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150 Frederick Street, Kitchener, Ontario
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   e) E-12-125, Ayr Wastewater Servicing Master Plan: Notice of Completion
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   COMMUNITY PLANNING
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5. TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
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8. NEXT MEETING – January 8, 2013

9. ADJOURN
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Works Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 8, 2013</td>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 29, 2013</td>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning, Housing and Community Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon., January 21, 2013</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Community Building Strategy Open House</td>
<td>Knox Presbyterian Church 50 Erb Street West Waterloo, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue., January 22, 2013</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Community Building Strategy Open House</td>
<td>Lang Tannery 36 Francis Street Kitchener, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., January 24, 2012</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Community Building Strategy Open House</td>
<td>Cambridge City Hall Lobby, 50 Dickson Street Cambridge, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu, January 31, 2013</td>
<td>6:30 P.M. – 9:00 P.M.</td>
<td>East Side Lands Public Information Centre #3</td>
<td>Catholic High School Father-René-de-Galinée 450 Maple Grove Road Cambridge, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and Environmental Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., February 6, 2013</td>
<td>6:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Victoria Street Improvements from Edna Street to Bruce Street, City of Kitchener – Public Input Meeting for Preferred Design Concept</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: December 11, 2012

FILE CODE: CO4-20, 7121

SUBJECT: CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STUDY FISCHER-HALLMAN ROAD IMPROVEMENTS, BLEAMS ROAD TO OTTAWA STREET, CITY OF KITCHENER

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Class Environmental Assessment Study for proposed improvements to Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street in the City of Kitchener:

a) Approve the Recommended Design Alternative for Fischer-Hallman Road as outlined in Report E-12-121;

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;

c) Approve full Region of Waterloo funding for the construction of a 3.0 metre wide multi-use trail on each side of Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street; and,

d) Amend the Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, upon completion of construction of the Recommended Design Alternative to:

   i) Remove from Schedule 24, Reserved Bicycle Lanes Monday to Friday on the east side of Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) from 30 metres south of Ottawa Street (Regional Road 4) to 150 metres south of Ottawa Street (Regional Road 4);

   ii) Remove from Schedule 24, Reserved Bicycle Lanes Anytime on the east side of Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) from 150 metres south of Ottawa Street (Regional Road 4) to Bleams Road (Regional Road 56); and,

   iii) Remove from Schedule 24, Reserved Bicycle Lanes Anytime on the west side of Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) from Ottawa Street (Regional Road 4) to Bleams Road (Regional Road 56).
SUMMARY:

The Region of Waterloo is currently undertaking a Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) Study to consider improvements to Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to immediately south of Ottawa Street in the City of Kitchener. Please refer to Appendix ‘A’ for a Key Plan of the Study Area.

This Class EA Study is being directed by a “Project Team” consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo, the City of Kitchener, Regional Councillor Tom Galloway and City of Kitchener Councillor Kelly Galloway.

A Public Consultation Centre was held on September 20, 2012 to receive public input. Comments received at the Public Consultation Centre are included in Appendix ‘D’ of this report and the Project Team's response to the comments received is included in Appendix ‘F’ of this report. 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 now recommending that Regional Council approve the following improvements for Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street in the City of Kitchener:

- Reconstruct or rehabilitate Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to immediately south of Ottawa Street to address the deteriorated pavement condition;
- Widen Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to immediately south of Ottawa Street to provide for one 3.35 metre wide inside lane and one 3.65 metre wide curb lane in each direction;
- Construct curb and gutter on each side of Fischer-Hallman Road within the Project Limits;
- Construct a new two-lane roundabout at the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Bleams Road designed to accommodate future expansion to three lanes if recommended beyond 2027;
- Install new storm sewers on Fischer-Hallman Road from Rockwood Road to Bleams Road;
- Construct a new 3.0 metre wide multi-use trail on each side of Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street to replace a) the existing on-road cycling lanes on each side of Fischer-Hallman Road from approximately 30 metres south of Ottawa Street to Bleams Road, b) the existing concrete sidewalk on the east side of Fischer-Hallman Road from Rockwood Road to Highbrook Court and c) the existing concrete sidewalk on the west side of Fischer-Hallman Road from Max Becker Drive/Westmount Road to Ottawa Street;
- Construct a pedestrian refuge island on Fischer-Hallman Road to provide connectivity with City of Kitchener trails across Fischer-Hallman Road at the following locations:
  i) Opposite the existing northbound designated left-turn lane at the intersection of Cotton Grass Street and Fischer-Hallman Road; and,
  ii) Approximately 350 metres north of the intersection of Cotton Grass Street and Fischer-Hallman Road.
- Provide increased storage capacity at all existing designated left-turn lanes on Fischer-Hallman Road at Activa Avenue, Cotton Grass Street, Westmount Road/Max Beck Drive and Rockwood Road;

- Provide increased storage capacity for the existing northbound designated right-turn lane on Fischer-Hallman Road at Westmount Road and the existing southbound designated right-turn lane on Fischer-Hallman Road at Activa Avenue;

- Reduce storage capacity for the existing southbound designated right-turn lane on Fischer-Hallman Road at Max Becker Drive from 256 metres to 120 metres of storage as recommended in the Transportation Study;

- Provide a new two-way left-turn lane on Fischer Hallman Road from approximately 110 metres south of Ottawa Street to approximately 190 metres south of Ottawa Street to replace the existing opposing left-turn lanes;

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

- Provide streetlights on each side of Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street; and,

- Provide new boulevard landscaping on Fischer-Hallman Road in conjunction with the road improvements consisting of small trees and shrubs where space permits.

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 a multi-use trail on each side of Fischer-Hallman Road will require that Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, be amended to remove Reserved Lanes for bicycles on each side of Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to approximately 30 metres south of Ottawa Street on each side of Regional Road No. 58 (Fischer-Hallman Road) from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street. Parking is not currently permitted on this section of Fischer-Hallman Road.

The Region’s Draft 2013 10-Year Transportation Capital Program includes funds of $11,875,000 in years 2013 to 2017 inclusive for design and construction of the improvements to Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street, all to be funded from the Development Charges Fund. Construction is currently scheduled to commence in 2016 subject to acquisition of the required property and utility relocations.

Letters advising of the recommendations contained in this Report E-12-121 were mailed to all agencies and those who attended the September 20, 2012 Public Consultation Centre, and hand-delivered to all owners/residents abutting the Fischer-Hallman Road project limits on November 28, 2012.
REPORT:

1.0 Background

The Region of Waterloo is currently undertaking a Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) Study to consider improvements to Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to immediately south of Ottawa Street in the City of Kitchener. Please refer to Appendix ‘A’ for a Key Plan of the Study Area. This Class EA Study has been initiated by the Region to address several needs on Fischer-Hallman Road. The Region’s 2010 Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) identified the need to widen Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street within the five (5) to ten (10) year timeframe in order to provide adequate capacity for forecasted traffic volumes along this corridor. Additionally, there is a need for enhanced pedestrian and cycling facilities on the section of Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street. The existing roadway asphalt on Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street is in fair to poor condition and in need of rehabilitation or replacement. The planning of these 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 Kitchener, Regional Councillor Tom Galloway and City of Kitchener Councillor Kelly Galloway.

Within the Study Area, Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street is under the jurisdiction of the Region of Waterloo. Local intersecting streets under the jurisdiction of the City of Kitchener include Activa Avenue, Cotton Grass Street, Max Becker Drive and Rockwood Road. Properties abutting Fischer-Hallman Road are primarily a mixture of commercial and back-lotted low density residential uses. Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street is currently constructed as a two lane semi-urban road throughout most of the Study Limits. The sections of Fischer-Hallman Road from Ottawa Street to approximately 200 metres south of Ottawa Street and from Westmount Road/Max Becker Drive to Cotton Grass Street currently exist as four (4) lane or five (5) lane urbanized sections. There is an existing 1.5 metre wide sidewalk on the east side of Fischer-Hallman Road from Rockwood Road to Highbrook Court and on the west side of Fischer-Hallman Road from Max Becker Drive to Ottawa Street.

Existing utilities along Fischer-Hallman Road within the study limits include a Regional 600mm diameter watermain, storm and sanitary sewers, overhead hydro poles and two high pressure gas mains. Union Gas is currently completing an environmental assessment to replace its high pressure gas main along Fischer-Hallman Road from approximately 250 metres north of Cotton Grass Street to approximately 300 metres south of Ottawa Street.

Sections of concrete and wood noise walls and landscaped earth berms currently exist on both sides of Fischer-Hallman Road. These noise walls and earth berms were installed by adjacent developers as a requirement of planning approval in order to mitigate traffic noise from Fischer Hallman Road.

The intersection of Ottawa Street and Fischer-Hallman Road is not included within the limits of this Class EA Study. When this Class EA Study was initiated in October 2008, the intersection of Ottawa Street and Fischer-Hallman Road was originally included as part of the Class EA Study in order to assess the need for potential improvements to this intersection to reduce delays for motorists; however, in 2008, the Region was in the process of completing its new 2010 RTMP and the MTO was moving forward with plans for improvements to Highway 7&8.
from Courtland Avenue to Fischer-Hallman Road, including a reconfiguration of the Highway 7&8 and Fischer-Hallman Road interchange. In 2009, staff determined that the Class EA Study for improvements to Fischer Hallman Road from Ottawa Street to Bleams Road, including the intersection of Ottawa Street and Fischer Hallman Road, could not be advanced until the new 2010 RTMP was completed to confirm the widening requirements and the future transit priority needs at the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Ottawa Street, and new traffic patterns resulting from the MTO’s improvements had been established.

In 2011, the Class EA Study was re-initiated as the new RTMP had confirmed the need to widen Fischer Hallman Road from Ottawa Street to Bleams Road within the five (5) to ten (10) year timeframe. New traffic patterns emerging at the intersection of Ottawa Street and Fischer Hallman Road from the MTO’s improvements as well as transit priority needs along Fischer Hallman Road and Ottawa Street will not be known until 2015. Accordingly, the Project Team decided to advance the Class EA Study for improvements to Fischer Hallman Road from immediately south of Ottawa Street to Bleams Road, excluding the intersection of Ottawa Street and Fischer Hallman Road. Once traffic patterns have been established after the MTO has completed the Highway 7&8 improvements in 2015, staff will assess the operations of the signalized intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Ottawa Street to determine if further modifications are required. If modifications are required for the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Ottawa Street, they will be included in the Ten Year Transportation Capital Program for Council’s future deliberations.

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 for this section of Fischer-Hallman Road are summarized in Appendix ‘B’.

The Transportation Study provided the following recommendations to improve roadway capacity and traffic operations on Fischer-Hallman Road within the Study Area:

- Provide two through lanes in each direction on Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street;
- Provide designated left-turn lanes on Fischer-Hallman Road at Activa Avenue, Max Becker Drive/Westmount Road and Rockwood Road;
- Provide a new two-way left-turn lane from approximately 110 metres south of Ottawa Street South to approximately 190 metres south of Ottawa Street in place of the existing opposing left-turn lanes;
- Provide a new two-lane roundabout at the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Bleams Road designed to accommodate future expansion to three lanes if recommended beyond 2027; and,
- Provide pedestrian, cycling facilities and transit stop facilities on Fischer-Hallman Road to encourage alternative modes of transportation.

The Intersection Control Study completed for the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Bleams Road identified that a two-lane roundabout provides an adequate level-of-service at this
intersection to the year 2027. Beyond 2027, the intersection may require an additional southbound entry lane on Fischer-Hallman Road and an additional westbound entry lane on Bleams Road. Accordingly, the Project Team is recommending that the roundabout be initially constructed to accommodate two lanes of traffic, but configured so that an expansion to three (3) lanes can be undertaken quickly and cost effectively in the future.

The implementation of modern roundabouts was also considered by the Project Team to replace the existing traffic control signals on Fischer-Hallman Road at its intersections with Activa Avenue and Westmount Road/MaxBecker Drive. 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 Design Alternatives

Based on all identified needs and objectives for Fischer-Hallman Road, including the recommendations in the Transportation Study, the Region’s Transportation Master Plan, the Region’s Cycling Master Plan, the Region’s Draft Active Transportation Master Plan, the existing condition of the roadway, other relevant Region policies, practices and guidelines, the Project Team developed a series of preliminary design alternatives for improvements to Fischer-Hallman Road. Please refer to Appendix ‘C’ for drawings of all Design Alternatives developed by the Project Team in advance of a Public Consultation Centre. These four (4) Design Alternatives presented at the PCC are described as follows:

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

**Design Alternative 2** - Construct two 3.35 metre wide through lanes in each direction, 1.25 metre wide on-road cycling lanes on each side of the road, a 1.5 metre wide to 2.1 metre wide concrete sidewalk on the west side of Fischer-Hallman Road and a 3.0 metre wide multi-use trail on the east side of Fischer-Hallman Road.

**Design Alternative 3** – Construct two through lanes in each direction comprised of a 3.35 metre wide inside lane and a 3.65 metre wide curb lane and a 3.0 metre wide multi-use trail on each side of Fischer-Hallman Road.

**Design Alternative 4** - Construct two 3.35 metre wide through lanes in each direction, 1.25 metre wide on-road cycling lanes on each side of the road and a 3.0 metre wide multi-use trail on each side of the road.

4.0 September 20, 2012 Public Consultation Centre

A Public Consultation Centre (PCC) was held at John Sweeney Catholic School, 185 Activa Avenue in the City of Kitchener on Thursday, September 20, 2012 from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Plans showing the Project Team’s proposed design alternatives were on display and Project Team representatives were present to answer questions and to receive feedback from members of the public. Approximately thirty (30) members of the public attended the PCC with twenty-five members of public that formally signed in. Nine (9) comment sheets and three (3) emails were received. Please refer to Appendix ‘D’ for a summary of the written comments received.

Prior to the Public Consultation Centre, the Design Alternatives were evaluated by the Project Team according the following criteria:
Transportation: How does the alternative serve the expected vehicular, transit, pedestrian and cycling traffic in terms of corridor capacity, level of service, transportation network and movement of emergency vehicles?

Social Economic Environment: How does the alternative affect the residential and commercial properties abutting the road (driveway access, on-site parking, property impacts, noise, air quality, archaeological, and cultural heritage)?

Natural Environment: How does the alternative affect existing trees, stormwater management, vegetation and wildlife?

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

Please refer to Appendix ‘E’ for the Project Team’s evaluation of the Design Alternatives presented at the Public Consultation Centre on September 20th, 2012.

Based on this preliminary evaluation of the Design Alternatives using the above noted criteria, Design Alternative No. 3 was presented by the Project Team as being preliminarily preferred by the Project Team at this Public Consultation Centre.

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 3 provided the following advantages:

- Design Alternative 3 fully aligns with the Region’s Draft Active Transportation Master Plan; and,

- Construction of a 3.0 metre wide multi-use trail on each side of Fischer-Hallman Road provides enhanced facilities for both recreational and experienced cyclists as well as pedestrians, and provides full connectivity with existing City of Kitchener trails located both east and west of Fischer-Hallman Road.

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

- The majority of comments expressed support for the Project Team’s Preferred Design Alternative No. 3 to construct two through lanes in each direction comprised of a 3.35 metre wide inside lane and a 3.65 metre wide curb lane and a 3.0 metre wide multi-use trail on each side of Fischer-Hallman Road;

- Two comments indicated support for construction of a proposed 3.0 metre wide multi-use trail on each side of Fischer-Hallman from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street;

- Two comments indicated the need for additional noise mitigation measures such as noise barrier walls on Fischer-Hallman Road adjacent to Highbrook Court, Highbrook Crescent and Bush Clover Crescent;

- Five (5) comments were received regarding the proposed roundabout at the intersection of Fischer Hallman Road and Bleams Road. These comments are summarized as follows:
Two (2) comments expressed opposition to the construction of a roundabout at the intersection, suggesting that roundabouts negatively impact traffic flow;

Two comments indicated support for a two-lane roundabout, but not for an ultimate three-lane roundabout at the intersection; and,

One comment expressed support for a roundabout at the intersection and suggested that roundabouts also be constructed at the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Activa Avenue and at the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Westmount Road, as these roundabouts would improve the traffic flow.

One comment indicated opposition to the construction of the proposed raised centre median on Fischer-Hallman Road north of Bleams Road and supported the ‘Do Nothing’ alternative as it would preserve their current access configuration and the property’s barn, garage and trees that are impacted by the road widening.

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

5.0 Recommended Design Alternative for Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street

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 now recommending that Regional Council approve the following improvements for Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to immediately south of Ottawa Street in the City of Kitchener:

- Reconstruct or rehabilitate Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to immediately south of Ottawa Street to address the deteriorated pavement condition;

- Widen Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to immediately south of Ottawa Street to provide for one 3.35 metre wide inside lane and one 3.65 metre wide curb lane in each direction;

- Construct curb and gutter on each side of Fischer-Hallman Road within the Project Limits;

- Provide a new two-lane roundabout at the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Bleams Road designed to accommodate three lanes if recommended beyond 2027;

- Install new storm sewers on Fischer-Hallman Road from Rockwood Road to Bleams Road;

- Construct a new 3.0 metre wide multi-use trail on each side of Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street to replace a) the existing on-road cycling lanes on each side of Fischer-Hallman Road from approximately 30 metres south of Ottawa Street to Bleams Road, b) the existing concrete sidewalk on the east side of Fischer-Hallman Road from Rockwood Road to Highbrook Court and c) the existing concrete sidewalk on the west side of Fischer-Hallman Road from Max Becker Drive/Westmount Road to Ottawa Street;
• Construct a pedestrian refuge island on Fischer-Hallman Road to provide connectivity with City of Kitchener trails across Fischer-Hallman Road at the following locations:
  i) Opposite the existing northbound designated left-turn lane at the intersection of Cotton Grass Street and Fischer-Hallman Road; and,
  ii) Approximately 350 metres north of the intersection of Cotton Grass Street and Fischer-Hallman Road.

• Provide increased storage capacity at all existing designated left-turn lanes on Fischer-Hallman Road at Activa Avenue, Cotton Grass Street, Westmount Road/Max Beck Drive and Rockwood Road;

• Provide increased storage capacity for the existing northbound designated right-turn lane on Fischer-Hallman Road at Westmount Road and the existing southbound designated right-turn lane on Fischer-Hallman Road at Activa Avenue;

• Reduce storage capacity for the existing southbound designated right-turn lane on Fischer-Hallman Road at Max Becker Drive from 256 metres to 120 metres of storage as recommended in the Transportation Study;

• Provide a new two-way left-turn lane on Fischer-Hallman Road from approximately 110 metres south of Ottawa Street to approximately 190 metres south of Ottawa Street to replace the existing opposing left-turn lanes;

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

• Provide streetlights on each side of Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street; and,

• Provide new boulevard landscaping on Fischer-Hallman Road in conjunction with the road improvements consisting of small trees and shrubs where space permits.

Please refer to Appendix ‘C3’ for a drawing of the Project Team’s Recommended Design Alternative for Fischer-Hallman Road. Implementation of the Project Team’s proposed improvements will require that small parcels of property be required from approximately eleven (11) property owners abutting Fischer-Hallman Road. Property is required from ten (10) abutting owners in the vicinity of the proposed roundabout at the intersection of Fischer Hallman Road and Bleams Road and from one property owner at the northeast corner of the intersection of Fischer Hallman Road and Westmount Road.

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 a multi-use trail on each side of Fischer-Hallman Road will require that Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, be amended to remove Reserved Lanes for bicycles on each side of Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to approximately 30 metres south of Ottawa Street on each side of Regional Road No. 58 (Fischer-Hallman Road) from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street. Parking is not currently permitted on this section of Fischer-Hallman Road.
6.0 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 Fischer-Hallman Road to provide two (2) through lanes in each direction from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street including intersection improvements will improve current and future traffic operations along this section of Fischer-Hallman Road;

- Construction of a two-lane roundabout at the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Bleams Road designed to accommodate three lanes if recommended beyond 2027 will improve current and future traffic operations at this intersection;

- Construction of a 3.0 metre wide multi-use trail on each side of Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street will improve facilities for recreational and utilitarian cyclists and pedestrians, improve connectivity with City of Kitchener trails and fully aligns with the Region’s Draft Active Transportation Master Plan and the Region’s Pedestrian Charter;

- Construction of two (2) pedestrian refuge islands on Fischer-Hallman Road will provide connectivity with City of Kitchener trails across Fischer-Hallman Road;

- Enhanced boulevard landscaping will result in a more aesthetically pleasing roadway corridor and improve the streetscape for users of the multi-use trails; and

- The Recommended Design Alternative is the lowest capital cost of the design alternatives (excluding the ‘Do Nothing’ option).

7.0 Deviation from Region’s Current Sidewalks and Multi-Use Trails Policy

The Region’s “Sidewalks and Multi-Use Trails on Regional Roads Policy” (Sidewalk Policy) was endorsed by the Local Municipalities and approved by the Region in 2007. This Sidewalk Policy stipulates that:

- The design, ownership, maintenance and rehabilitation of a multi-use trail on a Regional Road will remain the Local Municipalities responsibility;

- If a sidewalk already exists on a Regional Road and it is proposed to be replaced by a multi-use trail, then the Local Municipality is responsible for the cost to remove the existing sidewalk and to construct the multi-use trail; and

- If a sidewalk does not exist, the Region will apply the cost of constructing a sidewalk towards the cost of a multi-use trail.

In a situation arising where the Local Municipality is not prepared to build and/or maintain a multi-use trail and Regional staff is recommending that a multi-use trail be constructed and maintained at Regional cost, then Regional Council approval of this recommendation is required.

Sidewalk currently exists on approximately half of the section of Fischer-Hallman Road from Ottawa Street to Bleams Road. Therefore, based on the Region’s Sidewalk Policy, the responsibility for the cost of constructing and maintaining multi-use trails on Fischer-Hallman
Road from Ottawa Street to Bleams Road would be shared between the Region and the City of Kitchener as follows:

a) The Region would be responsible for contributing the cost of a concrete sidewalk towards the cost of a multi-use trail where no sidewalk currently exists; and,

b) The City of Kitchener would be responsible for the cost of removing and replacing the existing concrete sidewalk on Fischer-Hallman Road with a multi-use trail where a sidewalk currently exists.

On this project, the Region’s Sidewalk Policy would require the City of Kitchener to pay for approximately half of the cost of the new multi-use trails as there are existing sidewalks on each side of Fischer-Hallman Road for approximately half of the available boulevard area. To date, City of Kitchener staff has stated that the City will not contribute towards the capital cost of constructing the multi-use trails and will not maintain the multi-use trails. Region staff is recommending that the Region construct and pay for the multi-use trails for this project because the multi-use trails would eliminate the need for the Region to construct more expensive on-road cycling facilities. Additionally, the multi-use trails would provide better connectivity with existing City trails that tie into Fischer-Hallman Road.

With respect to the maintenance responsibility for the multi-use trails for this project, Region staff believes that this responsibility properly resides with the City of Kitchener; however, to date City staff does not agree with this assessment. Although discussion of this issue is ongoing, staff notes that the new Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP) will be presented to the Planning & Works Committee in the Spring of 2013. It is the intention of staff that the ATMP will set out recommended roles and responsibilities between the Region and Local Municipalities for the cost of constructing and maintaining sidewalks and multi-use trails on Regional Roads. These recommended roles and responsibilities are likely to differ from those stipulated in the Region’s currently approved Sidewalk Policy.

8.0 Coordination with Transit Priority Project

The Region will be undertaking a separate study in the future to evaluate options to provide priority for transit vehicles (features that allow transit vehicles to have priority over other vehicles at intersections) along Fischer Hallman Road. Staff anticipates that transit priority needs for Fischer Hallman Road will be identified by 2015. Any transit priority features identified for Fischer Hallman Road as part of the Transit Priority Study will be incorporated as part of the improvements for construction in 2016. If transit priority features are identified that require additional utility relocations or property acquisition, staff will review the impacts to the schedule and to adjacent property owners to determine if construction can be staged for completion in different years or if construction of the improvements should be deferred to reduce the number of disruptions to adjacent properties.

9.0 Project Cost

The estimated total project cost associated with the proposed Fischer-Hallman Road improvements, including engineering, construction, utility relocations, property acquisition and other project costs is $11,875,000.
10.0 Project Timing

Construction of the Fischer-Hallman Road improvements is currently scheduled for 2016 in the Region’s Draft 2013 Ten-Year Transportation Capital Program. This construction timing is considered to be aggressive and is contingent upon the timely acquisition of required property, utility relocations, and receipt of technical and financial approvals. Since construction is anticipated to take two years to complete, staff will review the potential of staging construction of this project. The first stage of construction would likely include the section of Fischer-Hallman Road from Rockwood Road to Ottawa Street since only one property purchase is required to implement the improvements for this section of Fischer Hallman Road. The second stage of construction will likely include construction of Fischer-Hallman Road from Rockwood Road to Bleams Road, including construction of the roundabout at the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Bleams Road.

11.0 Traffic Management During Construction

The construction of Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street will be completed by maintaining one through lane of traffic in each direction plus left-turn lanes at intersections where feasible. Traffic may be reduced to one lane for short periods requiring flagging operations to maintain two-way traffic. Construction of the roundabout at the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Bleams Road will require that this intersection be closed to traffic for up to three weeks to permit final paving operations to be completed with traffic being detoured.

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 Study will be completed and filed in January 2013 and detailed design will commence in February 2013.

Letters advising of the recommendations contained in this Report E-12-121 were mailed to all agencies and those who attended the September 20, 2012 Public Consultation Centre, and hand-delivered to all owners/residents abutting the Fischer-Hallman Road project limits on November 28, 2012.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This project is in harmony with the Region’s Corporate Strategic Plan in that implementation of the Fischer-Hallman Road Improvements aligns with Focus Area 2.2 to develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs and Focus Area 3.2 to develop, promote and integrate active forms of transportation (cycling and walking).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Region’s Draft 2013 10-Year Transportation Capital Program includes funds of $11,875,000 in years 2013 to 2017 inclusive for design and construction of the improvements to Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street, all to be funded from the Development Charges Fund. Under the Region’s current Sidewalk Policy, responsibility for maintaining the multi-use trails being recommended for this project resides with the City of Kitchener; however, for this project, City staff to date has not agreed to assume the maintenance responsibility for the multi-use trails. Although discussion of this issue is still ongoing and is awaiting direction from the Active Transportation Master Plan expected to be presented to Committee in Spring 2013, the estimated additional cost for maintaining the multi-use trails is approximately $5,000 per year.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from the Transportation Planning Division of the Planning, Housing and Community Services Department was 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 removal of reserved lanes for cyclists on both sides of Regional Road No. 58 (Fischer-Hallman Road) from Bleams Road to Ottawa Street.
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# APPENDIX B

## Fischer-Hallman Road Current and Forecasted Traffic Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Section</th>
<th>Current (2011) AADT</th>
<th>Forecasted (2027) AADT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fischer-Hallman Road South of Bleams Road</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer-Hallman Road (Bleams Road to Rockwood Road)</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer-Hallman Road (Rockwood Road to Westmount Road/Max Becker Drive)</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>26,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer-Hallman Road (Westmount Road/Max Becker Drive to Cotton Grass Street)</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>24,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer-Hallman Road (Cotton Grass Street to Activa Avenue)</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer-Hallman Road (Activa Avenue to Ottawa Street)</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C1
DESIGN ALTERNATIVE 1
DO NOTHING
FISCHER HALLMAN ROAD
(REGIONAL ROAD 58)
RECONSTRUCT IN CURRENT CONFIGURATION
EXISTING TYPICAL CROSS SECTION
APPENDIX C2
DESIGN ALTERNATIVE 2
FISCHER HALLMAN ROAD
(REGIONAL ROAD 58)

3.35m TRAVEL LANES
1.25m WIDE BICYCLE LANES
CONCRETE SIDEWALK ON THE WEST SIDE
AND MULTI-USE TRAIL ON THE EAST SIDE
# APPENDIX D - WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE SEPTEMBER 20, 2012
PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jack P.</td>
<td>I have just read your notice regarding the improvements planned for Fischer-Hallman Rd. As a resident of the area, I was surprised and disappointed that the plans do not call for the construction of roundabouts at the intersections of Fischer-Hallman with Activa Ave. and also with Westmount Rd./Max Becker Dr. These roundabouts, in addition to the one at Bleams Rd., would be essential to the flow of traffic in this area. Please consider adding these roundabouts to the reconstruction plans for this stretch of Fischer-Hallman Rd. Thank you for your consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob M.</td>
<td>I’m concerned about traffic noise. I feel the present ground berm is not satisfactory and will only get worse. Sound travel is in all directions not just at 90 degrees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Garry A.   | 1. My sump pump has a line hooked into the drain at the road. This needs to be maintained.  
2. The driveway needs to remain both left and right turn.  
3. As per prior agreement with the Region a 2nd driveway, right turn only is to be put in down to the shed for access.  
4. The city water line to be maintained. |
<p>| Gradimir J.| Serbian Community is organizing Serbian Food Festival every year at 700 Fischer-Hallman Road. The event is held every year at the end of July and access to property and parking are extremely important during the event. The church also has a large hall on property where weekly events/weddings are held. Parking and access to property during these events is also very important. We would also appreciate if another PIC would be held during the design to allow us to update the Region with any new issues. Overall, the PIC was very informative and presentable and any questions regarding this property should be forwarded to the name below. |
| Anne C.    | I love the multi-use trail. Make sure there is clear signage indicating that both pedestrians and cyclists are supposed to use trails. Line down middle to encourage separating. |
| Anne S.    | As an adjacent property owner (1198 Westmount Road E., Kitchener), I wish to be kept informed of all further meetings and related to this matter and all further information sessions. Wishes to upgrade water and sanitary sewer service. In addition to my comment sheet handed in on September 20, 2012, I wish to add that I prefer Design Alternative # 1 (Do Nothing) so that the barn and garage on my property would not have to be demolished and all the large trees along my property line on Fischer-Hallman Road cut down &amp; so that my driveway access to &amp; from Fischer-Hallman Road would not be restricted post-construction to exiting only northward &amp; entering only from the south. If Design Alternative # 3 is approved &amp; implemented, my question is approximately how much it would cost me to connect my house at its current location to the City of Kitchener water service pipe at the corner of Fischer-Hallman Road &amp; Rockwood Roads, assuming that it would be possible to do that during re-construction of Fischer-Hallman? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Howard B.</td>
<td>I am not in favour of a round-about at Bleams. The design indicates a 3-lane roundabout similar to what was tried and abandoned at Homer Watson at Block Line. Based on the rush-hour volume I feel congestion will increase if the roundabout is used, especially during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bart F.</td>
<td>I am in favour of the proposed option for this road. The 3.0 m wide multi-use trail is of great importance to me being a cyclist. I am not in favour of a 3 lane roundabout. Please keep the roundabout down to two lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne H. &amp; Larry H.</td>
<td>We are concerned about the noise level for us that live directly beside Fischer Hallman. We have no noise barrier and we also feel that the Noise Study completed by Stantec does not reflect the noise level of our home. Thank you Mr. Zehr for your letter and for following up so quickly. It was nice talking to you as well. Thank you for working to make our lives a bit easier if possible. If a noise barrier wall will not be constructed to help the whole neighbourhood out then in talking with some of my other neighbours, we are really hoping that the Region and the City will work together to plant more trees. Those spruce trees provide a tiny bit of noise reduction but they certainly help with the wind and afford the neighbourhood a bit of privacy. It is wonderful also to have the birds around as well. Thank you again for letting Larry and I have our worries heard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chuxted@waterloo.ca">chuxted@waterloo.ca</a></td>
<td>please, no more roundabouts! They do not help stream the traffic. As a matter of fact, they make it worse. take a look at what's happening on IRA needles. It's not just the volume and that it's one lane, it's the roundabouts that is causing the backup in traffic. It is not helping to conserve gas, as everyone has to slow down and wait now to get through the roundabouts. F.H already has two very close together. The lights work fine at bleams. I don't appreciate my taxes being wasted on something that doesn't need to be done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra R.</td>
<td>I was unable to attend the public consultation but wanted to share my views on this project. I live very close the intersection of Fischer-Hallman and Bleams Rd and use this intersection frequently. I am vehemently opposed to the construction of a 2-lane (potential to upgrade to a 3-lane) round-about at this intersection. You only need to look at the controversy and accidents at the round-about at Homer Watson and Blockline to see why this is NOT a good idea. These large round-abouts are NOT safe for pedestrian traffic and vehicular traffic does not know how to use them properly. And I question whether they actually move traffic faster. I have often been on Ira Needles Blvd where traffic is at a complete standstill through the round-abouts. While I am definetely in favour of widening Fischer-Hallman Rd and providing bike and pedestrian lanes, I cannot support any project that includes a multi-lane round-about at what will grow to become a very busy intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Group / Criteron</td>
<td>Design Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORTATION</strong></td>
<td>Does not align with Region’s Transportation Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation capacity for motor vehicles, transit, pedestrians, cyclists and emergency vehicle response times.</td>
<td>Does not address capacity needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change to existing on-road cycling lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No improvement to existing condition for emergency services response times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not improve transit operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic may infiltrate into side streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Environment</strong></td>
<td>No change to existing conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts to adjacent commercial residential properties including: driveway access, property acquisition, noise, archaeological, and cultural or built heritage.</td>
<td>No change to driveway entrance grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noise levels similar under all alternatives*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No impact to built heritage, archaeological or cultural heritage features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widened road requires reduced front yard setback to house at 1198 Fischer-Hallman Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access at 1198 Fischer-Hallman Road may be restricted for intersection improvements at Bleams Road and Fischer-Hallman Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeological impacts to be assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Environment</strong></td>
<td>No changes to existing conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts to watercourses, floodplains, trees, fish and animals.</td>
<td>Air pollution may increase due to increase in traffic congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing trees remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Environment</strong></td>
<td>Capital Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL EVALUATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Noise levels do not increase by widening a road surface. Noise levels are calculated based on traffic volumes and the distance from the traffic.

