3.75 metre wide curb lane in each direction on Northfield Drive and a 3.0 metre wide multi-use trail on each side of Northfield Drive.

Based on the public comments received and considering the Region’s current Cycling Master Plan and the Region’s Draft Active Transportation Master Plan, the Project Team assessed that Design Alternative 2 provided the following advantages:

- Design Alternative 2 fully aligns with the Region’s current Cycling Master Plan and the Region’s Draft Active Transportation Master Plan;
- Construction of a 3.0 metre wide concrete multi-use trail on the south side of Northfield Drive along with on-road cycling facilities provides cycling facilities for both recreational and experienced cyclists; and,
- Design Alternative 2 provides pedestrian facilities on each side of Northfield Drive.

Please refer to Appendix ‘G’ for a drawing of the Project Team’s Recommended Design Alternative for Northfield Drive. Implementation of the Project Team’s proposed improvements will require that small parcels of property be required from approximately two (2) abutting property owners on Northfield Drive, one located adjacent to the south property line of Northfield Drive from King Street to Kraus Drive and the other in the south-west corner of the intersection of Northfield Drive and Bridge Street.

6.0 Recommended Design Alternative for Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue

Based on a review of the technical information gathered for this project as well as a review of all public comments received, the Project Team is recommending that Regional Council approve the following improvements for Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue in the City of Waterloo:

- Reconstruct Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue to address the deteriorated pavement condition;
- Widen Northfield Drive from Davenport Road to University Avenue to provide for two (2) 3.35 metre wide through lanes in each direction complete with curb and gutter;
- Install new storm sewers on Northfield Drive from Wissler Road to University Avenue;
- Construct dual left-turn lanes on westbound Northfield Drive at King Street;
- Construct 1.25 to 1.80 metre wide reserved on-road cycling lanes on Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue;
- Construct a new 3.0 metre wide concrete multi-use trail on the south side of Northfield Drive from Davenport Road to University Avenue;
- Maintain the existing 1.50 metre wide sidewalks on each side of Northfield Drive from King Street to Davenport Road; however, if the road construction requires the removal of the existing sidewalk, reinstate 1.80 metre wide concrete sidewalks;
- Construct a new 1.80 metre wide concrete sidewalk on the north side of Northfield Drive from Davenport Road to University Avenue;
- Provide increased storage capacity at all existing designated left-turn lanes on Northfield Drive at Kraus Drive, Davenport Road, Wissler Road, Bridge Street, Toman Drive and University Avenue;
- Remove the existing eastbound dedicated right-turn lane on Northfield Drive at Davenport Road;
- Remove the existing northbound dedicated right-turn lane on King Street at Northfield Drive;
- Provide increased storage capacity for the existing eastbound dedicated right-turn lane on Northfield Drive at Bridge Street;
- Provide improved signal timing at all intersections within the project limits currently controlled by traffic control signals;
- Provide underground plant for new traffic control signals at the intersection of Toman Drive and Northfield Drive when recommended in the future;
- Provide streetlights on each side of Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue;
- Provide new boulevard landscaping on Northfield Drive in conjunction with the road improvements consisting of small trees and shrubs where space permits; and,
- Re-assess the need for capacity improvements to the existing Bridge Street/University Avenue corridor from Northfield Drive to King Street as part of the next RTMP update, expected to occur within five (5) years.

Staff is now also recommending that Regional Council direct staff to file the Notice of Completion for this Class Environmental Assessment Study by means of advertisements in local newspapers and mailings to adjacent property owners, tenants and agencies, and place the Environmental Study Report on public record for a period of 30 days.

The construction of reserved on-road cycling lanes on each side of Northfield Drive will require that Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, be amended to provide Reserved Lanes for bicycles on each side of Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue and “No Parking” at anytime on each side of Regional Road No. 22 (Northfield Drive) from King Street to University Avenue. Parking is not currently permitted on this section of University Avenue.

As part of detailed design, staff will review the potential for implementing as a ‘pilot project’ bicycle boxes and/or bicycle left-turn lanes at traffic controlled signalized intersections in accordance with current Region draft guidelines.
7.0 Advantages of the Recommended Design Alternative

The Project Team believes that the Recommended Design Alternative offers the following advantages compared to other alternatives considered in this Class EA Study:

- Widening Northfield Drive from two (2) to four (4) lanes in the short-term and re-assessing the need for capacity improvements to the Bridge Street/University Avenue corridor in the longer-term is the most cost-effective solution to accommodate existing and forecasted traffic volumes in the Study Area;

- Widening Northfield Drive to provide two (2) through lanes in each direction on Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue and providing intersection improvements will improve current and future traffic operations along this section of Northfield Drive;

- Construction of on-road cycling lanes on each side of Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue will provide designated cycling facilities for experienced cyclists and is consistent with the Region’s current Cycling Master Plan and the Region’s Draft Active Transportation Master Plan;

- Construction of a 3.0 metre wide concrete multi-use trail on the south side of Northfield Drive from Davenport Road to University Avenue and a 1.80 metre wide concrete sidewalk on the north side of Northfield Drive from Davenport Road to University Avenue will improve facilities for recreational cyclists, families and pedestrians, and is consistent with the Region’s current Cycling Master Plan, the Region’s Draft Active Transportation Master Plan and the Region’s Pedestrian Charter;

- Installation of traffic control signals, when recommended, at the intersection of Northfield Drive and Toman Drive will improve traffic operations at the intersection of Northfield Drive and University Avenue and at the intersection of Bridge Street and Labrador Drive; and,

- Enhanced boulevard landscaping will result in a more aesthetically pleasing roadway corridor and improve the streetscape for users of the pedestrian and cycling facilities.

8.0 Coordination with Light Rail Transit

The Region of Waterloo is in the process of implementing Phase 1 of the Rapid Transit Initiative. The proposed light rail transit line (LRT) is to be located on Northfield Drive between the existing railway crossing (west of Highway 85) and King Street and on King Street from Northfield Drive to the Conestoga Mall. The intersection of King Street and Northfield Drive will be designed to accommodate the needs of both the LRT and the transportation improvements identified for this Northfield Drive Class EA Study. Additionally, the construction timing of any improvements to Northfield Drive will be scheduled to avoid any conflicts with construction of the LRT.

9.0 Project Cost

The estimated total project cost associated with the proposed Northfield Drive improvements, including engineering, construction, utility relocations, property acquisition and other project costs, is $10,065,000.
The City of Waterloo’s estimated share of the project costs for construction of a concrete multi-use trail on the south side of Northfield Drive from Davenport Road to University Avenue is $158,000. The City’s share of $158,000 for the 3.0 metre wide concrete multi-use trail is based on the following approach:

- **Northfield Drive, Davenport Road to Wissler Road:**
  
  The City’s responsible for the full cost of removing the existing 1.50 metre wide sidewalk and replacing it with a 3.0 metre wide concrete multi-use trail; and,

- **Northfield Drive, Wissler Road to University Avenue:**
  
  The City is responsible for the premium cost of the additional 1.20 metre width above the cost of the standard 1.80 metre wide sidewalk which would typically be provided.

### 10.0 Project Timing

Construction of the Northfield Drive improvements is currently scheduled for 2015 in the Region’s Draft 2013 Ten-Year Transportation Capital Program. This construction timing is considered to be aggressive and is contingent upon acquisition of required property, utility relocations, and receipt of technical and financial approvals. The construction timing may also have to be adjusted in order to avoid conflicts with construction of the LRT on Northfield Drive.

### 11.0 Traffic Management During Construction

The construction of Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue will be completed by maintaining one (1) through lane of traffic in each direction plus left-turn lanes at intersections where feasible. Traffic may be reduced to one (1) lane for short periods requiring flagging operations to maintain two-way traffic.

### 12.0 Next Steps

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

Subject to Regional Council approval of the Recommended Design Alternative, this Class EA will be completed and filed in December 2012 and detailed design will commence in early 2013. Construction is currently scheduled for 2015 in the Region’s Draft 2013 10-Year Transportation Capital Program.
Letters advising of the recommendations contained in this Report E-12-106 were mailed to all agencies and those who attended the June 28, 2012 Public Consultation Centre, and hand-delivered to all owners/residents abutting the Northfield Drive project limits on October 19, 2012.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This project is in harmony with the Region’s Corporate Strategic Plan in that implementation of the Northfield Drive Improvements achieves Focus Area 2.2 to develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs, Focus Area 3.2 to develop, promote and integrate active forms of transportation (cycling and walking) and Focus Area 3.3 to optimize existing road capacity to safely manage traffic throughout Waterloo Region.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Region’s Draft 2013 10-Year Transportation Capital Program includes funds of $10,065,000 in years 2013 to 2016 inclusive in order to complete construction of the improvements to Northfield Drive from King Street to University in 2015, subject to acquisition of the required property and utility relocations, to be funded from the Development Charges Fund and the Roads Capital Levy.

The City of Waterloo will confirm that it has funds budgeted for their share of the project costs and has asked that the Region proceed on its behalf.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from the Transportation Planning Division of the Planning, Housing and Community Services Department were consulted for the preparation of this report.

The Council and Administrative Services Division of the Corporate Resources Department will be required to prepare the amending By-law to reflect reserved lanes for cyclists on both sides of Regional Road No. 22 (Northfield Drive) from King Street to University Avenue.
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Appendix A – Key Plan

NORTHFIELD DRIVE CORRIDOR STUDY
(REGIONAL ROAD No. 22)
KING STREET TO UNIVERSITY AVENUE
CITY OF WATERLOO / TOWNSHIP OF WOOLWICH
APPENDIX B – Current and Projected Traffic Volumes

Northfield Drive Current and Forecasted Traffic Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Section</th>
<th>Current (2010) AADT</th>
<th>Forecasted (2027) AADT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West of King Street</td>
<td>25,600</td>
<td>30,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street to Kraus Drive</td>
<td>21,200</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraus Drive to Davenport Road</td>
<td>20,600</td>
<td>41,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport Road to Wissler Road</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>37,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wissler Road to Bridge Street</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Street to Toman Drive</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>30,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toman Drive to University Avenue</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of University Avenue</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>14,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: AADT – Average Annual Daily Traffic

Bridge Street/University Avenue Corridor Current and Forecasted Traffic Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Section</th>
<th>Current (2010) AADT</th>
<th>Forecasted (2027) AADT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alt. 2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Street from (King Street to University Avenue)</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>10,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Avenue from (Bridge Street to Northfield Drive)</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C – ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION 1A

DO NOTHING

ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION 1A
REHABILITATION OF EXISTING ROAD IN ITS CURRENT CONFIGURATION
(NO CYCLING OR PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES)
APPENDIX C – ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION 1B

REGIONAL ROAD 22 (NORTHFIELD DRIVE) INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS

LEGEND: □ Intersection Improvement

ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION 1B
RECONSTRUCTION OF ROAD IN ITS CURRENT CONFIGURATION WITH TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNALS AT TOMAN/NORTHFIELD AND PROVIDE AUXILIARY LANES AT OTHER EXISTING SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS, (NO CYCLING OR PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES OR TRANSIT STOP INCLUDED)
APPENDIX C – ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION 1C
(RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION)

WIDEN REGIONAL ROAD 22 (NORTHFIELD DRIVE)
WITH TWO LANES IN EACH DIRECTION

LEGEND:
- Green: Section to Be Widened
- Red: Intersection Improvement

ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION 1C
REHABILITATE EXISTING ROAD AND WIDEN ROAD TO TWO (2) LANES IN EACH DIRECTION
(WISSLER TO UNIVERSITY) INCLUDING INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS. (INCLUDES CYCLING,
PEDESTRIAN AND TRANSIT STOP FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS FROM KING ST. TO UNIVERSITY AVE.)

Region of Waterloo

HDR
APPENDIX C – ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION 2A

REHABILITATE EXISTING BRIDGE ST./UNIVERSITY AVE. CORRIDOR

LEGEND:
- Section to Be Improved
- Intersection Improvement

ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION 2A
REHABILITATE EXISTING ROAD (KING TO NORTHELFIELD) IN ITS CURRENT CONFIGURATION INCLUDING AUXILIARY LANES AT THE INTERSECTION OF KING ST. AND BRIDGE ST.
APPENDIX C – ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION 2B

Minor Realignment of Bridge St. to Connect Directly with Hwy 85 / RR-15 Interchange

ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION 2B
REALIGN A SECTION OF BRIDGE ST. CORRIDOR (KING TO UNIVERSITY) TO CONNECT TO HIGHWAY 85/R.R. NO. 15 INTERCHANGE.

LEGEND:
- Potential Realignment Area
- Potential Realignment
New Road Alignment from Hwy. 85/R. No. 15 Interchange to Intersection of Northfield Dr. and University Ave.

NEW ROAD ALIGNMENT

LEGEND:
New Road Alignment Center Line
New Road Corridor

ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION 2C
Establish new University Avenue road alignment from Highway 85/R. No. 15 interchange to intersection of University Ave. and Northfield Dr.
ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION 3B

WIDEN NORTHFIELD TO TWO (2) Lanes in each direction (Wissler to University) & Realign a section of Bridge St. Corridor (King to University) to connect to Highway 85/R.R. No. 15 interchange. (Includes cycling, pedestrian and transit stop facility improvements on Northfield from King St. to University Ave.)
ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION 3C

REHABILITATE AND WIDEN NORTHFIELD TO TWO (2) LINES IN EACH DIRECTION (WISSLER TO UNIVERSITY) & ESTABLISH NEW ROAD ALIGNMENT FROM HIGHWAY 85/R.R. NO. 15 INTERCHANGE TO INTERSECTION OF UNIVERSITY AVE. AND NORTHFIELD DR. (INCLUDES CYCLING, PEDESTRIAN AND TRANSIT STOP FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS ON NORTHFIELD FROM KING ST. TO UNIVERSITY AVE.)
### APPENDIX D - WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE JUNE 28, 2012

#### PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dianna F.</td>
<td>Any consideration to bike paths + pedestrian areas is paramount – I am in favour of the current proposal – for safety reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie K.</td>
<td>I would suggest pro-active steps for bicycles to minimize collisions. For example, the bike box at Davenport and Lexington… could these be offered at key intersections (Wissler, Bridge, and University)? Otherwise, this looks like a well-considered and thorough plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim K.</td>
<td>Widening Northfield the entire way makes sense.                                                                                     Waiting 10 years to re-evaluate the Bridge Street/University Ave situation is way too long.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David M.</td>
<td>It is vital that any changes to the road (Northfield) include cycling infrastructure.                                                                                                             There is a major problem on Bridge Street from King to University but I under the City must fix this unless you re-align it. If you do re-align it, it is vital cycling infrastructure be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat H.</td>
<td>It is gratifying to see a plan in place to accommodate traffic including bikes and pedestrians. This seems like a very straightforward, sensible projection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete F.</td>
<td>Being an avid cyclist, it is very encouraging to see the proposal for on-street bike lanes and a separate multi-use trail. This multi-use trail provides parents and children a relative safe way to travel between Eastbridge and the stores/mall @ King/Northfield. A suggestion would be to paint the on-street bike lanes a different colour (i.e. dark red or blue) and separate these bike lanes from the road by applying double white lines to ‘slow down’ the vehicle traffic or a ‘visual’ narrowing of the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne R.</td>
<td>Vote for 1C at a minimum.                                                                                                            Concerned about lack of street lighting at King/Bridge W intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatyanna</td>
<td>Outside the survey area... On Northfield past University the speed limit changes to 80 km/h. With increase traffic flow the speed of traffic will increase before the limit. I would like the speed limit to be moved to after the bridge on Northfield. Residential driveways exist + horse &amp; buggies on the bridge with speeders is not safe. There have been several accidents!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna C.</td>
<td>Please build Option 1C with bike lanes and multi-use trail                                                                                                                                  Critical connector between rapid transit at Conestoga Mall and E side of Waterloo, and between Trans Canada Trail and Walter Bean Trail. Bridge &amp; University need bike lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Peter D.   | Nice to see the bike lanes.                                                                                                       
|            | Sidewalks on the North side of Northfield may be unnecessary. Potential cost savings.                                                |
| N/A        | Don’t think on road bike lanes are wide enough (1.25m) – not consistent with Transp. Master Plan                                      
<p>|            | Happy to see multi-use trail on one side + sidewalk on other                                                                      |
| Margaret M.| From talking to representatives nothing is being done to King + Bridge St. We live at 730 King St. + would effect our water line if they were to extend Regional Road 15 to Bridge. We are also concerned about widening of King St. + losing property. Walking lanes + bike lanes should be done in one. |
| Peter B.   | Property 20 Northfield Dr. East – an entrance from Northfield Drive to this property has existed since 1969. This was the first entrance onto Northfield Drive between King Street and Wissler Road predating the City of Waterloo and the Regional Municipality of Waterloo in this area. This entrance was subject of a previous Class EA Environmental Assessment referred to the Ministry of Environment in Toronto. This issue was subsequently resolved with a document from the Region of Waterloo stating that the entrance would remain. I wish to object to the extension of the median from King St. N. to Kraus Drive as it eliminates access to my property when travelling east on Northfield Drive. The present median extends approximately 15 m across the west frontage of my property rather than the total frontage. I noticed the existing sidewalk is 1.5 m wide with a proposal to increase it to 2.1 m wide. I would estimate the pedestrian traffic in this area not to exceed 4 persons per hour on average and so I fail to see why a sidewalk width increase is necessary. Keeping this one item the same would eliminate the need for extra land and the associate expense of acquiring it. |
| Chris K.   | The major 4-lane corridor that the Region is envisioning for Northfield is probably going to receive a lot of support, but your traffic projection numbers are astronomical. What do you see generating this traffic? Has a calmer 3 lane configuration being seriously considered? My main concern with Northfield becoming such a large and heavily trafficked road is the pedestrian and cycling connection that Northfield could represent, and the need for off-road cycling in this corridor. WalkCycleWR envisions a multi-use trail on most of the study area and I would strongly urge you to carry this kind of improvement all the way from University to Davenport. This would link the cycle-friendly parallel streets of University, Bridge and Davenport with a solid cross route. Beyond multi-use trails, I believe there is potential here for dedicated bikeways and an eventual connection to Rapid Transit. Regardless, some form of segregated cycling infrastructure is critical. On-street bike lanes will not be sufficient given the level of traffic you are forecasting for this corridor. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda W.</td>
<td>I would like to weigh in on this proposal because I think it is again going to affect us in Conestogo. Why is everyone so fixated on Northfield Dr.? I feel there needs to be changes to existing major arteries so that the traffic is elevated on Northfield. Why divert traffic off King St. only to reroute it back to King and once again encourage motorists to use Northfield Dr. Why not widen King directly to the Expressway and continue to widen the Expressway to four lanes over the bridge to Elmira. We need much bigger plans than simply creating left hand turn lanes and widening roads in areas which were not intended to handle the growing traffic problems. Why should I or anyone else have to sell part of my property or lose my house as the last article in the Woolwich Observer suggested a few weeks ago because the City of Waterloo cannot solve it's traffic problems. You need a major route to connect K-W to Guelph and Cambridge and do so from the source - that is the cities of Waterloo an Kitchener. Don't dump your problems on us. Answer the question - where are the people going when they take Northfield Dr.? What area of the cities are they coming from? And create a major route or transport system to accommodate them instead of piddling around. I'm against the new revisions on Northfield and Sawmill in Conestogo. The residents on the SW corner have no more property to give up. This is a residential area with a lot of history so the traffic needs to slow down not create a thruway. I haven't followed the Highway 7 proposal. Why can't the existing #7 be widen to four lanes to Guelph. Even the Expressway cannot fully accommodate the rush hour traffic. It used to get congested by Frederick but now by 4:30 it is that way right to Waterloo. In Toronto they were talking about some new type of traffic lights for the really busy intersections. In my mind you are thinking way too small for the future traffic problems and not solving them at the source. We need a bypass or as I stated some major routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugenio D.</td>
<td>Based on my conversations with neighbours and community members on the Eastbridge Neighbourhood Association, we are hoping for the expansion option of 4 lanes to be implemented as soon as budgets allow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our community is extremely active with cycling and running, so having the paved paths on both sides of the street would be a worthwhile investment in my opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please advise if there area any options for bushes/other features on the north side to help break-up the wind effect for this open space, between the road and this path. Just a thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott P.</td>
<td>Labreche Patterson and Associates Inc. representing Piller’s Fine Foods are concerned about the impacts construction will cause their trucking to and from their distribution centre at 250 Frobisher Drive that may impact their daily operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX E
DETAILED PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

#### Summary of Preliminary Evaluation of Alternative Planning Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Group</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION</th>
<th>ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>PROJECT COSTS</th>
<th>OVERALL PROJECT EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PROJECT COSTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. OVERALL PROJECT EVALUATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Northfield Drive Improvements Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Planning Concepts</th>
<th>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</th>
<th>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</th>
<th>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</th>
<th>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</th>
<th>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative A</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative B</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative C</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative D</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Improvements Only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Planning Concepts</th>
<th>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</th>
<th>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</th>
<th>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</th>
<th>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</th>
<th>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative A</td>
<td>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</td>
<td>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</td>
<td>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</td>
<td>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</td>
<td>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative B</td>
<td>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</td>
<td>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</td>
<td>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</td>
<td>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</td>
<td>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative C</td>
<td>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</td>
<td>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</td>
<td>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</td>
<td>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</td>
<td>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative D</td>
<td>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</td>
<td>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</td>
<td>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</td>
<td>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</td>
<td>Bridge Street/University Avenue Improvements Only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Planning Concepts</th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative A</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative B</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative C</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative D</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Combined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Additional Notes

- Each alternative is evaluated based on transportation, economic environment, natural environment, and project costs.
- The overall project evaluation is determined by the weighted scores of the individual criteria.
- The evaluation criteria include traffic flow, cost-effectiveness, environmental impact, and sustainability.
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### APPENDIX E
**DETAILED PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS**

#### NORTHFIELD DRIVE IMPROVEMENTS ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Planning Concepts</th>
<th>NORTHFIELD DRIVE IMPROVEMENTS ONLY</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 1A</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 1B</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 1C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Realignment of Existing Bridge</td>
<td>Major Realignment of Existing Bridge</td>
<td>Major Realignment of Existing Bridge</td>
<td>Major Realignment of Existing Bridge</td>
<td>Major Realignment of Existing Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Roadway</td>
<td>Existing Roadway</td>
<td>Existing Roadway</td>
<td>Existing Roadway</td>
<td>Existing Roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Lane Configuration</td>
<td>Existing Lane Configuration</td>
<td>Existing Lane Configuration</td>
<td>Existing Lane Configuration</td>
<td>Existing Lane Configuration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Bridge Features</td>
<td>Existing Bridge Features</td>
<td>Existing Bridge Features</td>
<td>Existing Bridge Features</td>
<td>Existing Bridge Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Traffic Patterns</td>
<td>Existing Traffic Patterns</td>
<td>Existing Traffic Patterns</td>
<td>Existing Traffic Patterns</td>
<td>Existing Traffic Patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>Existing Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>Existing Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>Existing Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>Existing Pedestrian Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Transit Operations</td>
<td>Existing Transit Operations</td>
<td>Existing Transit Operations</td>
<td>Existing Transit Operations</td>
<td>Existing Transit Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Emergency Services</td>
<td>Existing Emergency Services</td>
<td>Existing Emergency Services</td>
<td>Existing Emergency Services</td>
<td>Existing Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BRIDGE STREET UNIVERSITY AVENUE IMPROVEMENTS ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Planning Concepts</th>
<th>BRIDGE STREET UNIVERSITY AVENUE IMPROVEMENTS ONLY</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 2A</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 2B</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 2C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Realignment of Existing Bridge</td>
<td>Major Realignment of Existing Bridge</td>
<td>Major Realignment of Existing Bridge</td>
<td>Major Realignment of Existing Bridge</td>
<td>Major Realignment of Existing Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Roadway</td>
<td>Existing Roadway</td>
<td>Existing Roadway</td>
<td>Existing Roadway</td>
<td>Existing Roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Lane Configuration</td>
<td>Existing Lane Configuration</td>
<td>Existing Lane Configuration</td>
<td>Existing Lane Configuration</td>
<td>Existing Lane Configuration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Bridge Features</td>
<td>Existing Bridge Features</td>
<td>Existing Bridge Features</td>
<td>Existing Bridge Features</td>
<td>Existing Bridge Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Traffic Patterns</td>
<td>Existing Traffic Patterns</td>
<td>Existing Traffic Patterns</td>
<td>Existing Traffic Patterns</td>
<td>Existing Traffic Patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>Existing Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>Existing Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>Existing Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>Existing Pedestrian Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Transit Operations</td>
<td>Existing Transit Operations</td>
<td>Existing Transit Operations</td>
<td>Existing Transit Operations</td>
<td>Existing Transit Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Emergency Services</td>
<td>Existing Emergency Services</td>
<td>Existing Emergency Services</td>
<td>Existing Emergency Services</td>
<td>Existing Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DETAILED PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Alternative Planning Concepts</th>
<th>NORTHFIELD DRIVE IMPROVEMENTS ONLY</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 1A</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 1B</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 1C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>Pedestrian Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table above provides a detailed preliminary evaluation of alternative solutions for Northfield Drive improvements, including considerations for safety, traffic operations, pedestrian facilities, transit operations, and emergency services.
## Preliminary Detailed Evaluation of Alternative Planning Solutions

### Criteria Group

#### 2. SOCIO-ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Impacts</th>
<th>What will the alternative impact be on access to properties fronting on Northfield, Bridge, and University?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change to driveway entrance grades.</td>
<td>Access to and from properties may improve marginally due to reduced congestion on roadways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change to driveway entrance grades.</td>
<td>Access to and from properties on Northfield Drive may increase in difficulty due to longer traffic queues lengths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased traffic congestion may encourage traffic infiltration into existing neighbourhoods and may result in fewer users of active transportation facilities.</td>
<td>Less congestion may reduce traffic infiltration into existing neighbourhoods and may encourage greater use of active transportation facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less congestion may reduce traffic infiltration into existing neighbourhoods and may result in fewer users of active transportation facilities.</td>
<td>Less congestion may reduce traffic infiltration into existing neighbourhoods and may encourage greater use of active transportation facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal reduction in congestion may encourage traffic infiltration into existing neighbourhoods and may encourage greater use of active transportation facilities.</td>
<td>Less congestion may reduce traffic infiltration into existing neighbourhoods and may encourage greater use of active transportation facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less congestion may reduce traffic infiltration into existing neighbourhoods and may encourage greater use of active transportation facilities.</td>
<td>Less congestion may reduce traffic infiltration into existing neighbourhoods and may encourage greater use of active transportation facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Impacts</th>
<th>How does the alternative impact the adjacent neighborhood and enhance Northfield for pedestrians and cyclists?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased traffic congestion may encourage traffic infiltration into local neighbourhoods and may result in fewer users of active transportation facilities.</td>
<td>Less congestion may reduce traffic infiltration into existing neighbourhoods and does not encourage Northfield Drive for pedestrians and cyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less congestion may reduce traffic infiltration into existing neighbourhoods and does not encourage Northfield Drive for pedestrians and cyclists.</td>
<td>Less congestion may reduce traffic infiltration into existing neighbourhoods and does not encourage Northfield Drive for pedestrians and cyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less congestion may reduce traffic infiltration into existing neighbourhoods and may encourage greater use of active transportation facilities.</td>
<td>Less congestion may reduce traffic infiltration into existing neighbourhoods and may encourage greater use of active transportation facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less congestion may reduce traffic infiltration into existing neighbourhoods and may encourage greater use of active transportation facilities.</td>
<td>Less congestion may reduce traffic infiltration into existing neighbourhoods and may encourage greater use of active transportation facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Impacts</th>
<th>How does the alternative impact the properties along the corridor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impacts to private property.</td>
<td>Some property may be required at intersections to accommodate designated turn lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibly more property than required than Alternative 1B may be required at intersections to accommodate designated turn lanes.</td>
<td>Some property may be required at intersections to accommodate designated turn lanes at King Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some additional property required to accommodate new road alignment to connect from Highway 85 Interchange to Northfield University intersection. Property fragmentation will occur.</td>
<td>Significant property required to accommodate new road alignment to connect from Highway 85 Interchange to Northfield University intersection. Property fragmentation will occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some additional property required to accommodate new road alignment to connect from Highway 85 Interchange to Northfield University intersection. Property fragmentation will occur.</td>
<td>Some property may be required at intersections to accommodate designated turn lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some additional property required to accommodate new road alignment to connect from Highway 85 Interchange to Northfield University intersection. Property fragmentation will occur.</td>
<td>Significant property required to accommodate new road alignment to connect from Highway 85 Interchange to Northfield University intersection. Property fragmentation will occur.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Impacts</th>
<th>What effect does the alternative have on noise within the study area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise may marginally increase due to additional traffic volumes.</td>
<td>Noise may marginally increase due to additional traffic volumes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise may marginally increase due to additional traffic volumes.</td>
<td>Noise may marginally increase due to additional traffic volumes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise may marginally increase due to additional traffic volumes.</td>
<td>Noise may marginally increase due to additional traffic volumes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise will increase at the Martin Grove Trailer Park due to providing realignment of Bridge Street.</td>
<td>Noise will increase at the Martin Grove Trailer Park due to providing realignment of Bridge Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise will increase at the Martin Grove Trailer Park due to providing realignment of Bridge Street.</td>
<td>Noise will increase at the Martin Grove Trailer Park due to providing realignment of Bridge Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise will increase more than for Alternative 2B.</td>
<td>Noise will increase more than for Alternative 2B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX E

#### DETAILED EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Planning Concepts</th>
<th>NORTHFIELD DRIVE IMPROVEMENTS ONLY</th>
<th>BRIDGE STREET/UNIVERSITY AVENUE IMPROVEMENTS ONLY</th>
<th>WIDEN NORTHFIELD DRIVE (ALT. No. 1C) &amp; IMPROVE BRIDGE STREET/UNIVERSITY AVENUE COMBINED ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATIVE 1A</td>
<td>&quot;Do Nothing&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATIVE 1B</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Intersection Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATIVE 1C</td>
<td>Widen Northfield Drive with Two Lanes in Each Direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATIVE 2A</td>
<td>Rebuild Existing Bridge Street/University Avenue Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATIVE 2B</td>
<td>Minor Realignment of Bridge Street to connect directly with Hwy ESR&amp;R No. 15 Interchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATIVE 3A</td>
<td>New University Ave. Alignment from Highway ESR&amp;R No. 15 Interchange and intersection of University Avenue and Northfield Drive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATIVE 3B</td>
<td>Widen Northfield (Alt. 1C) &amp; Construct New University Alignment (Alt. 2B) Combined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATIVE 3C</td>
<td>Widen Northfield (Alt. 1C) &amp; Construct New University Alignment (Alt. 2B) Combined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Lowest has the poorest scoring evaluation with Highest being the best scoring evaluation.
APPENDIX F - PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE JUNE 28, 2012 PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRE

The main comments received at the Public Consultation Centre and the Project Team’s responses to these comments are summarized as follows:

Comment No. 1 – Support for the Project Team’s Preferred Planning Solution

Summary of Comments - At the Public Consultation Centre (PCC), most verbal and written comments received supported the Project Team’s Preferred Planning Solution Alternative 1C to reconstruct and widen Northfield Drive to provide for two (2) through lanes in each direction from King Street to University Avenue.

Project Team Response – the Project Team confirmed Planning Solution 1C as the recommended solution.

Comment No. 2 – Need for Improvements to Bridge Street/University Avenue

Summary of Comments – Three comments received identified the need to improve the existing pavement condition of Bridge Street and University Avenue and provide for cycling lanes and sidewalk or a path. One comment received expressed the need to reassess the need for improvements to the Bridge Street/University Avenue corridor again sooner than in 10 years. Concern was also raised by one person over property required for the University Avenue realignment option.

Project Team Response – The 2010 Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) identified the need for improvements to Northfield Drive in the 5-10 year timeframe and to the Bridge Street/University Avenue corridor in the 10-20 year timeframe. The Transportation Study completed as part of this Class EA Study assessed the transportation benefits of improvements to Northfield Drive and/or the Bridge Street/University Avenue corridor. The Transportation Study found that improvements to the Bridge Street/University Avenue corridor provide only marginal transportation benefits in the short to medium term. Region staff have committed to re-examine the Bridge Street/University Avenue corridor for potential capacity improvements as part of the next RTMP update, planned to occur within the next five (5) years.