Lowest has poor evaluation. Highest has best Evaluation.
APPENDIX F - PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE SEPTEMBER 20, 2012 PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRE

Twenty-five (25) members of the public formally signed in at the Public Consultation Centre and twelve (12) comment sheets plus three (3) emails were received. 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 Design Alternative

Summary of Comments
Two comments received expressed support for the Project Team’s Preferred Design Alternative.

Project Team Response
Following the PCC, the Project Team confirmed that Design Alternative 3 is the Project Team’s Recommended Design Alternative for this project. Members of the public generally expressed a preference for this design alternative because of the proposed 3.0 metre wide multi-use asphalt trails on each side of Fischer Hallman Road.

The Project Team recommends that a painted centreline stripe, as well as appropriate symbols and signage, be provided on the trails to delineate cyclist and pedestrian traffic.

Comment No. 2 – Proposed Roundabout at the Intersection of Fischer Hallman Road and Bleams Road – Mixed Comments

Summary of Comments
1. One (1) comment expressed support for the proposed roundabout at the intersection of Fischer Hallman Road and Bleams Road, and suggested that roundabouts should also be constructed at the intersection of Fischer Hallman Road and Activa Avenue and at the intersection of Fischer Hallman Road and Westmount Road, as these roundabouts would provide improved traffic flow along Fischer-Hallman Road.

2. Two (2) comments expressed opposition to construction of a roundabout at the intersection of Fischer Hallman Road and Bleams Road citing increased traffic congestion due to this roundabout.

3. Two (2) comments expressed support for construction of a 2-lane roundabout at the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Bleams Road, but expressed opposition for expanding the roundabout in the future to an ultimate 3-lane configuration.
Project Team Response

The Project Team's response to each of these issues is summarized below:

1. The Project Team’s completed evaluation found that taking into account the estimated capital and operating costs of traffic control signals and roundabouts, collision histories at each intersection and property constraints that a roundabout was not recommended over traffic control signals at the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Activa Avenue and at the intersection of Fischer Hallman Road and Westmount Road.

2. The Project Team notes that the Transportation Study completed as part of this Class EA Study found that the proposed roundabout at the intersection of Fischer Hallman Road and Bleams Road will provide a comparatively higher level-of-service than traffic control signals at this location.

3. The Project Team notes that the Transportation Study completed as part of this Class EA Study found that a 2-lane roundabout would provide an acceptable level-of-service at the intersection of Fischer Hallman Road and Bleams Road to the horizon year 2027, based on forecast traffic traffic volumes. Beyond 2027, a 3-lane roundabout may be required to provide an acceptable level-of-service for traffic operations. Based on the findings of the Transportation Study, the Project Team is recommending that the roundabout at the intersection of Fischer Hallman Road and Bleams Road be initially constructed to accommodate a 3-lane configuration with only 2-lanes being operable. In order to provide this configuration, an impressed coloured concrete apron would be provided on the inner circle of the roundabout, which could quickly and inexpensively be converted to a third travel lane in the future if recommended.

Comment No. 3 – Request for Measures to Mitigate Traffic Noise

Summary of Comments

Two comments received requested that noise mitigation measures, such as noise barrier walls, be provided along Fischer Hallman Road as part of this project in order to mitigate traffic noise.

Project Team Response

Implementation of noise control measures in connection with the widening of a Regional roadway is assessed in accordance with Part ‘B’ of the Region’s Implementation Guideline for Noise Policies. Under this Guideline, existing and projected average noise levels for the outdoor living area of abutting properties are calculated in accordance with Ministry of Environment procedures. In accordance with the Region’s Guideline, a noise barrier will be considered by residents, Area Municipal Council and Regional Council in the following situations:

- Where the projected noise level exceeds 65 decibels (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.

As part of this Class EA Study, the Region retained the engineering firm Stantec Consulting Ltd. to complete a noise study in accordance with Ministry of Environment requirements. This noise study took into account the existing noise walls along Fischer-Hallman Road and grass berms.
The results of the noise study for representative receivers including the most sensitive receivers are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2011 Current Average Daytime Noise Levels (dBA)</th>
<th>2027 Projected Average Daytime Noise Levels (dBA)</th>
<th>Difference (Values over 60 dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>136 Woodpoppy Court</td>
<td>54.42</td>
<td>55.88</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144 Woodpoppy Court</td>
<td>55.10</td>
<td>56.21</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Hackberry Street</td>
<td>52.96</td>
<td>54.20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 Dinison Crescent</td>
<td>52.91</td>
<td>55.24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Bush Clover Crescent</td>
<td>54.81</td>
<td>56.52</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 Bush Clover Crescent</td>
<td>55.67</td>
<td>57.39</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 Bush Clover Crescent</td>
<td>59.96</td>
<td>61.66</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 Bush Clover Crescent</td>
<td>54.65</td>
<td>56.47</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 Bush Clover Crescent</td>
<td>58.86</td>
<td>60.59</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327 Dinison Place</td>
<td>52.66</td>
<td>54.66</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322 Highbrook Crescent</td>
<td>58.87</td>
<td>60.95</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330 Highbrook Crescent</td>
<td>60.41</td>
<td>62.33</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334 Highbrook Crescent</td>
<td>60.37</td>
<td>62.49</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539 Highbrook Court</td>
<td>61.71</td>
<td>63.88</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534 Highbrook Court</td>
<td>55.75</td>
<td>57.94</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106 Highbrook Street</td>
<td>56.23</td>
<td>58.08</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 Highbrook Street</td>
<td>54.82</td>
<td>56.67</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>937 Erinbrook Court</td>
<td>51.20</td>
<td>52.66</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Rockwood Road</td>
<td>51.41</td>
<td>53.14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Riehm Street</td>
<td>53.21</td>
<td>55.57</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the results of the noise study, additional noise mitigation measures are not warranted. A noise increase of up to 3 dBA is not noticeable for most people.

The Project Team also notes that adjacent developments of the east side of Fischer Hallman Road include several properties backing onto Fischer Hallman Road. Implementation of noise mitigation measures was required as part of the development approvals for these subdivisions. These noise mitigation measures consist of a wood noise barrier fence adjacent to Highbrook Court and a landscaped earth berm adjacent to Bush Clover Crescent. Additionally, as a condition for development of these lots, the developers were required to include noise warning clauses on title and require the installation of central heating systems that would allow future occupants to add an air conditioning system so that windows could remain closed during warmer months.

The Project Team also notes that the existing concrete noise wall that extends along the east side of Fischer-Hallman Road, adjacent to back-lotted properties on Dinison Crescent and Dinison Place, was constructed in 1999 by the Region as part of the Fischer-Hallman Road extension.
Comment No. 4 – Preference for Design Alternative # 1 (Do Nothing) so that Trees, Barn, Garage, Driveway and Access to Property at 1198 Fischer-Hallman Road is Not Affected

Summary of Comments

One comment expressed a preference for the ‘Do Nothing’ design alternative as it would preserve the property owner’s barn, garage, driveway, trees and full movement access.

Project Team Response

The Transportation Study completed as part of this Class EA Study found that Design Alternative 1 (Do Nothing) does not address the current and forecasted traffic volumes for Fischer Hallman Road.

The property at 1198 Fischer-Hallman Road was identified by the City of Kitchener as having potential heritage value, including the existing house, barn and garage located on this property. A heritage overview assessment was completed for this property by a licensed heritage consultant. The heritage overview concluded that the existing barn and garage require photographic documentation acceptable to the City of Kitchener before removal of the barn and garage. Region staff will ensure that the photographic documentation of the barn and garage will be completed in accordance with requirements of the City of Kitchener’s heritage documentation policy prior to demolition of these buildings.

The Project Team has carefully considered the preliminary alignment of Fischer Hallman Road and the proposed roundabout at the intersection of Fischer Hallman Road and Bleams Road in order to minimize impacts to the property at 1198 Fischer Hallman Road. The removal of the existing barn and garage is necessary under the Project Team’s Recommended Design Alternative in order to provide an acceptable geometric design of the roadway and roundabout at the intersection of Fischer Hallman Road and Bleams Road. The existing house can remain in place with a reduced setback of one (1) metre to four (4) metres or 3.25 feet to 13 feet.

Implementation of the Project Team’s Recommended Design Alternative would restrict the driveway access from 1198 Fischer Hallman Road onto Fischer Hallman Road to a right-in, right-out configuration only due to construction of a proposed raised centre median on Fischer Hallman Road immediately north of Bleams Road required for the roundabout. The driveway at 1198 Fischer-Hallman Road is too close to the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Bleams Road to permit left-turn access movements in from Fischer-Hallman Road; however, this property can be readily accessed from the north by utilizing the proposed roundabout at the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Bleams Road. It is noted that the developer of the property located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Bleams Road has submitted plans for a commercial development. Access restrictions will be placed on the two proposed entrances to the commercial development from Fischer-Hallman Road due to the proximity of these entrances to the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Bleams Road. These access restrictions also require that a raised centre median be constructed on Fischer-Hallman Road north of Bleams Road to prevent left-turn movements from the commercial property to Fischer-Hallman Road.
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
DATE: December 11, 2012
FILE CODE: C04-30, 7186

SUBJECT: CHURCH STREET IMPROVEMENTS FROM BARNSWALLOW DRIVE TO HERBERT STREET, ELMIRA, TOWNSHIP OF WOOLWICH

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the proposed improvements of Church Street in Elmira:

a) approve the Recommended Design Alternative for Church Street from Barnswallow Drive to Herbert Street as outlined in Report E-12-125 and

b) amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, upon completion of construction to accommodate the proposed improvements as follows:

i. Add to Schedule 1, No Parking Anytime on both sides of Church Street (Regional Road 86) from Barnswallow Drive to 125 metres East of Raising Mill Gate; and

ii. Add to Schedule 24, Reserved Lane Anytime on Both Sides of Church Street (Regional Road 86) from Barnswallow Drive to 125 metres East of Raising Mill Gate for Bicycles and Horse-Drawn Vehicles;

SUMMARY:

The Region of Waterloo is currently considering improvements to Church Street from Barnswallow Drive to Herbert Street within the Town of Elmira in the Township of Woolwich. Please refer to Appendix ‘A’ for a Key Plan.

A Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo and the Township of Woolwich, and Township of Woolwich Councillors Julie-Anne Herteis and Allan Poffenroth was established to direct the planning of these improvements. The engineering consulting firm of Stantec Consulting Ltd. has been retained by the Region to complete the engineering design for these improvements.

A Public Consultation Centre (PCC) was held at the Elmira Mennonite Church, 58 Church Street West, Elmira on Wednesday September 12, 2012. Approximately 40 people attended the PCC with twenty-nine (29) signing the attendance register. Twelve (12) comment sheets were received. Please refer to Appendix ‘C’ for a summary of the written comments received at the PCC.

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 now recommending that Regional Council approve the following improvements for Church Street from Barnswallow Drive to Herbert Street in the Township of Woolwich:
- Milling and Resurfacing of the pavement on Church Street;
- Installation of curb and gutter on each side of Church Street to provide for improved roadway drainage and removal of the roadside ditches;
- Installation of a storm sewer to collect stormwater runoff;
- Replacement of the existing Township watermain and sanitary sewer on the section of Church Street from Herbert Street to 125 metres east of Raising Mill Gate;
- Construction of 1.50 metre wide on-road reserved cycling/buggy lanes;
- Construction of a new 2.10 metre sidewalk on the north side of Church Street;
- Construction of designated left-turn lanes on eastbound Church Street at Killdeer Road and at Raising Mill Gate;
- Construction of three 3.25 metre wide raised concrete centre median islands varying in length from 10 metres to 30 metres in length on Church Street from Barnswallow Drive to Raising Mill Gate in order to provide refuge areas for pedestrians crossing Church Street;
- Installation of new street lighting on the existing overhead hydro poles on the south side of Church Street from Barnswallow Drive to Herbert Street; and
- Boulevard and centre median island landscaping on Church Street where feasible.

Subject to Council approval of the Recommended Design Alternative and receipt of all technical and financial approvals, construction of the project is scheduled for 2013.

The Region’s Draft 2013 Transportation Capital Program and Ten-Year Forecast includes funding of $2,000,000 in 2013 for this project to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund. The Township of Woolwich will fund the cost of the sanitary sewer and water main replacement and repairs to the existing sidewalk in the estimated amount of $275,000. The Township has confirmed that it has sufficient funding allocated for this work and has asked that the Region proceed on its behalf.

Letters advising the public of the recommendations included in this report were mailed and hand-delivered on November 28, 2012 to area residents and those who attended the PCC.

1. Background

The Region of Waterloo is currently considering improvements to Church Street from Barnswallow Drive to Herbert Street within the Town of Elmira in the Township of Woolwich. Please refer to Appendix ‘A’ for a Key Plan.

A Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo and the Township of Woolwich, and Township of Woolwich Councillors Julie-Anne Herteis and Allan Poffenroth was established to direct the planning of these improvements. The engineering consulting firm of Stantec Consulting Ltd. has been retained by the Region to complete the engineering design for these improvements.

The section of Church Street from Barnswallow Drive to Herbert Street is currently constructed as a two lane rural roadway with paved asphalt shoulders and grassed ditches located behind the shoulders. A 1.50 metre wide sidewalk currently exists on the south side of Church Street from Barnswallow Drive to Herbert Street. There is currently no sidewalk on the north side of Church Street within the project limits. The Township of Woolwich currently clears snow from the sidewalk on Church Street in accordance with the Township’s practice to clear all sidewalks in Elmira. The paved shoulders are designated as existing on-road cycling facilities in the Region’s Cycling Map but they are not designated as reserved lanes for cyclists in the Region’s Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072. Church Street is currently signed no parking from Barnswallow Drive to Herbert Street. Existing grassed boulevards on each side of Church Street vary in width from 3.0 metres to 4.0
metres. Overhead hydro poles currently exist on the south side of Church Street and there is currently limited street lighting on Church Street.

This project has been initiated to address several needs for the section of Church Street from Barnswallow Drive to Herbert Street. These needs are described as follows:

- The existing roadway asphalt is in need of rehabilitation;
- Roadside ditches do not provide for proper roadway drainage;
- There is a need for enhanced facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-drawn buggies;
- The existing Township watermain and sanitary sewer on the section of Church Street from Herbert Street to 125 metres east of Raising Mill Gate require replacement; and
- There is a need for traffic operational improvements on Church Street to accommodate increased traffic due to a new residential subdivision located immediately north of Church Street.

The Region’s Context Sensitive Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines identify the section of Church Street from Barnswallow Drive to Herbert Street as a Rural Village Main Street. Rural Village Main Streets are prioritized for vehicular movements and active transportation. The role of the Main Street designation is to support the urban life of the village and to move traffic efficiently at an appropriate speed.

A traffic study was completed for Church Street by the adjacent developer as a requirement of planning approval for the residential subdivision. The traffic study was reviewed and accepted by the Region. The traffic study found that new designated left-turn lanes are required on eastbound Church Street at the intersection of Church Street and Killdeer Road and on eastbound Church Street at the intersection of Church Street and Raising Mill Gate.

2. Development of the Preferred Design Alternative

Based on the approved Context Sensitive Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines, technical studies and investigations completed and other Regional practices and policies, the Project Team developed a Preferred Design Alternative in advance of a Public Consultation Centre (PCC). The Project Team’s Preferred Design Alternative included the following elements:

- Mill and Resurfacing of the pavement on Church Street;
- Installation of curb and gutter on each side of Church Street to provide for improved roadway drainage and removal of the roadside ditches;
- Installation of a storm sewer to collect stormwater runoff;
- Replacement of the existing Township watermain and sanitary sewer on the section of Church Street from Herbert Street to 125 metres east of Raising Mill Gate;
- Construction of 1.50 metre wide on-road reserved cycling/buggy lanes;
- Construction of a new 2.10 wide metre sidewalk on the north side of Church Street;
- Construction of designated left-turn lanes on eastbound Church Street at Killdeer Road and at Raising Mill Gate; and
- Construction of seven 3.25 metre wide raised landscaped concrete centre islands varying in length from 10 metres to 30 metres on Church Street from Barnswallow Drive to Raising Mill Gate in order to provide refuge areas for pedestrians crossing Church Street and to potentially provide a traffic calming effect; and
- Enhanced boulevard and centre island landscaping where feasible.

Please refer to Appendix ‘B’ for drawings of the Project Team’s Preferred Design Alternative.
3. Public Consultation

A Public Consultation Centre (PCC) was held at the Elmira Mennonite Church, 58 Church Street West, Elmira on Wednesday September 12, 2012. Notices were placed in the local papers advertising the PCC. Signboards were erected on site in advance of the PCC and notices were hand delivered to area residents, property owners, and businesses directly adjacent to the road improvement limits. Plans showing the proposed improvements were on display at the PCC and Project Team representatives were present to answer questions and receive feedback.

Approximately 40 people attended the PCC with twenty-nine (29) signing the attendance register. Twelve (12) comment sheets were received. Please refer to Appendix ‘C” for a summary of the written comments received at the PCC.

4. Main Issues Raised by the Public and Project Team Responses

The main issues raised by the public at the PCC are as summarized as follows:

i) Concerns with the Proposed 1.50 Metre Wide Cycling/Buggy Lane Width

Public Comments

Seven comments expressed concern that the proposed 1.50 metre wide cycling/buggy lanes are too narrow. There are a large number of buggies using this road and the buggy lane is not wide enough to fit the entire buggy in the lane. The design also incorporates raised centre median islands that will restrict traffic from passing the buggies.

Project Team Response

The Project Team is recommending that the cycling/buggy lane remain 1.50 metre wide as presented at the PCC. The 1.50 metre wide cycling/buggy lane is consistent with the Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines and has been implemented successfully on roads similar to Church Street in Heidelberg and Linwood on past Regional projects. A standard buggy measures 1.54 metres (5 feet) in width and there are some larger buggies that are wider than 1.54 metres. The Project Team recognizes that buggies would have to encroach slightly into the driving lane however the 1.50 metre wide cycling/buggy lane width is considered appropriate because it discourages illegal car parking within the cycling/buggy lane. Based on previous consultation with the Mennonite community on past Regional projects, Mennonite representatives indicated that they prefer the proposed 1.50 metre wide cycling/buggy lane width (as opposed to a wider lane) to ensure the lane is not used for parking.

Following the PCC, the Project Team reviewed the extent of the proposed raised concrete centre islands. Upon review, the Project Team agreed that there should be some longer stretches where vehicles have the opportunity to pass buggy traffic. Accordingly, the Project Team reduced the number of proposed raised centre islands from seven to three. Please refer to Appendix ‘D’ for a drawing illustrating the Project Team’s revised centre median island locations for Church Street.

The Project Team notes that the reduction in the number of centre median islands will reduce future landscape maintenance costs. The savings realized by reducing the number of proposed raised centre islands from seven to three is approximately $16,000 in initial capital costs for the landscaping, plus an ongoing savings of approximately $3,000 per year in landscaping maintenance costs.
ii) Concern with Snow Clearing due to the Proposed Raised Centre Islands

**Public Comments**

Two comments expressed concern that the raised centre median islands will cause problems with snow removal.

**Project Team Response**

The Project Team confirmed that construction of the proposed raised centre islands will not impede winter maintenance operations. As noted, the Project Team reduced the number of proposed raised centre islands from seven to three in order to provide more opportunity for vehicles to pass buggy traffic. Please refer to Appendix ‘D’ for a drawing of the recommended configuration of the proposed centre median islands.

iii) Insufficient Sight Distance on Church Street at Herbert Street

**Public Comments**

One comment suggested that there is insufficient sight distance on Church Street approaching the Weigel Street and Herbert Street intersection due to the vertical geometry of Church Street.

**Project Team Response**

The Region’s engineering consultant for this project, Stantec Consulting Ltd., reviewed the Church Street road geometrics and confirmed that the existing vertical profile of Church Street meets the requirement for geometric sight distance standards established by the Transportation Association of Canada. Accordingly, the profile of Church Street will not be altered as part of the proposed reconstruction of Church Street.

iv) Requests for Additional Street Lighting

**Public Comments**

Two comments suggested that the current street lighting on Church Street is inadequate.

**Project Team Response**

Following the PCC, the Project Team reviewed the need for additional street lighting on Church Street. Based on Regional policy, street lighting is warranted on one side of the roadway within the project limits. Street lighting can be readily provided on the exiting overhead hydro poles on the south side of Church Street. Accordingly, the Project Team is recommending that street lighting be provided on the south side of Church Street within the project limits.

v) Comments Requesting a Westbound Designated Left-Turn Lane on Church Street at Killdeer Road

**Public Comments**

Two comments were received requesting construction of a new westbound designated left-turn lane on Church Street at Killdeer Road.
**Project Team Response**

Following the PCC, the Project Team requested that appropriate Regional staff assess the need for a westbound designated left-turn lane on Church Street at Killdeer Road. This completed assessment found a westbound designated left-turn is not warranted and is not anticipated to be warranted in the future based on the forecast traffic volumes generated from full residential development. Additionally, the Project Team is proposing that a raised pedestrian refuge island be constructed opposite the new eastbound designated left-turn lane on Church Street at Killdeer Road to accommodate pedestrian movements travelling to a proposed elementary school to be constructed in the new subdivision north of Church Street. This pedestrian refuge island precludes construction of a westbound designated left-turn lane on Church Street at Killdeer Road.

5. **Recommended Design Alternative**

Based on a review of the technical information gathered for this project as well as a review of all public comments received, the Project Team is now recommending that Regional Council approve the following improvements for Church Street from Barnswallow Drive to and Herbert Street in the Township of Woolwich:

- Milling and Resurfacing of the pavement on Church Street;
- Installation of curb and gutter on each side of Church Street to provide for improved roadway drainage and removal of the roadside ditches;
- Installation of a storm sewer to collect stormwater runoff;
- Replacement of the existing Township watermain and sanitary sewer on the section of Church Street from Herbert Street to 125 metres east of Raising Mill Gate;
- Construction of 1.50 metre wide on-road reserved cycling/buggy lanes;
- Construction of a new 2.10 metre sidewalk on the north side of Church Street;
- Construction of designated left-turn lanes on eastbound Church Street at Killdeer Road and at Raising Mill Gate;
- Construction of three 3.25 metre wide raised concrete centre median islands on Church Street varying in length from 10 metres to 30 metres from Barnswallow Drive to Raising Mill Gate in order to provide refuge areas for pedestrians crossing Church Street;
- Installation of new street lighting on the existing overhead hydro poles on the south side of Church Street from Barnswallow Drive to Herbert Street; and
- New boulevard and centre median island landscaping on Church Street where feasible.

Letters advising the public of the recommendations included in this report were mailed and hand-delivered on November 28, 2012 to area residents and those who attended the PCC.

6. **Project Cost**

The Region of Waterloo is funding the cost of the road improvements and new sidewalk on this project. The estimated total Regional project cost for the proposed Church Street improvements, including engineering, construction, street lighting and other projects costs is $2,000,000. The Township of Woolwich is funding the cost of the sanitary sewer and water main replacement and the cost of minor repairs to the existing sidewalk. The estimated cost of the Township’s improvements is $275,000.

7. **Project Schedule**

Subject to Council approval of the Recommended Design Alternative and receipt of all technical and financial approvals, construction of the project is scheduled for 2013.
8. Traffic Management During Construction

It is anticipated that one through lane of traffic will be maintained in each direction at most times during construction, with traffic being restricted to one lane with flagging operations for short periods. Local, emergency and pedestrian traffic will be maintained during construction.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This project is in harmony with the Region’s Corporate Strategic Plan in that implementation of the Church Street Improvements supports Focus Area 2.2 to develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs and Focus Area 3.2 to develop, promote and integrate active forms of transportation (cycling and walking).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Region’s Draft 2013 Transportation Capital Program and Ten-Year Forecast includes funding of $2,000,000 in 2013 for this project to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund. The Township of Woolwich will fund the cost of the sanitary sewer and water main replacement and repairs to the existing sidewalk in the estimated amount of $275,000. The Township has confirmed that it has sufficient funding allocated for this work 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 was 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 prohibit parking and to reflect reserved lanes for Bicycles and Horse-Drawn Buggies on both Sides of Church Street (Regional Road 86) from Barnswallow Drive to 125 metres East of Raising Mill Gate.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A - Key Plan
Appendix B - Proposed Typical Cross-sections and Renderings
Appendix C - Public Consultation Centre Comments
Appendix D – Proposed Raised Centre Island Configuration

PREPARED BY: John Lee, Project Manager, Transportation Base Program

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner - Transportation and Environmental Services
Appendix A
Project Area

CHURCH STREET REGIONAL ROAD 86
BARNSWALLOW DRIVE TO HERBERT STREET
ELMIRA, ONTARIO
TOWNSHIP OF WOOLWICH
Appendix B.1
Typical Sections and Renderings

**EXISTING TYPICAL CROSS SECTION**
Church Street Regional Road B6
Barnswallow Drive to Herbert Street

**PROPOSED TYPICAL CROSS SECTION WITH TURN LANE**
Church Street Regional Road B6
Barnswallow Drive to Herbert Street

**PROPOSED TYPICAL CROSS SECTION WITH CENTRE MEDIAN**
Church Street Regional Road B6
Barnswallow Drive to Herbert Street
Appendix B.2
Typical Sections and Renderings
# Appendix C
## Public Consultation Centre Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel W. Boyle</td>
<td>1 Weigel Ave, Elmira</td>
<td>Repair the 6&quot; dip in front of Weigel Ave. on Church. Don’t like medians, think it will be easier to remove snow if they are not there. The plow will be there longer as it has to clean snow from between median strips. Please place manholes in the centre and to the side but not where we drive like on Arthur Street South. Suggest maybe you look at signs like ‘hidden intersection (Herbert and Weigel)’. You have a seniors sign but is it in the right place? Should have a sign for bus picking up children in AM and dropping off in PM right in dip at Weigel Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orman Martin</td>
<td>2974 Northfield Dr. Elmira</td>
<td>As horse and buggy people, we have a real concern for the 1.5m bike and buggy lane. We strongly feel the lane should be 3m. If parking or passing is a concern, could there not be signs put up to eliminate that. Horses and trucks need more not less room to pass. We want to thank you for letting us drive our horses and buggies on your roads and also for everything you do for us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Martin</td>
<td>2240 New Jerusalem Rd, Elmira</td>
<td>We have concerns about the narrow buggy lanes. We would rather have wider lanes then grass so we can get to side for traffic to pass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Weber</td>
<td>106 Church St. W., Elmira</td>
<td>Concern with width of land for buggy and cars. I think you should consider widening the buggy lane by 1 meter or so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Frey</td>
<td>8 Weigel Ave.</td>
<td>Buggy lanes have to be wider; more left turn lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Keil</td>
<td>156 Killdeer Road, Elmira</td>
<td>Very concerned with allocations for buggies, farm traffic and transportation trucking traffic. Given the guidelines that the planner had to work with, I am happy with the changes that are being made. Concerned with intersection management at Killdeer/Country Club Estates and Church Street, especially once the development is complete north of Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Ropp</td>
<td>11 Robb Rd., Elmira</td>
<td>I live at 11 Robb Road on the corner of Church and Robb (end unit). While I am glad you will be creating green space where the ditches exist today, I have BIG concern about the space you are giving to the horse &amp; buggy lanes. It is definitely not wide enough and will create problems with trucks and Sunday morning parade of buggies heading to church. This needs to be revisited. Looking forward to the changes, it will be beautiful I'm sure. On September 12th, I dropped in to see the proposed changes planned for Church Street. I was able to provide some comments in writing that evening, but later had a few more concerns/comments that I wanted to bring to your attention. I trust I haven't missed the deadline for submitting additional comments. Before I raise my concerns, let me first note that I'm very much looking forward to the upcoming changes. I live right on the corner of Robb Rd. and Church St., with my front door facing Church St. I love where I live. Being able to look out my windows and view the horse and buggies, traffic of all sorts and open spaces, has been an appealing part of my home. I'm not bothered by traffic as some people are. However, being on an end unit, allows me more privacy than others on my street. There are many wonderful aspects of the changes you are proposing. I'm glad that you'll be getting rid of that horrible ditch which infests my yard with weeds and provides an easy access for mice and voles to find a way to my flowerbeds - and replacing it with green space and new trees. Can't wait!! Having new curbs, sidewalks and proper drainage will also be welcomed changes. However, there are a few issues I am deeply concerned about: 1. The horse and buggy lanes - I presented my concerns regarding this in my written comments on September 12th but want to reiterate again that 1.5 metres is simply not wide enough for these buggies. There are many flat-bed carts that get pulled by horses and these seem to be used for hauling furniture, and other large items. Many of these are wider than the average buggy. These narrower lanes will certainly be a deterrent to horse and buggy traffic and will definitely back-up truck and car traffic. I've seen many instances of cars and trucks waiting for buggy traffic to clear before they can pass. I can see this becoming more of an issue when these lanes are significantly reduced. Is there any reason why the boulevards need to be so wide? Could they not be made narrower to accommodate extra room for these bike/buggy lanes? As you know, Church Street is the only road which leads them to their place of worship each Sunday. There are hundreds of buggies that pass by my place each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sunday. Question - has anyone gathered comments from the Mennonite community on these new plans? After all, they have as much right to an opinion as any of us residents do.

2. John Deer - Years ago, John Deer was on the outskirts of Elmira - there was no residential traffic. Today, it's a different story. You'd be surprised at how large some of that farm equipment is that comes out of their facility. Large combines, thrashing machines, tractors, etc. that can easily take up 2 lanes of traffic (usually the current buggy lane plus the roadway). I can't see how they will get through some of those narrow passageways with medians in the centre of the road. While I understand that medians help slow down traffic and can be attractive green space - are they really necessary on Church St.? I can see a need for space to allow traffic to move around buggies, when necessary. Medians will quite often prevent that from happening and will create more back-up in traffic.

Thanks for allowing me an opportunity to comment further.

Mr. Martin

Unfortunately I was not able to attend the open house meeting in Elmira on September 12 but I do have a few concerns regarding this stretch of roadway. I realize that they may have been addressed in your plan but it needs to be surfaced never the less.

The street lighting on this stretch of roadway is terrible (non-existent). With the high volume of traffic and roadside cycle, buggy and pedestrian traffic, I would like to see proper ‘in town quality’ street lights along this stretch of road.

Speeding traffic is also a concern. If the road were better lit, I think that drivers would realize that they are in fact in town at this point and slow down a bit.

Another point, there is a lot of residential development about to begin on the north side of this road that would benefit from improved lighting as well.

Also, with the rather steep hill beside the Mennonite church, any sort of traffic, pedestrian or automotive, trying to cross Church Street at Snyder, has to contend with cars and trucks speeding blindly over the crest of this hill. If the hill could be re-graded slightly to give more visibility towards this intersection at Snyder Ave., it would help a lot. I use this intersection daily and traffic (transport trucks especially) are still doing 80 kms as they top this hill headed towards town.

Thank-you for the opportunity to air a few concerns.

P.S. Although this is outside of your plan, the above mentioned intersection at Snyder Ave and Church Street really should have a proper crosswalk installed with overhead flashing warning lights. This is a main pedestrian route for children heading towards Rivierside school a couple of blocks away.

Val Hummel

I work in the Council and Information Services Department at the Township of Woolwich and I’m responsible for managing the School Crossing Guard program. I visited the Public Consultation Centre in Elmira on September 12, 2012, viewed the maps and talked to staff. I am aware that a Crossing Guard is expected to be posted at the intersection of Church Street West and Killdeer Road in approximately 2015. I appreciate having an opportunity to comment on the project and I am submitting my comments as follows:

I would like Regional staff to have another look at incorporating design features into the intersection that will maximize safety for the Crossing Guard, students and pedestrians at the crossover at Church Street and Killdeer Road. In this location a median will divide the road and the Crossing Guard will be expected to cross students over the bike lane and traffic lanes on Church Street (watching for cars, trucks, buggies, buses and bikes), then stand on the centre median until able to cross the students over the second lane of traffic and bike lane. In the design I viewed, all that protects the Crossing Guard and students from oncoming traffic when they stand on the median is a 6” curb. (I expect that the actual walkway where the Guard and students will stand will have a depressed curb so that it is accessible.) I know that farm traffic has to be able to use the road, so would it be possible for Regional staff to consider a design feature such as low bollards on the median around the school crossing?

I’m concerned that the centre median will be slippery in winter and it will be dangerous if the Crossing Guard or a student loses their footing. I’d like to see the concrete of the school crossing texturized for added traction in some way.

I would like to see traffic lights at the intersection of Church and Killdeer, but I was told this is not possible. Would it be possible to incorporate features into the design that would facilitate traffic lights in the future?

At the Public Consultation Centre, I spoke to a Regional staff member who advised me that the design of the pedestrian crossover is a design that has been approved by the Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee that that’s why the
Region is satisfied with the design. GRAAC’s advice is important but should not preclude a continued effort to look at creative ways of making pedestrian crossovers safer for Crossing Guards and students. I hope you will take another look at the future school crossing and consider what you would do if you had to work as a Crossing Guard there, or if your son or daughter had to cross over that road to get to school. I hope the final design will provide a reasonably safe work area for future Crossing Guards. Thanks for considering my comments.

Vernon Martin  
3 Herbert St.  
Elmira

Most buggies are about 6 feet or 1.9 meters wide, then you need to add at least 1 foot on curb side for flexibility, nobody wants a truck passing with less than 1 meter between truck and horse or buggy. This means the truck needs 10 feet from curb side of truck to curb when passing buggy, no less. In particular, if truck is going 60 km/hr, then you need width of truck plus whatever truck wants between truck and centre island. This means from curb to centre line or island should be 7 meters or 21 feet or narrow enough that truck knows he cannot pass buggy. I measured existing shoulder west of Raising Mill Street which is paved. It is approximately 10.5 feet or 3.2 meters. I then measured the shoulder on the east side of Raising Mill Street which was approximately 8 feet or 2.5 meters paved plus 1 foot of grass to guard rail which is about 2.8 meters from guard rail to line paved on pavement. When one car is going west and buggy going east, then a truck going east wants to pass buggy beside guard rails, this is very tight. It would be nice if buggies were not used as a means of slowing down traffic since a lot of people get very frustrated when buggies are slowing them down. I will leave the planning up to you people that do your research. Just thought I would send you thought’s from a buggy drivers point of view.

Ken and Muriel Bradley  
2 Weigel Ave.,  
Elmira

1. Repair the big bump where Weigel joins Church.
2. Weigel can’t be closed as it is a dead end street.
3. Lower the hill on Church St. near the Mennonite churches as it makes turns onto or off Church St. more dangerous.
4. Lower the speed limit on Church St.
5. Put in a stop light at Barnswallow.
6. Create truck routes around the town, rather than have trucks driving down Church and Arthur Streets and right through the centre or town.
Thanks for the chance to give our opinions.

Fred Lichti  
Elmira

As a resident of Elmira, I frequently walk along Church Street West. The sidewalk on the south side of Church Street West (across from the Mennonite Churches) dips far below the road level and runs along a swamp. It is poorly lit. On moonless or overcast nights, it is exceedingly difficult to see the sidewalk and to navigate along that stretch of sidewalk. If you are making improvements, please consider adding lights to this stretch of the sidewalk.
Thanks.

Tim Campbell  
15 Snyder Ave. N., #17, Elmira

Thank you for the opportunity to submit written comments after the Public Consultation Centre. I hope that you can appreciate the time and effort I have spent in preparing this document. The proposed improvements on Church Street are considered a Schedule ‘A+’ undertaking in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment document. This means the project is pre-approved to proceed provided that appropriate public consultation is conducted.

I can’t understand how two hours of public consultation is considered appropriate for a $2,000,000 project. I sincerely hope that not only will the undocumented comments made at the PCC be taken seriously, but that the 20-something hours I have spent since are not taken in vain.

I will concede that staff at the PCC claimed that one reason for this design proposal was for traffic calming due to eastbound traffic speeding. I feel that planners have not taken all issues into consideration. I do not know if an appropriate traffic study has been conducted to warrant this proposal.

**Urbanization of Church Street**

The “Urbanization of Church Street” is not an appropriate plan for the identified project area. Church Street in the settlement area of Elmira is not a quiet urban avenue, but is a “Rural Main Street” as defined by the “Implementation Guidelines for Regional Transportation Corridor Design – Public Consultation Centre Information Package” (April 6, 2010: File Code: D09-00/TCDG). Historically, Church Street is the name assigned to the portion of the former Highway 86 that traverses through the Elmira settlement area. In its whole it is one of a few roads that spans the entire region from east to west, and as such continues to serve as...
a primary thoroughfare for cars, trucks, farm machinery and horse-drawn vehicles.

Discrepancies in documentation

The PCC Information Package states “Proposed roadway improvements on this section of Church Street include: widening of the existing roadway to provide buggy/cycle lanes…” It may simply be a contradiction of terms but the information package and displays and staff comments at the PCC clearly show that the existing “road” is only being widened at the expense of removing the “shoulder”; and that the new road will be no wider that the existing paved surface. This cross section seems to me to be a common roadway design for Regional Roads in Woolwich Township. Broad shoulders are provided for the safety of buggy and farm machinery traffic.

A recent article in The Record highlighted the issue of buggy accidents.

“Any time there’s an accident, it prompts the talking about how we need better safety measures for buggies,” said Lindsay Tuckerman, owner of the Kenilworth Country Kitchen and Bakery with her husband. That’s a conversation that might extend to Waterloo Region, which has its own Mennonite Community and a growing urban population.

“The problem is, when the crashes do happen, it’s usually severe,” said Nixon. From 2002 to 2010, there were 47 collisions involving horse-drawn vehicles on Waterloo Region’s roads, which don’t include city streets or provincial highways. That’s an average of slightly more than 5 per year.

Yet, the PCC Information Package states that this project will include “construction of a 1.5 metre designated on-road cycling lane/buggy lane on Church Street within the project limits to provide a continuous cycling facility as well as provide extra space for horse-and-buggy traffic;” How does the reduction of a current 3.048m (10’) shoulder to a 1.5m “cycling lane” provide “extra” space? “Some people don’t live in the same world as other people...Buggys do not fit into bicycle lanes...”

A Case IH 8120 combine is 4.88m (16’) across its front wheels (and ladders and accessories make it wider across its body). We already witness these machines mounting the curbs on Church Street West between Snyder Avenue and Herbert Street (~87m); to restrict traffic flow for another 1000m will create further congestion and safety issues. Farm machinery regularly travels through the project area on route to one of two machinery dealers (Premier Equipment at 122 Church Street West and Stoltz Sales & Service at Highway 86 and Floradale Road). Furthermore, although my combine example may be limited, double-wheeled tractors are more common and use the roadway year round; not only engaged in farming activities but also used in the construction industry as well as snow clearing services in winter. Reduced road width will be detrimental.

The PCC Information Package states that both the eastbound lane and westbound lane will be 3.35m wide. However, existing lane widths on Church Street east of the project area are wider: Church Street east of Snyder Avenue is 3.556m (140”) Church Street west of Snyder Avenue is 3.4544m (136”) The westbound lane of Church Street, between the two laneways of Elmira Mennonite Church, is 4.572m (180” or 15’). I will note that the north-side of Church Street, at the cross-walk between Snyder Avenue and Herbert Street is 3.302m (130”); and Church Street east of Raising Mill Gate is 3.35m (132”) with a shoulder of 3.048m (120”). Again it appears as though this project would reduce road widths.

The PCC Information Package also includes “New turn lane improvements at the Killdeer Road and Raising Mill Gate intersections with Church Street;” I don’t recall if the PCC display showed a left-turn lane for Raising Mill Gate, but it DID NOT include one at Killdeer Road. The Lunor Group Development Traffic Impact Study Addendum (April 2009) states “The build-out of the subject site is anticipated to meet MTO warrant criteria for eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes on Church Street at the intersections of Street “A” [Kissing Bridge Drive], Street “O” [Country Club Estates], and Snyder Avenue.” Specifically this study calls for “a westbound left-turn lane with 40 metres of storage” at Killdeer Road. Killdeer Road is the only road in the housing development south of Church Street that intersects with First Street, and is a common thoroughfare for traffic heading south to the Birdland subdivision. Church Street is a major thoroughfare for horse-drawn traffic primarily due to the public parking barn access at Maple Street. As evidenced in the photos above there are no buggy lanes from about 71 Church Street West (the crest of the hill inside the project zone) throughout.

Church Street is a major thoroughfare for horse-drawn traffic primarily due to the public parking barn access at Maple Street. As evidenced in the photos above there are no buggy lanes from about 71 Church Street West (the crest of the hill inside the project zone) throughout.
Marshall Macklin Monaghan Limited (MMM) in association with Intus Road Safety Engineering Incorporated (Intus), presented the City of Burlington with the final report "Bike Lanes, Edge Lines, and Vehicular Lane Widths" (Jan 14/05). Council elected to retain a qualified consultant to assess the experience gained in other municipalities with respect to edge lines and minimum vehicular lane widths. This report discusses the safety and operational issues related to bike lanes and edge lines, also known as "urban shoulders", including a comprehensive evaluation of collision data and case law. "The lack of collisions and law suits concerning bicycle facilities, or the lack of facilities, does not automatically imply that the current system is "safe". Although collisions are the normal measure of safety, collisions have a degree of randomness associated with them, and dangerous conditions do not always produce collisions."

I have provided a number of measurements to illustrate traffic situations I am aware of. Typically cars and trucks coexist with farm machinery and horse and buggies: farm machines inhibit traffic due to their width and buggies inhibit traffic due to their slow speed. The typical result is aggressive drivers passing in a no passing zone. I am not aware if there are any current collision statistics in this area, but I do believe that the likelihood of collisions is increasing. Prior to the reconstruction of the portion of Church Street West at Snyder Avenue in 2010, west-bound traffic had a line-of-sight from the crest of the hill west of Dunke Street to about 71 Church Street West; some 290m. Despite "close call" incidents at Snyder Avenue, aggressive drivers have been passing horse-drawn vehicles. Now, with left-turn lanes and a cross-walk median just beyond, aggressive drivers must greatly increase their speed to make the same pass within 110m (or less if they use the left turn lanes as a passing lane). Likewise with the 160m stretch from Dunke Street to Maple Street.

If drivers now are getting aggressive in 160m or less, what will be the result if you inhibit traffic over another 1000m? Will aggressive drivers dodge the medians at side street intersections to effect passing? Possibly; but probably no more issue that east-bound speeders. What will likely happen is more rear-end collisions by frustrated drivers.

**Speeding by east-bound traffic**

The speed limit on Line 86 west of the settlement area of Elmira is 80km/h. The speed limit is reduced to 50km/h at a point approximately 50m west of Eldale Road, some 400m west of Barnswallow Drive. Without comprehensive traffic data we do not know if speeding by eastbound traffic is a real or perceived problem. However, I would suggest that if drivers have not reduced their speed sufficiently within 400m there are other issues or reasons. It is my experience that Waterloo Regional Police provide sufficient enforcement in this area.

**Suggestions**

1. With 8.8392m (29') from the south side of Church Street to the sidewalk, I would expect that there is sufficient space within the current right-of-way to widen the road while including a 3.048m (10') urban shoulder on each side.
2. The Lunor Group Development Traffic Impact Study included future provision for traffic signals at the intersection of Church Street and Street “A” [Kissing Bridge Drive]. Since traffic signals also serve as a traffic-calming technique perhaps it would be more prudent to consider the installation of traffic signals at the intersections of Church Street and Barnswallow Drive (which will be extended across Church to facilitate more access to the future subdivision) and Church Street and Snyder Avenue; effectively controlling traffic from either end rather than by one signal in the middle of the area.

The Lunor Group website states “Elmira is a fresh, natural country town, filled with a captivating authenticity which is preserved through the presence and pristine lifestyle of the Mennonite influence of Elmira. Everyday living is interwoven with a nurturing gentility.” Although I am aware that a portion of this project is for the purpose of extending services to a new subdivision, expecting current taxpayers to pay for a project that will not only cause great safety concerns but also grossly affect the nature of our community is inappropriate. What Lunor is embracing would be rejected and forced out. Furthermore, “the build-out of the subject site will consist of approximately 1,500 residential units estimated to generate approximately 1,355 vehicle trips during the AM peak hour and 1,540 vehicle trips during the PM peak hour.” With that increase in traffic it is absurd to plan on restricting traffic.
Mark Weber  
106 Church St. W, Elmira  

I have concerns with the proposed center islands on Church St, from Herbert to Barnswallow. I understand having a short island at Killdeer / Country Club Estates and maybe at Raising Mill Gate / Kissing Bridge Drive, but the rest of the way, a center paved lane would be more practical. With the plan of placing the Elmira Station at the corner of Kissing Bridge Drive and Church St, a wider road with paved center lane would lend itself better to emergency response by the Fire Department or any emergency vehicle for that matter. The frequency and length of the proposed raised islands will make it very difficult for emergency vehicles to pass buggy and large truck traffic while responding to an emergency. For this reason alone, it is crucial that you reconsider. Removing most of the raised center islands except for Killdeer and Raising Mill or have two full width traffic lanes in both directions to allow for buggy and emergency traffic. I am currently District Deputy Fire Chief for Elmira station and my residence is at 106 Church St W. Elmira. Concerned resident..
Appendix D
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: December 11, 2012
FILE CODE: D28-80

SUBJECT: FARE FREE TRANSIT SERVICES FOR COMMUNITY EVENTS

RECOMMENDATION:
For information.

SUMMARY:
Earlier this year Regional Council requested a report reviewing the feasibility of offering fare free rides on GRT to support community events. This report outlines the current policy, the financial impacts and includes a summary of what a few other communities have done regarding this issue.

Offering fare free access to GRT services for community events can be done provided there is a framework to determine which events will be supported and also that there is funding available to offset the revenue reduction which will occur when cash or ticket paying customers have temporary access to the fare free transit service.

Should Council wish to develop a fare free transit policy, then staff would recommend that Council determine an appropriate budget amount prior to staff developing a policy. Knowing the amount of funding available would assist staff in developing a policy to fit the level of funding. Once an annual budget has been created, a program framework, including the selection criteria needed to offer fare free transit services to community events would be developed and presented to Regional Council for review and approval.

REPORT:
Currently providing free transit for community events is managed through the attached Regional Policy F-11-050 - Financial Assistance for Events providing an Economic Benefit to the Region, and in a more limited capacity through the GRT Marketing Program.

The policy for providing Financial Assistance for Events is broad based, but Section 3 outlines the criteria for offering GRT services through the Economic Development and Promotion (EDP) grants. However, in practice EDP grants are rarely used to subsidize free transit services. In the past five years the only event to receive an EDP grant to subsidize transit was the National Blind Lawn Bowling Tournament, held in Kitchener in 2011.

The following are the criteria from Section 3 of this policy for providing free transit through EDP grants:

Grand River Transit will accommodate “smaller” local and community requests subject to the following limitations:

- For charitable fundraising events up to 5 hours free service; services in excess of 5 hours provided at 50% of the full charter rate;
For non-profit community services provided at 50% of the full charter rate for a maximum of 5 hours per event;

Existing annual subsidized services for Oktoberfest, New Years Eve and Seniors Christmas Light Tours will continue to be provided as per previous arrangements.

Of the three “annual subsidized services” identified in this policy, only the fare free New Years Eve service is fully funded within the GRT operating budget. The cost of the fare free extended services provided during Oktoberfest is recovered from the festival. The free Seniors Christmas Light Tour charters are partially funded through the GRT operating budget, since many of these charters are driven by volunteer Bus Operators which reduces the overall subsidized cost.

The GRT Marketing program promotes the use of transit by providing discounted or free transit services. Examples include providing free multi-day bus passes to local conference delegates, offering free service to promote new routes and providing discounts for bulk ticket purchases, such as the recent Kitchener Rangers promotion, in exchange for promotional recognition. Also each year, in partnership with the local school boards, high school students participating in the “Strip the Sheets” program to fight homelessness are provided with free transit rides to and from Uptown Waterloo. A detailed GRT Marketing Plan is currently being developed and will be presented to Regional Council in early 2013 as outlined in the 2011-2014 GRT Business Plan.

Financial Impact of providing Fare Free GRT Service to Community Events

Beyond the annual subsidized services identified previously (New Years Eve & Senior’s Christmas Tours) the GRT operating budget does not include funding to absorb the lost revenue impact which would occur by offering fare free transit to community events. The lost revenue would occur when the current cash or ticket paying customers have access to free transit services. There is no revenue loss anticipated from pre-paid monthly bus pass use.

The table below provides an estimate of the lost revenue for one event in either the summer or non-summer service seasons, based on 2011 ridership levels and cash and ticket fares. It’s further assumed that rider demand for the free service can be met using existing service levels and no additional service hours would be added.

Since GRT operates an integrated transfer based route network throughout the Region, if fare free transit is introduced, it should be offered on all routes as it would be challenging to implement in a fragmented manner. However, should Council wish to limit the provision of fare free transit service to riders boarding only in the city where the event is occurring, then the lost revenue per event would be less than identified in the tables below.

### Estimated Lost Revenue Impact of Providing Free GRT Service per Event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Free Service Hours</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Non-Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday after 6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday after 6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday after 12:00 p.m.</td>
<td>$6,300</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday after 12:00 p.m.</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
<td>$6,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table is a summary of the impact of offering fare free transit service for a weekend event based on a variety of service combinations.
Multi-Day Free GRT Service Hour Combinations for a Weekend Event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Free Combinations</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Non- Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday &amp; Saturday evenings after 6:00pm</td>
<td>$9,500</td>
<td>$17,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday &amp; Sunday afternoon and evenings (after 12:00pm)</td>
<td>$9,700</td>
<td>$17,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday after 6:00 pm and also Saturday &amp; Sunday afternoons</td>
<td>$16,700</td>
<td>$30,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is a summary of how requests to provide free transit service to support community events are handled in a few other Canadian municipalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Policy or Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Developed a Transit Fare Waiver and Free Equipment Use Policy. The policy includes 13 historically supported events which were included in the transit budget. There is an additional $50,000 budgeted annually to support other requests which are processed in accordance with the criteria of the policy and do not require City Council approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Do not have a policy. Provide free New Years Eve transit service. Funding for free transit service or free chartered bus services subject to Council approval. On occasion has bartered transit services in exchange for transit advertising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>Policies require transit services to be funded from either the municipal budget or through an external sponsorship. Transit operating budget currently funds additional bus services for Canada Day celebrations and the Bluesfest event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>Municipal Strategic Initiatives Fund can be used to provide funding for events and these grants can be used to pay for free or additional transit services. Otherwise requires cost recovery for municipal services to community events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Has relied on the criteria outlined in their Community Sponsorship Strategy to process a significant number of application requests for free transit services for community events. Has an annual budget of $130,000 for these services. They are modifying this strategy to commit to only a few events annually which are better aligned with their corporate values to leverage the impact they want to make in the community when offering free transit services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, some of the challenges identified by other municipalities included: managing multiple requests for free services, establishing an equitable process to select sponsored events, minimizing the impact to regular transit services and ensuring adequate funding exists to meet the demand for free transit services or free charter services.

Should Council wish to develop a Fare Free Transit Policy, staff request Council allocate funding for the policy. Once the level of funding is allocated staff can develop a policy for Council’s review and approval. Knowing the amount of funding available would assist staff in developing a policy to fit the level of funding.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Focus Area 2.4 - Promote and enhance arts, culture and heritage. Providing access to free transit services for community events and festivals would assist in strengthening the local arts and culture sector within the community.

Focus Area 3.1.3 - Develop and implement programs to improve access to and awareness of public transit. Providing access to free transit services for community events and festivals would raise
awareness of the role of public transit to access community events.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The existing subsidized transit services (fare free New Years Eve Service and the free Christmas Light Tour charters) are included in the annual operating budget. Requests for Economic Development and Promotion (EDP) grants for additional subsidized transit services are considered through the Regional Policy. Should service be introduced for community events then the GRT operating budget should be amended to include a funding provision as directed by Council.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

The Finance Department was consulted in preparation of this report.

ATTACHMENTS:

Policy F-11-050 - Financial Assistance for Events providing an Economic Benefit to the Region

PREPARED BY: Eric Gillespie, Director, Transit Services

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO

POLICY ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR EVENTS PROVIDING AN ECONOMIC BENEFIT TO THE REGION

POLICY OBJECTIVE

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo recognizes that certain events held in the Region of Waterloo may provide an economic benefit to Region and the area municipalities. As such, Regional Council has adopted a policy, as recommended by the Economic Development and Promotion Committee, with respect to providing financial assistance for these events. Financial assistance provided under this policy may be in the form of cash grants, transit services or other in-kind services.

The objective of the policy is to ensure that funding assistance is provided in accordance with an established set of criteria and processes. In addition, the policy recognizes that the economic benefits to the community may change over time and the financial assistance provided to events should reflect the changes.

This policy is specific to financial assistance for events having an economic benefit to the Region. Grants for voluntary organizations; capital grants for hospitals; grants for disaster relief activities; and grants for events taking place at the invitation of Regional Council are covered under separate policies of Regional Council.

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

Section 107(1) of the Municipal Act:

Despite any provision of this or any other Act relating to the giving of grants or aid by a municipality, subject to section 106, a municipality may make grants, on such terms as to security and otherwise as the council considers appropriate, to any person, group or body of any kind, including a fund, within or outside the boundaries of the municipality for any purpose that council considers to be in the interest of the municipality.
APPROVAL

This policy was approved by Regional Council on September 24th, 2003.

1) CRITERIA

The following criteria will be considered when reviewing requests for financial assistance for events having an economic benefit:

- events are to be one-time events or special events being held in the Region;
- objectives and values of the event are to be consistent with those of the Region;
- events are to be non religious / non–denominational;
- events should provide a quantifiable economic benefit to the region;
- sponsorship of the event by charitable or non-profit organizations which does not in-turn provide grants to other organizations;
- use of the proceeds from the event;
- planned use of financial assistance requested from the Region (assistance not provided to cover deficits);
- the appeal of the event to a broad sector of persons;
- the accessibility of the event for spectators;
- the ability of the event to bring people into the Region;
- the ability of the event to result in repeat visits by those attending;
- the ability of the event to enhance the Region’s image;
- the ability of the event to promote the Region within and beyond its boundaries;
- media coverage for the event (including television, newspaper and radio);
- how the Region’s support would be recognized;
- the heritage, cultural or recreational significance of the event;
- overlap with other Regionally funded programs (e.g. Grants to Voluntary Organizations);

- other sources of funding for the event;

It is recognized that some of the above criteria will be difficult to quantify or measure and there will need to be some reliance on the organization making the request to provide such information.

For specific requests for Transit Services or for opportunities to provide transit services in lieu of a cash grant, consideration will also be given to the ability of the event to create additional riders for Grand River Transit.

2) AMOUNT OF FINANCIAL / IN-KIND ASSISTANCE

Unless otherwise approved, $5,000 is the maximum financial assistance to be provided as either cash or services in-kind for events having an economic benefit.

In-kind assistance in the form of advertising on the Region’s buses may be available subject to certain limitations. Use of exterior space for advertising is a contracted service and while the contractor has the exclusive right to handle the lease of exterior space for advertising, some advertising space may be available at discounted rates. In addition, the Region will provide some of
its own exterior advertising space, if available, to a maximum of one community event per area municipality per year. The Region has some rights over the use of interior space for advertising and may provide the use of such space as an in-kind service subject to availability.

3) LOCAL / COMMUNITY REQUESTS FOR TRANSIT SERVICES

Grand River Transit will accommodate “smaller” local or community requests for service or charters within the Transit budget. Generally such requests are from charitable, non-profit and community organizations linked to a fund raising campaign or community event. In reviewing these requests, consideration will be given to the following:

- the nature of the organization as a registered local charitable or non-profit organization;
- the nature of the event as a charitable fund raiser with all funds raised donated to the local organization or a subsidized or “no fee” community event;
- the marketing value of the event;
- the extent of Regional involvement and Regional presence at the event;
- other Regional funding for the group or the event; particularly funding provided through the Grants to Voluntary Organizations program.

Grand River Transit will accommodate “smaller” local and community requests subject to the following limitations:

- for charitable fund raising events, up to 5 hours free service; services in excess of 5 hours provided at 50% of the full charter rate;
- for non-profit community events, services provided at 50% of the full charter rate for a maximum of 5 hours per event;
- existing annual subsidized services for Oktoberfest, New Years Eve and Seniors Christmas Lights Tour will continue to be provided as per previous arrangements.

Requests for such services under Section 3 are to be provided at least 30 days in advance and the provision of services is subject to the availability of resources (including funds within the transit budget) and shall not impact on the delivery of regularly scheduled service.