Interim improvements to address the existing pavement condition of the Bridge Street/University Avenue corridor and to provide enhanced pedestrian and/or cycling facilities would be programmed and undertaken by the City of Waterloo and Township of Woolwich as Bridge Street from King Street to University Avenue and University Avenue from Bridge Street to Northfield Drive are boundary roads under the joint jurisdiction of the City of Waterloo and the Township of Woolwich. Bridge Street from University Avenue to Northfield Drive is under the jurisdiction of the City of Waterloo.

Comment No. 3 – Support for Cycling and Pedestrian Facilities

Summary of Comments – Most comments received expressed support for implementing on-road cycling lanes on Northfield Drive, a trail on the south side of Northfield Drive and sidewalk on the north side of Northfield Drive. Suggestions were also received for wider cycling lanes or greater separation of cycling lanes, painting the cycling lanes, painting a double stripe to separate the cycling lanes and narrowing the vehicle lanes, and planting bushes to cut down the wind for pedestrians.
Project Team Response – In addition to comments received at the Public Consultation Centre, the Project Team has also consulted with the Regional Active Transportation Advisory Committee. Provisions for wider on-road cycling lanes on each side of Northfield Drive and a boulevard multi-use trail on the south side of Northfield drive from Davenport Road to University Avenue received the largest support of the options presented, and this configuration also conforms with the recommendations for this section of Northfield Drive contained in the current Cycling Master Plan and in the Draft Active Transportation Master Plan. The Project Team believes this configuration provides the best combination of on-road comfort for experienced cyclists and the option of an off-road multi-use trail on the south side of Northfield Drive which can be used by recreational cyclists. The proposed on-road cycling lanes also facilitate connections with existing on-road cycling facilities on Davenport Road, Bridge Street and University Avenue. As part of detailed design, staff will review the potential for implementing as a ‘pilot project’ bicycle boxes and/or bicycle left-turn lanes at traffic controlled signalized intersections in accordance with current Region draft guidelines.

Comment No. 4 – Traffic Forecasts for Northfield Drive are Too High and a 3-lane Northfield Drive Will be Adequate

Summary of Comments – One comment was received expressing concern that the traffic projections were too high and that a 3-lane cross-section was adequate, and that a 3-lane cross section would allow more space for cycling facilities.

Project Team Response – The Transportation Study for this Class EA Study concluded that a three-lane cross section does not adequately address the current and future traffic needs for Northfield Drive. A road with a 3-lane cross section is generally of benefit to facilitate left-turn movements when there are a large number of accesses. There are few front-lotted properties with direct access to Northfield Drive within the study area.

Comment No. 5 – Widening Northfield Drive will Increase Traffic through the Village of Conestogo

Summary of Comments – One comment was received expressing concern that improvements to Northfield Drive will lead to more traffic on Northfield Drive through the Village of Conestogo.

Project Team Response – The analysis of existing traffic conditions shows traffic congestion during peak hours at some intersections in the Study Area. Transportation demand forecasts were generated for 10 years beyond the anticipated date of construction, and included employment growth around the Research In Motion office campus and residential growth on the east side of Waterloo. These forecasts included demand reductions achieved through Rapid Transit, improvements in bus transit and promotion of active transportation consistent with the goals of the Regional Transportation Master Plan. Northfield Drive and Highway 85 serve as a key route for motorists travelling to and from north-east Waterloo to Elmira. If Northfield Drive was not widened to provide additional capacity, it may lead to some motorists using Northfield Drive through the Village of Conestogo in order to travel to and from Elmira, in order to avoid traffic congestion on Northfield Drive from University Avenue to Highway 85. Therefore, widening Northfield Drive from King Street to University Avenue should decrease traffic on Northfield Drive through the Village of Conestogo.
Comment No. 6 – Potential for Improvements to King Street

Summary of Comments – Two comments received suggested the need for illumination at the intersection of King Street and Bridge Street, and expressed concern that any future widening of King Street may require that property be acquired from property owners in the vicinity of this intersection.

Project Team Response – The Project Team consulted with appropriate Regional Transportation staff and was advised that additional illumination is not warranted on King Street North at Bridge Street as there are no existing streetlights on Bridge Street in the vicinity of the King Street/Bridge Street intersection and there has not been a high night-time collisions ratio. Therefore, based on the Regional Illumination Policy, street lighting on King Street at Bridge Street is not recommended at this time.

With regard to the future widening of King Street, the Project Team notes that the Region’s 2012 Ten-Year Transportation Capital Program includes construction of a southbound left-turn lane on King Street at Bridge Street in 2018. Based on a preliminary assessment, construction of this designated left-turn lane on King Street would not require that any property be purchased by the Region from adjacent property owners. The section King Street from Northland Road/Wyman Road to the Highway 85 interchange is identified in the Region’s Transportation Master Plan for potential widening beyond 2031.

Comment No. 7 – Speed Limit Change Requested Outside Project Limits Northeast of University Avenue

Summary of Comments – One comment expressed concern regarding the 80km/h speed limit that currently exists on Northfield Drive from University Avenue northeasterly. The comment suggested that the speed limit should be reduced from University Avenue to the bridge at the Conestogo River and indicated that widening Northfield will only increase speeds approaching University Avenue from the north. The comment also noted that there are residential driveways and horse and buggies crossing the bridge that isn’t safe with speeders.

Project Team Response – Since this section of Northfield Drive is outside of the Study Area, the Project Team consulted with the appropriate Regional Transportation staff to advise them of the resident’s comments and to request that the speed limit on Northfield Drive from University Avenue to the Conestogo Bridge be reviewed. The Region’s Policy is to establish the posted speed limit based on the average travel speed determined from a completed speed survey. Based on a review of a recently completed speed survey for this section of Northfield Drive, Transportation staff advised the Project Team that no changes to the existing speeds limits are recommended at this time.
APPENDIX G - RECOMMENDED DESIGN ALTERNATIVE

NORTHFIELD DRIVE - KING STREET TO DAVENPORT ROAD

NORTHFIELD DRIVE - DAVENPORT ROAD TO UNIVERSITY AVENUE

IMPLEMENTATION OF BICYCLE BOXES AND BICYCLE LEFT-TURN LANES TO BE CONSIDERED AT DETAILED DESIGN.
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REGION OF WATERLOO
TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
Design and Construction

TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: November 6, 2012
FILE CODE: C04-30, 8797

SUBJECT: KITCHENER WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT PHASE 3 UPGRADES - ENGINEERING CONSULTING SERVICES FOR DETAILED DESIGN AND SERVICES DURING CONSTRUCTION

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an Engineering Agreement with AECOM Canada Ltd. to undertake detailed design and services during construction of Phase 3 upgrades to the Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant at an upset fee limit $24,782,850 plus applicable taxes.

SUMMARY:

In order to accelerate project schedules for the delivery of key wastewater capital projects, Council approved a process in 2008 whereby the Region would initially award consulting assignments for the preliminary design of key wastewater projects and later extend these assignments with the same consultant to include the provision of consulting services during the detailed design and construction administration phases (Report E-08-010). The extensions would be subject to satisfactory completion of the preliminary design assignment, review of the extension proposal and upset fees by staff, successful fee negotiations, a detailed review of the proposal and upset fees by an independent consultant, and Council approval of the extension.

Based on a competitive consultant selection process, the Region retained AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) in June 2010 to complete the Class Environmental Assessment (EA) and preliminary design for Phase 3 of the Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Upgrades. The Class EA and preliminary design are complete and Region staff has been satisfied with AECOM’s performance to date. In June 2012, Council directed staff (Report E-12-059) to enter into negotiations with AECOM for the extension of their existing assignment to include detailed design and services during construction of Phase 3 upgrades to the Kitchener WWTP.

Staff has completed these negotiations and also retained an independent consulting engineer to conduct a third-party evaluation of AECOM’s proposal and upset fee. Staff and the independent consulting engineer have concluded that the proposal and upset fee meets all the Region’s requirements, that it is appropriate for the scope of this project and that the negotiated upset fee is fair, competitive and provides both good service and financial value to the Region. The upset fee ($24,782,850) has been validated by comparing to industry benchmarks and is at the low end of the consulting fee budget range ($23.7 to $29 million) as presented most recently to Council in Report E-12-059.

A Steering Committee that included Regional Councillors Jim Wideman and Jean Haalboom met to review the proposal and upset fee from AECOM and received a copy of the third party peer review report. The Steering Committee members offered recommendations that were incorporated into the final proposal and final upset fee.
Based on AECOM’s satisfactory performance during the preliminary design stage and based on the review of AECOM’s proposal and upset fee by staff, the third party peer reviewer and the Steering Committee, staff recommends that AECOM be awarded this assignment for a total upset fee of $24,782,850 plus applicable taxes.

The construction costs for this project excluding engineering fees are estimated to be $194,555,000. Subject to Council’s approval of this consultant assignment, it is anticipated that the detailed design will commence immediately to allow the first of three construction tenders in 2014 in order to honour the Region’s commitment to the public and to Government Agencies to improve effluent quality to the Grand River by 2018.

REPORT:

Background

The 2007 Wastewater Treatment Master Plan Update (WWTMP) recommended major upgrades to the Kitchener WWTP and the work was planned in three phases, as follows:

- **Phase 1**: Manitou Drive Dewatering Facility – completed in February 2012;
- **Phase 2**: Upgrades to Plant 2 aeration, new UV disinfection and effluent pumping station (currently under construction, to be completed in 2013);
- **Phase 3a**: Decommissioning of biosolids storage lagoons (design complete, construction scheduled for 2013); and
- **Phase 3b**: Construction of new Plant 3 and associated upgrades (scheduled for 2014 to 2018).

The first two phases were completed as Schedule A projects under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process and included several public information centres. The Phase 3 upgrades are being completed as a Schedule B project under the Municipal Class EA and included public information centres in November 2011 and June 2012. In August 2012, Council received the Class EA recommendations and authorized staff to issue the Notice of Completion and commence the 30-day public review period (Report E12-054). The 30-day public review period was completed and no comments were received. Therefore, EA approval of the design and construction of the Phase 3 Upgrades is now received.

The Class EA and preliminary design of the Phase 3 upgrades are now complete and the Region must award an engineering assignment to complete the detailed design and services during construction for Phase 3 in order to honour the Region’s commitment to the public and to Government Agencies to improve effluent quality to the Grand River by 2018.

Consultant Selection Process

In 2008, the Region completed a project delivery review to optimize the implementation of this project and other large wastewater projects (Report E-08-010). In order to accelerate project schedules and to increase the efficiency for the delivery of key wastewater capital projects, Council approved a process whereby the Region would initially award consulting assignments for the preliminary design of key wastewater projects and later extend these assignments with the same consultant to include the provision of consulting services during the detailed design and construction administration phases. The extensions would be subject to satisfactory completion of the preliminary design assignment, review of the extension proposal and upset fees by staff, successful fee negotiations, a detailed review of the proposal and upset fees by an independent Consultant, and Council approval of the extension. The Kitchener WWTP Upgrades is the largest of these key wastewater projects from the WWTMP.
Based on the Council-approved approach for consultant selection for the Kitchener WWTP Upgrades (Report E-08-010), the Region initiated a competitive engineering consultant selection process for Phase 3 engineering services in February 2010. AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) had the highest overall score and lowest total estimated cost for the assignment and in June 2010, Council awarded the preliminary design phase of the assignment to AECOM at an upset fee limit of $2,098,275 (plus applicable taxes) (Report E-10-071).

Region staff has been satisfied with AECOM’s performance in completing the Class EA and preliminary design for the Phase 3 Upgrades, and in June 2012, Council directed staff (Report E-12-059) to enter into negotiations with AECOM for the extension of their existing assignment to include detailed design and services during construction of Phase 3 upgrades to the Kitchener WWTP.

The advantages of extending the current assignment with AECOM include time and cost savings and increased engineering efficiency by maintaining one source of responsibility throughout the design and construction phases of the project. Extension of the current assignment could save the Region up to one year in time and associated cost savings, as compared to engaging in a new procurement process and potentially selecting a new consultant. This time and cost savings are essential in order to honour the Region’s commitment to the public and to Government Agencies to improve effluent quality to the Grand River by 2018.

Negotiation Process

The Region’s negotiating team was comprised of representatives from Design and Construction, Water Services, Procurement and Supply Services, Finance and Legal Services. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was developed to govern the negotiations by establishing the goals, objectives, and conduct for the negotiations. Staff and AECOM met on three occasions from August to September 2012 to negotiate an appropriate scope of work and upset fee for detailed design and services during construction for the Phase 3 Upgrades.

During the course of the negotiations, the Region’s working group reviewed and clarified various components of the AECOM detailed work plan and upset fee proposal. AECOM provided justification for their proposal which included a detailed work plan, qualifications and commitment of their technical project team, project schedule and upset fee. The Region’s working group compared this proposal against benchmarks of similar detailed design and contract administration projects completed within the Region.

The Region also engaged the services of Arcadis, an independent consulting engineer, to provide a third party peer review of AECOM’s proposal and upset fee from the perspective of value for the Region of Waterloo. Arcadis was the engineering consultant that completed the Value Engineering Study for the Kitchener WWTP Phase 3 Upgrades in June 2012, and was fully familiar with this project. As part of its review, the third party peer reviewer compared several benchmarks for engineering detailed design and contract administration costs for wastewater treatment projects in other municipalities. The third party reviewer attended the negotiation meetings and confirmed that AECOM’s work plan was comprehensive covering all aspects of the engineering services required to implement the Phase 3 Upgrades at the Kitchener WWTP. Arcadis also verified that the proposed upset fee provides value to the Region in the areas of environmental protection, financial efficiency and meeting the Region’s commitments. Arcadis was satisfied with the negotiation process and recommends that the Region extend AECOM’s current assignment to include detailed design and services during construction for the Phase 3 Upgrades. Arcadis’ recommendation letter is attached as Appendix A.

A Steering Committee that included Regional Councillors Jim Wideman and Jean Haalboom met to review the proposal and upset fee from AECOM and received a copy of the third party
peer review report. The Steering Committee members offered recommendations that were incorporated into the final proposal and final upset fee.

The upset fee for the extension of services has been validated by comparing it to industry benchmarks and is at the low end of the consulting fee budget range described for this project in Report E-12-59 ($23.7 to 29 million). The negotiated upset fee is $24,782,850 (plus applicable taxes) and represents approximately 12.7% of the total construction cost, which is considered competitive for a project of this magnitude and complexity. Based on the careful scrutiny of the detailed work plan, schedules, and upset fees provided, including review by the Steering Committee, staff and Arcadis concluded that AECOM’s fee is fair, competitive and provides both good service and financial value to the Region.

**Scope of Work**

Based on the preliminary design and the Region’s commitment to improve the effluent quality to the Grand River by 2018, the Phase 3 project was initially divided into five construction contracts; however, during the negotiations, some of the five contracts were combined to reduce the number to three contracts. Staff, AECOM and the third-party peer reviewer all agreed that this reduction to three contracts provides the best balance of timely delivery to meet the Region’s schedule commitment while ensuring an adequate pool of available contractors, allowing adequate time for required environmental studies and approvals, minimizing risks of delay and maximizing engineering and construction efficiency.

The scope of work for this engineering assignment will include detailed design and services during construction for each of the three Phase 3 Upgrades Construction Contracts as follows:

- New Energy Centre and Digestion Upgrades Contract;
- New Headworks and New Secondary Treatment Contract; and
- New Tertiary Treatment and Outfall Contract.

The contracts are sequenced to ensure that new facilities, such as the new Energy Centre, which are required for the subsequent contracts, are completed as early as possible. With this approach, construction can commence more quickly for the first contract while detailed design work and approvals are still ongoing for the subsequent contracts. The Tertiary Treatment and Outfall contract is scheduled as the third construction contract in part because additional studies are included in the scope of this engineering assignment and will be required in order to finalize the design. These studies will include pilot studies of the proposed new disk filters and aquatic and terrestrial studies within the Grand River for the construction of the new Outfall including consultation with the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA), Department of Fisheries Ontario (DFO), and Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR). The construction costs for all three contracts are estimated to be $194,555,000, excluding the cost of engineering fees.