4) PROCESS FOR REQUESTING FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

a) Requests for financial assistance for events are to be submitted to the Chief Financial Officer by March 1st in the year in which the event is to be held. Finance staff will prepare a report on the requests for consideration by the Economic Development and Promotion Committee with recommendations going forward to Regional Council. Requests for financial assistance received after March 1st will be considered at the discretion of the Committee. In either case, requests for financial assistance must be submitted no later than 60 days prior to the event. Committee will not consider requests for financial assistance that are received after the event has occurred.

b) Requests for transit services for local or community events (per Section 3) are to be submitted to the Director of Transit Services. Requests for services received by Grand River Transit that do not fall under Section 3 will be forwarded to the Chief Financial Officer for review by the
Economic Development and Promotion Committee per Section 4 a) above.

5) PAYMENT OF FUNDS

Cash grants may be provided prior to the event or at the completion of the event as recommended by the Economic Development and Promotion Committee and approved by Regional Council and payment is subject to any reporting conditions established by Regional Council.

6) GRANTS IN-KIND

The awarding of a grant in-kind is subject to any conditions that Regional Council may impose such as insurance, safety of regional employees and participants in the activity and indemnification of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo. In-kind services will be accounted for once the event has been completed and the final costs for the in-kind services are known.

7) USE OF FUNDS

Any financial assistance provided by the Region of Waterloo must be used for the purposes approved by Regional Council unless subsequent approval is given by Regional Council to change the purpose of the assistance.

8) RECOGNITION OF THE REGION’S CONTRIBUTION

Organizations receiving financial assistance for an event from the Region of Waterloo will recognize the Region’s contribution in promotional literature prepared for the event or other agreeable advertising. Use of the Region’s logo in advertising and promotional literature will be coordinated through the Region’s Communications Department.
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: December 11, 2012

FILE CODE: E03-20/4930

SUBJECT: WEST MONTROSE WATER SUPPLY CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) – NOTICE OF COMPLETION

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo receive the report entitled “West Montrose Class Environmental Assessment Project File Report” prepared by Aecom Canada Ltd., dated December 2012, according to Report E-12-124 dated December 11, 2012;

AND THAT Regional Municipality of Waterloo issue the Notice of Completion of Project File Report, and file the Project File Report for public review in accordance with Municipal Class Environmental Assessment requirements.

SUMMARY:

The West Montrose Water Supply System currently services approximately 60 residences within the community of West Montrose, located within the Township of Woolwich. The water supply system has typically been unable to meet water demands of the community due to declining performance of the existing wells. This Class EA was initiated to develop a long-term reliable and sustainable water supply solution for the community of West Montrose.

During the Class EA the proposed alternatives were evaluated against environmental, social, economic and technical criteria. The preferred solution for future water supply to West Montrose is a connection to the Conestogo Plains Water Supply located within the Village of Conestogo. Throughout the Class EA, consultation with the public and government agencies was conducted including a public information centre and presentation at the West Montrose Residents’ Association Annual General Meeting. The primary concern was from the residents of Conestogo who are currently not connected to the municipal water system and who may desire to do so in the future. Based on initial investigations, the Conestogo Plains system has sufficient capacity to supply the current residents connected to the Conestogo Plains system, the community of West Montrose and future potential expansion of the distribution system to unserviced areas of the Village of Conestogo. This will be confirmed through a Class EA for the Conestogo Plains system planned for 2013.

The background studies, evaluation of alternatives, public consultation and proposed work have been documented in a Project File Report for this study. Regional staff is recommending that the Notice of Completion be issued and the Project File Report be made available for 30 day public review in order to complete the required Class Environmental Assessment Process.

REPORT:

Background

The West Montrose Water Supply System partly supplies the community of West Montrose and currently consists of four infiltration wells located within the floodplain of the Grand River. These
wells pump water to a treatment plant which provides iron and manganese removal and cartridge filtration is used as an additional barrier to the treatment process. Water is stored in a reservoir prior to being distributed by the Township of Woolwich to approximately 60 residences.

The water supply system was constructed by a developer in 1988 with the Region assuming ownership in 1994. The Region completed a Class EA in 1997 to address known deficiencies at that time. The recommendations from this study included the construction of a fourth infiltration well as well as a number of treatment upgrades. In recent years, the water supply source has not been able to meet community demands due to declining performance of the existing wells. In order to supplement the well supply water from another Regional source has been transported to the reservoir via trucks.

Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

In February 2011, Regional Council approved retaining Aecom Canada Ltd. to complete the West Montrose Water Supply Class EA and Preliminary Design (Report E-11-019, dated February 25, 2011). The Class EA has been conducted in accordance with the Municipal Engineers Association Class Environmental Assessment Process (October 2000, as amended in 2007 and 2011) including public consultation and preparation of the Project File Report. The preliminary design report for the proposed facilities will be completed following the filing of the Project File Report.

As part of the Class EA a detailed hydrogeologic assessment for the study area was completed. This included a review of the hydrogeologic investigation that was completed in 1995 (as part of the 1997 Class EA), a desktop evaluation of any new geologic mapping and well records for the area, and the construction of five boreholes to gain a better understanding of the local geology. Through the Class EA the following options were examined:

- Do nothing
- Reduce water demand
- Limit community growth
- Modify current O&M practices
- Solely truck water in
- Addition of 5th infiltration well
- New groundwater source (deep overburden aquifer)
- New groundwater source (bedrock)
- Surface water source
- Use surplus capacity from Elmira
- Use Surplus Capacity from Conestogo

The options short-listed for detailed evaluation included a new surface water source, solely trucking water in, local groundwater sources and use of surplus capacity from another water supply system.

As required by the Class EA process, the alternatives identified were evaluated based on potential impacts on the natural, social, technical and economical environments. The proposed preferred solution for the West Montrose Water Supply System is a connection via a new water main to the Region’s Conestogo Plains Water Supply System at an estimated capital cost of $5,000,000. This solution presented a low to average life-cycle cost, as compared to the other alternatives and provided high reliability for a long term water supply as related to quantity, quality and ease of operation.

Based on initial investigations, the Conestogo Plains system has sufficient capacity to supply the current residents connected to the Conestogo Plains system, the community of West Montrose and future potential expansion of the existing distribution system to unserviced areas in the Village of Conestogo. A Class EA for the Conestogo Plains system is planned for 2013 and will confirm the water supply quantity and quality needed for servicing these communities.
Public and Agency Consultation

The evaluation process incorporated public consultation including a Public Information Centre held in September 2012 to present the preferred solution. Notices of the Public Information Centre were mailed to property owners within the study area, appropriate agencies and were posted in the Woolwich Observer, the Elmira Independent and on the Region’s website.

The Public Information Centre (PIC) regarding the Class EA was held on September 18, 2012 at the Conestogo Public School. During the PIC concerns were expressed by residents of Conestogo in regards to sufficient capacity being available for future expansion of the Conestogo distribution system if water were diverted to West Montrose. As previously indicated a Class EA planned for 2013 will examine any impacts on the Conestogo Water Supply System.

Next Steps

Subject to Regional Council approval of the recommendations of this report, a Notice of Completion of the Class EA will be issued according to Class EA requirements, by means of advertisements in local newspapers and mailings to affected property owners, municipalities and agencies. Upon Region Council approval, the Project File Report will be made available for a 30 day public review period.

The preliminary design for the new water main and required modifications to the existing West Montrose Water Treatment Plant will be postponed until after the completion of Class EA for Conestogo Plains starting in 2013.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Implementation of the updated preferred alternative for the West Montrose Water Supply System Class EA will support the Region’s Strategic Plan Focus Area 2: Growth Management and Prosperity, Strategic Objective 2.2, Develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Region’s 2012 Ten Year Water Capital Program provides $5.2 million between 2012 and 2018 for the design, construction administration and construction of the West Montrose Water Supply Project. More detailed cost estimates will be developed during the preliminary and detailed design phases of the project and incorporated into future updates of the Water Capital Program.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL

ATTACHMENTS:

NIL

PREPARED BY:  Pam Law, Senior Project Engineer, Water Services

APPROVED BY:  Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: December 11, 2012

FILE CODE: E12-40/8306

SUBJECT: AYR WASTEWATER SERVICING MASTER PLAN: NOTICE OF COMPLETION

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo receive the report entitled “Ayr Wastewater Servicing Master Plan” prepared by XCG Consultants Inc. dated November 2012, according to Report E-12-125 dated December 11, 2012;

AND THAT Regional Municipality of Waterloo issue the Notice of Completion of the Ayr Wastewater Servicing Master Plan and file the Master Plan Report for public review in accordance with Municipal Engineers Association Master Planning requirements.

SUMMARY:

The goal of the Ayr Wastewater Servicing Master Plan is to develop long term wastewater servicing strategies for the Village of Ayr, taking into account sustainability for long term growth and financially responsible practices. The strategies will define infrastructure requirements and staging necessary to support growth in this community to the year 2031.

The study is being conducted in accordance with the Master Planning requirements of the Municipal Engineers Association Class Environmental Assessment process (June 2000, as amended in 2007 and 2011). The Master Plan will follow Phases 1 and 2 of the Municipal Class EA process.

Consultation with the public, interested parties, municipalities and government agencies was conducted including one Public Information Centre. As part of the master plan three alternatives were evaluated against environmental, social, economic and technical criteria.

The major conclusions and recommendations from the Master Plan include:

- The wastewater collection system has sufficient capacity to accommodate all existing and currently approved development flows;

- The preferred alternative to accommodate flows from future development is to construct a new sanitary sewer pumping station near the intersection of Swan Street and Brant Waterloo Road, including a new forcemain directly connecting the pumping station to the Ayr Wastewater Treatment Plant.

The background studies, evaluation of upgrade requirements, public consultation and proposed work have been documented in a Master Plan Report. Regional staff is recommending that the Notice of Completion be issued and this report be made available for 30 day public review in order to complete the Municipal Engineers Association Master Planning requirements.
**REPORT:**

**Background**

The Village of Ayr is located in the Township of North Dumfries in the southern part of the Region of Waterloo (Region). The Region has historically owned and operated the Ayr Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) and the Rose Street Pumping Station. In 2005, the Region also took over ownership and operational responsibilities for the Ayr wastewater collection system. The wastewater system consists of approximately 24,000 metres of sewers, the Rose Street and Nith River Way Pumping Stations and associated forcemains, and the Ayr WWTP. In 2006, the Ayr WWTP was expanded to a rated capacity of 3,000 m3/d to service a future population to the year 2025. The Class Environmental Assessment Study for the Ayr Wastewater Treatment Capacity Expansion predicted an average flow capacity of 4,100 m3/d would be required to service Ayr to the year 2041.

In 2012, the Region initiated the Ayr Wastewater Servicing Master Plan to develop a long term wastewater collection servicing strategy taking into account sustainability for long term growth and financial responsibility. The study involves development of future population and flow projections, assessment of servicing opportunities and constraints, the development and evaluation of alternatives for future servicing, and selection of the preferred long term servicing strategy. A calibrated computer simulation model of the wastewater collection system was used for assessing existing and future constraints and opportunities. The results of this assessment were used to develop and evaluate alternatives to provide wastewater long term servicing for the Village of Ayr.

**Population and Growth Projections**

The current and future population projections for the Village of Ayr were provided by the Region of Waterloo Department of Planning, Housing and Community Services (Planning) and the Planning Department of the Township of North Dumfries. Current residential and employment populations were based on 2011 data. Future population projections were developed for the short term (including development of all draft approved, registered and un-built units between 2012 to 2017), long term (2031), and ultimate build-out conditions (mature state). The table below summarizes the residential and employment population projections for Village of Ayr for these conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Short (2012 to 2017)</th>
<th>Term (2031)</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Ultimate Build-Out (Mature State)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Population</td>
<td>4,255</td>
<td>5,682</td>
<td>8,691</td>
<td>12,001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Population</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>3,572</td>
<td>3,969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Opportunities and Constraints Analysis**

The Region maintains a calibrated computer simulation model of the wastewater collection system based on the current flow conditions. This model was loaded with flows to represents future population growth scenarios, and a thorough assessment of the existing and future constraints and opportunities was completed.
The above assessment showed the following sanitary sewer sections in which modeled peak flows potentially exceed the pipe design capacity:

Current conditions:

- The existing wastewater collection system has sufficient capacity to convey current peak flows

2017 conditions:

- One sanitary sewer section on Stanley Street between Swan Street and Northumberland Street

2031 conditions (in addition to the 2017 conditions above):

- Two sanitary sewer sections on Swan Street from St. Andrews Street to Stanley Street
- Three sanitary sewer sections on Swan Street in the vicinity of Mitchell Street
- Four sanitary sewer sections on Swan Street in the vicinity of Burnside Drive

As part of the Municipal Engineers Association Master Planning process, evaluation of the “Do Nothing” alternative (Alternative 1) is mandatory. However, this alternative does not meet the long term sewer servicing requirements for Ayr. Two other alternatives were considered and evaluated to resolve the limitations above, and to provide collection system servicing for Ayr to the year 2031 (Alternatives 2 and 3). Although these alternatives were required to provide capacity to the year 2031, consideration was given to future expandability to accommodate additional flows for the Mature State of Ayr. These alternatives were as follows:

- Alternative 2: upgrade the above sections of the collection system presenting long term constraints and expand the existing Rose St. Pumping Station and Forcemain;
- Alternative 3: construct a new Pumping Station and Forcemain to service new development areas in the southern part of Ayr.

Alternative 3 above is recommended to provide wastewater servicing capacity to Ayr to the year 2031. Figure 1 in Appendix A shows the location of the required infrastructure for this alternative. It consists of a new sanitary sewer pumping station near the intersection of Swan Street and Brant Waterloo Road, including a new forcemain directly connecting the pumping station to the Ayr WWTP. This alternative avoids the replacement of deep sections of the existing sewer on Swan Street and any major upgrades to the existing Rose Street Pumping Station. Moreover, this alternative will be generally constructed in undeveloped areas, minimizing disruptions of existing developed areas. Finally, this alternative represents the lowest cost option. Future flow monitoring will confirm whether upgrades to the section of sewer on Stanley Street will be required.

Public Consultation

A Public Information Centre (PIC) was held on November 7, 2012, in the North Dumfries Community Complex, in the Village of Ayr. Two notices of the PIC were posted in the Kitchener Record and Ayr News and PIC notices were posted on the Regions and Townships website and also mailed to interested parties, municipalities and government agencies. 14 attended the PIC and comments were generally positive regarding the Master Plan.
Next Steps

Subject to Regional Council approval of the recommendations of this report, a Notice of Completion of the Ayr Wastewater Servicing Master Plan will be issued according to Municipal Engineers Association Master Planning requirements. The Notice of Completion will be posted in local newspapers and mailed to interested parties, municipalities and government agencies. Upon Region Council approval, the Master Plan Report will be made available for a minimum 30 day public review period.

Following approval of the Ayr Wastewater Servicing Master Plan, the Region will initiate a Class Environmental Assessment for the facilities identified in the preferred alternative of this Master Plan.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Implementation of the updated preferred alternative for the Ayr Wastewater Servicing Master Plan will support the Region's Strategic Plan Focus Area 2: Growth Management and Prosperity, Strategic Objective 2.2, Develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Region’s 2013, Ten Year Wastewater Capital Program provides $3 million between 2015 and 2017 for the design, construction administration and construction of the new Wastewater Pumping Station and Forceemain recommended in the Ayr Wastewater Servicing Master Plan. More detailed cost estimates will be developed during the preliminary and detailed design phases of the project.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL

ATTACHMENTS:

NIL

PREPARED BY: Kevin Dolishny, Senior Project Engineer, Water Services

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
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REGION OF WATERLOO
PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
Community Planning

TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
DATE: December 11, 2012
FILE CODE: D01-01
SUBJECT: REGION OF WATERLOO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT REVISED PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT (SEPTEMBER 2012)

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo forward Report No. P-12-120, dated December 11, 2012, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing as Regional Council’s formal response to the first draft of the revised Provincial Policy Statement.

SUMMARY:

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development. The overall goal of the PPS is to create strong, liveable and healthy communities. Under the Planning Act, all decisions on land use planning matters made by municipalities (including the Region of Waterloo), the Province and the Ontario Municipal Board, must be consistent with the PPS.

In 2010, the Provincial government initiated a five-year review of the 2005 PPS which is currently in effect. As part of the review, the Province invited municipalities, stakeholders and the public to provide input into the process. Regional Council submitted Report P-10-072 to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing for consideration in October 2010. The report recognized the Region’s interrelated interests in land use planning and public health (Regional Council acts as the Board of Health in Waterloo Region) and identified several key policy areas where the PPS could be strengthened.

Overall, the draft PPS (Attachment A) improves on the 2005 PPS in terms of addressing economic development as a matter of provincial interest, incorporating “sustainability” into the policy framework; improving the links between land use, transportation and public health; providing opportunity to plan for infrastructure beyond a 20-year planning horizon; modifying specific cultural heritage policies; introducing new access to local and healthy food policies; and including further guidance on alternative energy renewal systems.

However, priority for additional refinements to the draft PPS policies should be given to:

1) more explicitly supporting the economy;
2) greater consistency with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan);
3) planning for infrastructure;
4) better balancing of environmental protection and mineral aggregate resource extraction;
5) strengthening public health considerations;
6) protecting prime agricultural land;
7) enhancing cultural heritage considerations;
8) consulting with Aboriginal communities; and
9) editorial refinements
Regional comments generally align with those of the Area Municipalities, the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) and other Regions.

REPORT:

The Province of Ontario has initiated a five-year review of its land use planning policies contained in the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). The PPS sets out the Province’s interests in land use planning and development and provides direction on matters of provincial interest. These interests include building strong communities, wise use and management of resources and protecting public health and safety. Under the Planning Act, all decisions on land use planning matters made by municipalities, the Province and the Ontario Municipal Board must be consistent with the PPS.

In September 2012, the Province released a draft set of revised PPS policies (Attachment A) and has invited municipalities, stakeholders and the public to provide input on the revised PPS policies.

General Comments

The overall goal of the PPS is to create strong, liveable and healthy communities. Many of the key planning principles of the PPS reflect principles that Waterloo Region and the Area Municipalities have been advocating for many years. Examples include promoting efficient development and land use patterns, protecting natural features and areas (including agricultural land), promoting economic development and competitiveness, promoting healthy communities, and achieving an appropriate range and density of housing. The draft PPS generally provides strong and consistent policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development, and generally aligns with Regional Council’s vision for a more liveable, healthy and thriving community as expressed through the new Regional Official Plan (ROP).

The next section of this report provides more specific comments regarding key policy areas and identifies some additional policy refinements that would allow municipalities and other stakeholders to implement the PPS in a more effective and consistent manner.

Key Policy Areas

1. Supporting the Economy

   a) Protecting employment areas. The Region strongly supports having a policy to restrict the conversion of lands within employment areas (i.e. suburban industrial/business parks) to residential or retail uses, to promote economic development and competitiveness. However, the policy and associated definition of “employment area” within the PPS need to be refined to provide more specific direction on how this policy is to be implemented. For example, the definition of “employment areas” in the PPS refers to “clusters of business and economic activities including, but not limited to manufacturing, warehousing, offices, and associated retail and ancillary facilities.” This definition has led to several different interpretations by the OMB as to what constitutes an “employment area” (for example, a business park, a downtown, or a retail commercial strip). It is also further complicated by the definition of “employment” (i.e. industrial, commercial and institutional uses) contained in Policy 1.1.1 b).

   The employment land conversion policies in the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan) help to address this problem in part by clarifying that “major retail uses” are considered to be non-employment uses. However, the term “major retail” is not defined in either the Growth Plan or the PPS, leading to interpretation problems when reviewing development applications.
Recommendation: That the term “employment” as used in PPS Policy 1.1.1 b) and elsewhere throughout the PPS be replaced by the term “non-residential”. Alternatively, that the definition of “employment areas” be changed to reflect the original intent of the policy which was to protect suburban industrial/business parks from conversion to residential or retail uses. Further, that the PPS be consistent with the Growth Plan and explicitly note that major retail uses are considered non-employment uses, and that the term “major retail uses” be defined in the Glossary.

b) Choice of sites for business. Section 1.3.2 addresses the protection of employment lands and Section 1.7 addresses long-term economic prosperity, but the draft PPS does not contain policies that specifically address the need to provide a range of designated employment lands to accommodate the future employment growth of existing and future businesses.

The Growth Plan contains language regarding employment land designations in municipalities located within the Greater Golden Horseshoe. For example, Policy 2.2.6 of the Growth Plan states that “2. Municipalities will promote economic development and competitiveness by …b) providing opportunities for a diversified economic base, including maintaining a range and choice of suitable sites for employment uses which support a wide range of economic activities and ancillary uses, and take into account the needs of existing and future businesses…”

New strategic employment lands (i.e. large scale, greenfield employment areas) typically build-out over longer time frames than new residential areas and have unique infrastructure planning requirements to address goods movement and land use compatibility issues. In addition, demand for large industrial lots is often unpredictable, but maintaining an inventory of large lots is critical for a municipality to be able to respond quickly to new employment opportunities when they arise. Recent experiences in Waterloo Region (e.g. in establishing the Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve lands in the East Side and the 97/401 area) and throughout the Greater Golden Horseshoe, have shown that because of these considerations, planning for new strategic employment land may have to exceed the quantum of land otherwise required within the 20 year planning horizon currently provided for in the PPS.

Recommendation: That the PPS be revised to incorporate language similar to Growth Plan Policy 2.2.6 concerning the need to maintain a range and choice of sites for existing and future businesses, and that municipalities be permitted to exceed the quantum of employment lands otherwise required within a 20-year time horizon to address shortfalls in the range and choice of employment lands meeting specific characteristics (e.g. location, rail access, size of sites). Where municipalities exceed the 20 year time horizon, municipal official plans shall have staging and employment land conversion policies to ensure that the lands are maintained for the intended employment uses.

c) Long-term infrastructure planning. While the PPS continues to provide a growth management framework designed to restrict urban designations to a maximum time horizon of 20 years, the Region welcomes the proposed addition to Policy 1.1.2 which would permit municipalities to plan for infrastructure and public service facilities beyond a 20-year time horizon. This addition helps support the development of strong communities through the use of policies such as ROP Policy 2.B.3 which provide a basis for long-term infrastructure planning for areas like the East Side which are not yet designated in the ROP as Urban Area or Township Urban Area.

Recommendation: That the proposed addition to Policy 1.1.2 to allow for infrastructure planning beyond a 20 year time horizon, be strongly endorsed.
2. **Consistency with the Growth Plan**

   a) **Growth Plan terms in the PPS.** Regional staff recognizes that the PPS applies to the entire Province of Ontario, whereas the Growth Plan applies specifically to the Greater Golden Horseshoe. However, absent a statement that the Growth Plan policies supersede the PPS policies within the Greater Golden Horseshoe, there are several terms that are defined in the Growth Plan which support the ROP, which should also be included in the PPS.

   **Recommendation:** That the PPS be revised to explicitly state that where conflicts arise between PPS and Growth Plan policies, the Growth Plan policies take precedence. That in the absence of such a statement, the defined Growth Plan terms “complete communities”, “municipal comprehensive review”, “community infrastructure” and “higher order transit” be incorporated into the PPS to provide for consistent policy direction across the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

   b) **Municipal comprehensive review.** The PPS requires that planning decisions pertaining to settlement area expansions and employment land conversions be considered only as part of a “comprehensive review.” The Growth Plan has similar provisions, but uses the term “municipal comprehensive review.” The definitions and policy requirements of the two terms are different, leading to potential inconsistencies in how the policies are applied. For example, when addressing employment land conversion, use of the term “municipal comprehensive review” means that the review must be initiated by the council of a municipality, whereas use of the term “comprehensive review” means that the review may be initiated by the council of a municipality or any other stakeholder.

   **Recommendation:** That the PPS be revised to use the Growth Plan’s definition of “municipal comprehensive review” with respect to development applications within the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

   c) **Linking residential land need requirements with Growth Plan targets.** The PPS policies relating to housing provide a significant amount of guidance for regional and area municipalities. However, there are policies in the draft PPS that do not link the projected housing needs with the relevant housing policies and targets in the Growth Plan.

   Specifically, Policy 1.4.1 (a & b) states, “[T]o provide for an appropriate range of housing types and densities required to meet projected requirements of current and future residents of the regional market area identified in Policy 1.4.3, planning authorities shall:...” This wording is different than the wording in the Growth Plan that is explicitly intended to yield a range, mix and density of housing types and development patterns that are different from what has typically been built throughout the Greater Golden Horseshoe in the past. This lack of common wording between the PPS and the Growth Plan was a key issue in the Regional Land Budget portion of the ROP OMB Hearing where the Region put forward a land budget based on the requirements of the Growth Plan and the appellants have put forward an alternative land budget based to a large extent on past housing trends consistent with their interpretation of the wording in the PPS.

   **Recommendation:** That Policy 1.4.1 be revised to include the phrase “…projected needs for a time horizon of up to 20 years and where applicable achieve the targets set out in other Provincial Plans, such as the Growth Plan.”

   d) **Combining the PPS and the Growth Plan Reviews.** The Province is currently in the process of considering an amendment to the Growth Plan to extend the population and employment projections contained in Schedule 3 from 2031 to 2041. The Province is also required to undertake a comprehensive review of the Growth Plan every 10 years after it was approved, which means that the first comprehensive review will occur in 2016. Given the strong linkages
between the PPS and the Growth Plan and the timing of required Growth Plan amendments and reviews, it is appropriate to consider whether the initiatives to review and update the PPS and the Growth Plan can be better aligned and, where policy conflicts arise, clearly clarify which of the documents takes precedence through such processes.

There are also several other major provincial planning-related acts and/or plans such as the Aggregate Resources Act, the Greenbelt Plan, and Source Protection Plans which are currently being reviewed or will shortly be reviewed. Municipalities are required to bring their official plans and related planning documents into conformity with these acts and plans. The result of these requirements is that it is very difficult for municipalities to develop and implement their own planning policies, regulations, programs and guidelines in a timely manner.

Recommendation: That the Province combine the PPS review with the comprehensive review of the Growth Plan in 2016. Further, that the Province work with stakeholders to consider timing options for the review and release of Provincial acts and plans, such as reviewing the PPS every 10 years, in order to provide reasonable opportunity for municipalities to fully implement such reviews and provide for monitoring of the policy implementation before the next review begins.

3. Strengthening Public Health Considerations

a) Public health and land use patterns. Various public health considerations have been incorporated into the policy framework of the draft PPS. Examples include transportation demand management, green infrastructure, local food and green building. However, these considerations are currently absent in Policy 1.1.3.2 which deals with land use patterns within settlement areas. This policy could be simplified and address public health considerations in a more effective manner.

Recommendation: That Policy 1.1.3.2 be revised to read:

“Land use patterns within settlement areas shall be based on:

a. Densities and a mix of land uses which:

1. Achieve sustainable use of land and resources, including the protection of prime agricultural areas;
2. Optimize the use of existing infrastructure and public service facilities which are planned or available, and avoid the need for unjustified and/or uneconomical infrastructure and public service facilities expansion;
3. Minimize negative impacts to air quality, water quantity and quality, and promote per capita decreases in energy consumption; and
4. Support, where applicable, transit-supportive development, active transportation and goods movement.

b) Local food systems. The Region is pleased to see the reference to local food within Policy 1.7.1 regarding long-term economic prosperity. However, the draft PPS does not address local food systems.

Recommendation: That Policy 1.7.1 be revised to include “i) promoting improvements to local food systems including food processing, farmer’s markets and community gardens.”
c) **Protecting public health and safety.** The Region is concerned with the addition of the word “generally” in the introductory language of Section 3.0 because it suggests that there are situations where it would be appropriate to direct development towards natural or human-made hazards where there is an unacceptable risk to public health.

**Recommendation:** That the word “generally” be deleted from Section 3.0.

4. **Better Balancing of Environmental Protection and Mineral Aggregate Resources Extraction**

   a) **Municipal discretion.** The PPS contains several areas of Provincial planning interest including natural heritage, water, agriculture and mineral aggregate resources. However, the PPS as currently drafted provides little direction to municipalities on situations where these policies pertaining to Provincial planning interests conflict, and does not provide municipalities with sufficient discretion to consider local conditions and circumstances when a conflict between these areas arises. This situation is of particular concern with respect to conflicts between mineral aggregate resources and other Provincial planning interests such as water resource and environmental protection.

   **Recommendation:** That the PPS be revised to further clarify the ability of municipalities to take local circumstances into consideration when addressing provincial interests related to water resource protection, natural heritage, agriculture and mineral aggregate resources.

   b) **Cumulative impacts.** The PPS as currently drafted does not make reference to studying or examining the cumulative impacts of mineral aggregate extraction, which is of particular importance in areas where multiple mineral aggregate extraction operations are present and proposed.

   **Recommendation:** That a new policy be added to the PPS requiring the study of cumulative impacts of existing and proposed aggregate extraction when establishing new mineral aggregate operations.

   c) **No negative impact.** The Region is concerned with the introduction of Policy 2.5.3.2 which provides the ability to take into consideration rehabilitation plans when assessing no negative impact of extraction on natural heritage features. In the absence of clear understanding of what the introduction of this policy into the PPS entails, the high level of protection associated with the no negative impact test in the current PPS would be opened up for potential abuse.

   **Recommendation:** That the Province undertake further consultation relating to the introduction of Policy 2.5.3.2 to allow municipalities to fully understand the intent of this policy and how the implementation of this policy is to be put into practice.

5. **Planning for Infrastructure**

   a) **Regulatory requirements for sewage and water services.** Provision of infrastructure that meets all regulatory requirements, is technically feasible and is economically sustainable has always been difficult. The requirement for increasingly complex and expensive treatment processes to meet regulatory requirements will make sustainability and financial viability even more difficult in the future. Proposed Policy 1.6.5.1 b) is of concern in this respect because it states that “Planning for sewage and water services shall ensure that these systems are provided in a manner that is feasible, financially viable and complies with all regulatory requirements.”

   **Recommendation:** That in establishing regulatory requirements, the Province carefully consider the financial viability and sustainability prior to implementing new regulations,
and where appropriate, provide financial support for capital projects. The Province should also continue to support research to develop cost-effective treatment technologies.

6. Protecting Prime Agricultural Areas

a) Remnant farm parcels. PPS Policy 2.3.4.1 c) regarding the severance of a residence surplus to a farming operation focuses on accommodating the proposed new residential lot rather than the remnant farm parcel.

Recommendation: That Policy 2.3.4.1 c) make specific reference to and place priority on the long-term viability of the remnant farm parcel when considering the severance of a residence surplus to a farming operation.

7. Enhancing Cultural Heritage Considerations

a) Definition of “conserve”. The changes made to several of the Cultural Heritage policies in the revised PPS are appreciated, specifically in respect to Policies 2.6.2 and 2.6.3. However, there is an opportunity to refine the definition of “conserve” so that it does not apply solely to matters under the Ontario Heritage Act.

Recommendation: That the PPS definition of “conserve” be refined to read “…of interest is retained under the Planning Act, the Ontario Heritage Act, the Cemeteries Act, the Environmental Assessment Act, the Municipal Act, and the Ontario Building Code Act, the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists, the Ontario Heritage Toolkit, the Heritage Conservation Principles for Land Use Planning, and the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada.”

b) Additional references to cultural heritage planning. The PPS currently contains a single reference to cultural planning within Policy 1.7.1 d). It is unclear as to how this relates to Section 2.6 which contains specific policies on Cultural Heritage and Archaeology and why this term is not used elsewhere in the document.

Recommendation: That PPS Policy 2.6.1 be revised to grant municipalities the ability to require Heritage Impact Assessments where development and site alteration is proposed on lands adjacent to any significant heritage resource where the resource may be negatively impacted. Further, that the Province clarify how municipalities are expected to implement Policies 1.7.1 d) and 2.6.

8. Consulting with Aboriginal communities. The draft PPS contains new polices regarding consultation with Aboriginal communities. However, the proposed wording is vague and it is unclear how it is expected to be implemented. Until such time as the intent of the new policies is clarified, the Region will continue its regular communication with Aboriginal communities.

Recommendation: That the Province provide clearer direction in the PPS regarding its expectations of municipalities with respect to addressing the land use planning interests of Aboriginal communities.
9. Editorial Refinements

a) Planning principles. The introductory language in Part IV: Vision for Ontario’s Land Use Planning System of the PPS contains phrases such as “…based on good planning principles…” and “…The fundamental principles set out in the Provincial Policy Statement…”. However, as these “good planning principles” and “fundamental principles” are never explicitly identified, there is increased risk that the PPS will not be interpreted or applied appropriately.

Recommendation: That the introductory language of the PPS be revised to explicitly state the good planning principles and/or the fundamental principles upon which the PPS is based.

b) New terms. The draft PPS contains a number of new terms including “sustainability”, “resilient”, “place-based” and “climate change”. Little or no direction is provided within the policy framework or within the definitions section as to the meaning of these terms.

Recommendation: That the draft PPS be revised to define or describe these terms to promote consistency of interpretation, and/or that the appropriate technical guidelines are developed or updated to provide context for these terms. Alternatively, it is recommended that some of these terms be deleted from of the PPS.

c) Ambiguous policies. There are a number of ambiguous policies within the PPS. For example Policy 1.2.3 states that “Planning authorities should coordinate emergency management and other economic, environmental and social planning considerations to support efficient and resilient communities” and Policy 1.6.1 states that “Infrastructure and public service facilities shall be provided in a coordinated, efficient and cost-effective manner that considers impacts from climate change while accommodating projected needs” These policies regarding planning for resilient communities and climate change do not provide enough direction to be meaningful for implementation at the municipal level.

Recommendation: That Policies 1.2.3 and 1.6.1 be revised with the intent of making the wording of the proposed new policies less ambiguous and promote clearer reading of the PPS.

Next Steps

Regional staff will seek additional dialogue with Provincial staff on the matters of Regional interest identified in this report and will report back to Regional Council as appropriate regarding the next steps in the Province’s Five Year Review of the PPS.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

The Area Municipalities and Grand River Conservation Area (GRCA) are aware of the Provincial Policy Statement Review process. Regional staff met with Area Municipal and GRCA staff on October 22, 2012 to discuss the draft revised Provincial Policy Statement. Notes from that meeting were provided to all participants. This report has been circulated to Area Municipal and GRCA staff for their information. Regional comments generally align with those of our Area Municipal and GRCA colleagues. Regional staff will continue to co-ordinate discussion and responses regarding the Five Year Review of the PPS with Area Municipal and GRCA staff.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This report addresses four of the five focus areas of the Corporate Strategic Plan: Environmental Sustainability, Growth Management and Prosperity, Sustainable Transportation, and Healthy and Inclusive Communities.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

NIL

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from Transportation and Environmental Services, Public Health and Corporate Resources (Legal Services) have been consulted and their comments have been included in this report.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A – Provincial Policy Statement Review Under the Planning Act, Draft Policies

PREPARED BY:  Kevin Curtis, Manager Strategic Policy Development
   Alyssa Bridge, Principal Planner

APPROVED BY:  Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT REVIEW UNDER THE PLANNING ACT

Draft Policies

September 2012
For additional copies of this document in either French or English, please contact:

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Provincial Planning Policy Branch
777 Bay Street, 14th Floor
Toronto, ON M5G 2E5

Tel: 416-585-6014 or 1-877-711-8208
Fax: 416-585-6870
E-mail: PPSreview@ontario.ca
Website: ontario.ca/PPS
How to Participate in the Provincial Policy Statement Review

We want your views on the draft policies of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), and on the legislated review cycle for the PPS.

The Province is holding regional workshops in communities across Ontario. Please visit our website at ontario.ca/PPS for information on dates and locations, or call 1-877-711-8208, if you have any questions.

The following sections provide important background information. Specific consultation questions are included in the final section of this document. You can remove the consultation questions section and mail or fax your comments to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

To submit your comments electronically, complete an online questionnaire available at ontario.ca/PPS.

You may send written comments to:

Provincial Policy Statement Review
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Provincial Planning Policy Branch
777 Bay Street, 14th Floor
Toronto, ON M5G 2E5

Tel: 416-585-6014 or 1-877-711-8208
Fax: 416-585-6870
E-mail: PPSreview@ontario.ca
Website: ontario.ca/PPS

Please note: All comments and submissions received will become part of the public record.

Comments must be received no later than November 23, 2012.

Thank you for helping to shape planning in Ontario.
Provincial Policy Statement

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), issued under the Planning Act, is the statement of the Province’s policies concerning land use planning. The PPS provides policy direction for the entire province on matters of provincial interest in land use planning and development and recognizes the diversity of Ontario. Provincial plans apply to certain areas of the province and provide specific direction that generally takes precedence over the PPS.

Implementation of the PPS is set out through the Planning Act, which requires that decisions on land use planning matters made by municipalities, the Province, the Ontario Municipal Board and other decision-makers “shall be consistent with” the PPS. Municipalities are the prime implementers of the PPS through policies in their municipal official plans and through decisions on other planning matters.

The current PPS came into effect on March 1, 2005. Subsection 3(10) of the Planning Act states that the PPS must be reviewed every five years from the date that the PPS came into effect, to determine whether revisions are needed.

The five-year review of the PPS commenced in March 1, 2010 and has included extensive consultation across Ontario with members of the public, municipalities, Aboriginal communities and organizations, and stakeholders. The input, ideas and suggestions from the consultation have helped shape proposed revisions to the PPS and prompted consideration of whether to extend the legislated PPS five-year review cycle.

The PPS review provides an opportunity to examine the Province’s land use policy direction on key interests that affect our overall well-being. These include: creating strong, livable and healthy communities; supporting a vibrant and strong economy; and protecting the environment and resources, such as water, green space, agricultural lands and natural and cultural heritage.
Highlights of Proposed New Policy Directions

The draft policies are intended to ensure that provincial land use planning interests are protected.

The draft policies build upon the existing policy framework of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2005 and are intended to provide stronger, clearer direction to support the following goals:

Building strong, healthy communities by:

- Promoting greater coordination between municipalities and other levels of government, agencies and boards
- Strengthening linkages between land use planning and healthy, active communities
- Encouraging coordination and co-location of public facilities and coordination between municipalities and other levels of government
- Supporting active transportation and transit, and providing connectivity within and among transportation modes
- Recognizing the range and diversity of settlement areas across Ontario
- Recognizing that all areas experience land use change but not necessarily growth
- Clarifying that the requirements to support small expansions of settlements may be less than those for large expansions
- Allowing limited use of septic tanks and wells for minor infill development and rounding out of unserviced settlement areas
- Recognizing Aboriginal interests
- Encouraging planning authorities to coordinate planning with Aboriginal communities, where appropriate
- Acknowledging that the PPS is to be implemented in a manner consistent with Aboriginal and treaty rights in the Constitution Act, 1982
- Encouraging coordination of emergency management with other planning considerations
- Recognizing the importance of parks and recreation, green spaces, trails and trail linkages
- Requiring the consideration of potential impacts of climate change adaptation and mitigation
- Encouraging green infrastructure and strengthening stormwater management requirements
- Directing development away from areas of high to extreme risk of wildland fire unless the risk is mitigated
Supporting a strong economy by:

- Promoting investment-ready communities and opportunities for economic development
- Recognizing the importance of communication infrastructure
- Strengthening protection for major industries from incompatible uses
- Planning for and protecting corridors for goods movement and future employment along those corridors
- Protecting provincially planned corridors and promoting land use compatibility for lands adjacent to the planned and existing corridors
- Clarifying that planning for infrastructure can go beyond the 20 year time horizon
- Supporting long-term planning for employment areas
- Supporting the adaptive re-use of infrastructure
- Requiring consideration of the life-cycle cost of infrastructure
- Permitting additional uses on farms and providing flexibility for agricultural-related uses
- Requiring agricultural areas to be designated in municipal official plans and impacts of non-farm development surrounding agricultural operations to be mitigated

Protecting the environment and resources by:

- Recognizing the importance of biodiversity
- Requiring identification of shoreline areas
- Requiring the identification of natural heritage systems in southern Ontario
- Recognizing the importance of the Great Lakes and expanding protection for Great Lakes coastal wetlands
- Refining the area of protection for significant woodlands and valleylands in southern Ontario
- Strengthening requirements for the rehabilitation of specialty crop areas that are subject to aggregate extraction
- Clarifying provisions for aggregate extraction within and adjacent to certain natural heritage features
- Encouraging comprehensive rehabilitation planning after aggregate extraction
- Supporting the conservation of aggregate resources, including recycling and reuse
- Promoting the conservation of cultural heritage and archaeological resources
- Requiring mineral deposits, petroleum resources and aggregate resources to be identified in municipal official plans

The draft policies generally focus on outcomes, rather than the process. This protects provincial interests while considering unique local circumstances and providing an opportunity for approaches to be developed locally to achieve those outcomes.

Questions for Your Consideration

The Province wants your views on the draft Provincial Policy Statement policies.

As you read through the attached draft policies, we would appreciate hearing your views on the following questions:

1. Do the draft policies provide sufficient direction to effectively protect provincial interests in land use planning? (See page 4.)
2. Are there additional land use planning matters that require provincial policy direction and which are not included?
3. Do you foresee any implementation challenges with the draft policies?
4. Is additional support material needed to help implement the Provincial Policy Statement?

The Province also wants your views on the current 5-year review period for the Provincial Policy Statement, and whether you believe section 3 of the Planning Act should be amended to extend the period between reviews of the PPS.

5. Do you think that the legislated Provincial Policy Statement review cycle should be extended from the current 5-year period?
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Part I: PREAMBLE

The Provincial Policy Statement provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development. As a key part of Ontario’s policy-led planning system, the Provincial Policy Statement sets the policy foundation for regulating the development and use of land. It also supports the provincial goal to enhance the quality of life for all Ontarians.

The Provincial Policy Statement provides for appropriate development while protecting resources of provincial interest, public health and safety, and the quality of the natural environment. The Provincial Policy Statement supports improved land use planning and management, which contributes to a more effective and efficient land use planning system.

The policies of the Provincial Policy Statement may be complemented by provincial plans or by locally-generated policies regarding matters of municipal interest. Provincial plans and municipal official plans provide a framework for comprehensive, integrated, place-based and long-term planning that supports and integrates the principles of strong communities, a clean and healthy environment and economic growth, for the long term.

Land use planning is only one of the tools for implementing provincial interests. A wide range of legislation, regulations, policies and programs may also affect planning matters, and assist in implementing these interests.

Part II: LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

The Provincial Policy Statement is issued under the authority of section 3 of the Planning Act and came into effect on <DATE>.

In respect of the exercise of any authority that affects a planning matter, section 3 of the Planning Act requires that decisions affecting planning matters “shall be consistent with” policy statements issued under the Act.

Part III: HOW TO READ THE PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT

The provincial policy-led planning system recognizes and addresses the complex inter-relationships among environmental, economic and social factors in land use planning. The Provincial Policy Statement supports a comprehensive, integrated, place-based and long-term approach to planning, and recognizes linkages among policy areas.

Read the Entire Provincial Policy Statement

The Provincial Policy Statement is more than a set of individual policies. It is intended to be read in its entirety and the relevant policies are to be applied to each situation. When more than one policy is relevant, a decision-maker should consider all of the relevant policies to understand how they work together. The language of each policy, including the implementation and interpretation policies, will assist decision-makers in understanding how the policies are to be implemented.

There is no implied priority in the order in which the policies appear.
Consider Specific Policy Language

When applying the Provincial Policy Statement it is important to consider the specific language of the policies. Each policy provides direction on how it is to be implemented, how it is situated within the broader Provincial Policy Statement, and how it relates to other policies.

Some policies set out positive directives, such as “settlement areas shall be the focus of growth and development”. Other policies set out limitations and prohibitions, such as “development and site alteration shall not be permitted”. Other policies use enabling or supportive language, such as “should,” “promote” and “encourage”.

The choice of language is intended to distinguish between the types of policies and the nature of implementation. There is some discretion when applying a policy with enabling or supportive language in contrast to a policy with a directive, limitation or prohibition.

Geographic Scale of Policies

The Provincial Policy Statement recognizes the diversity of Ontario and that local context is important. Policies are outcome oriented, and some policies provide flexibility in their implementation provided that provincial interests are upheld.

While the Provincial Policy Statement is intended to be read as a whole, not all polices will be applicable to every site, feature or area. The Provincial Policy Statement applies at a range of geographic scales.

Some of the policies refer to specific areas or features and can only be applied where these features or areas exist. Other policies refer to planning objectives that need to be considered in the context of the municipality or planning area as a whole, and are not necessarily applicable to a specific site or development proposal.

Policies Represent Minimum Standards

The policies of the Provincial Policy Statement represent minimum standards.

Within the framework of the provincial policy-led planning system, planning authorities and decision-makers may build upon these minimum standards to address matters of importance to a specific community, unless doing so would conflict with any policy of the Provincial Policy Statement.

Defined Terms and Meanings

Except for references to legislation which are italicized, other italicized terms in the Provincial Policy Statement are defined in the Definitions section. For other terms, the normal meaning of the word applies. Terms may be italicized only in specific policies; for these terms, the defined meaning applies where they are italicized and the normal meaning applies where they are not italicized. Defined terms in the Definitions section are intended to capture both singular and plural forms of these terms in the policies.
Part IV: VISION FOR ONTARIO'S LAND USE PLANNING SYSTEM

The long-term prosperity and social well-being of Ontarians depend on maintaining strong, sustainable and resilient communities, a clean and healthy environment and a strong economy.

Ontario is a vast province with diverse urban, rural and northern communities which may face different challenges related to diversity in population levels, economic activity, pace of growth and physical and natural conditions. Some areas face challenges related to maintaining population and diversifying their economy, while other areas face challenges related to accommodating and managing the development and population growth which is occurring, while protecting important resources and the quality of the natural environment. The Provincial Policy Statement reflects this diversity, which includes the histories and cultures of Aboriginal peoples, and is based on good planning principles that apply in communities across Ontario. The Province recognizes the importance of consulting with Aboriginal communities, as appropriate, on planning matters that may affect their rights and interests.

The Provincial Policy Statement focuses growth and development within settlement areas and away from significant or sensitive resources and areas which may pose a risk to public health and safety. It recognizes that the wise management of land use change may involve directing, promoting or sustaining development. Land use must be carefully managed to accommodate appropriate development to meet the full range of current and future needs, while achieving efficient development patterns.

Efficient development patterns optimize the use of land, resources and public investment in infrastructure and public service facilities. These land use patterns promote a mix of housing, including affordable housing, employment, recreation, parks and open spaces, and transportation choices that increase the use of active transportation and transit before other modes of travel. They also support the financial well-being of the Province and municipalities over the long term, and minimize the undesirable effects of development, including impacts on air, water and other resources. Strong, liveable and healthy communities promote and enhance human health and social well-being, are economically and environmentally sound, and are resilient to climate change.

The Province’s natural heritage resources, water resources, including the Great Lakes, agricultural resources and the food provided by these areas, mineral resources, and cultural heritage and archaeological resources provide important environmental, economic and social benefits. The wise use and management of these resources over the long term is a key provincial interest. The Province must ensure that its resources are managed in a sustainable way to maintain biodiversity, protect essential ecological processes and public health and safety, minimize environmental and social impacts, and meet its long-term needs.

It is equally important to protect the overall health and safety of the population. The Provincial Policy Statement directs development away from areas of natural and human-made hazards, where these hazards cannot be mitigated. This preventative approach supports provincial and municipal financial well-being over the long term, protects public health and safety, and minimizes cost, risk and social disruption.

Taking action to conserve land and resources avoids the need for costly remedial measures to correct problems and supports economic and environmental principles.

Strong communities, a clean and healthy environment and a strong economy are inextricably linked. Long-term prosperity, human and environmental health and social well-being should take precedence over short-term considerations.
The fundamental principles set out in the Provincial Policy Statement apply throughout Ontario. To support our collective well-being, now and in the future, all land use must be well managed.
Part V: POLICIES

1.0 BUILDING STRONG HEALTHY COMMUNITIES

Ontario is a vast province with urban, rural, and northern communities with diversity in population levels, economic activities, pace of growth and physical and natural conditions. Ontario’s long-term prosperity, environmental health and social well-being depend on wisely managing change and promoting efficient land use and development patterns. Efficient land use and development patterns support sustainability by promoting strong, liveable, healthy and resilient communities, protecting the environment and public health and safety, and facilitating economic growth.

Accordingly:

1.1 MANAGING AND DIRECTING LAND USE TO ACHIEVE EFFICIENT AND RESILIENT DEVELOPMENT AND LAND USE PATTERNS

1.1.1 Healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by:

a) promoting efficient development and land use patterns which sustain the financial well-being of the Province and municipalities over the long term;
b) accommodating an appropriate range and mix of residential (including affordable housing), employment (including industrial, commercial and institutional uses), recreation, park and open space uses to meet long-term needs;
c) avoiding development and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns;
d) avoiding development and land use patterns that would prevent the efficient expansion of settlement areas in those areas which are adjacent or close to settlement areas;
e) promoting cost-effective development patterns and standards to minimize land consumption and servicing costs;
f) improving accessibility for persons with disabilities by identifying, preventing and removing land use barriers which restrict their full participation in society;
g) ensuring that necessary infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available to meet current and projected needs; and
h) promoting development and land use patterns that maintain biodiversity and resilience to climate change.

1.1.2 Sufficient land shall be made available through intensification and redevelopment and, if necessary, designated growth areas, to accommodate an appropriate range and mix of employment opportunities, housing and other land uses to meet projected needs for a time horizon of up to 20 years. However, where an alternate time period has been established for specific areas of the Province as a result of a provincial planning exercise or a provincial plan, that time frame may be used for municipalities within the area.

Nothing in policy 1.1.2 limits the planning for infrastructure and public service facilities beyond a 20-year time horizon.
1.1.3 Settlement Areas

Settlement areas are urban areas and rural settlement areas, and include cities, towns, villages and hamlets. Ontario's settlement areas vary significantly in terms of size, density, population levels, economic activity, diversity and intensity of land uses, and types of infrastructure available.

The vitality of settlement areas is critical to the long-term economic prosperity of our communities. Development pressures and land use change will vary across Ontario. It is in the interest of all communities to use land and resources wisely, to promote efficient development patterns, protect resources, promote green spaces, ensure effective use of infrastructure and public service facilities and minimize unnecessary public expenditures.

1.1.3.1 Settlement areas shall be the focus of growth or development, and their vitality and regeneration shall be promoted.

1.1.3.2 Land use patterns within settlement areas shall be based on:

a) densities and a mix of land uses which:
   1. efficiently use land and resources;
   2. are appropriate for, and efficiently use, the infrastructure and public service facilities which are planned or available, and avoid the need for their unjustified and/or uneconomical expansion;
   3. minimize negative impacts to air quality and climate change, and promote energy efficiency;
   4. support active transportation;
   5. are transit-supportive, where transit is planned, exists or may be developed; and
   6. support the efficient movement of goods; and

b) a range of uses and opportunities for intensification and redevelopment in accordance with the criteria in policy 1.1.3.3, where this can be accommodated.

1.1.3.3 Planning authorities shall identify and promote opportunities for intensification and redevelopment where this can be accommodated taking into account existing building stock or areas, including brownfield sites, and the availability of suitable existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities required to accommodate projected needs.

Intensification and redevelopment shall be directed in accordance with the policies of Section 2: Wise Use and Management of Resources and Section 3: Protecting Public Health and Safety.

1.1.3.4 Appropriate development standards should be promoted which facilitate intensification, redevelopment and compact form, while avoiding or mitigating risks to public health and safety.

1.1.3.5 Planning authorities shall establish and implement minimum targets for intensification and redevelopment within built-up areas. However, where provincial targets are established through provincial plans, the provincial target shall represent the minimum target for affected areas.

1.1.3.6 New development taking place in designated growth areas should occur adjacent to the existing built-up area and shall have a compact form, mix of uses and densities that allow for the efficient use of land, infrastructure and public service facilities.
1.1.3.7 Planning authorities shall establish and implement phasing policies to ensure:

a) that specified targets for intensification and redevelopment are achieved prior to, or concurrent with, new development within designated growth areas; and

b) the orderly progression of development within designated growth areas and the timely provision of the infrastructure and public service facilities required to meet current and projected needs.

1.1.3.8 A planning authority may identify a settlement area or allow the expansion of a settlement area boundary only at the time of a comprehensive review and only where it has been demonstrated that:

a) sufficient opportunities for growth are not available through intensification, redevelopment and designated growth areas to accommodate the projected needs over the identified planning horizon;

b) the infrastructure and public service facilities which are planned or available are suitable for the development over the long term, are financially viable over their life cycle, and protect public health and safety and the natural environment;

c) in prime agricultural areas:
   1. the lands do not comprise specialty crop areas;
   2. alternative locations have been evaluated, and
      i. there are no reasonable alternatives which avoid prime agricultural areas; and
      ii. there are no reasonable alternatives on lower priority agricultural lands in prime agricultural areas;

d) the new or expanding settlement area is in compliance with the minimum distance separation formulae; and

e) impacts from new or expanding settlement areas on agricultural operations which are adjacent or close to the settlement area are mitigated to the extent feasible.

In determining the most appropriate direction for expansions to the boundaries of settlement areas or the identification of a settlement area by a planning authority, a planning authority shall apply the policies of Section 2: Wise Use and Management of Resources and Section 3: Protecting Public Health and Safety.

1.1.4 Rural Areas in Municipalities

Rural areas are important to the economic success of the Province and our quality of life. Rural areas are those areas which are located outside of settlement areas and prime agricultural areas. Ontario’s rural areas have diverse population levels, natural resources, geographies and physical characteristics, and economies.

Rural areas and settlement areas are interdependent in terms of markets, resources and amenities. It is important to protect and build on rural assets and amenities to support a sustainable economy.

1.1.4.1 In rural areas located in municipalities, permitted uses and activities shall relate to the management or use of resources, resource-based recreational activities, limited residential development and other rural land uses.

1.1.4.2 Development shall be appropriate to the infrastructure which is planned or available, and avoid the need for the unjustified and/or uneconomical expansion of this infrastructure.

1.1.4.3 New land uses, including the creation of lots, and new or expanding livestock facilities, shall comply with the minimum distance separation formulae.
1.1.4.4 Development that is compatible with the rural landscape and can be sustained by rural service levels should be promoted.

1.1.4.5 Agricultural uses, agriculture-related uses, on-farm diversified uses and normal farm practices should be protected and promoted in accordance with provincial standards.

1.1.4.6 Locally-important agricultural and resource areas should be designated and protected by directing non-related development to areas where it will not constrain these uses.

1.1.4.7 Opportunities should be retained to locate new or expanding land uses that require separation from other uses.

1.1.4.8 Recreational, tourism and other economic opportunities should be promoted.

1.1.5 **Territory Without Municipal Organization**

1.1.5.1 In rural areas located in territory without municipal organization, the focus of development activity shall be activities and land uses related to the sustainable management or use of resources and resource-based recreational activities.

1.1.5.2 The establishment of new permanent townsites shall not be permitted.

1.1.5.3 In areas adjacent to and surrounding municipalities, only development that is related to the sustainable management or use of resources and resource-based recreational activity shall be permitted unless:

a) the area forms part of a planning area;

b) the necessary infrastructure and public service facilities are planned or available to support the development and are financially viable over their life cycle; and

c) It has been determined, as part of a comprehensive review, that the impacts of development will not place an undue strain on the public service facilities and infrastructure provided by adjacent municipalities, regions and/or the Province.

1.2 **COORDINATION**

1.2.1 A coordinated, integrated and comprehensive approach should be used when dealing with planning matters within municipalities, across lower, single and/or upper-tier municipal boundaries, and with other levels of government, agencies and boards including:

a) managing and/or promoting growth and development;

b) economic development strategies;

c) managing natural heritage, water, agricultural, mineral, and cultural heritage and archaeological resources;

d) infrastructure, multi-modal transportation systems, public service facilities and waste management systems;

e) ecosystem, shoreline, watershed, and Great Lakes related issues;

f) natural and human-made hazards;

g) population, housing and employment projections, based on regional market areas; and
h) addressing housing needs in accordance with provincial policy statements such as the Ontario Housing Policy Statement.

1.2.2 Planning authorities are encouraged to coordinate planning matters with Aboriginal communities, where appropriate.

1.2.3 Planning authorities should coordinate emergency management and other economic, environmental and social planning considerations to support efficient and resilient communities.

1.2.4 Where planning is conducted by an upper-tier municipality, the upper-tier municipality in consultation with lower-tier municipalities shall:

a) identify, coordinate and allocate population, housing and employment projections for lower-tier municipalities. Allocations and projections by upper-tier municipalities shall be based on and reflect provincial plans where these exist;

b) identify areas where growth or development will be directed, including the identification of nodes and the corridors linking these nodes;

c) identify targets for intensification and redevelopment within all or any of the lower-tier municipalities, including minimum targets that should be met before expansion of the boundaries of settlement areas is permitted in accordance with policy 1.1.3.8;

d) where transit corridors exist or are to be developed, identify density targets for areas adjacent or in proximity to these corridors, including minimum targets that should be met before expansion of the boundaries of settlement areas is permitted in accordance with policy 1.1.3.8; and

e) identify and provide policy direction for the lower-tier municipalities on matters that cross municipal boundaries.

1.2.5 Where there is no upper-tier municipality, planning authorities shall ensure that policy 1.2.4 is addressed as part of the planning process, and should coordinate these matters with adjacent planning authorities.

1.2.6 Land Use Compatibility

1.2.6.1 Major facilities and sensitive land uses should be planned to ensure they are appropriately designed, buffered and/or separated from each other to prevent adverse effects from odour, noise and other contaminants, minimize risk to public health and safety, and to ensure the long-term viability of major facilities.

1.3 EMPLOYMENT

1.3.1 Planning authorities shall promote economic development and competitiveness by:

a) providing for an appropriate mix and range of employment (including industrial, commercial and institutional) uses to meet long-term needs;

b) providing opportunities for a diversified economic base, including maintaining a range and choice of suitable sites for employment uses which support a wide range of economic activities and ancillary uses, and take into account the needs of existing and future businesses;
c) encouraging compact, mixed-use development that incorporates compatible employment uses to support liveable and resilient communities; and

d) ensuring the necessary infrastructure is provided to support current and projected needs.

1.3.2 Employment Areas

1.3.2.1 Planning authorities shall plan for, protect and preserve employment areas for current and future uses and ensure that the necessary infrastructure is provided to support current and projected needs.

1.3.2.2 Planning authorities may permit conversion of lands within employment areas to non-employment uses through a comprehensive review, only where it has been demonstrated that the land is not required for employment purposes over the long term and that there is a need for the conversion.

1.3.2.3 Planning authorities shall protect employment areas in proximity to major goods movement facilities and corridors for employment uses that require those locations.

1.3.2.4 Planning authorities may plan for the long-term protection of employment areas provided lands are not designated beyond the planning horizon identified in policy 1.1.2.

1.4 HOUSING

1.4.1 To provide for an appropriate range of housing types and densities required to meet projected requirements of current and future residents of the regional market area identified in policy 1.4.3, planning authorities shall:

a) maintain at all times the ability to accommodate residential growth for a minimum of 10 years through residential intensification and redevelopment and, if necessary, lands which are designated and available for residential development; and

b) maintain at all times where new development is to occur, land with servicing capacity sufficient to provide at least a 3 year supply of residential units available through lands suitably zoned to facilitate residential intensification and redevelopment, and land in draft approved and registered plans.

1.4.2 Where planning is conducted by an upper-tier municipality:

a) the land and unit supply maintained by the lower-tier municipality identified in policy 1.4.1 shall be based on and reflect the allocation of population and units by the upper-tier municipality; and

b) the allocation of population and units by the upper-tier municipality shall be based on and reflect provincial plans where these exist.