The scope of engineering services for each of the construction contracts will include the development of the detailed design (60%, 90%, 100% design stages), preparation of provincial and municipal regulatory applications for all approvals and permits; community newsletters; tendering and constructability reviews; pre-selection of major equipment; pre-qualification of general contractors and SCADA integrators; co-ordination of supporting studies including aquatic and terrestrial environment, geotechnical, and tertiary treatment pilot studies; subsurface utility locates; preparation of electrical power system studies; participation in Value Engineering workshops; preparation of tender documents; tender administration; provision of contract administration and construction inspection services; attendance and preparation of Factory and Site Acceptance Tests; provision of pre-start health and safety reviews; development of custom Operations and Maintenance manuals and training sessions; and post-construction services including asset management data reports, record drawings and warranty administration. A list of consultant responsibilities including a breakdown of their upset fee is included in Appendix B attached to this report.
**Recommendation**

Based on the Council direction to negotiate with AECOM (Report E-12-059) and the thorough review of AECOM’s work plan and upset fees by both staff and an independent consultant staff recommends that AECOM be awarded this assignment for a total upset fee of $24,782,850 plus applicable taxes.

**Schedule**

Subject to Council’s approval of this consultant assignment, it is anticipated that the detailed design will commence immediately to allow the first of three construction tenders in 2014 in order to honour the Region’s commitment to the public and to Government Agencies to improve effluent quality to the Grand River by 2018.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

The Kitchener WWTP Upgrades supports the Corporate Strategic Plan Focus Areas 1 and 2: Environmental Sustainability and Growth Management and Prosperity, respectively; and the following strategic objectives: protect the quality and quantity of our water sources, and develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The Council-approved 2012 10-year Wastewater Capital Program includes a budget of $325,555,000 between 2012 and 2020 for upgrading the Kitchener WWTP. Approximately $23.5 million remains allocated for completing the Plant 2 upgrades and approximately $19.8 million has been allocated for the construction costs of decommissioning of the biosolids storage lagoons and upgrading of the biosolids pumping system. A portion of the remaining budget will be used for the consultant fees recommended in this report ($24,782,850) and construction ($194,555,000) of the Kitchener WWTP Phase 3 Upgrades. The remaining $63 million will be used for other upgrades to be completed after 2018. A future consultant selection process will be required for the consulting services required to implement these remaining upgrades at the Kitchener WWTP. The upset fee of $24,782,850 million for the Phase 3 detailed design and services during construction is at the low end of the consulting fee budget range ($23.7 to $29 million) as presented most recently to Council in Report E-12-059 and within the allowance for consultant services in the current project budget.

**OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:**

Staff from Finance, Procurement and Supply Services and Legal Services participated in the negotiations with AECOM.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Appendix A: Arcadis Recommendation Letter
Appendix B: Breakdown of Consultant’s Upset Fee

**PREPARED BY:** Jo-Anne Ing, Senior Project Manager, Design and Construction

**APPROVED BY:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation & Environmental Services
APPENDIX A
ARCADIS RECOMMENDATION LETTER
Mr. José Bicudo, PhD, PE  
Senior Project Engineer  
Region of Waterloo  
150 Frederick Street, 7th Floor  
Kitchener, Ontario N2G 4J3  
Canada  

Subject:  
Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant Phase 3 Upgrades  
Value Engineering Services Proposal  
Task 2 – AECOM Work Plan Review  
Summary of Findings and Recommendations  

Dear Mr. Bicudo:  

As part of ARCADIS’s Value Engineering Services Proposal for the Region of Waterloo, we have completed Task 2, AECOM Work Plan Review. The purpose of this review is to verify that AECOM’s Work Plan is inclusive of the types of engineering services necessary to assist the Region through the design and implementation of the Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Upgrades project. In addition, the review verified that the fees for these engineering services are reasonable and within the amounts that are normal and customary for the scope of services to be provided.  

AECOM’s Work Plan was initially submitted to the Region on July 31, 2012. ARCADIS subsequently reviewed the Work Plan and submitted a draft memorandum on August 24th, 2012, which summarized the results of the review. A meeting with AECOM, ARCADIS, and the Region was held on August 30th, 2012 to discuss the results of the review and to clarify several key items regarding the Work Plan. AECOM subsequently provided written responses to the key items identified during the meeting (September 14, 2012).  

The methodology used to analyze AECOM’s Work Plan and fees is based on a top down approach. At a high level, the engineering fees were evaluated as a percentage of the probable construction cost and were compared to cost curves published by the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) as well as ARCADIS experience on similar projects. At a lower level, the engineering fees for individual scope items were evaluated based ARCADIS’s experience with similar types of work.  

Imagine the result
For the evaluation of individual scope items, AECOM's fees were compared to several benchmarks developed by ARCADIS based on experience with similar types of services for other clients. These benchmarks included items such as design dollars per sheet, design hours per sheet, fee's as a percent of construction costs, and hours per month for post construction services. Based on Arcadis' review of AECOM's proposal, the design, construction and post construction fees are within typical benchmark ranges for this type of project and are reasonable for the scope of services.

As part of the Work Plan review meeting held on August 30th, 2012, the feasibility of combining the originally proposed five construction contracts into three larger construction contracts was discussed as a potential cost savings measure. Based on AECOM's subsequent review and response regarding this issue, it was determined that combining contracts was feasible. The following is a summary of the proposed contract consolidation:

- Contracts C2A, Energy Center/C2B, Digestion
- Contracts C3A, Headworks/Contract C4 Secondary Treatment
- Contract 3B Tertiary Treatment and Outfall

The benefit of combining the five contracts into three large contracts includes the following:
- Reduces engineering and construction related costs
- Eliminates two tender processes
- Reduces the overall construction period
- Reduces potential delays claims between individual Contractors
- Reduces the number of contractors to manage/coordinate on site

The major disadvantages associated with combining contracts include the potential to limit the number of Contractors that could bid the work and potential cash flow issues for the Region. However, based on AECOM's review, the impacts to the number of potential bidders and the Regions cash flow were determined to be minimal.

Since the advantages to consolidating contracts outweigh the disadvantages, it is recommended that the Region consider consolidation of the originally proposed five contracts to three contracts.
Based on our review of AECOM's Work Plan and fees, we believe the plan is comprehensive covering all aspects of the engineering services required to implement the Phase 3 Upgrades at the Kitchener WWTP. We also believe that the hours budgeted and the fees for the major tasks are reasonable for the engineering services for this consulting assignment and provide both good service and financial value to the Region. As a result, we recommend that the Region accept AECOM's proposal for engineering services on the Phase 3 Upgrades Project.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please let us know.

Sincerely,

Joseph N. Jacobs
Principal Engineer

抄送：
Jo-Anne Ing, Senior Project Manager
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task - Description</th>
<th>Total Upset Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1 - Detailed Design:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Energy Centre and Digestion upgrade Contract</td>
<td>$3,041,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Headworks, Plant 3 and 4 Secondary Treatment and Plant 2 RAS/WAS upgrade Contract</td>
<td>$5,117,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Tertiary Treatment and Outfall</td>
<td>$2,828,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2 - Provincial and Municipal Approvals and Permits/Community Newsletters</td>
<td>$412,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3 - Preselection &amp; Prequalification</td>
<td>$338,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4 - Studies (incl. Aquatic/Terrestrial, Geotechnical, Concrete Testing, Structural Steel Inspections, Subsurface Utility Locates)</td>
<td>$588,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5 - Construction Administration:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Energy Centre and Digestion upgrade Contract</td>
<td>$3,395,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Headworks, Plant 3 and 4 Secondary Treatment and Plant 2 RAS/WAS upgrade Contract</td>
<td>$5,386,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Tertiary Treatment and Outfall</td>
<td>$2,744,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6 - Factory/Site Acceptance Tests, Pre-Start Health &amp; Safety Reviews</td>
<td>$724,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7 - Post Construction</td>
<td>$205,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Consultant Upset Fee (plus applicable taxes)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,782,850</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: November 6, 2012  FILE CODE: C04-30, 04024

SUBJECT: CONSULTANT SELECTION – DETAILED DESIGN AND SERVICES DURING CONSTRUCTION FOR THE MANNHEIM RESIDUALS MANAGEMENT PLANT UPGRADES, CITY OF KITCHENER

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an Agreement for Professional Consulting Services with Associated Engineering Ltd., to provide engineering services during the detailed design and services during construction for the Mannheim Residuals Management Plant Upgrade in the City of Kitchener, at an upset fee limit of $689,783 plus applicable taxes.

SUMMARY:

The Mannheim Residuals Management Plant (RMP) is located on the site of the Mannheim Water Treatment Plant (Mannheim WTP), in the City of Kitchener, and treats all Mannheim WTP process water. The purpose of the proposed Mannheim RMP upgrades is to implement a long-term solution to managing process water from the Mannheim WTP by treating and recycling process water back to the plant for full treatment. This approach will make more efficient use of the Region’s surface water resources. This capital project will not increase the rated capacity of the treatment process, and is proceeding as a Schedule “A+” project under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA).

A preliminary design for the upgrades has been completed. In order to meet a scheduled 2013 construction start date for the proposed upgrades, a multi-disciplinary engineering consultant must be retained now to undertake the detailed design and construction administration for this upgrade. A consultant selection process was carried out in accordance with the Region of Waterloo’s Purchasing By-law 04-093 for the procurement of goods and services and included price as a factor. When considering all Quality, Equity, and Price Factors, the submission from Associated Engineering Ltd. scored the highest and staff recommends that Associated Engineering Ltd. be retained to undertake this assignment at an Upset Fee of $689,783.

Subject to Council approval of this consultant assignment, it is anticipated that final design will be completed in 2013 and construction will be completed in 2014. The approved capital budget in the 2012 Ten Year Water Capital Forecast for this project is $7,074,000.

REPORT:

1. Background

The Mannheim Water Treatment Plant (Mannheim WTP) treats water from the Grand River for the supply of drinking water to the Tri City system (Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo) and the Towns
of Elmira and St. Jacobs, Township of Woolwich. As part of the water treatment process at the plant, process water is generated from the settling and filtering processes at the plant and this water is then directed to the Residuals Management Plant (RMP) for treatment.

After treatment of the process water through the RMP, the water is then diverted to an on-site outdoor pond for evaporation and infiltration. Solids removed through the RMP are dewatered through a filter press and the resulting dewatered cake is trucked to the Waterloo Landfill for disposal. The discharge of process water to the outdoor pond is not sustainable because the outdoor holding pond is reaching its capacity. The purpose of this project is to implement a long-term solution to managing process water from the Mannheim WTP.

In 2009 the Region initiated a Preliminary Design to develop a long term solution for managing process water from the RMP. The recommended solution resulting from the Preliminary Design work is to upgrade the RMP to provide improved treatment of process water, which would allow treated process water to be recycled back to the head of the Mannheim WTP for full treatment. This approach will make more efficient use of the Region’s surface water resources. The upgrade will include replacement of the existing gravity settling process and installation of a new ultraviolet disinfection system on the process water recycle stream.

2. Consultant Selection

In order to meet a scheduled 2013 construction start date for the proposed upgrades, a multi-disciplinary engineering consultant must be retained now to undertake the detailed design and construction administration for this upgrade. On August 10, 2012, the Region of Waterloo placed advertisements on its website and in The Record and Daily Commercial News inviting submissions from consultants for detailed design and services during construction for the Mannheim Residuals Management Plant Upgrade. Three proponents submitted a Letter of Interest. Each Letter of Interest was reviewed by the consultant selection team consisting of: Phil Bauer, Head Environmental Engineering (Design and Construction Division); Jorge Cavalcante, Manager Engineer & Planning, (Water Services Division); Tim Walton, Acting Manager, Water Operations and Maintenance, (Water Services Division); and Chad Melitzer, Project Manager Environmental Engineering (Design and Construction Division). The consultant selection process was carried out in accordance with the Region of Waterloo’s Purchasing By-law 04-093 for the procurement of goods and services, and included price as a factor. The evaluation criteria were subdivided into Quality, Equity, and Price factors as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality factors</th>
<th>25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Approach and Understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of the Project Manager</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of the Project Support Staff</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience on Similar Projects</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equity Factors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Workload for Region</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Office</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price Factor</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upset Price</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All three proponents were short-listed and were invited to submit a Proposal including a detailed Workplan and Upset Fee. All three short-listed proponents submitted proposals. One proposal was non-compliant with the submission requirements and was disqualified prior to opening the Upset Fee Envelopes because contrary to the terms of reference for the consulting assignment price information was included with the detailed Workplan. The Upset Fee Envelopes from the following two short-listed consultants were then opened and evaluated:

- Associated Engineering; and
- R.V. Anderson

When considering all Quality, Equity, and Price Factors, the submission from Associated Engineering scored higher overall (including the higher quality score and the lower upset fee), and therefore, staff recommends that Associated Engineering Ltd. be awarded this assignment for an Upset Fee of $689,783.

3. **Scope of Work**

For this assignment, the Consultant will provide professional consulting services during the detailed design, tender, construction, and post-construction phases of the capital project. The consultant shall provide all required services for a design and construction project of this scope including: prepare issued-for-tender, issued-for-construction, and record versions of the Contract Drawings and Contract Specifications for one general construction contract. The consultant shall also provide services related to pre-selection of equipment, construction cost estimates and cash flow projections, approvals and permits, third-party materials testing and quality control, health and safety reviews, site inspection, equipment acceptance tests, commissioning of new works, a custom operation and maintenance manual, custom training sessions and administration of equipment warranties.

Appendix A provides a breakdown of the Consultant’s upset fee.

4. **Schedule**

Subject to Council’s approval of this assignment for professional consulting services, detailed design will commence in late 2012 to allow for equipment pre-purchases and a general contract tender in 2013. Construction will commence during 2013 with the upgrades being completed and commissioned in 2014. Post-construction services will be provided during 2015.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

This project meets the Region’s Corporate Strategic Plan objective to “develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs” under Focus Area 2 “Growth Management and Prosperity”.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The Region’s 2012 Ten Year Water Capital Forecast provides a total budget of $7,074,000 for this project. The consultant’s Upset Fee of $689,783 is within the budget allowance for engineering work and represents approximately 10% of the project cost estimate. The Upset Fee is considered competitive for a capital project with this magnitude, complexity and specific project requirements.

**OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:**

NIL
ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A – Breakdown of Consultant’s Upset Fee

PREPARED BY: Chad Melitzer, Project Manager, Environmental Engineering

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
APPENDIX A

MANNHEIM RESIDUALS MANAGEMENT PLANT UPGRADE

BREAKDOWN OF CONSULTANT’S UPSET FEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detailed Design Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1.1 - Project Management / Quality Control</td>
<td>$71,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1.2 - Documentation Review</td>
<td>$6,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1.3 - Coordinate Third-Party Quality Control Consultants</td>
<td>$10,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1.4 - Specialized Equipment Procurement</td>
<td>$7,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1.5 - Permits and Approvals</td>
<td>$4,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1.6 - Engineering and Design</td>
<td>$178,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tender Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2.1 - Tender</td>
<td>$8,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3.1 - Project Management</td>
<td>$31,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3.2 - Contract Administration</td>
<td>$83,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3.3 - Construction Technical Support</td>
<td>$18,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3.4 - Construction Inspection Services</td>
<td>$207,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3.5 - Commissioning, Health and Safety &amp; Training</td>
<td>$31,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Construction Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4.1 - General Post-Construction Services &amp; Inspection</td>
<td>$21,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4.2 - Warranty and Performance Verification Services</td>
<td>$9,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Upset Fee (plus applicable taxes)</strong></td>
<td>$689,783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
DATE: November 6, 2012 FILE CODE: E07-80
SUBJECT: PROJECT OUTLINE – WATER EFFICIENCY MASTER PLAN UPDATE

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Region of Waterloo appoint four members, Jim Wideman, Les Armstrong, Lou Lima and Jim Robinson, of the Water Efficiency Advisory Committee to the Water Efficiency Master Plan (WEMP) Steering Committee to assist with the Water Efficiency Master Plan Update, as detailed in report E-12-105.1;

AND THAT the Region of Waterloo invites each of the local municipalities to send a staff member to participate in a Water Efficiency Master Plan Update Stakeholder Committee that will meet approximately two times to review water efficiency program options.