1.4.3 Planning authorities shall provide for an appropriate range of housing types and densities to meet projected requirements of current and future residents of the regional market area by:

a) establishing and implementing minimum targets for the provision of housing which is affordable to low and moderate income households. However, where planning is conducted by an upper-tier municipality, the upper-tier municipality in consultation with the lower-tier
municipalities may identify a higher target(s) which shall represent the minimum target(s) for these lower-tier municipalities;

b) permitting and facilitating:
   1. all forms of housing required to meet the social, health and well-being requirements of current and future residents, including special needs requirements; and
   2. all forms of residential intensification and redevelopment in accordance with policy 1.1.3.3;

c) directing the development of new housing towards locations where appropriate levels of infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available to support current and projected needs;

d) promoting densities for new housing which efficiently use land, resources, infrastructure and public service facilities, and support the use of active transportation and transit in areas where it exists or is to be developed; and

e) establishing development standards for residential intensification, redevelopment and new residential development which minimize the cost of housing and facilitate compact form, while maintaining appropriate levels of public health and safety.

1.5 PUBLIC SPACES, RECREATION, PARKS, TRAILS AND OPEN SPACE

1.5.1 Healthy, active communities should be promoted by:

a) planning public streets, spaces and facilities to be safe, meet the needs of pedestrians, foster social interaction and facilitate active transportation and community connectivity;

b) planning and providing for a full range and equitable distribution of publicly-accessible built and natural settings for recreation, including facilities, parklands, public spaces, open space areas, trails and linkages, and, where practical, water-based resources;

c) providing opportunities for public access to shorelines; and

d) recognizing provincial parks, conservation reserves, and other protected areas, and minimizing negative impacts on these areas.

1.6 INFRASTRUCTURE AND PUBLIC SERVICE FACILITIES

1.6.1 Infrastructure and public service facilities shall be provided in a coordinated, efficient and cost-effective manner that considers impacts from climate change while accommodating projected needs.

Planning for infrastructure and public service facilities shall be coordinated and integrated with land use planning so that they are financially viable over their life cycle and available to meet current and projected needs.

1.6.2 Before consideration is given to developing new infrastructure and public service facilities:

a) the use of existing infrastructure and public service facilities should be optimized;

b) opportunities for adaptive re-use should be considered, wherever feasible; and

c) the use of green infrastructure should be encouraged, where feasible, to augment infrastructure, and for other associated ecological and hydrological benefits.
1.6.3 Infrastructure and public service facilities should be strategically located to support the effective and efficient delivery of emergency management services.

1.6.4 Public service facilities should be co-located in community hubs, where appropriate, to promote cost-effectiveness and facilitate service integration, access to transit and active transportation.

1.6.5 Sewage, Water and Stormwater

1.6.5.1 Planning for sewage and water services shall:

a) direct and accommodate expected growth or development in a manner that promotes the efficient use and optimization of existing:
   1. municipal sewage services and municipal water services; and
   2. private communal sewage services and private communal water services, where municipal sewage services and municipal water services are not available;

b) ensure that these systems are provided in a manner that:
   1. can be sustained by the water resources upon which such services rely;
   2. is feasible, financially viable and complies with all regulatory requirements; and
   3. protects human health and the natural environment;

c) promote water conservation and water use efficiency;

d) integrate servicing and land use considerations at all stages of the planning process; and

e) be in accordance with the servicing hierarchy outlined through policies 1.6.5.2, 1.6.5.3, 1.6.5.4 and 1.6.5.5.

1.6.5.2 Municipal sewage services and municipal water services are the preferred form of servicing for settlement areas. Intensification and redevelopment within settlement areas on existing municipal sewage services and municipal water services should be promoted, wherever feasible.

1.6.5.3 Where municipal sewage services and municipal water services are not provided, private communal sewage services and private communal water services may be used.

1.6.5.4 Where municipal sewage services and municipal water services or private communal sewage services and private communal water services are not provided, individual on-site sewage services and individual on-site water services may be used provided that site conditions are suitable for the long-term provision of such services with no negative impacts. In settlement areas, these services may only be used for infilling and minor rounding out of existing development.

1.6.5.5 Partial services shall only be permitted in the following circumstances:

a) where they are necessary to address failed individual on-site sewage services and individual on-site water services in existing development; or

b) within settlement areas, to allow for infilling and minor rounding out of existing development on partial services provided that site conditions are suitable for the long-term provision of such services with no negative impacts.

1.6.5.6 Subject to the hierarchy of services provided in policies 1.6.5.2, 1.6.5.3, 1.6.5.4 and 1.6.5.5 planning authorities may allow lot creation only if there is confirmation of sufficient reserve sewage system capacity and reserve water system capacity within municipal sewage services and municipal water services or private communal sewage services and private communal water services. The
determination of sufficient reserve sewage system capacity shall include treatment capacity for hauled sewage from private communal sewage services and individual on-site sewage services.

1.6.5.7 Planning for stormwater management shall:

a) minimize, or, where possible, prevent increases in contaminant loads;

b) minimize changes in water balance and erosion;

c) not increase risks to human health and safety and property damage;

d) maintain or increase the extent and function of vegetative and pervious surfaces; and

e) promote stormwater management best practices, including stormwater attenuation and reuse.

1.6.6 Transportation Systems

1.6.6.1 Transportation systems should be provided which are safe, energy efficient, facilitate the movement of people and goods, and are appropriate to address projected needs.

1.6.6.2 Efficient use shall be made of existing and planned infrastructure, including the use of transportation demand management where feasible.

1.6.6.3 As part of a multi-modal transportation system, connectivity within and among transportation systems and modes should be maintained and, where possible, improved including connections which cross jurisdictional boundaries.

1.6.6.4 A land use pattern, density and mix of uses should be promoted that minimize the length and number of vehicle trips and support current and future use of transit and active transportation.

1.6.6.5 Transportation and land use considerations shall be integrated at all stages of the planning process.

1.6.7 Transportation and Infrastructure Corridors

1.6.7.1 Planning authorities shall plan for and protect corridors and rights-of-way for transportation, transit and infrastructure facilities to meet current and projected needs.

1.6.7.2 Major goods movement facilities and corridors shall be protected for the long term.

1.6.7.3 Planning authorities shall not permit development in planned corridors that could preclude or negatively affect the use of the corridor for the purpose(s) for which it was identified.

New development proposed on adjacent lands to existing or planned corridors and transportation facilities should be compatible with, and supportive of, the long-term purposes of the corridor and should be designed to avoid or minimize negative impacts on and from the corridor and transportation facilities.

1.6.7.4 The preservation and reuse of abandoned corridors for purposes that maintain the corridor’s integrity and continuous linear characteristics should be encouraged, wherever feasible.
1.6.7.5 When planning for corridors and rights-of-way for significant transportation and infrastructure facilities, consideration will be given to the significant resources in Section 2: Wise Use and Management of Resources.

1.6.8 **Airports, Rail and Marine Facilities**

1.6.8.1 Planning for land uses in the vicinity of airports, rail facilities and marine facilities shall be undertaken so that their long-term operation and economic role is protected.

1.6.8.2 **Airports** shall be protected from incompatible land uses and development by:

a) prohibiting new residential development and other sensitive land uses in areas near airports above 30 NEF/NEP, as set out on maps (as revised from time to time) that have been reviewed by Transport Canada;

b) considering redevelopment of existing residential uses and other sensitive land uses or infilling of residential and other sensitive land uses in areas above 30 NEF/NEP only if it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the long-term function of the airport; and

c) discouraging land uses which may cause a potential aviation safety hazard.

1.6.9 **Waste Management**

1.6.9.1 Waste management systems need to be provided that are of an appropriate size and type to accommodate present and future requirements, and facilitate, encourage and promote reduction, reuse and recycling objectives. Planning authorities should consider the implications of development and land use patterns on waste generation, management and diversion.

Waste management systems shall be located and designed in accordance with provincial legislation and standards.

1.6.10 **Energy Supply**

1.6.10.1 Planning authorities should provide opportunities for the development of energy supply including electricity generation facilities, to accommodate current and projected needs, and promote renewable energy systems, where feasible.

1.7 **LONG-TERM ECONOMIC PROSPERITY**

1.7.1 Long-term economic prosperity should be supported by:

a) promoting opportunities for economic development;

b) optimizing the long-term availability and use of land, resources, infrastructure, and public service facilities;

c) maintaining and, where possible, enhancing the vitality and viability of downtowns and mainstreets;

d) encouraging a sense of place, through built form, cultural planning and promoting features that help define character, such as cultural heritage resources;
e) promoting community investment-readiness;
f) promoting the redevelopment of brownfield sites;
g) providing for an efficient, cost-effective, reliable multi-modal transportation system that is integrated with adjacent systems and those of other jurisdictions, and is appropriate to address projected needs to support the movement of goods and people;
h) providing opportunities for sustainable tourism development;
i) providing opportunities to support local food, and promoting the sustainability of agri-food and agri-product businesses by protecting agricultural resources, and minimizing land use conflicts;
j) promoting energy conservation and providing opportunities for development of energy supply, including the use of renewable energy systems;
k) minimizing negative impacts from a changing climate and considering the ecological benefits provided by nature; and
l) encouraging efficient and coordinated communications and telecommunications infrastructure.

1.8 ENERGY CONSERVATION, AIR QUALITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE

1.8.1 Planning authorities shall support energy conservation and efficiency, improved air quality, and climate change mitigation and adaptation through land use and development patterns which:

a) promote compact form and a structure of nodes and corridors;
b) promote the use of active transportation and transit in and between residential, employment (including commercial, industrial and institutional uses) and other areas;
c) focus major employment, commercial and other travel-intensive land uses on sites which are well served by transit where this exists or is to be developed, or designing these to facilitate the establishment of transit in the future;
d) focus freight-intensive land uses to areas well served by major highways, airports, rail facilities and marine facilities;
e) improve the mix of employment and housing uses to shorten commute journeys and decrease transportation congestion;
f) promote design and orientation which:
   1. maximizes energy efficiency and conservation, and considers the mitigating effects of vegetation;
   2. maximizes opportunities for the use of renewable energy; and
   3. takes into account the impacts of climate change; and
g) maintain or increase vegetation within settlement areas, where feasible.
2.0 WISE USE AND MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES

Ontario's long-term prosperity, environmental health, and social well-being depend on maintaining biodiversity, protecting the health of the Great Lakes, and protecting natural heritage, water, agricultural, mineral and cultural heritage and archaeological resources for their economic, environmental and social benefits.

Accordingly:

2.1 NATURAL HERITAGE

2.1.1 Natural features and areas shall be protected for the long term.

2.1.2 The diversity and connectivity of natural features in an area, and the long-term ecological function and biodiversity of natural heritage systems, should be maintained, restored or, where possible, improved, recognizing linkages between and among natural heritage features and areas, surface water features and ground water features.

2.1.3 Natural heritage systems shall be identified in Ecoregions 6E & 7E, recognizing that considerations in planning for natural heritage systems in settlement areas, rural areas, and prime agricultural areas may vary.

2.1.4 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted in:

a) significant wetlands in Ecoregions 5E, 6E and 7E; and
b) significant coastal wetlands.

2.1.5 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted in:

a) significant wetlands in the Canadian Shield north of Ecoregions 5E, 6E and 7E;
b) significant woodlands in Ecoregions 6E and 7E (excluding islands in Lake Huron and the St. Marys River);
c) significant valleylands in Ecoregions 6E and 7E (excluding islands in Lake Huron and the St. Marys River);
d) significant wildlife habitat;
e) significant areas of natural and scientific interest; and
f) coastal wetlands in Ecoregions 5E, 6E and 7E that are not subject to policy 2.1.4(b)

unless it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions.

2.1.6 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted in fish habitat except in accordance with provincial and federal requirements.

2.1.7 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted in habitat of endangered species and threatened species, except in accordance with provincial and federal requirements.

---

1 Ecoregions 5E, 6E and 7E are shown on Figure 1
2.1.8 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted on adjacent lands to the natural heritage features and areas identified in policies 2.1.4, 2.1.5, and 2.1.6 unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions.

2.1.9 Nothing in policy 2.1 is intended to limit the ability of existing agricultural uses to continue.

2.2 WATER

2.2.1 Planning authorities shall protect, improve or restore the quality and quantity of water by:

   a) using the watershed as the ecologically meaningful scale for integrated and long-term planning, which can be a foundation for considering cumulative impacts of development;

   b) minimizing potential negative impacts, including cross-jurisdictional and cross-watershed impacts;

   c) identifying water resource systems consisting of ground water features, hydrologic functions, natural heritage features and areas, and surface water features including shoreline areas, which are necessary for the ecological and hydrological integrity of the watershed;

   d) maintaining linkages and related functions among ground water features, hydrologic functions, natural heritage features and areas, and surface water features including shoreline areas;

   e) implementing necessary restrictions on development and site alteration to:
      1. protect all municipal drinking water supplies and designated vulnerable areas; and
      2. protect, improve or restore vulnerable surface and ground water, sensitive surface water features and sensitive ground water features, and their hydrologic functions;

   f) planning for efficient and sustainable use of water resources, through practices for water conservation and sustaining water quality; and

   g) ensuring stormwater management practices minimize stormwater volumes and contaminant loads, and maintain or increase the extent of vegetative and pervious surfaces.

2.2.2 Development and site alteration shall be restricted in or near sensitive surface water features and sensitive ground water features such that these features and their related hydrologic functions will be protected, improved or restored.

Mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches may be required in order to protect, improve or restore sensitive surface water features, sensitive ground water features, and their hydrologic functions.

2.3 AGRICULTURE

2.3.1 Prime agricultural areas shall be protected for long-term use for agriculture.

Prime agricultural areas are areas where prime agricultural lands predominate. Specialty crop areas shall be given the highest priority for protection, followed by Canada Land Inventory Classes 1, 2, and 3, and any associated Class 4 to 7 soils within the prime agricultural area, in this order of priority.
2.3.2 Planning authorities shall designate *prime agricultural areas* and *specialty crop areas* in accordance with guidelines developed by the Province, as amended from time to time.

2.3.3 Permitted Uses

2.3.3.1 In *prime agricultural areas*, permitted uses and activities are: *agricultural uses, agriculture-related uses* and *on-farm diversified uses*.

Proposed *agriculture-related uses* and *on-farm diversified uses* shall be compatible with, and shall not hinder, surrounding agricultural operations. Criteria for these uses may be based on guidelines developed by the Province or municipal approaches, as set out in municipal planning documents, which achieve the same objectives.

2.3.3.2 In *prime agricultural areas*, all types, sizes and intensities of *agricultural uses* and *normal farm practices* shall be promoted and protected in accordance with provincial standards.

2.3.3.3 New land uses, including the creation of lots, and new or expanding livestock facilities shall comply with the *minimum distance separation formulae*.

2.3.4 Lot Creation and Lot Adjustments

2.3.4.1 Lot creation in *prime agricultural areas* is discouraged and may only be permitted for:

a) *agricultural uses*, provided that the lots are of a size appropriate for the type of agricultural use(s) common in the area and are sufficiently large to maintain flexibility for future changes in the type or size of agricultural operations;

b) *agriculture-related uses*, provided that any new lot will be limited to a minimum size needed to accommodate the use and appropriate sewage and water services;

c) a *residence surplus* to a *farming operation* as a result of farm consolidation, provided that:
   1. the new lot will be limited to a minimum size needed to accommodate the use and appropriate sewage and water services; and
   2. the planning authority ensures that new residential dwellings are prohibited on any vacant remnant parcel of farmland created by the severance. The approach used to ensure that no new residential dwellings are permitted on the vacant remnant parcel may be recommended by the Province, or based on municipal approaches which achieve the same objective; and

d) *infrastructure*, where the facility or corridor cannot be accommodated through the use of easements or rights-of-way.

2.3.4.2 Lot adjustments in *prime agricultural areas* may be permitted for *legal or technical reasons*.

2.3.4.3 The creation of new residential lots in *prime agricultural areas* shall not be permitted, except in accordance with policy 2.3.4.1(c).

2.3.5 Removal of Land from Prime Agricultural Areas

2.3.5.1 Planning authorities may only exclude land from *prime agricultural areas* for:

a) expansions of or identification of *settlement areas* in accordance with policy 1.1.3.8;
b) extraction of *minerals, petroleum resources and mineral aggregate resources*, in accordance with policies 2.4 and 2.5; and

c) limited non-residential uses, provided that:
   1. the land does not comprise a *specialty crop area*;
   2. the proposed use complies with the *minimum distance separation formulae*;
   3. there is a demonstrated need within the planning horizon provided for in policy 1.1.2 for additional land to be designated to accommodate the proposed use; and
   4. alternative locations have been evaluated, and
      i. there are no reasonable alternative locations which avoid *prime agricultural areas*; and
      ii. there are no reasonable alternative locations in *prime agricultural areas* with lower priority agricultural lands.

2.3.5.2 Impacts from any new or expanding non-agricultural uses on surrounding agricultural operations and lands are to be mitigated to the extent feasible.

2.4 MINERALS AND PETROLEUM

2.4.1 *Minerals and petroleum resources* shall be protected for long-term use.

2.4.2 Protection of Long-Term Resource Supply

2.4.2.1 *Mineral mining operations* and *petroleum resource operations* shall be identified and protected from *development* and activities that would preclude or hinder their expansion or continued use or which would be incompatible for reasons of public health, public safety or environmental impact.

2.4.2.2 Known *mineral deposits*, known *petroleum resources* and significant areas of *mineral potential* shall be identified and development and activities in these resources or on adjacent lands which would preclude or hinder the establishment of new operations or access to the resources shall only be permitted if:

a) resource use would not be feasible; or
b) the proposed land use or development serves a greater long-term public interest; and

c) issues of public health, public safety and environmental impact are addressed.

2.4.3 Rehabilitation

2.4.3.1 Rehabilitation to accommodate subsequent land uses shall be required after extraction and other related activities have ceased. Progressive rehabilitation should be undertaken wherever feasible.
2.4.4 Extraction in Prime Agricultural Areas

2.4.4.1 Extraction of minerals and petroleum resources is permitted in prime agricultural areas provided that the site will be rehabilitated.

2.5 MINERAL AGGREGATE RESOURCES

2.5.1 Mineral aggregate resources shall be protected for long-term use and deposits of mineral aggregate resources shall be identified.

2.5.2 Protection of Long-Term Resource Supply

2.5.2.1 As much of the mineral aggregate resources as is realistically possible shall be made available as close to markets as possible.

Demonstration of need for mineral aggregate resources, including any type of supply/demand analysis, shall not be required, notwithstanding the availability, designation or licensing for extraction of mineral aggregate resources locally or elsewhere.

2.5.2.2 Extraction shall be undertaken in a manner which minimizes social and environmental impacts.

2.5.2.3 The conservation of mineral aggregate resources shall be undertaken, wherever feasible.

2.5.2.4 Mineral aggregate operations shall be protected from development and activities that would preclude or hinder their expansion or continued use or which would be incompatible for reasons of public health, public safety or environmental impact. Existing mineral aggregate operations shall be permitted to continue without the need for official plan amendment, rezoning or development permit under the Planning Act. When a license for extraction or operation ceases to exist, policy 2.5.2.5 continues to apply.

2.5.2.5 In known deposits of mineral aggregate resources and on adjacent lands, development and activities which would preclude or hinder the establishment of new operations or access to the resources shall only be permitted if:

a) resource use would not be feasible; or

b) the proposed land use or development serves a greater long-term public interest; and

c) issues of public health, public safety and environmental impact are addressed.

2.5.3 Rehabilitation

2.5.3.1 Progressive and final rehabilitation shall be required to accommodate subsequent land uses, to promote land use compatibility, and to recognize the interim nature of extraction. Final rehabilitation shall take surrounding land use and approved land use designations into consideration.

2.5.3.2 Rehabilitation in accordance with established standards may be taken into consideration in the demonstration of no negative impacts for purposes of policies 2.1.5 and 2.1.8 provided that:
a) ecological functions will be restored, and where possible improved; and
b) connectivity of natural features will be restored, and where possible improved.

2.5.3.3 Comprehensive rehabilitation planning is encouraged where there is a concentration of mineral aggregate operations.

2.5.3.4 In parts of the Province not designated under the Aggregate Resources Act, rehabilitation standards that are compatible with those under the Act should be adopted for extraction operations on private lands.

2.5.4 Extraction in Prime Agricultural Areas

2.5.4.1 In prime agricultural areas, on prime agricultural land outside of specialty crop areas, extraction of mineral aggregate resources is permitted as an interim use provided that the site will be rehabilitated back to an agricultural condition, so that substantially the same areas and same average soil capability for agriculture are restored.

In specialty crop areas extraction of mineral aggregate resources is permitted as an interim use provided that the site will be rehabilitated back to an agricultural condition, which allows for the same range and productivity of specialty crops common in the area; and, where applicable, the microclimate on which the site and surrounding area may be dependent for specialty crop production will be maintained, or restored.

Complete agricultural rehabilitation is not required if:

a) outside of a specialty crop area, there is a substantial quantity of mineral aggregate resources below the water table warranting extraction, or the depth of planned extraction in a quarry makes restoration of pre-extraction agricultural capability unfeasible;

b) in a specialty crop area, there is a substantial quantity of high quality mineral aggregate resources below the water table warranting extraction, and the depth of planned extraction in a quarry makes restoration of pre-extraction agricultural capability unfeasible;

c) other alternatives have been considered by the applicant and found unsuitable. The consideration of other alternatives shall include resources in areas of Canada Land Inventory Class 4 to 7 soils, resources on lands identified as designated growth areas, and resources on prime agricultural lands where rehabilitation is feasible. Where no other alternatives are found, prime agricultural lands shall be protected in this order of priority: specialty crop areas, Canada Land Inventory Classes 1, 2 and 3; and

d) agricultural rehabilitation in remaining areas is maximized.

2.5.5 Wayside Pits and Quarries, Portable Asphalt Plants and Portable Concrete Plants

2.5.5.1 Wayside pits and quarries, portable asphalt plants and portable concrete plants used on public authority contracts shall be permitted, without the need for an official plan amendment, rezoning, or development permit under the Planning Act in all areas, except those areas of existing development or particular environmental sensitivity which have been determined to be incompatible with extraction and associated activities.
2.6 CULTURAL HERITAGE AND ARCHAEOLOGY

2.6.1 Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.

2.6.2 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved.

2.6.3 Planning authorities shall not permit development and site alteration on adjacent lands to protected heritage property except where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved.

2.6.4 Planning authorities should consider and promote archaeological management plans and cultural plans in conserving cultural heritage and archaeological resources.

2.6.5 Planning authorities should consider the interests of Aboriginal communities in conserving cultural heritage and archaeological resources.
3.0 PROTECTING PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

Ontario’s long-term prosperity, environmental health and social well-being depend on reducing the potential for public cost or risk to Ontario’s residents from natural or human-made hazards. Development shall generally be directed away from areas of natural or human-made hazards where there is an unacceptable risk to public health or safety or of property damage, and not create new or aggravate existing hazards.

Accordingly:

3.1 NATURAL HAZARDS

3.1.1 Development shall generally be directed to areas outside of:

a) hazardous lands adjacent to the shorelines of the Great Lakes - St. Lawrence River System and large inland lakes which are impacted by flooding hazards, erosion hazards and/or dynamic beach hazards;

b) hazardous lands adjacent to river, stream and small inland lake systems which are impacted by flooding hazards and/or erosion hazards;

c) hazardous sites; and

d) hazardous lands associated with high to extreme risk of wildland fire.

3.1.2 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted within:

a) the dynamic beach hazard;

b) defined portions of the flooding hazard along connecting channels (the St. Marys, St. Clair, Detroit, Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers);

c) areas that would be rendered inaccessible to people and vehicles during times of flooding hazards, erosion hazards and/or dynamic beach hazards, unless it has been demonstrated that the site has safe access appropriate for the nature of the development and the natural hazard; and

d) a floodway regardless of whether the area of inundation contains high points of land not subject to flooding.

3.1.3 Planning authorities shall consider the potential impacts of climate change that may increase the risk associated with natural hazards.

3.1.4 Despite policy 3.1.2, development and site alteration may be permitted in certain areas: associated with the flooding hazard along river, stream and small inland lake systems:

a) in those exceptional situations where a Special Policy Area has been approved. The designation of a Special Policy Area, and any change or modification to the site-specific policies or boundaries applying to a Special Policy Area, must be approved by the Ministers of Municipal Affairs and Housing and Natural Resources prior to the approval authority approving such changes or modifications; or

b) where the development is limited to uses which by their nature must locate within the floodway, including flood and/or erosion control works or minor additions or passive non-structural uses which do not affect flood flows.
3.1.5 Development shall not be permitted to locate in hazardous lands and hazardous sites where the use is:

a) an institutional use associated with hospitals, nursing homes, pre-school, school nurseries, day care and schools;

b) an essential emergency service such as that provided by fire, police and ambulance stations and electrical substations; and

c) uses associated with the disposal, manufacture, treatment or storage of hazardous substances.

3.1.6 Where the two zone concept for flood plains is applied, development and site alteration may be permitted in the flood fringe, subject to appropriate floodproofing to the flooding hazard elevation or another flooding hazard standard approved by the Minister of Natural Resources.

3.1.7 Further to policy 3.1.6, and except as prohibited in policy 3.1.2, development and site alteration may be permitted in those portions of hazardous lands and hazardous sites where the effects and risk to public safety are minor and could be mitigated in accordance with provincial standards. Development and site alteration may be permitted if all of the following are demonstrated and achieved:

a) development and site alteration is carried out in accordance with floodproofing standards, protection works standards, and access standards;

b) vehicles and people have a way of safely entering and exiting the area during times of flooding, erosion and other emergencies;

c) new hazards are not created and existing hazards are not aggravated; and

d) no adverse environmental impacts will result.

3.1.8 Development and site alteration may be permitted in hazardous lands associated with high to extreme risk of wildland fire where the risk is mitigated in accordance with provincial wildland fire mitigation standards.

3.2 HUMAN-MADE HAZARDS

3.2.1 Development on, abutting or adjacent to lands affected by mine hazards; oil, gas and salt hazards; or former mineral mining operations, mineral aggregate operations or petroleum resource operations may be permitted only if rehabilitation measures to address and mitigate known or suspected hazards are under-way or have been completed.

3.2.2 Sites with contaminants in land or water shall be assessed and remediated as necessary prior to any activity on the site associated with the proposed use such that there will be no adverse effects.
4.0 IMPLEMENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 This Provincial Policy Statement applies to all decisions in respect of the exercise of any authority that affects a planning matter made on or after <DATE>.

4.2 In accordance with section 3 of the Planning Act, a decision of the council of a municipality, a local board, a planning board, a minister of the Crown and a ministry, board, commission or agency of the government, including the Municipal Board, in respect of the exercise of any authority that affects a planning matter, “shall be consistent with” this Provincial Policy Statement.

Comments, submissions or advice that affect a planning matter that are provided by the council of a municipality, a local board, a planning board, a minister or ministry, board, commission or agency of the government “shall be consistent with” this Provincial Policy Statement.

4.3 This Provincial Policy Statement shall be implemented in a manner that is consistent with the recognition and affirmation of existing Aboriginal and treaty rights in section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982.

4.4 This Provincial Policy Statement shall be read in its entirety and all relevant policies are to be applied to each situation.

4.5 In implementing the Provincial Policy Statement, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing may take into account other considerations when making decisions to support strong communities, a clean and healthy environment and the economic vitality of the Province.

4.6 The official plan is an important vehicle for implementation of this Provincial Policy Statement.

Official plans shall identify provincial interests and set out appropriate land use designations and policies. To determine the significance of some natural heritage features and other resources, evaluation may be required. Official plans should also coordinate cross-boundary matters to complement the actions of other planning authorities and promote mutually beneficial solutions.

Official plans shall provide clear, reasonable and attainable policies to protect provincial interests and direct development to suitable areas.

In order to protect provincial interests, planning authorities shall keep their official plans up-to-date with this Provincial Policy Statement. The policies of this Provincial Policy Statement continue to apply after adoption and approval of an official plan.

4.7 Zoning and development permit by-laws are also important for implementation of this Provincial Policy Statement. Planning authorities shall keep their zoning and development permit by-laws up-to-date with their official plans and with this Provincial Policy Statement.

4.8 The policies of this Provincial Policy Statement represent minimum standards. This Provincial Policy Statement does not prevent planning authorities and decision-makers from going beyond the minimum standards established in specific policies, unless doing so would conflict with any policy of this Provincial Policy Statement.
4.9 A wide range of legislation, regulations and policies may apply to decisions with respect to Planning Act applications. In some cases, a Planning Act proposal may also require approval under other legislation or regulation, and policies issued under other legislation may also apply.

4.10 In addition to land use approvals under the Planning Act, infrastructure may also require approval under other legislation and regulations. An environmental assessment process may be applied to new infrastructure and modifications to existing infrastructure under applicable legislation. There may be circumstances where land use approvals under the Planning Act may be integrated with approvals under other legislation, for example, integrating the planning processes and approvals under the Environmental Assessment Act and the Planning Act, provided the intent and requirements of both Acts are met.

4.11 Provincial plans shall be read in conjunction with the Provincial Policy Statement and generally take precedence over policies in this Provincial Policy Statement to the extent of any conflict, in accordance with relevant legislation or regulations. Examples of these are plans created under the Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act, the Ontario Planning and Development Act, 1994, the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Act, 2001, the Greenbelt Act, 2005 and the Places to Grow Act, 2005.

4.12 Within the Great Lakes - St. Lawrence River Basin, there may be circumstances where planning authorities should consider agreements related to the protection and restoration of the Great Lakes - St. Lawrence River Basin.

4.13 The Province, in consultation with municipalities, other public bodies and stakeholders shall identify performance indicators for measuring the effectiveness of some or all of the policies. The Province shall monitor their implementation, including reviewing performance indicators concurrent with any review of this Provincial Policy Statement.

4.14 Municipalities are encouraged to establish performance indicators to monitor the implementation of the policies in their official plans.
5.0 **FIGURE 1**
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6.0 DEFINITIONS

Access standards: means methods or procedures to ensure safe vehicular and pedestrian movement, and access for the maintenance and repair of protection works, during times of flooding hazards, erosion hazards and/or other water-related hazards.

Active transportation: means human-powered travel, including but not limited to, walking, cycling, inline skating and travel with the use of mobility aids, including motorized wheelchairs and other power-assisted devices moving at a comparable speed.