SUMMARY: Nil

REPORT:

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo has implemented water efficiency programs since 1974. The Region’s first “Water Efficiency Master Plan” (WEMP) was approved in 1998, followed by the current Master Plan update, which was approved in 2006. The current WEMP, covering the period 2007 – 2015, has set a cumulative water savings target of 8,146 m³ per day or 1.8 million gallons per day (MGD) by the year 2015. This target focuses on additional water savings to be achieved, and does not take into account water savings achieved through programs delivered prior to 2007.

The Water Efficiency Section, Water Services Division, delivers a variety of programs under the following WEMP categories:

- Public Education and Marketing
- Outdoor Water Use Reduction
- Efficient Toilet Replacements
- Commercial, Industrial and Institutional (CII) Efficiencies
- Municipal Leak Reduction
- Research and Development.

As detailed in Planning and Works Report E-12-031.1, the water demand trends have been declining for the past five years. This combined with WEMP initiatives in the residential, commercial, industrial and institutional sectors have achieved savings exceeding 42 per cent of target. From 2007 to 2011, these programs achieved cumulative water savings of 8,504 m³ per
day, which is enough water to supply the drinking water needs of 11,339 households. The WEMP target for this time period was 5,988 m$^3$ per day. An estimated average of 795 m$^3$ per day is also saved through the Region’s Outdoor Water Use Reduction Program.

The WEMP update is considered necessary to support water supply requirements as outlined in the Water Supply Master Plan (WSMP). The WSMP demand projections include the effect that water efficiency programs will have on demands in the future.

As mandated under Regional Council’s Strategic Plan, the next steps are to complete an update to the WEMP by 2014 and implement programs as of 2015. The purpose of this report is to provide a project outline for the WEMP update and to solicit appointments to a steering committee.

**WEMP Update Goals**

The main goals for the WEMP update are as follows:

1. To continue to measure program achievements.
2. To update water efficiency goals and targets.
3. To develop a sustainable water efficiency program from 2015 to 2025 supporting the Water Services Master Plan.
4. To achieve requirements of Ministry of Environment legislation and the Grand River Conservation Authority.

The Master Plan Working Group will be comprised of staff from Water Services and representatives from Community Planning.

**WEAC Steering Committee**

It is recommended that WEAC appoint two Councillors and two citizen members to participate in a Steering Committee that would meet as needed to engage in an in-depth review of project results and comment on direction.

**WEMP Update Stakeholder Committee**

It is recommended that a WEMP Stakeholder Committee, consisting of the Water Efficiency Advisory Committee plus one qualified staff appointee from each of the local municipalities, be formed. It is anticipated that the Stakeholder Committee would meet on one to two occasions to review water efficiency program options and comment on future directions.

**Public Consultation**

Public input on the draft Water Efficiency Master Plan will be solicited through three Public Information Centres and through social media and internet-based measures.

**Project Timeline**

The WEMP Update project will begin with a consultant selection process in the fall of 2012. The bulk of the research and preliminary work on the project will be completed during 2013 and 2014.
Following public feedback and draft plan revisions, it is anticipated the WEMP Update will be approved by Council in 2014. Program implementation will begin in 2015.

Consultant Selection

The next step is to initiate a request for proposals from consultants to undertake the WEMP Update. Attachment ‘A’ provides a list of deliverables required for the project.

Water Efficiency Advisory Committee Endorsement, October 18, 2012

The Water Efficiency Advisory Committee reviewed the WEMP Update project, as detailed in E-12-105, and made comments and suggestions regarding its scope during a meeting held October 18, 2012. Following discussion, WEAC passed a motion to endorse the recommendations, and appointed Jim Wideman, Les Armstrong, Lou Lima and Jim Robinson to participate on the WEMP update project Steering Committee. There was also discussion and clarification that the stakeholder committee would be comprised of the Water Efficiency Advisory Committee and representatives from the local municipalities.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Implementation of the Water Efficiency Master Plan relates to the Strategic Objective 1.4, to “Protect the quality and the quantity of our drinking water sources.” Action 1.4.3 states the Region of Waterloo should “Update and continue to implement the Water Efficiency Master Plan.”

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The estimated cost of the Water Efficiency Master Plan Update project is $300,000. Funding for this project will come from Regional Development Charges.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE: Nil

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A – 2012 – 2015 Water Efficiency Master Plan Update: Consultant Deliverables

PREPARED BY: Steve Gombos, Manager, Water Efficiency, Water Services

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
ATTACHMENT A

2012 – 2015 Water Efficiency Master Plan Update: Consultant Deliverables

1. Background Report:
   - Water Efficiency Program progress and impacts to date
   - Region water balance and consumption analysis
   - Future needs/requirements
   - WEMP Update Project Scope.

2. Commercial, Industrial, Institutional Status Report
   - Survey and/or focus groups to measure conservation opportunities.

3. Residential Survey Report
   - Results from representative sample telephone survey and 3 focus groups
   - Measure awareness, attitudes, receptiveness and communication preferences
   - Recommend future approaches to communicating with target audiences.

   - Research best practices and program options
   - Estimate potential program costs
   - Establish evaluation criteria
   - Evaluate options and recommend short list program options.

5. Facilitate Stakeholder Committee Plenary Session
   - Facilitate 1-2 stakeholder meetings to review and provide input on short list program options.

6. Draft Water Efficiency Master Plan Update Report
   - Incorporate information, conclusions and comments to date
   - Recommend program elements, goals, targets, timing and expenditures.

7. Attend and Support 3 Public Information Centres

8. Final Water Efficiency Master Plan Report
   - Incorporate all comments for final approval.
What are the Study Objectives?

- Undertake a Wastewater Servicing Master Plan for Ayr, completing Phases 1 and 2 of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA)
- Analyze performance of the existing wastewater collection system in Ayr to identify servicing opportunities and constraints.
- Develop short and long term wastewater servicing strategies for the Village of Ayr taking into account sustainability for long term growth and financial responsibility.
Study Area

Characteristics:

- Includes Built-Up Area and Designated Greenfield Area, including lands between the Township Urban Area and the Countryside Line

- Estimated existing residential population of 4,255 people
Existing Wastewater System

- Consists of:
  - 24,000m of sanitary sewers ranging in diameter from 250mm to 750mm.
  - Rose Street and Nith River Way Pumping Stations
  - Ayr WWTP
Existing Wastewater System

- Existing Wastewater Collection System
  - Has adequate capacity to convey existing flows.
- Nith River Way Pumping Station
  - Small station with a firm capacity of 6 L/s.
- Rose Street Pumping Station
  - Pumps all flows to the Ayr WWTP and has a firm capacity of 93 L/s.
- Ayr WWTP
  - Has an average flow capacity of 3,000 m³/d and a peak flow capacity of 8,100 m³/d.
All growth to the year 2031 is to occur within the Township Urban Area Boundary.
Development of draft approved, registered, and unbuilt units with building permits is estimated to result in population growth of 464 units or 1,427 persons.

Growth in Built-Up Area of 385 persons.

Residential growth in Designated Growth Areas estimated to be 4,051 persons.

Employment growth in Designated Growth Areas estimated to be 1,618 employees.
Beyond 2031

- Long-term Growth may occur in lands located between Township Urban Area Boundary designation and the Countryside Line.
## Growth Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Development of All Draft Approved, Registered and Unbuilt Units</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>Mature State of Ayr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Residential Population</td>
<td>4,255</td>
<td>5,682</td>
<td>8,691</td>
<td>12,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Employment Population</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>3,471</td>
<td>3,969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

1. Future Populations on the Lands Between the Township Urban Area Designation and the Countryside Line (as shown on Map 7 of the Regional Official Plan) are based on the capacity of the lands.
A series of capacity assessments were completed to identify servicing opportunities and constraints within the existing Ayr wastewater collection system.

Key findings:

- One section of the Stanley Street sanitary sewer does not have adequate full flow capacity to convey peak flows with development of draft approved, registered and unbuilt lots. All other components of the wastewater system do have adequate capacity.
- This section can convey peak flows with surcharge in the pipe.
Opportunities and Constraints (Cont’d)

Key findings (2031 conditions):

- 8 sections of the Swan Street Sanitary Sewer and the one section of the Stanley Street sanitary sewer do not have adequate capacity to convey peak flows. The section on Stanley Street can convey peak flows under surcharge conditions.
- The Rose Street Pumping Station does have not adequate firm capacity to pump 2031 estimated peak flows.
- The Ayr WWTP does have not adequate average flow and peak flow capacity to treat 2031 estimated flows.
# Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative No. 1 – Do Nothing</td>
<td>Planned development in Ayr would proceed with no upgrades to existing wastewater system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative No. 2 – Capacity Improvements in the Existing Wastewater System</td>
<td>Improvements to the Swan Street sanitary sewer and Stanley Street Sanitary sewer to convey peak flow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative No. 3 – Construct New Pumping Station and Forcemain to Service New Development Areas</td>
<td>Construct new pumping station in Southeast Residential Growth area to service area, construct new forcemain to discharge directly to Ayr WWTP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternative 2
Capacity Improvements in Existing Systems to Service New Development Areas

- New twin sewers on Swan Street and on Stanley Street
- New local pumping station
- New forcemain to Swan Street
- Upgrade of Rose Street Pumping Station.
Alternative 3
Construct New Pumping Station and Forcemain to Service New Development Areas

- New local pumping station
- New forcemain along existing roadways to Ayr WWTP
## Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Environment</th>
<th>Economic Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Water Resources</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Terrestrial Resources</td>
<td>Need for Property Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on Groundwater Resources</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Environment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Technical Environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on Adjacent Land Owners and Users</td>
<td>System Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts During Construction (noise, dust, odours)</td>
<td>Increased Operating Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on Future Development</td>
<td>Need for Additional Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for Odours</td>
<td>Approval Requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluation of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Alternative 1 – Do Nothing</th>
<th>Alternative 2 – Capacity Improvements in Existing Systems to Service New Development Areas</th>
<th>Alternative 3 – Construct New Pumping Station and Forcemain to Service New Development Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td>Alternative will have significant impacts on natural environment</td>
<td>Good construction practices will mitigate impacts on the natural environment.</td>
<td>Good construction practices will mitigate impacts on the natural environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Environment</td>
<td>Alternative will not provide for servicing of planned development.</td>
<td>Alternative will not flexibility to service growth beyond 2031. Significant construction impacts are anticipated on Stanley Street.</td>
<td>Alternative will have flexibility to service growth beyond 2031.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Environment</td>
<td>No change in system complexity</td>
<td>Alternative will result in increase in system operating requirements.</td>
<td>Alternative will result in increase in system operating requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Environment</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
<td>Capital cost of $1.7M, need for additional property for pumping station</td>
<td>Capital cost of 1.8M, need for additional pumping station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternative 3 – Construct New Pumping Station and Forcemain to Service New Development Areas was selected as the recommended preferred alternative based on the following:

- Alternative 3 does not require construction on Swan Street and Stanley Street where significant construction impacts are anticipated.
- Alternative will provide flexibility for servicing of the lands located between the Township Urban Boundary Area designation and the Countryside Line.
What Happens Next?

- Consider comments received at this PIC
- Complete Master Plan Report
- Notify Public and Agencies of Completion of Master Plan Report
- Issue Notice of Completion and Place Report on Public Record for 30 Day Review
- Respond to comments received from the public and review agencies
The Region is Interested in Your Comments

Contact Information:

**Kevin Dolishny**  
Senior Project Engineer  
Regional Municipality of Waterloo  
Transportation and Environmental Services, Water Services  
150 Frederick Street, 7th Floor  
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3  
519-575-4757  
kdolishny@regionofwaterloo.ca

**Christine Hill**  
Project Manager  
XCG Consultants Ltd.  
2620 Bristol Circle, Suite 300  
Oakville, ON L6H 6M9  
905-829-8880  
christineh@xcg.com
Ayr Wastewater Servicing Master Plan

Thank you for your input and participation
Welcome to the
REGION OF WATERLOO
ERB ST. WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM STUDY
CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

PLEASE SIGN IN!!

Region of Waterloo

Public Information Centre
November 21, 2012
Waterloo Region Emergency Services
Training and Research Complex
The Erb Street Water Supply System is located on Erb’s Road in the Township of Wilmot, between St. Agatha and the City of Waterloo. The system is comprised of four wells which pump to a reservoir prior to distribution.

The system supplies the community of St. Agatha, and about half of the City of Waterloo.

**STUDY TASKS**

The Study included:

- A water supply capacity assessment of the wells (examine need for rehabilitation, additional production or monitoring);
- A water quality assessment to determine whether further treatment would be required;
- A review of the operation of the existing well field and opportunities for optimization.
The project is being planned and implemented according to the Municipal Class EA process (June 2000), amended (2007 and 2011).

The study was initiated as a potential Schedule C Class EA. However, at this time, the preferred alternative solutions are considered Schedule A activities which are pre-approved.
WATER SUPPLY CAPACITY ASSESSMENT

• The historical 5-year average demand from the well field is 130 L/s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Year Constructed</th>
<th>Original Design (L/s)</th>
<th>Current Pumping Capacity (L/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W06A</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W06B</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W07</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W08</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (Annual Average): 245

Study Objective: 170

Permitted Annual Average Flow: 200

Permitted Maximum Day Flow: 344

• The annual average study objective of 170 L/s allows the well field to produce additional water to accommodate future water demands.

• The current installed capacity achieves the study objective of 170 L/s and provides flexibility for operation and maintenance.

• No additional wells are required.

• Modifications are required at Wells W6A/W6B to allow the wells to pump simultaneously (currently only one well can run at a time).
HYDROGEOLOGIC INVESTIGATION

- A hydrogeologic investigation was completed to support the Class EA and to evaluate potential quality concerns of the groundwater source in the area of the well field and at the production wells.

- Groundwater flow lines can be used to help understand the flow and capture of water by the production wells. The general regional groundwater flow direction is from west to east.

- Groundwater quality from the Erb Street Well Field is of excellent quality and meets all health related Ontario Drinking Water Standards.
• A water quality assessment was completed for all of the wells and for the blended water leaving the Erb Street Reservoir.

• The water met the Ontario Drinking Water Standards (as set by the Ministry of the Environment). Treated water leaving the reservoir to distribution was consistently below the iron and manganese aesthetic objectives.

• Aesthetic Objectives are established for parameters which are not health related but may impair taste or colour of the water.

• Iron and manganese may cause staining of fixtures at elevated concentrations.
A disinfectant residual is mandatory for drinking water as it enters the distribution system.

Discoloured water results from metals, such as iron and manganese, oxidizing and forming a precipitate (solids).

Chloramine appears to minimize discoloured water events.

This can be explained by the fact that chloramine does not oxidize iron and manganese as easily as free chlorine.

Discolouration is not evident in source water concentrations.

Discoloured water episodes have been associated with settled particulate being re-suspended in the distribution system.

Watermains are planned to be flushed in 2013 by the City of Waterloo to remove settled particulate.
REDUCING IRON AND MANGANESE OXIDATION

Supply Wells

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W06A</th>
<th>New Injection Location</th>
<th>Chloramination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W06B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Chlorine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Original Injection Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W07</th>
<th>Free Chlorine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W08</td>
<td>Free Chlorine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reservoir

30 to 40 hours of contact time

Distribution

- Chloramine does not oxidize metals as easily as free chlorine.
- Relocating the chloramination point to the reservoir inlet reduces iron and manganese oxidation by reducing the water’s contact time with free chlorine.
- The injection point has now been relocated and the reservoir cells have been cleaned.
Future Considerations

- Filtration treatment should be considered if the Region returns to using free chlorine in the distribution system.

Next Steps

- The recommended projects are all Schedule ‘A’ and are pre-approved under the Municipal Class EA process.
- Questions or comments can be provided to the Region’s Project Manager until December 3, 2012.

Ms. Pam Law, P.Eng.
Project Manager, Water Services
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 7th Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
Tel: 519-575-4095
Fax: 519-575-4452
Email: plaw@regionofwaterloo.ca
MEMORANDUM

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
From: Shiva Tiwari, Transportation Planning Engineer
Subject: King & Victoria Multimodal Hub Environmental Assessment Progress
File No: D10-20(A)

This memorandum is intended to provide a progress update of Environmental Assessment of the King & Victoria Multimodal Hub transportation elements. This memorandum is for information only.