Adjacent lands: means
a) for the purposes of policy 1.6.7.3, those lands contiguous to existing or planned corridors and transportation facilities where development would have a negative impact on the corridor or facility. The extent of the adjacent lands may be recommended by the Province or based on municipal approaches that achieve the same objectives;
b) for the purposes of policy 2.1.8, those lands contiguous to a specific natural heritage feature or area where it is likely that development or site alteration would have a negative impact on the feature or area. The extent of the adjacent lands may be recommended by the Province or based on municipal approaches which achieve the same objectives;
c) for the purposes of policy 2.4.2.2 and 2.5.2.5, those lands contiguous to lands on the surface of known petroleum resources, mineral deposits, or deposits of mineral aggregate resources where it is likely that development would constrain future access to the resources. The extent of the adjacent lands may be recommended by the Province; and

d) for the purposes of policy 2.6.3, those lands contiguous to a protected heritage property or as otherwise defined in the municipal official plan.

Adverse effects: as defined in the Environmental Protection Act, means one or more of:
a) impairment of the quality of the natural environment for any use that can be made of it;
b) injury or damage to property or plant or animal life;
c) harm or material discomfort to any person;
d) an adverse effect on the health of any person;
e) impairment of the safety of any person;
f) rendering any property or plant or animal life unfit for human use;
g) loss of enjoyment of normal use of property; and
h) interference with normal conduct of business.

Affordable: means
a) in the case of ownership housing, the least expensive of:
1. housing for which the purchase price results in annual accommodation costs which do not exceed 30 percent of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households; or
2. housing for which the purchase price is at least 10 percent below the average purchase price of a resale unit in the regional market area;
b) in the case of rental housing, the least expensive of:
1. a unit for which the rent does not exceed 30 percent of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households; or
2. a unit for which the rent is at or below the average market rent of a unit in the regional market area.

Agricultural uses: means the growing of crops, including nursery, biomass, and horticultural crops; raising of livestock; raising of other animals for food, fur or fibre, including poultry and fish; aquaculture: apiaries: agro-forestry: maple syrup production; and associated on-farm buildings and structures, including, but not limited to livestock facilities, manure storages, value-retaining facilities, and accommodation for full-time farm labour when the size and nature of the operation requires additional employment.

Agritourism uses: means those farm-related tourism uses, including limited accommodation such as a bed and breakfast, that promote the enjoyment, education or activities related to the farm operation.

Agriculture-related uses: means those farm-related commercial and farm-related industrial uses that are directly related to the farm operation, support agriculture, and are required in close proximity to farm operations, and provide direct service to farm operations as an exclusive activity.

Airports: means all Ontario airports, including designated lands for future airports, with Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF)/Noise Exposure Projection (NEP) mapping.

Archaeological resources: includes artifacts, archeological sites, marine archaeological sites, as defined under the Ontario Heritage Act. The identification and evaluation of such resources are based upon archaeological fieldwork undertaken in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act.

Areas of archaeological potential: means areas with the likelihood to contain archaeological resources. Methods to identify archaeological potential are established by the Province, but municipal approaches which achieve the same objectives may also be used. The Ontario Heritage Act requires archaeological potential to be confirmed through archaeological fieldwork.

Areas of mineral potential: means areas favourable to the discovery of mineral deposits due to geology, the presence of known mineral deposits or other technical evidence.

Areas of natural and scientific interest (ANSI): means areas of land and water containing natural landscapes or features that have been identified as having life science or earth science values related to protection, scientific study or education.
Brownfield sites: means undeveloped or previously developed properties that may be contaminated. They are usually, but not exclusively, former industrial or commercial properties that may be underutilized, derelict or vacant.

Built heritage resources: means one or more significant buildings, structures, monuments, installations or remains associated with architectural, cultural, social, political, economic or military history and identified as being important to a community, including an Aboriginal community. These resources may be identified through designation or heritage conservation easement under the Ontario Heritage Act, or listed by local, provincial or federal jurisdictions.

Coastal wetland: means
a) any wetland that is located on one of the Great Lakes or their connecting channels (Lake St. Clair, St. Mary's, St. Clair, Detroit, Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers); or
b) any other wetland that is on a tributary to any of the above-specified water bodies and lies, either wholly or in part, downstream of a line located 2 kilometres upstream of the 1:100 year floodline (plus wave run-up) of the large water body to which the tributary is connected.

Comprehensive rehabilitation: means rehabilitation of land from which mineral aggregate resources have been extracted that is coordinated and complementary, to the extent possible, with the rehabilitation of other sites in an area where there is a high concentration of mineral aggregate operations.

Comprehensive review: means
a) for the purposes of policies 1.1.3.8 and 1.3.2.2, an official plan review which is initiated by a planning authority, or an official plan amendment which is initiated or adopted by a planning authority, which:
   1. is based on a review of population and employment projections and which reflect projections and allocations by upper-tier municipalities and provincial plans, where applicable; considers alternative directions for growth or development; and determines how best to accommodate the development while protecting provincial interests;
   2. utilizes opportunities to accommodate projected growth or development through intensification and redevelopment; and considers physical constraints to accommodating the proposed development within existing settlement area boundaries;
   3. is integrated with planning for infrastructure and public service facilities, and considers financial viability over the life cycle of these assets;
   4. confirms sufficient water quality, quantity and assimilative capacity of receiving water are available to accommodate the proposed development;
   5. confirms that sewage and water services can be provided in accordance with policy 1.6.5; and
   6. considers cross-jurisdictional issues.

b) for the purposes of policy 1.1.5, means a review undertaken by a planning authority or comparable body which:
   1. addresses long-term population projections, infrastructure requirements and related matters;
   2. confirms that the land to be developed do not comprise specialty crop areas in accordance with policy 2.3.2; and
   3. considers cross-jurisdictional issues.

In undertaking a comprehensive review the level of detail of the assessment should correspond with the complexity and scale of the proposal.

Conservation: means
a) the recovery and recycling of manufactured materials derived from mineral aggregates (e.g. glass, porcelain, brick, concrete, asphalt, slag, etc.), for re-use in construction, manufacturing, industrial or maintenance projects as a substitute for new mineral aggregates; and
b) the wise use of mineral aggregates including utilization or extraction of on-site mineral aggregate resources prior to development occurring.

Conserved: means the identification, protection, use and/or management of cultural heritage and archaeological resources in a manner that ensures their cultural heritage value, or interest is retained under the Ontario Heritage Act. This may be achieved by the implementation of recommendations sent out in a conservation plan, archaeological assessment, and/or heritage impact assessment, which may include mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches.

Cultural heritage landscape: means a defined geographical area of heritage significance which may have been modified by human activities and is valued by a community, including Aboriginal communities. It involves a grouping of individual heritage features such as sites, structures, spaces, archaeological sites and natural elements, which together form a significant type of heritage form, distinctive from that of its constituent elements or parts. Examples may include, but are not limited to, heritage conservation districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act; other areas recognized by federal or international designation authorities (e.g. a National Historic Site or District designation, or a UNESCO World Heritage Site), and villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, main streets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways and industrial complexes of cultural heritage value.

Defined portions of the flooding hazard along connecting channels: means those areas which are critical to the conveyance of the flows associated with the one hundred year flood level along the St. Mary’s, St. Clair, Detroit, Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers, where development or site alteration will create flooding hazards, cause updrift and/or downdrift impacts and/or cause adverse environmental impacts.

Deposits of mineral aggregate resources: means an area of identified mineral aggregate resources, as delineated in Aggregate Resource Inventory Papers or comprehensive studies prepared using evaluation procedures established by the Province for surficial and bedrock resources, as amended from time to time, that has a sufficient quantity and quality to warrant present or future extraction.
Designated and available: means lands designated in the official plan for urban residential use. For municipalities where more detailed official plan policies (e.g. secondary plans) are required before development applications can be considered for approval, only lands that have commenced the more detailed planning process are considered to be designated and available for the purposes of this definition.

Designated growth areas: means lands within settlement areas designated in an official plan for growth over the long-term planning horizon provided in policy 1.1.2, but which have not yet been fully developed. Designated growth areas include lands which are designated and available for residential growth in accordance with policy 1.4.1(a), as well as lands required for employment and other uses.

Designated vulnerable area: means areas defined as vulnerable, in accordance with provincial standards, by virtue of their importance as a drinking water source.

Development: means the creation of a new lot, a change in land use, or the construction of buildings and structures requiring approval under the Planning Act, but does not include:

a) activities that create or maintain infrastructure authorized under an environmental assessment process;

b) works subject to the Drainage Act; or

c) for the purposes of policy 2.1.4(a), underground or surface mining of minerals or advanced exploration on mining lands in significant areas of mineral potential in Ontario SE, where advanced exploration has the same meaning as under the Mining Act. Instead, those matters shall be subject to policy 2.1.5(a).

Dynamic beach hazard: means areas of inherently unstable accumulations of shoreline sediments along the Great Lakes - St. Lawrence River System and large inland lakes, as identified by provincial standards, as amended from time to time. The dynamic beach hazard limit consists of the flooding hazard limit plus a dynamic beach allowance.

Ecological function: means the natural processes, products or services that living and non-living environments provide or perform within or between species, ecosystems and landscapes. These may include biological, physical and socio-economic interactions.

Employment area: means those areas designated in an official plan for clusters of business and economic activities including, but not limited to, manufacturing, warehousing, offices, and associated retail and ancillary facilities.

Endangered species: means a species that is listed or categorized as an “Endangered Species” on the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources official species at risk list, as updated and amended from time to time.

Erosion hazard: means the loss of land, due to human or natural processes, that poses a threat to life and property. The erosion hazard limit is determined using considerations that include the 100 year erosion rate (the average annual rate of recession extended over an one hundred year time span), an allowance for slope stability, and an erosion/erosion access allowance.

Essential emergency service: means services which would be impaired during an emergency as a result of flooding, the failure of floodproofing measures and/or protection works, and/or erosion.

Fish: means fish, which as defined in the Fisheries Act, includes fish, shellfish, crustaceans, and marine animals, at all stages of their life cycles.

Fish habitat: as defined in the Fisheries Act, means spawning grounds and nursery, rearing, food supply, and migration areas on which fish depend directly or indirectly in order to carry out their life processes.

Flood fringe: for river, stream and small inland lake systems, means the outer portion of the flood plain between the floodway and the flooding hazard limit. Depths and velocities of flooding are generally less severe in the flood fringe than those experienced in the floodway.

Flood plain: for river, stream and small inland lake systems, means the area, usually low lands adjoining a watercourse, which has been or may be subject to flooding hazards.

Floods hazard: means the inundation, under the conditions specified below, of areas adjacent to a shoreline or a river or stream system and not ordinarily covered by water:

a) Along the shorelines of the Great Lakes - St. Lawrence River System and large inland lakes, the flooding hazard limit is based on the one hundred year flood level plus an allowance for wave uprush and other water-related hazards;

b) Along river, stream and small inland lake systems, the flooding hazard limit is the greater of:

1. the flood resulting from the rainfall actually experienced during a major storm such as the Hurricane Hazel storm (1954) or the Timmins storm (1961), transposed over a specific watershed and combined with the local conditions, where evidence suggests that the storm event could have potentially occurred over watersheds in the general area;

2. the one hundred year flood; and

3. a flood which is greater than 1. or 2. which was actually experienced in a particular watershed or portion thereof as a result of ice jams and which has been approved as the standard for that specific area by the Minister of Natural Resources; except where the use of the one hundred year flood or the actually experienced event has been approved by the Minister of Natural Resources as the standard for a specific watershed (where the past history of flooding supports the lowering of the standard).

Floodproofing standard: means the combination of measures incorporated into the basic design and/or construction of buildings, structures, or properties to reduce or eliminate flooding hazards, wave uprush and other water-related hazards along the shorelines of the Great Lakes - St. Lawrence River System and large inland lakes.
System and large inland lakes, and flooding hazards along river, stream and small inland lake systems.

Floodway: For river, stream and small inland lake systems, means the portion of the flood plain where development and site alteration would cause a danger to public health and safety or property damage.

Where the one zone concept is applied, the floodway is the entire contiguous flood plain.

Where the two zone concept is applied, the floodway is the contiguous inner portion of the flood plain, representing that area required for the safe passage of flood flow and/or that area where flood depths and/or velocities are considered to be such that they pose a potential threat to life and/or property damage. Where the two zone concept applies, the outer portion of the flood plain is called the flood fringe.

Great Lakes - St. Lawrence River System: means the major water system consisting of Lakes Superior, Huron, St. Clair, Erie and Ontario and their connecting channels, and the St. Lawrence River within the boundaries of the Province of Ontario.

Green infrastructure: means natural and human-made elements that provide ecological and hydrological benefits. Green infrastructure can include components such as natural heritage features and systems, parklands, stormwater management systems, urban forests, permeable surfaces, and green roofs.

Ground water feature: refers to water-related features in the earth's subsurface, including recharge/discharge areas, water tables, aquifers and unsaturated zones that can be defined by surface and subsurface hydrogeologic investigations.

Habitat of endangered species and threatened species: means a) with respect to a species listed on the Species at Risk in Ontario List as an endangered or threatened species for which a regulation made under clause 55(1)(a) of the Endangered Species Act, 2007 is in force, the area prescribed by that regulation as the habitat of the species; or b) with respect to any other species listed on the Species at Risk in Ontario List as an endangered or threatened species, an area on which the species depends, directly or indirectly, to carry on its life processes, including life processes such as reproduction, rearing, hibernation, migration or feeding, as approved by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources; and c) places in the areas described in clause (a) or (b), whichever is applicable, that are used by members of the species as dens, nests, hibernacula or other residences.

Hazardous lands: means a) property or lands that could be unsafe for development due to naturally occurring processes. Along the shorelines of the Great Lakes - St. Lawrence River System, this means the land, including that covered by water, between the international boundary, where applicable, and the furthest landward limit of the flooding hazard, erosion hazard or dynamic beach hazard limits. Along the shorelines of large inland lakes, this means the land, including that covered by water, between a defined offshore distance or depth and the furthest landward limit of the flooding hazard, erosion hazard or dynamic beach hazard limits. Along river, stream and small inland lake systems, this means the land, including that covered by water, to the furthest landward limit of the flooding hazard or erosion hazard limits; and b) for the purposes of policies 3.1.1(d) and 3.1.8, areas assessed as being at high to extreme risk for wildland fire using evaluation procedures established by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, as amended from time to time.

Hazardous sites: means property or lands that could be unsafe for development and site alteration due to naturally occurring hazards. These may include unstable soils (sensitive marine clays [leda], organic soils) or unstable bedrock (karst topography).

Hazardous substances: means substances which, individually, or in combination with other substances, are normally considered to pose a danger to public health, safety and the environment. These substances generally include a wide array of materials that are toxic, ignitable, corrosive, reactive, radioactive or pathological.

Heritage attributes: means the principal features or elements that contribute to a protected heritage property's cultural heritage value or interest, and may include the property's built or manufactured elements, as well as natural landforms, vegetation, water features, and its visual setting (including significant views or vistas to or from a protected heritage property).

High quality: means primary and secondary sand and gravel resources and bedrock resources as defined in the Aggregate Resource Inventory Papers (ARIP).

Hydrologic function: means the functions of the hydrological cycle that include the occurrence, circulation, distribution and chemical and physical properties of water on the surface of the land, in the soil and underlying rocks, and in the atmosphere, and water's interaction with the environment including its relation to living things.

Individual on-site sewage services: means sewage systems, as defined in O. Reg. 350/04 under the Building Code Act, 1992, that are owned, operated and managed by the owner of the property upon which the system is located.

Individual on-site water services: means individual, autonomous water supply systems that are owned, operated and managed by the owner of the property upon which the system is located.

Infrastructure: means physical structures (facilities and corridors) that form the foundation for development. Infrastructure includes: sewage and water systems, septage treatment systems, stormwater management systems, waste management systems, electricity generation facilities, electricity transmission and distribution systems, communications/telecommunications, transit and transportation systems, etc.
Minerals: means metallic minerals and non-metallic minerals as herein defined, but does not include mineral aggregate resources or petroleum resources.

Metallic minerals means those minerals from which metals (e.g., copper, nickel, gold) are derived. Non-metallic minerals means those minerals that are of value for intrinsic properties of the minerals themselves and not as a source of metal. They are generally synonymous with industrial minerals (e.g., asbestos, graphite, limestone, mica, nepheline syenite, salt, talc, and wollastonite).

Mineral aggregate operation: means
a) lands under license or permit, other than for way-side pits and quarries, issued in accordance with the Aggregate Resources Act;
b) for lands not designated under the Aggregate Resources Act, established pits and quarries that are not in contravention of municipal zoning by-laws and including adjacent land under agreement with or owned by the operator, to permit continuation of the operation; and
c) associated facilities used in extraction, transport, benefication, processing or recycling of mineral aggregate resources and derived products such as asphalt and concrete, or the production of secondary related products.

Mineral aggregate resources: means gravel, sand, clay, earth, shale, stone, limestone, dolostone, sandstone, marble, granite, rock or other material prescribed under the Aggregate Resources Act suitable for construction, industrial, manufacturing and maintenance purposes but does not include metallic ores, asbestos, graphite, limestone, mica, nepheline syenite, salt, talc, wollastonite, mine tailings or other material prescribed under the Mining Act.

Mineral deposits: means areas of identified minerals that have sufficient quantity and quality based on specific geological evidence to warrant present or future extraction.

Mineral mining operation: means mining operations and associated facilities, or, past producing mines with remaining mineral development potential that have not been permanently rehabilitated to another use.

Minimum distance separation formulae: means formulae and guidelines developed by the Province, as amended from time to time, to separate uses so as to reduce incompatibility concerns about odour from livestock facilities.

Multi-modal transportation system: means a transportation system which may include several forms of transportation such as automobiles, walking, trucks, cycling, buses, rapid transit, rail (such as commuter and freight), air and marine.

Municipal sewage services: means a sewage works within the meaning of section 1 of the Ontario Water Resources Act that is owned or operated by a municipality.

Municipal water services: means a municipal drinking-water system within the meaning of section 2 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, 2002.
Natural heritage features and areas: means features and areas, including significant wetlands, significant coastal wetlands, fish habitat, significant woodlands south and east of the Canadian Shield, habitat of endangered species and threatened species, significant wildlife habitat, and significant areas of natural and scientific interest, which are important for their environmental and social values as a legacy of the natural landscapes of an area.

Natural heritage system: means a system made up of natural heritage features and areas, and linkages intended to provide connectivity (at the regional or site level) and support natural processes which are necessary to maintain biological and geological diversity, natural functions, viable populations of indigenous species and ecosystems. These systems can include: natural heritage features and areas; federal and provincial parks and conservation reserves, other natural heritage features, lands that have been restored or have the potential to be restored to a natural state, areas that support hydrologic functions, and working landscapes that enable ecological functions to continue. The Province has a recommended approach for identifying natural heritage systems, but municipal approaches that achieve or exceed the same objective may also be used.

Negative impacts: means

a) in regard to policy 1.6.5.4 and 1.6.5.5, degradation to the quality and quantity of water, sensitive surface water features and sensitive ground water features, and their related hydrologic functions, due to single, multiple or successive development. Negative impacts should be assessed through environmental studies including hydrogeological or water quality impact assessments, in accordance with provincial standards;

b) in regard to policy 2.2, degradation to the quality and quantity of water, sensitive surface water features and sensitive ground water features, and their related hydrologic functions, due to single, multiple or successive development or site alteration activities;

c) in regard to fish habitat, the harmful alteration, destruction or disruption of fish habitat, except where, in conjunction with the appropriate authorities, it has been authorized under the Fisheries Act, using the guiding principle of no net loss of productive capacity; and

d) in regard to fish habitat features and areas, degradation that threatens the health and integrity of the natural features or ecological functions for which an area is identified due to single, multiple or successive development or site alteration activities.

Normal farm practices: means a practice, as defined in the Farming and Food Production Protection Act, 1998, that is conducted in a manner consistent with proper and acceptable customs and standards as established and followed by similar agricultural operations under similar circumstances or makes use of innovative technology in a manner consistent with proper advanced farm management practices. Normal farm practices shall be consistent with the Nutrient Management Act, 2002 and regulations made under that Act.

Oil, gas and salt hazards: means any feature of a well or work as defined under the Oil, Gas and Salt Resources Act, or any related disturbance of the ground that has not been rehabilitated.

On-farm diversified uses: means small scale uses that are secondary to the principle use of the property and help support the farm. On-farm diversified uses include, but are not limited to, home occupations, home industries, agri-tourism uses, and uses that produce value-added agricultural products from the farm operation.

One hundred year flood: for river, stream and small inland lake systems, means that flood, based on an analysis of precipitation, snow melt, or a combination thereof, having a return period of 100 years on average, or having a 1% chance of occurring or being exceeded in any given year.

One hundred year flood level: means

a) for the shorelines of the Great Lakes, the peak instantaneous stillwater level, resulting from combinations of mean monthly lake levels and wind setups, which has a 1% chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year;

b) in the connecting channels (St. Marys, St. Clair, Detroit, Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers), the peak instantaneous stillwater level which has a 1% chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year; and

c) for large inland lakes, lake levels and wind setups that have a 1% chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year, except that, where sufficient water level records do not exist, the one hundred year flood level is based on the highest known water level and wind setups.

Other water-related hazards: means water-associated phenomena other than flooding hazards and wave uprush which act on shorelines. This includes, but is not limited to ship-generated waves, ice piling and ice jamming.

Partial services: means

a) municipal sewage services or private communal sewage services and individual on-site water services;

b) municipal water services or private communal water services and individual on-site sewage services.

Petroleum resource operations: means oil, gas and salt wells and associated facilities and other drilling operations, oil field fluid disposal wells and associated facilities, and wells and facilities for the underground storage of natural gas and other hydrocarbons.

Petroleum resources: means oil, gas, and salt (extracted by solution mining method) and formation water resources which have been identified through exploration and verified by preliminary drilling or other forms of investigation. This may include sites of former operations where resources are still present or former sites that may be converted to underground storage for natural gas or other hydrocarbons.

Planned corridors: means corridors or future corridors which are required to meet projected needs, and are identified through provincial plans, preferred alignment(s) determined through the Environmental Assessment Act, or identified through
planning studies where the Ontario Ministry of Transportation is actively pursuing the identification of a corridor. Approaches for the protection of planned corridors may be recommended in guidelines developed by the Province.

Portable asphalt plant: means a facility
a) with equipment designed to heat and dry aggregate and to mix aggregate with bituminous asphalt to produce asphalt paving material, and includes stockpiling and storage of bulk materials used in the process; and
b) which is not of permanent construction, but which is to be dismantled at the completion of the construction project.

Portable concrete plant: means a building or structure
a) with equipment designed to mix cementing materials, aggregate, water and admixtures to produce concrete, and includes stockpiling and storage of bulk materials used in the process; and
b) which is not of permanent construction, but which is designed to be dismantled at the completion of the construction project.

Prime agricultural area: means areas where prime agricultural lands predominate. This includes: areas of prime agricultural lands and associated Canada Land Inventory Class 4 to 7 soils; and additional areas where there is a local concentration of farms which exhibit characteristics of ongoing agriculture. Prime agricultural areas may be identified by the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs using guidelines developed by the Province as amended from time to time. A prime agricultural area may also be identified through an alternative agricultural land evaluation system approved by the Province.

Prime agricultural land: means land that includes specialty crop areas and/or Canada Land Inventory Classes 1, 2, and 3 soils, as amended from time to time, in this order of priority for protection.

Private communal sewage services: means a sewage works within the meaning of section 2 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, 2002 that serves six or more lots or private residences and is not owned by a municipality.

Private communal water services: means a non-municipal drinking-water system within the meaning of section 2 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, 2002 that serves six or more lots or private residences.

Protected heritage property: means property designated under Parts IV, V or VI of the Ontario Heritage Act; heritage conservation easement property under Parts VI or VIII of the Ontario Heritage Act; UNESCO World Heritage Sites; property identified by the Province and prescribed public bodies as provincial heritage property under the Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties; and property that is the subject of a covenant or agreement between the owner of a property and a conservation body or level of government, registered on title and executed with the primary purpose of preserving, conserving and maintaining a cultural heritage feature or resource, or preventing its destruction, demolition or loss.

Protection works standards: means the combination of non-structural or structural works and allowances for slope stability and flooding/erosion to reduce the damage caused by flooding hazards, erosion hazards and other water-related hazards, and to allow access for their maintenance and repair.

Provincial and federal requirements: means
a) in regard to policy 21.6, legislation and policies administered by the federal or provincial governments for the purpose of the protection of fish and fish habitat, and related, scientifically established standards such as water quality criteria for protecting lake trout populations; and
b) in regard to policy 21.7 legislation and policies administered by the provincial government or federal government, where applicable, for the purpose of protecting species at risk and their habitat.

Provincial plan: means a provincial plan within the meaning of section 1 of the Planning Act.

Public service facilities: means land, buildings and structures for the provision of programs and services provided or subsidized by a government or other body, such as social assistance, recreation, police and fire protection, health and educational programs, and cultural services. Public service facilities do not include infrastructure.

Quality and quantity of water: is measured by indicators associated with hydrologic function such as minimum base flow, depth to water table, aquifer pressure, oxygen levels, suspended solids, temperature, bacteria, nutrients and hazardous contaminants, and hydrologic regime.

Rail facilities: means rail corridors, rail sidings, train stations, inter-modal facilities, rail yards and associated uses, including designated lands for future rail facilities.

Recreation: means leisure time activity undertaken in built or natural settings for purposes of physical activity, health benefits, sport participation and skill development, personal enjoyment, positive social interaction and the achievement of human potential.

Redevelopment: means the creation of new units, uses or lots on previously developed land in existing communities, including brownfield sites.

Regional market area: refers to an area that has a high degree of social and economic interaction. The upper or single-tier municipality, or planning area, will normally serve as the regional market area. However, where the functional regional market area extends significantly beyond these boundaries, then the regional market area will be based on the larger market area. Where regional market areas are very large and sparsely populated, a smaller area, if defined in an official plan, may be utilized.

Renewable energy systems: means a system that generates electricity from an energy source that is renewed by natural
processes including, but not limited to, wind, water, biomass, biogas, solar energy and geothermal energy.

Reserve sewage system capacity: means design or planned capacity in a centralized waste water treatment facility which is not yet committed to existing or approved development. For the purposes of policy 1.6.5.6, reserve capacity for private communal sewage services and individual on-site sewage services is considered sufficient if the hauled sewage from the development can be treated or disposed of at sites approved under the Environmental Protection Act or the Ontario Water Resources Act, but not by land-applying untreated, hauled sewage.

Reserve water system capacity: means design or planned capacity in a centralized water treatment facility which is not yet committed to existing or approved development.

Residence surplus to a farming operation: means an existing habitable farm residence that is rendered surplus as a result of farm consolidation (the acquisition of additional farm parcels to be operated as one farm operation).

Residential intensification: means intensification of a property, site or area which results in a net increase in residential units or accommodation and includes:

a) redevelopment, including the redevelopment of brownfield sites;
b) the development of vacant or underutilized lots within previously developed areas;
c) infill development;
d) the conversion or expansion of existing industrial, commercial and institutional buildings for residential use; and
e) the conversion or expansion of existing residential buildings to create new residential units or accommodation, including accessory apartments, secondary suites and rooming houses.

River, stream and small inland lake systems: means all watercourses, rivers, streams, and small inland lakes or waterbodies that have a measurable or predictable response to a single runoff event.

Rural areas: means lands which are located outside settlement areas and which are outside prime agricultural areas.

Sensitive: in regard to surface water features and ground water features, means areas that are particularly susceptible to impacts from activities or events including, but not limited to, water withdrawals, and additions of pollutants.

Sensitive land uses: means buildings, amenity areas, or outdoor spaces where routine or normal activities occurring at reasonably expected times would experience one or more adverse effects from contaminant discharges generated by a nearby major facility. Sensitive land uses may be a part of the natural or built environment. Examples may include, but are not limited to: residences, day care centres, and educational and health facilities.

Settlement areas: means urban areas and rural settlement areas within municipalities (such as cities, towns, villages and hamlets) that are:

a) built up areas where development is concentrated and which have a mix of land uses; and
b) lands which have been designated in an official plan for development over the long-term planning horizon provided for in policy 1.1.2. In cases where land in designated growth areas is not available, the settlement area may be no larger than the area where development is concentrated.

Sewage and water services: includes municipal sewage services and municipal water services, private communal sewage services and private communal water services, individual on-site sewage services and individual on-site water services, and partial services.

Significant: means

a) in regard to wetlands, coastal wetlands and areas of natural and scientific interest, an area identified as provincially significant by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources using evaluation procedures established by the Province, as amended from time to time;
b) in regard to woodlands, an area which is ecologically important in terms of features such as species composition, age of trees and stand history; functionally important due to its contribution to the broader landscape because of its location, size or due to the amount of forest cover in the planning area; or economically important due to site quality, species composition, or past management history. These are to be identified using criteria established by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources.
c) in regard to other features and areas in policy 2.1, ecologically important in terms of features, functions, representation or amount, and contributing to the quality and diversity of an identifiable geographic area or natural heritage system;
d) in regard to mineral potential, an area identified as provincially significant through evaluation procedures developed by the Province, as amended from time to time, such as the Province’s Significant Mineral Potential Index; and

e) in regard to cultural heritage and archaeology, resources that are valued for the important contribution they make to our understanding of the history of a place, an event, or a people.

Criteria for determining significance for the resources identified in sections (c)-(e) are recommended by the Province, but municipal approaches that achieve or exceed the same objective may also be used.

While some significant resources may already be identified and inventoried by official sources, the significance of others can only be determined after evaluation.

Site alteration: means activities, such as grading, excavation and the placement of fill that would change the landform and natural vegetative characteristics of a site.

For the purposes of policy 2.1.4(A), site alteration does not include underground or surface mining of minerals or advanced
exploration on mining lands in significant areas of mineral potential in Ecoregion 58, where advanced exploration has the same meaning as in the Mining Act. Instead, those matters shall be subject to policy 2.1.5(a).

Special needs: means any housing, including dedicated facilities, in whole or in part, that is used by people who have specific needs beyond economic needs, including but not limited to, needs such as mobility requirements or support functions required for daily living. Examples of special needs housing may include, but are not limited to, housing for persons with disabilities such as physical, sensory or mental health disabilities, and housing for seniors with special needs.