Environmental Assessment (EA) of the proposed transportation elements of the Hub site is currently underway to satisfy the requirements of the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act. Together with the Rapid Transit – Transit Project Assessment approved by the Ministry of Environment in May 2012, and the forthcoming Official Plan / Zoning Bylaw Amendment applications to the City of Kitchener, successful completion of this EA assignment will conclude the process of obtaining regulatory approvals for all the constructed works concepts being envisioned within and contiguous to the Hub site.

Key progress milestones and public interface points as part of the applicable EA process are as follows.

**Milestones already achieved**

- Courtesy public notification through the Multimodal Hub open house on September 20, 2012.
- Public notifications as the statutory first point of contact through:
  - Advertisements in the Waterloo Region Record on September 25 and October 2, 2012; and
  - Region of Waterloo website.
- Appropriate liaisons established with the stakeholder agencies including government agencies, utilities, railways, bus and taxi companies, and community groups.

**Upcoming milestones**

- Statutory Public Consultation Centre (PCC) to be held on November 20, 2012 at the Regional Headquarters Building from 4:00 – 7:00 pm.
- Development of the subject opportunity definition and alternatives per the EA process requirements.
- Stakeholder outreach to solicit feedback and endorsement; design adjustments to mitigate impacts and resolve issues, if any.
- Preparation of the Project File and Notice of Study Completion followed by mandatory 30 day public review (targeted for mid January to mid February 2013).
- Filing of completion of the overall Hub EA Study Report with the Ministry of Environment (targeted for end of February 2013).

This EA process is expected to conclude in the spring of 2013.

Copies of the display materials for the Public Consultation Centre on November 20, 2012 will be provided to members of Regional Council prior to this meeting.
To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

From: Chris Gosselin, Manager of Environmental Planning
David Roewade, Sustainability Planner

Subject: Region of Waterloo Community Environmental Fund - Call for Proposals

File No: D03-80/CEF, D06-80

The Community Environmental Fund was established in 2011 by Regional Council as an integrated funding program for environmental projects. It combined the Environmental Stewardship Fund initiated in 2010 and the newer Community Sustainability Fund (See Report CR-FM-11-022/ P-11-085, dated October 25, 2011). The fund consists of two grant streams, stewardship and sustainability.

Staff is now planning to issue a new call for proposals for 2013 projects. A proposal call will be made in November 2012, and will be publicized in area newspapers, the Regional website and other forms (e.g. posters, email and social media). The deadline for applications will be January 18, 2013. As project funding is subject to Council approval (and available funding), final recommendations by staff on the proposals received will be contained in a detailed report early in 2013. Approximately $185,000 remains available from budget allocations made by Regional Council in previous years.

The Community Environmental Fund has been a well subscribed Regional program in past years. To date, for every Regional dollar funded, over $2 has been matched by other community contributions. For further information, please do not hesitate to contact Chris Gosselin at 519-575-4501, or David Roewade at 519-575-4757 x 3308.
RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Class Environmental Assessment for Manitou Drive Widening, Bleams Road to Fairway Road, in the City of Kitchener:

a) Approve the improvements to Manitou Drive from Fairway Road to Bleams Road in the City of Kitchener including a roundabout at the intersection of Manitou Drive and Bleams Road and replacement of the bridge at Schneider Creek, all as presented as Recommended Design Concept 1 in Report E-12-1086 dated September 11, 2012; and

b) Direct staff to file the Notice of Completion for this Class Environmental Assessment by means of advertisements in the local newspapers and mailings to the adjacent property owners, tenants, and agencies and place the Environmental Study Report on the public record for a period of 30 days.

SUMMARY:

NIL

REPORT:

1.0 BACKGROUND:

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo is undertaking a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) study for the widening of Manitou Drive from Fairway Road / Courtland Avenue to Bleams Road in the City of Kitchener. The Class EA study is being guided by a team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo, City of Kitchener, Grand River Conservation Authority, Regional Councillor Jean Haalboom and City of Kitchener Councillor John Gazzola. A plan of the Study Area is presented in Appendix “A”.

On September 11, 2012, staff presented the Project Team’s Recommended Design Concept for this project to the Region’s Planning and Works Committee as per Report E-12-086 (attached to this report in Appendix “B”). The Project Team’s Recommended Design Concept includes one lane in each direction on Manitou Drive with road widening to provide a centre two-way left-turn lane from 100 metres south of Fairway Road to the Schneider Creek Bridge and on-road cycling lanes and sidewalks. The Recommended Design Concept also includes a two-lane roundabout at the Bleams Road intersection and a raised median on Manitou Drive at Webster Road to restrict left turns and to provide pedestrian refuge at that location. On September 11, 2012, the Region’s Planning and Works Committee deferred a decision on this project to allow staff to report back to the Committee with more detailed rationale to support:
1. Widening Manitou Drive to three lanes instead of four lanes; and
2. Restricting left turns at Webster Road.

2.0 THREE LANES VERSUS FOUR LANES ON MAINTOU DRIVE:

Currently, motorists using Manitou Drive during peak periods are experiencing long delays. In addition, there have been higher than expected numbers of collisions along this stretch of Manitou Drive. In reviewing the traffic analysis for this project, the Project Team strived to understand the causes of those problems and to develop practical measures to address them. It was very clear to the Project Team that the main cause of congestion on Manitou Drive is the low capacity of the Bleams Road intersection. During peak periods queues develop for south bound traffic that extend over the Schneider Creek Bridge and past the bend in the road near Cress Lane. The Project Team concluded that it is the capacity of the Bleams Road intersection and not the number of lanes in the mid-block locations that is controlling the capacity of this corridor. This conclusion is supported by traffic engineering theory that in general, the capacity of an arterial corridor with closely spaced high-volume intersections, such as Manitou Drive, is controlled by the capacity of the intersections and not the capacity of the mid-block sections. A good example to illustrate this “theory” is the recently reconstructed Bridge/Lancaster intersection where prior to installation of the roundabout, the motorists on all the roads were experiencing long delays with north bound queues extending hundreds of metres over the Grand River Bridge. After the installation of the roundabout, with no changes to the number of lanes on the approach roads, the queues and delays have vanished.

The only exception to this theory is when the mid-block sections of a corridor experience “friction” due to the high number of left turns from the through lanes. This “friction” can significantly reduce the capacity of the road corridor. There are a 18 closely-spaced driveways along a 600m length of Manitou Drive that produce this “friction” on this corridor. Currently, whenever a vehicle stops to make a left turn, it essentially blocks the through lane. This results in queuing and rear-end collisions. The Project Team clearly understood this left-turn “friction” to be a significant factor on this project, and strived to reduce this “friction” by restricting movements to some driveways where possible and restricting left turns where possible. The addition of a centre two-way left-turn lane would provide a location for motorists to turn left without blocking the through lane, thus maximizing the capacity of the two through lanes.

The proposed roundabout at Bleams Road includes two lanes northbound but requires one of these lanes to be dropped after the roundabout to develop the three-lane cross-section on Manitou Drive. Staff had some concerns that the merge condition would discourage drivers from using both lanes fully on the approach to the roundabout, resulting in excessive queuing on the south side of the intersection. This condition is occurring now at some of the locations on Ira Needles Boulevard where the second entry lanes are not being fully utilized by motorists due to short tapers to drop the lanes after exiting the roundabouts. Staff reviewed the Bleams Road roundabout design and extended the second lane significantly north of the intersection. This second lane extends approximately 100 metres north of the roundabout. This lane extension has been implemented at some of the Region’s newer roundabouts, such as the one at Fountain/Dickie Settlement, and has proven to be effective in ensuring drivers more fully use both lanes on approaches to roundabouts. The transportation study completed as part of this Class EA concluded that the three-lane concept, as recommended will operate well for the forecasted traffic volumes for 2031 and beyond.

The Project Team also considered a second design concept (Alternative Design Concept 2) which is exactly the same as the Recommended Design Concept at the Fairway Road and Bleams Road intersections except that it includes four through lanes without a centre two-way left-turn lane in the mid-block section from the Schneider's Creek Bridge to 100 metres south of the Fairway Road intersection. Again, the capacity of Design Concept 2 would be largely controlled by the capacity of the intersections at the project limits, similar to the Recommended Design Concept. In addition, the mid-block capacity of Design Concept 2, without a two-way left-turn lane, would not be higher than three lanes because whenever a vehicle stops to turn left it blocks one of the through lanes, effectively reducing the road to a two lane road. In fact, there are times when the four lane road
would operate worse than the three lane road as the left-turn “friction” created by vehicles stopping in the through lanes will result in reduced capacity and more rear-end and sideswipe collisions. The Project Team also notes that the three-lane road would provide a significantly better pedestrian and cycling environment than the four lane road because of the reduced pavement width that reduces pedestrian crossing distances and encourages lower vehicle operating speeds.

Implementation of a four-lane road at the existing CP Rail bridge would require two 30 to 40 metre long pedestrian tunnels “jacked” under the rail embankments as there would not be sufficient room under the existing bridge for sidewalks. The tunnels would be similar to the pedestrian tunnels under Westmount Road north of Highland Road in Kitchener and under the CP Rail Bridge on Blair Road in Cambridge. These tunnels are not “inviting” to pedestrians as they are dark and constrictive. Although functional, the Project Team has concerns about how the public would perceive the “friendliness” of these tunnels.

The Project Team and the public who attended the Public Consultation Centres had significant concerns about the property impacts that would be associated with the four lane road. The additional widening required for four lanes would result in significantly higher property acquisition costs and significant adverse impacts to driveways and parking for some of the businesses operating on Manitou Drive. In particular, the four-lane widening would make it impossible to maintain the existing intersection with Cress lane. To maintain the access to Manitou Drive, the four-lane alternative would require Cress Lane and Connor Street to be re-aligned to connect to Webster Road, resulting in the complete “buyout” and demolition of the residential property at 28 Manitou Drive. Please refer to the plan in Appendix “C” illustrating this impact. Earlier this year and again on October 16, 2012, the Region received email messages from Joyce and Gerald Diebold, the owners of 28 Manitou Drive who expressed their concern that a 4-lane road widening would force them out of their home and asked that their request be presented to the Committee with this report. Copies of their messages are in Appendix “D”.

Lastly, the Project Team has assessed that the four-lane alternative would cost significantly more than the three-lane alternative. Report E-12-086 included a cost premium of $2.4 million for the four-lane alternative. Staff recently conducted a review of the cost estimate and discovered that the cost of constructing the pedestrian tunnels at the CP Rail Bridge had inadvertently not been included in the earlier cost estimate for the four-lane alternative. The revised cost premium to construct the four-lane alternative is now estimated to be $5.4 million including additional road construction, property acquisition and needed pedestrian tunnels.

In light of the adverse capacity and safety concerns inherent with implementing a full four-lane road as per Alternative Design Concept 2, and after due consideration of the significant negative impacts associated with the widening for a four-lane road, including the demolition of 28 Manitou Drive and an additional $5.4 million in implementation costs, the Project Team concluded the best solution for this project is the three-lane road as per the Recommended Design Concept.

3.0 RESTRICTION OF LEFT TURNS AT WEBSTER ROAD:

The history of collisions at the intersection of Webster Road and Manitou Drive shows that for a 5 year period from 2007 to 2011, a total of 13 collisions were reported whereas a total of 6 collisions would be expected at this intersection. Of those totals, 3 injury collisions were reported whereas 2 would be expected. Of the 13 reported collisions, a total of 7 involved westbound left-turning motorists. These collisions are a type that would be preventable with effective restriction of westbound left-turns.

Given the existing adverse collision history at this intersection and given that the proposed 2015 improvements are designed to last 50 years before full reconstruction is again needed, the Project Team concluded that good engineering practice dictates that the current safety problem be addressed as part of this Class EA. The Project Team also concluded that the collision history will likely worsen over time even with the proposed road improvements unless there is some restriction of left turns at this location. Growth in traffic using Manitou Drive will result in fewer acceptable gaps
for motorists wishing to turn left out from Webster Road. In addition, the proposed roundabout would also result in fewer large gaps in northbound traffic because roundabouts do not tend to create “platoons” of traffic as traffic signals do. The fewer number of acceptable gaps will likely cause some motorists to take greater “chances” when pulling out of Webster Road, possibly resulting in an increase in collisions.

During the course of this Class EA, the Project Team considered two alternatives for addressing the collisions at Webster Road:

1. Raised median island on Manitou Drive preventing all “left-ins” and “left-outs”; and
2. Partial prohibition of left turns using a “No Left Turn” sign on Webster Road (No left-turn from Webster Road onto Manitou Drive during peak hours).

With both of these alternatives, the Project Team believes that the installation of a pedestrian refuge island is critical at this location in order to provide a safe and effective mid-block crossing to the bus stops on both sides of Manitou Drive at Webster Road.

The Project Team fully considered the benefits and disbenefits of each alternative. While the left-turn prohibition using a sign would address the “left-out” collision problem to a degree, the Project Team concluded:

- There would still be some left-turn collisions at this location due to some motorists’ non-compliance with the left-turn prohibition. The Region’s past experience has shown that compliance with left-turn prohibition signs is less than 100%.
- In addition, left-turn movements at two commercial entrances opposite the Webster Road intersection cause conflicts which would be eliminated by the median but would not be eliminated by a “no-left-turn” sign on Webster Road at Manitou Drive.
- As illustrated in Appendix “E”, pedestrians crossing Manitou Drive near the bus stops would suffer from poor visibility of motorists turning left from Webster Road.

The Project Team also considered the degree of inconvenience that some motorists would experience as a result of the raised median. For motorists travelling south on Manitou Drive wishing to turn left onto Webster Road, the raised median island would require them to continue south to the roundabout at Bleams Road, make a U-turn and drive north to Webster Road, a trip that would add only one minute to the travel time. For westbound motorists wishing to turn left out from Webster Road, the raised median island would mean an alternate route using Wilson Avenue and Wabanaki Drive, a trip that would add approximately two to three minutes to the travel time. Building and connecting the River Road Extension at Manitou Drive would reduce this alternative route to one to two minutes in duration. Both of the alternate routes are illustrated in Appendix “F”. The Project Team believes these increased travel times are acceptable when weighed against the significant vehicular and pedestrian safety improvements that are provided by the raised median island at this location.

In conclusion, the Project Team is recommending the restriction of all left turns through the use of a raised median island, which would eliminate all left-turn collisions at the Webster Road intersection and would be the safest measure with respect to the pedestrian crossing at this location.

### 4.0 PROJECT TEAM RECOMMENDATION:

The Project Team is recommending that Regional Council endorse Alternative Design Concept 1 (Three-lane road) as the Recommended Design Concept for this project, as described in Report E-12-086. The three-lane road is being recommended because the resulting corridor would operate similar to the four-lane corridor from a traffic capacity perspective, better from a safety point-of-view, and would create a much better environment for pedestrians and cyclists. In addition, the three-lane corridor avoids significant costs and adverse property impacts associated with the four-lane corridor.
As part of the Recommended Design Concept, the Project Team is also recommending the implementation of a raised median at Webster Road, restricting all left turns, to reduce existing and potential future left-turn collisions at that location.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The Manitou Drive Improvements between Bleams Road and Fairway Road /Courtland Avenue, when complete will support Focus Area 2 – Growth Management and Prosperity by optimizing infrastructure to meet current and projected needs and Focus Area 3 – Sustainable Transportation by optimizing existing road capacity to safely manage traffic.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The capital cost of the road improvements under Recommended Design Concept 1 is estimated to be in range of $8.5 million to $9.0 million to be funded from the Region Development Charges and Roads Capital Levy Reserve funds.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Nil

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix “A” – Key Plan
Appendix “B” – Report E-12-086
Appendix “C” – Impacts of 4 Lane Widening on 28 Manitou Drive
Appendix “D” – Email Correspondence from the Owners of 28 Manitou Drive, Kitchener
Appendix “E” – Potential Conflicts Between Pedestrians and Left-turning Vehicles at Webster Road
Appendix “F” – Alternative Routes Due to Proposed Left-turn Restrictions

PREPARED BY:  Wayne Cheater, Senior Project Manager

APPROVED BY:  Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner Transportation and Environmental Services
APPENDIX B

REGION OF WATERLOO
TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
Design and Construction

TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
DATE: September 11, 2012
FILE CODE: T04-20, 5340
SUBJECT: CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, RECOMMENDED DESIGN CONCEPT FOR MANITOU DRIVE WIDENING, BLEAMS ROAD TO FAIRWAY ROAD, CITY OF KITCHENER

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Class Environmental Assessment for Manitou Drive Widening, Bleams Road to Fairway Road, in the City of Kitchener:

c) Approve the improvements to Manitou Drive from Fairway Road to Bleams Road in the City of Kitchener including a roundabout at the intersection of Manitou Drive and Bleams Road and replacement of the bridge at Schneider Creek, as presented as Recommended Design Concept 1 in Report E-12-086, dated September 11, 2012; and

d) Direct staff to file the Notice of Completion for this Class Environmental Assessment by means of advertisements in the local newspapers and mailings to the adjacent property owners, tenants, and agencies and place the Environmental Study Report on the public record for a period of 30 days.

SUMMARY:

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo is undertaking a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) study for the widening of Manitou Drive from Fairway Road and Courtland Avenue to Bleams Road in the City of Kitchener. The Class EA study is being guided by a team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo, City of Kitchener, Grand River Conservation Authority, Regional Councillor Jean Haalboom and City of Kitchener Councillor John Gazzola. A plan of the Study Area is presented in Appendix "A".

Currently, Manitou Drive is 4 lanes wide from Fairway Road to Webster Road and 2 lanes wide from Webster Road to Bleams Road. Sections of Manitou Drive between Bleams Road and Fairway Road are currently experiencing higher than expected numbers of collisions and are also experiencing high levels of traffic congestion during times of peak traffic demand. The congestion is caused primarily by capacity deficiencies at the Bleams Road and Fairway Road intersections. In addition, the capacity of the existing road is reduced by “friction” from numerous left turns at various locations along Manitou Drive. The existing Schneider Creek bridge structure is of concern both for the narrow width limiting traffic capacity and for the age and potential deterioration of the structure.

The Project Team, after reviewing various high-level planning-solutions to address the congestion and collision problems, developed two Alternative Design Concepts:

- Design Concept 1 – widen Manitou Drive to 3 lanes including a centre two-way left-turn lane,
- Design Concept 2 – widen Manitou Drive to 4 lanes.
There has been extensive public consultation on this project, including two Public Consultation Centres, a presentation to the Regional Active Transportation Advisory Committee and meetings with several affected property owners. Based on the public feedback received and a thorough review of all technical information, the Project Team is recommending Council approve Design Concept 1 (3 lanes) for implementation. Recommended Design Concept 1 includes:

- four lanes from Fairway Road to 100 metres south of Fairway Road
- two lanes with a centre two-way left-turn lane from 100 metres south of Fairway Road to the Schneider Creek bridge
- two lanes in each direction from Schneider Creek to Bleams Road
- replacement of the existing bridge at Schneider Creek with additional width for sidewalks, cycling lanes, and a centre two-way left turn lane and sufficient length and height for a pedestrian/cycling trail crossing beneath the bridge
- two-lane roundabout at Manitou Drive/Bleams Road
- signalized intersection improvements at Manitou Drive/ Fairway Road /Courtland Avenue
- on-road cycling lanes and sidewalks on both sides of the road from Fairway Road to Bleams Road
- construction of a median at the Manitou drive/Webster Road intersection to provide a pedestrian refuge and prohibition of left-turns at that intersection

Recommended Design Concept 1 is estimated to cost $8.5 - $9 million and is scheduled for construction in 2015 as per the Region’s Ten Year Capital Transportation Plan.

REPORT:

1. Background

1.1 Existing and Future Conditions

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo is undertaking a Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) study for improvements to Manitou Drive from Fairway Road to Bleams Road in the City of Kitchener. A plan of the Study Area is presented in Appendix “A”.

Manitou Drive from Fairway Road to Bleams Road is a well travelled road in the City of Kitchener serving a mix of commercial and industrial land-uses. Currently, this section of Manitou Drive is a 4 lane curbed roadway from Fairway Road to Webster Road and a 2 lane roadway without curbs from Webster Road to Bleams Road. There are no sidewalks or cycling facilities on this section of Manitou Drive (excepting a short section of sidewalk on the west side for a limited distance immediately south of Fairway Road). A singe line CP Rail Overpass crosses the four lane section of Manitou Drive south of Fairway Road.

The historic German Mills settlement is located in the area of Manitou Drive from Bleams Road northerly to Cress Lane and Connor Street. A 2-lane bridge on Manitou Drive crosses Schneider Creek within this area. A City of Kitchener trail follows the north bank of Schneider creek on the east side of Manitou Drive with no current connection to other pedestrian trail or sidewalks in the area. In addition, the Region’s Parkway Well Field and Water Reservoir are located beside Manitou Drive on the north bank of Schneider Creek.

The 1999 and 2010 Waterloo Region Transportation Master Plans (RTMP’s) both identified the need to widen Manitou Drive between Bleams Road and Fairway Road in order to reduce traffic congestion and accommodate future projected traffic demand. In addition, annual structural assessments of the Schneider Creek Bridge on Manitou Drive north of Bleams Road are indicating a need to reconstruct the bridge. The existing Schneider Creek bridge structure is of concern both for the narrow width limiting traffic capacity and for the age and potential deterioration of the structure.
An updated traffic study for Manitou Drive completed in 2012 confirms that sections of Manitou Drive between Bleams Road and Fairway Road are currently experiencing higher than expected numbers of collisions and are also experiencing high levels of traffic congestion during times of peak traffic demand. These existing conditions are expected to worsen as traffic increases in the future. The factors which contribute to both the congestion and collision concerns include:

- Vehicles turning at numerous high volume driveway entrances in close proximity to each other and to intersections (between Schneider Creek bridge and Webster Road)
- Poor vertical and horizontal alignment (north side of Schneider Creek bridge)
- Low capacity of the intersection at Bleams Road

Existing and future traffic operations are summarized in Appendix “B”.

1.2 Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

The Manitou Drive Improvements study is being completed in accordance with the Municipal Class EA, October 2000 as amended in 2007 and 2011. The Manitou Drive Class EA is being conducted concurrently with the River Road Extension Class EA, also being completed by the Region of Waterloo. The River Road Extension Class EA is considering the extension of River Road to the west from its terminus at King Street East to the intersection of Bleams Road and Manitou Drive. The results of the River Road Extension Class EA will not be known until after completion of the Manitou Drive Class EA process and as such, analysis of options being considered for the Manitou Drive Class EA include both options for River Road being extended and River Road not being extended.

The Manitou Drive Class EA is being directed by a Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo, City of Kitchener and the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) as well as Regional Councillor Jean Haalboom and City of Kitchener Councillor John Gazzola. The engineering consulting firm of McCormick Rankin has been retained to assist with this Class EA study.

1.3 Problem Statement

The Project Team has developed the following problem statement for the project, identifying the traffic and transportation needs to be addressed as part of this study:

- Road improvements are required in the Manitou Drive corridor to reduce delays, queuing, and collisions for the current traffic conditions, as well as for the expected future traffic growth up to 2031 and beyond;
- The existing bridge over Schneider Creek is in need of replacement;
- There is a need to accommodate cycling, walking and transit use with a high level of service and network connectivity; and
- The extension of the River Road corridor would not alleviate the need for improvements within the Manitou Drive corridor.

1.4 Alternative Solutions and Alternative Design Concepts

Alternative Solutions

The Project Team developed Six Alternative Solutions to address the problems along Manitou Drive. The Project Team found that some of the solutions provided benefit when combined with others, while others were determined not to fully address the problem which has been identified. At the first Public Consultation Centre (PCC), the Project Team presented these Alternative Solutions which are described in more detail in Appendix “C”. The Project Team considered the following
Alternative Solutions:

- ALTERNATIVE 1 - “DO NOTHING”
- ALTERNATIVE 2 - INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS/ROUNDBOOUTS
- ALTERNATIVE 3 - ROAD WIDENING OF MANITOU DRIVE
- ALTERNATIVE 4 - ACCESS MANAGEMENT
- ALTERNATIVE 5 - IMPROVING TRANSIT SERVICE
- ALTERNATIVE 6 - UPGRADE, EXPAND OR BUILD OTHER ROUTES

**Preferred Alternative Solution:** The Project Team identified a combination of Alternative 2 – Intersection Improvements and Alternative 3 – Widening of Manitou Drive as the Preferred Alternative Solution. Improvements to Transit Service as identified in the RTMP and consideration of access management are also carried forward in the Preferred Solution.

The “Do Nothing” solution (Alternative 1) would have little or no negative impact on the natural and cultural environments. The “Do Nothing” solution, however, would not address the transportation problems for vehicles or pedestrians. Therefore, the Project Team rejected the “Do Nothing” solution for this Class EA study. Options to upgrade, expand or build other routes (Alternative 6) have been examined in the 2010 RTMP. Unfortunately these options are not feasible and the Project Team rejected Alternative 6 as a solution for this Class EA study.

**Alternative Design Concepts**

Two Alternative Design Concepts (as illustrated in Appendix “C”) were developed for the Preferred Solution and are described below. Both Alternative Design Concepts consist of combinations of intersection improvements and road widening complete with curbs and storm sewers. In addition, both alternative design concepts include: sidewalks and on-road cycling lanes on both sides of Manitou Drive; a raised concrete median at Webster Road, to prohibit left turns, reduce conflicts, delays and collisions, and to provide a pedestrian crossing refuge; and, replacement of the Schneider Creek bridge with a wider structure to provide additional traffic capacity and a longer structure to accommodate extension of the City of Kitchener’s multi-use trail under Manitou Drive. Other elements of the Alternative Design Concepts were also considered and evaluated by the Project Team, including: alternative intersection types; a continuous centre median; multi-use trails for pedestrians and cyclists; and alternative boulevard widths.

**Alternative Design Concept No. 1 – Widen to Three Lanes Including a Centre Two-Way Left Turn Lane**

This alternative would maintain Manitou Drive as 4 lanes south of Fairway Road, narrowing to 3 lanes (two through lanes with a centre two-way left turn lane) approaching the CPR bridge, continuing south as 3 lanes crossing Schneider Creek and widening to 4 lanes from the bridge to Bleams Road, along with signalized intersection improvements at Fairway Road and a 2-lane roundabout at Bleams Road. This option includes a single westbound left-turn lane from Fairway Road onto Manitou Drive if River Road is extended and dual westbound left-turn lanes if River Road is not extended.

This alternative would improve traffic operations and increase overall capacity of the transportation corridor by removing left turning vehicles from the through lanes and improving intersection capacity with a roundabout at Bleams Road and adding turning lanes at Fairway Road.

**Alternative Design Concept No. 2 – Widen Manitou Drive to Four (4) Lanes**

This alternative would maintain Manitou Drive as 4 lanes south of Fairway Road to Webster Road and widen it from the existing 2-lanes to 4 lanes from Webster Road to Bleams Road, along with signalized intersection improvements at Fairway Road and a 2-lane roundabout at Bleams Road.
Similar to Alternative Design Concept 1 this option includes a single westbound left-turn lane from Fairway Road onto Manitou Drive if River Road is extended and dual westbound left-turn lanes if River Road is not extended.

This alternative would improve traffic operations and increase overall capacity of the transportation corridor by providing two (2) lanes in each direction.

1.5 Issues Common to Both Alternative Design Concepts

CP Rail Bridge and Schneider Creek Bridge

The existing CP Rail Bridge is sufficient in size and structural integrity to meet the service requirements of the railway and the needs of the proposed Manitou Drive improvements. Neither of the two Alternative Design Concepts requires modification of the CP Rail bridge structure.

Both of the Alternative Design Concepts being evaluated require replacement of the existing Schneider Creek Bridge. Rehabilitation is not a viable option because of the deteriorated condition of the existing structure and the additional width and height required for a new structure. The proposed bridge will be widened to accommodate the required vehicle lanes, cycling lanes and sidewalks. An increased span of the bridge will be constructed to provide a sufficient size of opening for the creek to control the Regional flood impact. The proposed bridge will also be designed to provide sufficient height and width on the north bank of Schneider Creek to accommodate a multi-use trail by the City of Kitchener for pedestrians and cyclists to cross beneath the bridge. Preliminary details of the proposed bridge are shown in Appendix “C”.

Roundabouts versus Signalized Intersections

The Project Team considered the use of roundabouts at both existing signalized intersections of Manitou Drive at Fairway Road and at Bleams Road. The value in reduction in expected injury collisions for a roundabout at Fairway Road would be outweighed by the additional cost of the need for a full buyout of a business at the intersection in comparison to the signalized intersection improvement option. A screening tool was prepared which compared the life cycle costs of a roundabout versus a signalized intersection at the intersection of Manitou Drive and Fairway Road. The screening tool determined that a signalized intersection would have substantially lower life cycle costs. Therefore, a roundabout at Fairway Road is not being recommended.

An Intersection Control Study (ICS) was undertaken for the intersection of Manitou Drive and Bleams Road. The ICS compared the implementation costs and expected injury collision costs to determine the total Life Cycle Costs for both the roundabout and signalized intersection configurations. The ICS concluded that the roundabout would have the least Life Cycle Cost. The roundabout would have advantages in terms of speed control, less overall negative environmental impact and is expected to operate with lower peak hour delays for motorists in either a three-leg or four-leg configuration. Pending the outcome of the River Road/Bleams Road Extension Class EA, adding a fourth leg to a roundabout at the Manitou Drive/Bleams Road intersection at a future date would not require any future modifications to the other approaches of the roundabout as currently proposed and would cost much less than expanding a signal control alternative.

After consideration of the forecasted transportation requirements, the life-cycle costs and safety performance for the intersection of Manitou Drive and Bleams Road, the Project Team determined that a roundabout is recommended at this intersection, with or without the River Road Extension.
River Road Extension

For the Manitou Drive Class EA, all of the Alternative Solutions and Design Concepts have been evaluated based on both scenarios of River Road being extended and not being extended from King Street to Manitou Drive. Taking this approach has allowed the Project Team for the Manitou Drive Class EA to identify the Manitou Drive improvements that are needed, with or without River Road Extension.

Replacement and/or Extension of Existing Infrastructure

The Project Team has consulted with City of Kitchener staff; the Region’s Water Services Division and all potentially impacted utility companies to identify any known requirements for replacement, improvement or expansion of infrastructure within the project limits that could be foreseen for the next 30 years. Staff will continue to liaise with the above stakeholders during the detailed design stage for the Manitou Drive improvements to incorporate all necessary works required in conjunction with the planned road improvements. Region staff also met with City of Kitchener staff in response to a request received at PCC No. 1 with respect to clarification of plans for the extension of sanitary sewer services along Manitou Drive from Schneider Creek to Bleams Road. City of Kitchener staff have advised the Project Team that the extension of sanitary services at this location is not being considered as part of this project.

Records show that a 450mm diameter cast iron watermain was installed across Schneider Creek beside the north side of the bridge on Manitou Drive prior to 1961. The watermain is located on the stream bed and is visible beneath the water. The watermain is jointly owned by the City of Kitchener and the Region of Waterloo and is a trunk watermain which also provides service to properties on both sides of Manitou Drive. The proposed Manitou Drive bridge improvements across Schneider Creek will require the watermain to be relocated. Region Water Services staff has advised that the watermain should be entirely replaced rather than relocated due to its age, location and condition. The preferred relocation methodology for the watermain is to realign it across the creek and lower it beneath the stream bed, clear away from the new bridge structure, utilizing trench-less construction technology in order to minimize any disturbance to the existing creek. Relocating and replacement of this section of the watermain will be undertaken in conjunction with the timing of the road improvements.

2. Public Consultation

2.1 First Public Consultation Centre (PCC No. 1) February 2, 2012:

The Project Team hosted a Public Consultation Centre (PCC) on February 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2012 at Conestoga Place, 110 Manitou Drive. At PCC No.1, the Project Team presented the Problem Statement, Alternative Solutions, draft Alternative Design Concepts and Evaluation Criteria for the Manitou Drive Improvements study. A total of 36 guests signed-in at PCC No. 1 and there was strong support received for road improvements at the PCC. Comments received from PCC No. 1 and Project Team responses are summarized in Appendix D. The comments included:

- Recognition/agreement with the problem;
- Support for widening of Manitou Drive;
- Support for improved pedestrian and cycling facilities and trail connection;
- Concerns with impact of road widening on private property use, driveways, grading and access and redevelopment concerns;
- Concern about potential impacts on Schneider Creek, wetlands and the Regional flood plain; and;
- Requests for signals on Manitou Drive at Webster Road and the Wabanaki Drive at Fairway Road intersections.
2.2 Second Public Consultation Centre (PCC No. 2) June 7, 2012:

The Project Team hosted a second PCC on June 7th, 2012 at 110 Manitou drive. At PCC No.2, the Project Team’s evaluation of Alternative Design Concepts and the Project Team’s Preferred Design Alternative, Design Concept No. 1 – Widen to Three Lanes Including a Centre Two-Way Left Turning Lane, were presented to the public along with responses to comments received at the first PCC. A total of 25 guests signed-in at PCC No. 2. Comments received from PCC No. 2 and Project Team responses are summarized in Appendix “D”. The comments included:

- Support for Alternative Design Concept No. 1 including:
  - Trail under Schneider Creek Bridge,
  - Sidewalks and cycling lanes
  - Limited impact on Schneider Creek and on adjacent properties
- Concerns with the impact of road widening on private property use, driveways, grading and access. Region staff and project consultants met with owners of properties at 26, 38 and 50 Manitou Drive in relation to property impacts of the Project Team’s Preferred Design Alternative.
- Concern that a roundabout would be costly and lead to increased collisions
- Concern with the impacts of prohibiting left-turns at the Webster Road intersection

In preparation for and subsequent to the second PCC, Region staff and project consultants met with Grand River Conservation Authority staff regarding the Schneider Creek natural environment and flood plain. It was agreed that all requirements of the GRCA for approval of the work can be met by the detailed design of the Recommended Design Concept 1. The Region of Waterloo Active Transportation Advisory Committee reviewed facilities proposed in the Preferred Design Alternative for pedestrians, cycling and access to public transit and advised that they support the proposed facilities.

3. Evaluation of Alternative Design Concepts

The Project Team found that Alternative Design Concept 1, which includes road widening to 3 lanes (one lane in each direction plus one centre two-way left-turn lane), cycling lanes and sidewalks, satisfied all evaluation criteria better than Alternative Design Concept 2. Differences in the two Alternative Design Concepts are summarized below:

- **Transportation** - The Project Team closely examined the analyses of traffic volume forecasts and the capacity and performance of both the 3-lane and 4-lane alternatives and concluded that both would achieve the same levels of reduction to delays and congestion for traffic during the peak traffic volume periods, but that the 3-lane alternative, Design Concept 1, which features a centre two-way left-turn lane would also:
  - reduce sideswipe collisions; and
  - produce a significantly better pedestrian and cycling environment, with reduced pavement width and somewhat lower driving speeds. Design Concept 1 also provides sufficient width beneath the existing CP Rail Bridge to accommodate sidewalks and avoid the need for pedestrian tunnels under the railway (as required by 4 lane Design Concept 2).
Natural Environment - Alternative Design Concept 1 would have lower negative impacts on drainage to Schneider Creek, adjacent wetlands and existing vegetation adjacent to the road than would Alternative Design Concept 2.

Social Environment - Alternative Design Concept 1 will not require the realignment of Cress Lane and Connor Street to intersect with Webster Road nor the demolition of the house at 28 Manitou Drive, all of which would be necessary as part of Alternative Design Concept 2. Alternative Design Concept 1 will require 1200 square metres of land to be acquired from 8 properties, which is 43% less than the land required for Alternative Design Concept 2 which will require 2100 square metres from 10 properties.

Costs - Alternative Design Concept 1 will have a lower capital cost ($8.5M versus $10.9M) than Alternative Design Concept 2.

Therefore the Project Team has identified Alternative Design Concept 1 as the Recommended Design Concept for this project. A summary of the Project Team’s full evaluation of both Alternative Design Concepts and the evaluation criteria is presented in Appendix “E”.

4. Project Team Recommended Design Concept 1

4.1 Description of the Recommended Design Concept:

The Project Team’s Recommended Design Concept 1, which is illustrated in Appendix “F”, includes: maintaining Manitou Drive as 4 lanes for 100 metres south of Fairway Road and narrowing to 3 lanes (two through lanes with a centre two-way left turn lane) under the CPR bridge, continuing southerly as 3 lanes crossing Schneider Creek and widening to 4 lanes from the bridge to Bleams Road, along with signalized intersection improvements at Fairway Road and a 2-lane roundabout at Bleams Road. This design concept includes a single westbound left-turn lane from Fairway Road onto Manitou Drive and if it is determined in the future that River Road is not being extended, intersection improvements will be required at that time to provide dual westbound left-turn lanes from Fairway Road onto Manitou Drive.

A two-lane roundabout at the intersection of Bleams Road and Manitou Drive would provide efficient traffic operations for the projected future traffic volumes with fewer injury collisions than traffic signals, as well as provide for a low impact conversion for a fourth approach at the roundabout in the event that River Road would be extended from King Street to Manitou Drive in the future.

The full three-lane road cross-section with sidewalks and on-road cycling lanes can cross beneath the CP rail bridge, with a slight reduction in width of sidewalks and the centre turn-lane. The existing bridge across Schneider Creek will be replaced with a new single span structure at an increased height and width to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists both on Manitou Drive and those using the trail under the bridge. The new bridge would also provide hydraulic capacity for the Regional storm. Although the new Schneider Creek bridge will operate as a three lane structure with sidewalk and cycling lanes, it will be designed to accommodate 4 lanes of traffic with sidewalks and cycling lanes without any structural alteration to the bridge should future traffic volumes exceed future projections.

4.2 Benefits of the Recommended Design Concept:

Recommended Design Concept 1 would increase overall capacity of the transportation corridor by removing left turning vehicles from the through lanes and improving intersection capacity. Improved horizontal and vertical road geometry, most notably between Schneider Creek and Webster Road, together with the provision of the centre two-way left-turn lane will lead to an expected reduction in collisions. A median to prohibit left-turns at the Webster Road intersection will reduce conflicts that currently result in delays and collisions. In addition, the median will serve as a pedestrian refuge for crossing Manitou Drive near an existing transit stop at Webster Road.
The Recommended Design Concept will facilitate alternative modes of travel by incorporating the following improvements:

- Continuous sidewalks on both sides of the road throughout the entire project limits;
- Continuous on-road cycling lanes on both sides of the road throughout the entire project limits;
- A multi-use trail for pedestrians and cyclists beneath the bridge at Schneider Creek which will link the City of Kitchener trail currently located on the east side of Manitou Drive along Schneider Creek with proposed sidewalk and on-road cycling lanes on the west side of Manitou Drive and provide for a future westerly extension of the City’s Schneider Creek trail;
- Better access to public transit in coordination with Grand River Transit improvements via the improved cycling and pedestrian facilities; and

The Project Team notes that the proposed sidewalks and on-road cycling lanes on Manitou Drive will comprise the Manitou Drive portion of the proposed Trans Canada Trail from Schneider Creek to Fairway Road.

4.3 Staging and Detours,

Replacement of the bridge that carries Manitou Drive over Schneider Creek is expected to require complete closure of Manitou Drive for approximately eight months. Signage will be placed well in advance of the closure advising of the detour and duration of the closure. In addition, there will be times when the nature and extent of the construction work will require short-term temporary closures of one or more of the side streets.

A detailed construction staging and traffic management plan will be developed during detailed design and will include for identification of all detour routes. Detours using Wabanaki Drive and Wilson Avenue, which are City of Kitchener streets, are supported by engineering staff of the City of Kitchener. Both the Region’s Emergency Medical Services and Kitchener Fire Department have been consulted regarding the possible road closure and detours required for the reconstruction. Alternate emergency response routes are available and no additional concerns have been received.

4.4 Historic “German Mills” area:

While there are not many visible reminders of the German Mills settlement area remaining, the intersection of Connor Street and Cress Lane was centrally located in the settlement area. In recognition of this historic settlement area, Region staff will coordinate interests with City of Kitchener staff to identify opportunities for the City to provide enhanced trail features which could be incorporated in the trail crossing under Manitou Drive to provide historical interpretation of the “German Mills” area.

4.5 Impacts to Schneider Creek and Regional Water Supply Wells:

The proposed improvements on Manitou Drive and reconstruction of the Schneider Creek Bridge have raised concerns about the potential for adverse impacts on Schneider Creek, on two of the Region’s water reservoirs on the east side of Manitou Drive and on production water supply wells and pump station facilities located on the west side of Manitou Drive. In addition, several Region monitoring wells exist in the area adjacent to Manitou Drive. The potential for any of these adverse impacts resulting from the proposed road improvements has been reviewed as part of this Class EA in consultation with the GRCA and Regional Water Services staff. All of these concerns are addressed as follows:

- The design and construction of road and bridge impacts will incorporate the Region’s “Standard Recommendations for work near a Well Field” and “Standard Operating Procedure for Construction in Proximity to a GUDI-EF Well” which will address security of the water supply during construction.
Proposed road drainage improvements will collect storm runoff including de-icing salt for treatment and discharge to an outlet downstream of the water wells, which is an improvement of the existing road drainage.

Existing buried infrastructure for operation of the water wells and reservoirs has been identified and will be protected and if necessary relocated during construction of the road and bridge improvements.

The design of trail facilities and entrances to the water well facilities will ensure that proper maintenance access and protection of these facilities will be provided during and after construction of the road improvements.

All requirements of the GRCA for approval of the work can be met by the detailed design of the Recommended Design Concept 1.

5. Estimated Project Cost

The capital cost for the Recommended Design Concept 1 is estimated to be in the range of $8.5 million to $9.0 million. The final cost will be further refined as part of the detailed design phase and will depend on costs for relocation of utilities and property acquisition.

6. Next Steps

All members of the public who have expressed an interest in this project have been notified directly of the opportunity to comment before a final decision is made for this project.

Subject to Regional Council approval of the Recommended Design Concept, the Environmental Study Report (ESR) documenting the planning and decision process for the project will be completed and a “Notice of Study Completion” will be ‘filed’ in the public record for a 30 day review period. This filing will be advertised by mail-outs and notices in newspapers. During this filing period, anyone concerned that the study did not fully follow the appropriate requirements of the Class EA process or address all of the issues may request that the Minister of Environment order the project to a more detailed environmental assessment, referred to as a Part II Order request. The Minister of Environment must receive such requests in writing, with a copy sent to the Region’s Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services. The Minister will determine if a more detailed environmental assessment is required and the Minister’s decision will be final. If there are no significant unresolved objections following the 30 day review period, the project will be considered approved and proceed to detailed design and construction.

It is anticipated that construction of the improvements will occur in 2015. This schedule is dependent on completion of property acquisitions, co-ordination of utilities and securing necessary approvals. It is anticipated that the relocation of the existing watermain across Schneider Creek will be completed in advance of the road improvements.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The Manitou Drive Improvements between Bleams Road and Fairway Road /Courtland Avenue, when complete will support Focus Area 2 – Growth Management and Prosperity by optimizing infrastructure to meet current and projected needs and Focus Area 3 – Sustainable Transportation by optimizing existing road capacity to safely manage traffic.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The capital cost of the road improvements under Recommended Design Concept 1 is estimated to be in range of $8.5 million and $9.0 million to be funded from the Region Development Charges and Roads Capital Levy Reserve funds. The capital cost of watermain replacement from Schneider Creek to Bleams road is estimated to be in the range of $550,000. to be funded from the Region’s Water and Development Charges Reserve funds.
OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:
Nil

PREPARED BY:  Wayne Cheater, Senior Project Manager

APPROVED BY:  Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner Transportation and Environmental Services
APPENDIX C

IMPACTS OF 4 LANE WIDENING AT 28 MANITOU DRIVE

28 MANITOU DRIVE
FULL 'BUYOUT' 2500 SQ.M = 0.63 ACRES

100 CRESS LANE
114 SQ.M = 0.03 ACRES

28 MANITOU DRIVE
REGIONAL RD 99
FAIRWAY ROAD TO BEANS ROAD
CLASS I ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STUDY
ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 2 - WIDEN TO FOUR LANES

DOCS #1259616 Page 18 of 21
Email Correspondence from the Owners of 28 Manitou Drive, Kitchener

From: joyce diebold -----
Sent: Tuesday, October 16, 2012 10:02 AM
To: Ken Seiling; Wayne Cheater
Subject: FW: Manitou Drive Class Environmental Assessment - 28 Manitou Drive

Mr. Seiling: We are sending you a copy of an e-mail we sent in April to Mr. Cheater, Senior Project Manager of the Manitou widening project when we discovered the fact that our property may be considered for demolition if the four lane road is selected at your Nov. 6 meeting. Please present our request at your Council Meeting and consider going with the Project Teams recommendation of a three land road instead of the four lane. We would be very upset to be forced out of our home, through no fault of our own, at this time of our lives. Gerald and Joyce Diebold

From: joyce diebold -----
To: joyce diebold -----
Subject: RE: Manitou Drive Class Environmental Assessment - 28 Manitou Drive
Date: Wed, 4 Apr 2012 13:27:06 +0000

Dear Mr. Cheater: We are in receipt of your very distressful e-mail about the possibility of a new road way if the four lane project for Manitou is used. The property of 28 Manitou has been in continual family ownership since 1927. I, Joyce, was born in this house over seventy years ago and have lived here ever since, never moving. Gerry has lived here since our marriage 51 years ago and has also become attached to the home. This place has become a tradition with all the descendants of the Cook family over the years. We were very upset to learn we may be forced from our home of so many years. Please consider the upheaval you would be causing when making your plans. Gerry & Joyce Diebold
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting date</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Assigned Department</th>
<th>Anticipated Response Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-Aug-11</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>One year review of Report E-11-085 re: Parking on Bleams Road</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>27-Nov-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Jan-12</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>Update report on proposed Source Protection Policies after GRCA Source Protection Committee public consultation is completed</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Jan-12</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>That staff meet with representatives of the Canadian National Institute for the Blind and the Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee to develop solutions for the visually- and hearing-impaired at all roundabouts and intersections in the Region of Waterloo.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Feb-12</td>
<td>J. Brewer</td>
<td>Report regarding reducing the speed limit from 70 kilometers per hour (70 kms) on Can-Amera Parkway approaching the Roundabout at Conestoga Boulevard.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Mar-12</td>
<td>D. Craig</td>
<td>Report on possible enhancements similar to what is proposed for Weber Street in Kitchener at the railway overpass for the Delta construction in Cambridge.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Mar-12</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Staff to review the operation of the Homer Watson Boulevard/Block Line Road roundabout and report back to Council in 2013.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-May-12</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>Report detailing the rationale for the Injury Crash Cost calculation used by staff in reports for roadway improvements. (E-12-045 page 48 authored by Frank Kosa)</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>27-Nov-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-May-12</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>Staff to review options for signalized vehicle lights and signalized pedestrian crosswalks in Roundabouts in the detailed design report prepared later in 2012 for Franklin Boulevard Improvements.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>29-Jan-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting date</td>
<td>Requestor</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Assigned Department</td>
<td>Anticipated Response Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-May-12</td>
<td>G. Lorentz</td>
<td>Through the Transportation Master Plan exercise, that staff review the feasibility of providing Grand River Transit for community events and festivals.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-May-12</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>That the Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive Improvements project be referred back to staff to look at alternatives which include the following: relocating parking off of Sawmill Road; alternative multi-use trails or alternate cycling infrastructure on Flaxmill Drive; traffic calming and truck diversion for Sawmill Road; minimizing property impacts; and preserving the history and culture of the village.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>11-Dec-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Aug-12</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>Update report on the Regional Airport airline services.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>6-Nov-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Sep-12</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>Staff and the project team to come back to the September 25, 2012 Committee meeting with detailed rationale for 3 and 4 lane configurations and the restriction of left turn maneuvers at Manitou Drive and Webster Road with pedestrian refuge options.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>6-Nov-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Sep-12</td>
<td>S. Strickland</td>
<td>Staff were requested to look into potential improvements at the King Street and University Avenue intersection due to the high pedestrian volumes during the school season and the increase of incidents there.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>Feb-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Sep-12</td>
<td>C. Millar</td>
<td>Staff were requested to look at diverting transport truck traffic off Blair Road.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>Feb-2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>