Special Policy Area: means an area within a community that has historically existed in the flood plain and where site-specific policies, approved by both the Ministers of Natural Resources and Municipal Affairs and Housing, are intended to provide for the continued viability of existing uses (which are generally on a small scale) and address the significant social and economic hardships to the community that would result from strict adherence to provincial policies concerning development. The criteria and procedures for approval are established by the Province.

A Special Policy Area is not intended to allow for new or intensified development and site alteration, if a community has feasible opportunities for development outside the flood plain.

Specialty crop area: means areas designated using guidelines developed by the Province, as amended from time to time. In these areas, specialty crops are predominately grown such as tender fruits (peaches, cherries, plums), grapes, other fruit crops, vegetable crops, greenhouse crops, and crops from agriculturally developed organic soil, usually resulting from:

a) soils that have suitability to produce specialty crops, or
b) lands that are subject to special climatic conditions, or a combination of both;
c) farmers skilled in the production of specialty crops; and

d) a long-term investment of capital in areas such as crops, drainage, infrastructure and related facilities and services to produce, store, or process specialty crops.

Surface water feature: refers to water-related features on the earth's surface, including headwaters, rivers, stream channels, inland lakes, seepage areas, recharge/discharge areas, springs, wetlands, and associated riparian lands that can be defined by their soil moisture, soil type, vegetation or topographic characteristics.

Threatened species: means a species that is listed or categorized as a "Threatened Species" on the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources' official species at risk list, as updated and amended from time to time.

Transit-supportive: in regard to land use patterns, means development that makes transit viable and improves the quality of the experience of using transit. It often refers to compact, mixed-use development that has a high level of employment and residential densities. Approaches may be recommended in guidelines developed by the Province or based on municipal approaches that achieve the same objectives.

Transportation demand management: means a set of strategies that result in more efficient use of the transportation system by influencing travel behaviour by mode, time of day, frequency, trip length, regulation, route, or cost.

Transportation system: means a system consisting of facilities, corridors and rights-of-way for the movement of people and goods, and associated transportation facilities including transit stops and stations, sidewalks, cycle lanes, bus lanes, high occupancy vehicle lanes, rail facilities, parking facilities, park 'n' ride lots, service centres, rest stops, vehicle inspection stations, inter-modal facilities, harbours, airports, marine facilities, ferries, canals and associated facilities such as storage and maintenance.

Two zone concept: For river, stream and small inland lake systems, the floodway is the portion of the flood plain where development and site alteration would cause a danger to public health and safety or property damage. Where the two zone concept is applied, the floodway is the contiguous inner portion of the flood plain, representing that area required for the safe passage of flood flow and/or that area where flood depths and/or velocities are considered to be such that they pose a potential threat to life and/or property damage. Where the two zone concept applies, the outer portion of the flood plain is called the flood fringe.

Valleylands: means a natural area that occurs in a valley or other landform depression that has water flowing through or standing for some period of the year.

Valuatable: means surface and ground water that can be easily changed or impacted by virtue of their vicinity to activities or events or by permissive pathways between activities and the surface and/or ground water.

Waste management system: means sites and facilities to accommodate solid waste from one or more municipalities and includes recycling facilities, transfer stations, processing sites and disposal sites.

Watershed: means an area that is drained by a river and its tributaries.

Wave uprush: means the rush of water up onto a shoreline or structure following the breaking of a wave; the limit of wave uprush is the point of furthest landward rush of water onto the shoreline.

Wayside pits and quarries: means a temporary pit or quarry opened and used by or for a public authority solely for the purpose of a particular project or contract of road construction and not located on the road right-of-way.

Wetlands: means lands that are seasonally or permanently covered by shallow water, as well as lands where the water table is close to or at the surface. In either case the presence of abundant water has caused the formation of hydric soils and has
favoured the dominance of either hydrophytic plants or water tolerant plants. The four major types of wetlands are swamps, marshes, bogs and fens.

Periodically soaked or wet lands being used for agricultural purposes which no longer exhibit wetland characteristics are not considered to be wetlands for the purposes of this definition.

Wildland fire mitigation standards: means the combination of risk assessment tools and mitigation measures identified by the Province, as amended from time to time, to be incorporated into the design, construction and/or modification of buildings, structures, properties and/or communities to reduce the risk to public safety, infrastructure and property from wildland fires.

Wildlife habitat: means areas where plants, animals and other organisms live, and find adequate amounts of food, water, shelter and space needed to sustain their populations. Specific wildlife habitats of concern may include areas where species concentrate at a vulnerable point in their annual or life cycle; and areas which are important to migratory or non-migratory species.

Woodlands: means treed areas that provide environmental and economic benefits to both the private landowner and the general public, such as erosion prevention, hydrological and nutrient cycling, provision of clean air and the long-term storage of carbon, provision of wildlife habitat, outdoor recreational opportunities, and the sustainable harvest of a wide range of woodland products. Woodlands include treed areas, woodlots or forested areas and vary in their level of significance at the local, regional and provincial levels. Woodlands may be delineated according to the Forestry Act definition or the Province’s Ecological Land Classification system definition for “forest”.
Consultation Questions

This section contains specific consultation questions for your consideration and input.

For your convenience, this section of the discussion paper can be removed and used to mail or fax back your comments to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

Comments should be directed to:

Provincial Policy Statement Review
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Provincial Planning Policy Branch
777 Bay Street, 14th Floor
Toronto, ON M5G 2E5

Tel: 416-585-6014 or 1-877-711-8208
Fax: 416-585-6870
E-mail: PPSreview@ontario.ca
Website: ontario.ca/PPS

Please note: All comments and submissions received will become part of the public record.

You can also submit your comments electronically, by visiting ontario.ca/PPS.

The Province values your input and thanks you for your comments. Public input is essential to ensure we have a land use planning system that supports a strong Ontario.

Comments must be received no later than November 23, 2012.

Your Contact Information

______________________________
Name

______________________________
Organization

______________________________
Address

______________________________
Telephone  Fax

______________________________
E-mail Address
1. Do the draft policies provide sufficient direction to effectively protect provincial interests in land use planning? (See page 4.)
2. Are there additional land use planning matters that require provincial policy direction and which are not included?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
3. Do you foresee any implementation challenges with the draft policies?

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
4. Is additional support material needed to help implement the Provincial Policy Statement?
The Province also wants your views on the current 5-year review period for the Provincial Policy Statement, and whether you believe section 3 of the Planning Act should be amended to extend the period between reviews of the FPS.

5. Do you think that the legislated Provincial Policy Statement review cycle should be extended from the current 5-year period?
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: December 11, 2012

FILE CODE: D09-30/GTAW

SUBJECT: GREATER TORONTO AREA WEST CORRIDOR AND HIGHWAY 401 (HESPELER – HALTON) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo convey to the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) its' major concerns with the new highway alignment component of the Greater Toronto Area West Corridor Transportation Development Strategy, as described in Report. P-12-131, dated December 11, 2012;

THAT the MTO be requested to work toward a different highway alignment during Stage 2 of the GTA West Corridor Environmental Assessment that will provide additional capacity than available on Highway 401;

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo continue working with MTO and its municipal partners on advancing the Waterloo-Wellington-Brant inter-regional transportation study;

AND THAT Regional staff initiate further discussions between the Region, the MTO and the City of Cambridge to consider the acceleration of construction timing and cost sharing of pedestrian and cyclist provisions for the Franklin Boulevard interchange.

SUMMARY:

The Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) has completed and is now requesting comment on the Transportation Development Strategy for the GTA West Corridor, which has already been approved by the Minister of Transportation. The study will now proceed to the Stage 2 Environmental Assessment of the new highway components, which will take place over the next five or more years. Council has previously expressed support for the transportation system efficiency and public transit elements of the strategy. In particular, improvements to the existing GO Train service to Kitchener, and extension of GO Train service from Milton to Cambridge, are needed in the short term to provide an alternative mode of travel to the GTA. However, Council has also previously expressed concern about the short-term planning horizon and western terminus of new highway construction, which will end near Milton and leave the Region with a single 400-series highway connection to the GTA. MTO’s traffic projections show capacity constraints on Highway 401 beyond 2031, and the new highway would neither provide much-needed redundancy for Highway 401 nor leverage the Provincial investment in the new Highway 7 to Guelph.

MTO has also completed and is requesting comment on the preferred plan for improvements to Highway 401 between Hespeler Road and the Wellington County/Halton Region boundary. Although studied separately, this work is also a component of the GTA West Corridor Transportation Development Strategy. The Region has been generally supportive of the direction to protect for the future widening of the highway and provide high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes. The Region needs to continue working with MTO and the City of Cambridge to identify provisions for active transportation across the highway, and in particular needs to consider a cost-sharing arrangement that will accelerate construction of the Franklin Boulevard interchange.
In addition to the GTA West Corridor, there is a large number of current or proposed inter-regional initiatives of interest to the Region, such as the Niagara-GTA Corridor (ongoing), the Brantford–Cambridge Transportation Corridor (ongoing), the Big Move, and the Active Traffic Management Study (proposed). The Region continues to work with MTO, the Cities of Brantford and Guelph, and the Counties of Brant and Wellington, on the Waterloo/Wellington/Brant inter-regional transportation planning study. This is the best forum to examine a strategic transportation plan that incorporates all modes, particularly intercity passenger rail service, and also plan for long-term infrastructure needs. Data collection is almost complete and work can begin on the study itself, which is expected to be complete around spring 2015.

REPORT:

The Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) recently issued two notices regarding:

- Completion of the Transportation Development Strategy for the GTA West Corridor Environmental Assessment (EA)
- Completion of the Transportation Environmental Study Report (TESR) for the Highway 401 Improvements (Hespeler – Wellington County/Halton Region Boundary) Class EA

MTO is seeking public comment on both documents before the end of 2012.

GTA West Corridor Transportation Development Strategy

MTO has been undertaking an EA for the GTA West Corridor to accommodate increased transportation demand because of projected population and employment growth in Southern Ontario. MTO has completed the Transportation Development Strategy (Attachment 1) that involves:

1. Transportation system efficiency improvements
2. Expansions of public transit
3. Widening of selected highways, including Highway 401
4. A new corridor between Highway 400 north of Vaughan and Highway 401 east of Milton

The strategy has been approved by the Minister of Transportation. The Region supports many elements of the strategy, in particular the need for efficiency improvements and expansions to public transit service. The Region has also been supportive of protecting for the future widening of Highway 401, also discussed in this report and which forms part of item #3 noted above. However, with respect to the new corridor described as item #4, the Region has previously expressed concern that the study’s 2031 planning horizon is too short-term to properly identify the need for the new corridor. The proposed western terminus east of Milton will leave the Region with a single 400-series highway connecting to the GTHA, and MTO’s transportation analysis has shown that Highway 401 would be capacity-constrained by 2031.

Regional Council previously adopted the recommendations of Report P-12-089 (August 14, 2012), and a November 16, 2012 letter to the Regional Clerk (Attachment 2) contained responses by MTO as follows:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo advise the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) that the Draft Transportation Development Strategy for the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) West Corridor will not provide sufficient infrastructure for the long term to connect Waterloo Region, Wellington County and the City of Guelph to the Greater Toronto Area, as described in Report No. P-12-089, dated August 14, 2012; MTO noted a variety of current and future infrastructure projects for this area, including:

- GO Rail service expansion to Cambridge (GO 2020 Strategic Plan)
• Construction of the new Highway 7 (expected to start by 2015)
• Current widening of Highway 7/8 (Fischer-Hallman Road – Highway 8)
• Completed widening of Highway 8 to 8 lanes (Fairway Road – Sportsworld Drive)
• Widening of Highway 401 to 10 lanes (Highway 8 – Hespeler Road)
• New westbound freeway-to-freeway connection (Highway 401 to/from Highway 8)

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo support the Group 1 (Optimize Existing Networks) and Group 2 (New/Expanded Non-Road Infrastructure) elements of the Draft Transportation Development Strategy for the GTA West Corridor; MTO noted and appreciated the Region’s support of the Group 1 and 2 elements of the draft Strategy.

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo formally request MTO to confirm the Region of Waterloo’s participation in the forthcoming Provincial Active Traffic Management Study; MTO noted that it will consult with municipalities regarding participation in the study.

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo request MTO to defer its decision on the western portion of the final transportation network until the completion of the Waterloo-Wellington-Brant inter-regional transportation planning initiative; MTO noted that the Waterloo-Wellington-Brant inter-regional transportation planning initiative can be complementary to, and coordinated with, the transit and highway improvements identified in the GTA West Corridor Transportation Development Strategy.

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo request MTO to prioritise enhancement of the GO Rail service to Kitchener-Waterloo, and the extension of service to Cambridge, to reduce travel demand on Highway 401; MTO noted that the Waterloo/Wellington/Brant inter-regional transportation planning study can be coordinated with other recommendations in the Transportation Development Strategy. MTO also noted that it provides a good opportunity to discuss and address the issues raised by the Region such as enhancement of the GO Rail service to Kitchener-Waterloo and the extension of service to Cambridge.

THAT MTO be requested to provide a formal response to the concerns expressed by Region of Waterloo Council, as described in this report;

AND THAT this report be circulated to the Minister of Transportation, all area Members of Provincial Parliament, and to the City of Guelph and the County of Wellington.

Now that MTO has approved the Transportation Development Strategy, they will begin studying the new highway components in a detailed Stage 2 Environmental Assessment that will take place over the next five years or more. Given this long-term timeframe, it is critical for MTO to prioritize the other elements of the strategy, both because system efficiency measures may improve the safety and reliability of existing infrastructure, and because it takes time to build public transit ridership. Consequently, the Region recommends using the ongoing Waterloo-Wellington-Brant inter-regional transportation study to better understand travel patterns, identify the ability of transportation system efficiency improvements and public transit to serve these trips, and refine and prioritize any new highway construction. At the same time, the Region will continue to advocate for improvements/extensions to passenger rail service to Kitchener and Cambridge, and participate in other MTO initiatives, such as the proposed Active Traffic Management Study, and advocate on behalf of public transit expansions to serve Regional residents.

Highway 401 Improvements (Hespeler – Wellington County/Halton Region Boundary)

MTO has been conducting a Class EA to study improvements to Highway 401 between Hespeler Road and the Wellington County/Halton Region boundary. Council last examined this project in Report P-12-014 (January 31, 2012), at which time MTO had presented its preliminary preferred plan. Within the
Region of Waterloo, MTO is recommending the same preferred plan, which consists of the following changes:

**Mainline Highway 401:**
Widen to four general-purpose lanes in each direction (i.e. eight lanes total) and one high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane in each direction throughout the study area.

**Hespeler Road Interchange:**
Reconstruction of structure with a partial shift to the east, and other minor improvements.

**Franklin Boulevard Interchange:**
Replacement of structure at existing location, and other minor improvements.

**Townline Road Interchange:**
Minor improvements to existing interchange.

There is currently no funding identified for the widening of Highway 401 in MTO’s Southern Highways Program to 2015. Council previously issued the following recommendations about the preferred plan, with the following responses from MTO noted in the TESR document:

*THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the following with regard to Highway 401 (Hespeler Road to Halton), as described in Report No. P-12-014, dated January 31, 2012:*

a) **Endorse the protection of the Highway 401 corridor to accommodate eight lanes and two high-occupancy vehicle lanes, and the provision of sufficient width to accommodate these lanes when replacing all structures;** MTO noted this comment.

b) **Encourage the Province of Ontario to consider increased passenger rail service, including extension of GO Rail service along the Milton Line to Cambridge and enhanced GO Rail service along the Georgetown Line to Kitchener, prior to the physical widening of Highway 401;** MTO noted that GO Transit/Metrolinx is considering new/increased services to the Region.

c) **Continue to work with the Ontario Ministry of Transportation and the City of Cambridge to identify appropriate pedestrian and cyclist crossing provisions for the Hespeler Road and Franklin Boulevard interchanges, and develop cost sharing agreements to implement these measures as soon as possible;** MTO affirmed that it will continue to work with the City of Cambridge and the Region.

d) **Encourage the Ontario Ministry of Transportation to consider modifications to the Townline Road interchange and carpool lot to accommodate inter-regional bus operators.** MTO has noted that the current carpool lot is operating at or near capacity most of the time, and is proposing to expand the lot to accommodate the heavy park and ride demand. Reducing the number of new parking spaces to accommodate bus platforms would result in a failure to address the current capacity issues. Additionally, converting the interchange to provide more direct access to the carpool lot would make the geometry and traffic operations unacceptable to MTO.

Regarding reconstruction of the Franklin Boulevard interchange, the following points merit consideration:

1. The Franklin Boulevard interchange must be fully reconstructed to accommodate the proposed widening of Highway 401.
2. The draft Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP) is recommending pedestrian and cyclist provisions, in the form of boulevard multi-use trails, on both sides of Franklin Boulevard and across Highway 401.
3. The Highway 401 Pedestrian/Cyclist Bridge Feasibility Study, a joint Region of Waterloo/City of Cambridge study with MTO participation, recommended pedestrian and cyclist provisions be included in the Franklin Boulevard interchange if reconstruction proceeds by 2015.
4. If reconstruction does not occur by 2015, the study recommended a separate pedestrian and cyclist bridge be constructed adjacent to the Franklin Boulevard bridge.

5. MTO has proposed to fully close the interchange, with the exception of the eastbound off-ramp, and rebuild it during one construction season to minimize the disruption for drivers.

6. MTO has not identified reconstruction of the Franklin Boulevard interchange in the Southern Highways Program to 2015, but has previously stated that they are open to accelerating the reconstruction if cost sharing is available.

7. Coordination of the Franklin Boulevard interchange reconstruction with the Regional planned reconstruction of Franklin Boulevard south of Pinebush Road would assist to minimize the duration and number of disruptions for drivers and businesses in the area.

8. MTO has stated that any new walking and cycling facilities will need to be funded by the Region and/or the City of Cambridge.

Since the EA is nearing completion, this report consequently recommends that Regional staff coordinate with MTO and City of Cambridge staff to host a meeting in January 2013 to explore cost sharing arrangements and the acceleration of construction timing to coincide with the planned reconstruction of Franklin Boulevard.

The draft ATMP is also recommending pedestrian and cyclist provisions across the highway at the Hespeler Road interchange. MTO has noted difficulty in providing this crossing directly on the bridge, but has offered to continue working with the Region and the City of Cambridge to identify an appropriate crossing point. It is recommended that Regional staff continue working with MTO and City of Cambridge staff to identify appropriate active transportation provisions for the Hespeler Road bridge.

The Waterloo/Wellington/Brant Inter-Regional Transportation Study

The Region has been working with MTO, the Cities and Brantford and Guelph and the Counties of Brant and Wellington on an inter-regional transportation planning initiative. The purpose of the initiative is to study trip patterns in this area, recommend inter-regional infrastructure and network improvements, and complement the work done by Metrolinx in the GTHA. The initial data collection phase of the initiative, involving a post-secondary study survey, an origin-destination license plate survey, traffic classification counts and a commercial vehicle survey, is almost complete. The study is expected to be completed around spring 2015.

Attachment 3 shows the overlap and proximity of the study areas for the inter-regional transportation study, the GTA West Corridor and the Niagara-GTA Corridor. This highlights the need for inter-regional network planning and cooperation over a broad geographic area to determine long-term infrastructure that will benefit the Province.

Next Steps

For the GTA West Transportation Corridor Development Strategy, MTO has provided a 45-day review period and has stated that any changes will be implemented in the next phase of the EA, which is to start in late 2013.

For the Highway 401 (Hespeler – Halton) TESR, MTO has provided a 30-day review period, after which the EA will be complete. MTO would then enter into detailed design of the preliminary plan.

For the Waterloo/Wellington/Brant inter-regional transportation study, Regional staff will meet with staff from MTO, the Cities of Brantford and Guelph, and the Counties of Brant and Wellington, to draft the study Terms of Reference and determine cost sharing arrangements.
Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

The City of Cambridge supports the findings of this report and has participated in the Highway 401 EA.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This study is directly related to Strategic Objective 3.4 (Encourage improvements to intercity transportation services to and from Waterloo Region) and Action 3.4.2 (Actively participate in the Ministry of Transportation’s long-term strategic plan for South Central Ontario). Additionally, the inclusion of HOV lanes along Highway 401 and provision for active transportation at Highway 401 interchanges will help advance the following Strategic Plan objectives:

- 1.2: Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and work to improve air quality;
- 2.2: Develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs;
- 3.2: Develop, promote and integrate active forms of transportation (cycling and walking).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The GTA West Corridor has no identified financial implications at this time.

Regarding the Highway 401 (Hespeler – Halton) EA, MTO is open to discussing the acceleration of the Franklin Boulevard interchange reconstruction funding if cost sharing is available. MTO has provided preliminary cost estimates of integrating sidewalks on both sides of the Hespeler Road bridge, and an additional sidewalk on the west side of the Franklin Boulevard bridge, of $655,000 and $300,000, respectively. MTO has stated that any new walking and cycling facilities will need to be funded by the Region and/or the City of Cambridge. Funding for active transportation provisions across Highway 401 is not currently identified in the Region’s 10-year Transportation Capital Program. The draft ATMP has not accounted for funding of pedestrian and cycling improvements across the 401, however, the area has been identified as a special study area to investigate further. Staff recommend moving forward with cost sharing discussions because this is a key Regionally significant active transportation area. Any additional funding would be requested during the 2014 development of the Transportation Capital Budget.

The Region’s contribution to the Waterloo/Wellington/Brant inter-regional transportation planning study would be funded from the budget allocation for continuing work on the Regional Transportation Master Plan.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Transportation and Environmental Services and Finance have been consulted for this report.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1 – GTA West Corridor Transportation Development Strategy
Attachment 2 – November 16, 2012 Response Letter to Regional Clerk
Attachment 3 – Study Areas of Various MTO Projects

PREPARED BY: Geoffrey Keyworth, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
ATTACHMENT 1 – GTA WEST CORRIDOR TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY
November 16, 2012

Ms. Kris Fletcher
Regional Clerk
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 2nd Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3

Dear Ms. Fletcher:

RE: GTA West Corridor Planning and Environmental Assessment (EA) Study
Release of Final Transportation Development Strategy Report

The Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) initiated Stage 1 of a formal Environmental Assessment (EA) Study for the GTA West Corridor. The purpose of the study is to proactively plan for future infrastructure needs by examining long-term transportation problems and opportunities to the year 2031 and consider options to provide better movement of both people and goods between urban areas in the GTA West Corridor Preliminary Study Area, including designated Urban Growth Centres.

The MTO released the GTA West draft Transportation Development Strategy Report in March 2011. In response to input received on the draft Strategy, MTO carried out additional analysis and consultation to further examine the recommendations for inter-regional transportation improvements in the Halton area and update the Preliminary Route Planning Study Area throughout.

The Transportation Development Strategy Report has been finalized, following the additional analysis and consultation in the Halton area and study area revisions elsewhere. The report explains and documents the planning process followed in Stage 1 of the GTA West Planning and EA Study in developing the Transportation Development Strategy, including the assessment and evaluation of the area transportation system alternatives and a recommendation for the preferred alternative to be carried forward to Stage 2.

The final report, executive summary and appendices are now available on the study website (www.gta-west.com) and can also be reviewed at the attached list of local libraries and clerks offices beginning November 16, 2012. The report will be available for a 45 day public and stakeholder review period. We invite you to provide your feedback on the released Strategy report. All comments received during the review period will be documented as input to Stage Two of the EA.

Written comments can be provided on the project website at http://www.gta-west.com/comment-form.php or email to: project.team@gta-west.com.

The final Strategy report incorporates and reflects input from many individuals and stakeholders the Study Team has received since the release of the draft Strategy Report in March 2011 and the results of the additional analysis in the Halton area in June 2012.

We thank you for your input and participation in this study. In particular, we would like to thank you for forwarding providing Region of Waterloo’s staff report on August 14, 2012 regarding the GTA West Corridor Study.

We have noted and appreciate the Region’s support of the Group 1 and 2 elements of the draft Strategy. The finalized Strategy includes a recommendation for a multimodal area-wide study in the WaterlooWellington/Brampton area to explore potential for inter-regional transit service improvements west of the GTA. We believe that this study can be coordinated with the other recommendations in the Strategy, and will provide a good opportunity to discuss and address...
the issues raised by the Region such as enhancement of the GO Rail service to Kitchener-Waterloo and the extension of service to Cambridge.

With the completion of the Stage 1 EA, the MTO will move forward to implement various recommendations, including identifying the specific route for the new highway in the next Stage of the EA which is anticipated to begin in late 2013.

It would be appreciated if you could distribute this letter to the Waterloo Regional Council as an information item.

Should you require further information, please feel free to contact Mr. Jin Wang, MTO Project Coordinator at (416) 585-7246 or Mr. Neil Ahmed, P. Eng., Consultant Project Manager at (905) 823-6500.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

Mr. Jin Wang
Project Coordinator
Provincial Planning Office
Ontario Ministry of Transportation

Mr. Neil Ahmed, P. Eng.
Consultant Project Manager
McCormick Rankin, A Member of MMM Group Ltd.

cc: Geoff Keyworth, Region of Waterloo (via email)
    Paula Sawicki, Region of Waterloo (via email)
ATTACHMENT 3 – STUDY AREAS OF VARIOUS MTO PROJECTS

- GTA West Corridor Study Area
- Niagara-GTA Corridor Study Area
- Waterloo/Wellington/Brant Inter-Regional Transportation Planning Study Area

---
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To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

From: Blair Allen, Supervisor Transit Development

Subject: Grand River Transit Route 9 Lakeshore – Overcrowding Concerns

File No: D28-50 (A)

At the October 16, 2012 Planning and Works Committee, two Wilfrid Laurier students, Jameson Glosenk and Bhawneet Gulati, appeared as delegations and expressed concerns from students about overcrowded buses on the Route 9 LAKESHORE. Staff was directed to investigate and report back to Planning and Works Committee, the purpose of this memo.

Routes that serve the university campuses are monitored more closely at the start of the school year recognizing that student travel patterns change from year to year. Based on on-street monitoring, and customer and bus operator feedback, several adjustments were made to Route 9 LAKESHORE in September and October.

**Route 9 Fall 2012 Service Changes**

- A supplementary morning trip to the regular service was extended to start service at Glen Forrest and Cedarbrae rather than Parkside and Cedarbrae.
- A supplementary trip from Highpoint and Northfield to University of Waterloo was added in the morning peak.
- Four other trips on Route 9 were adjusted by 1 or 2 minutes to better distribute passenger volumes between regular and supplementary trips.

While the delegation acknowledged in a follow-up email that the completed fall changes made to date have “definitely helped”, they re-confirmed that overcrowding was still a concern during the evening period along the Hazel Street section of Route 9.

The analysis of the on-board automatic passenger counter (APC) data has identified a number of trips in the peak student travel time period in the evening and mid-day have been found to approach or exceed normal capacity. As a result, staff is planning to add more supplementary trips, as described below.

**Route 9 Planned Service Changes for Winter 2013**

Further adjustments to the Route 9 are to take effect on January 7, 2013 as part of the normally-planned schedule changes for the winter of 2013. These include:
• Added trips departing UW Davis via University Avenue, Wilfrid Laurier University, Hazel Street and terminating at the McCormick station at 8:00 p.m., 8:30 p.m., 9:00 p.m., and 9:30 p.m. Monday to Thursday only during fall-winter schedule
• Added trip departing UW Davis to McCormick at 12:30 p.m. during fall-winter schedule
• Added trip departing Hazel at Albert to UW Davis at 1:59 p.m. during fall-winter schedule
• Adjusted schedule times slightly on four trips during morning and midday time periods to better distribute passenger loads
• Removed trip departing Hazel at University to McCormick at 3:00 p.m.
  ▪ this trip was underutilized so removing it saves a bus that can more effectively be used elsewhere

These changes will require the use of approximately 312 hours of service and can be accommodated within the existing approved GRT budget. A small contingency of 500 hours is budgeted each year to be able to respond to unforeseen ridership demands that exceed service capacity.

Next Steps

The proposed 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan is under development and four public consultation centres were recently held, including at the University of Waterloo and at Wilfrid Laurier University. Along with other previous feedback and staff analysis, comments were received from students and staff at the universities concerning overcrowding on the Route 9 as well as other routes such as the Route 7, 8, 12, 13, 31 and 200 iXpress along the main corridors serving the universities. These issues are being taken into account as the 2013 service plan is refined and is ultimately considered by Regional Council.

Pending Regional Council approval of the 2013 Budget and 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan, new services could be implemented in September 2013. The proposed improvements would address the majority of overcrowded buses that have been noted above and discussed with other users.
To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

From: John Cicuttin, Manager Transit Development

Subject: Sportsworld Transit Terminal and Car-Pool Facility

File No: D28-20 (A)

The GRT Business Plan identified the Sportsworld Drive area where the Ministry of Transportation Ontario (MTO) is planning to construct a carpool lot as a good location where GRT and GO services could be integrated. In 2011, a project team of staff from the Region, the GO Division of Metrolinx (GO), the southwestern branch of MTO and consultants was established. The MTO are owners of the property and led the design study for a combined carpool parking lot and transit passenger facility. Please see the site design in Appendix A. MTO also issued the tender and selected the contractor to construct the facility. The facility will be available for GRT use starting in January 2013.

MTO is finalizing an agreement with GO for sharing the capital and operating costs of the facility. In turn, GO and the Region is finalizing a similar cost-sharing agreement for capital and ongoing maintenance costs.

The Sportsworld carpool/transit facility includes:

- 128 parking spots
- 4 bus bays designed to accommodate articulated buses (2 bays for GO and 2 bays for GRT)
- 2 large heated bus shelters (1 adjacent to the GO bays and 1 adjacent for GRT)
- Real-time variable message sign in the GRT shelter
- Bike racks
- Pedestrian lighting

The Sportsworld carpool/transit facility will be fully constructed by the end of this year. With the start of the winter schedule on January 7, 2013, Route 52 Coronation (northbound) and Route 72 Cherry Blossom will use the Sportsworld transit facility. The Route 52 Coronation (southbound) will use the existing stop on Sportsworld Crossing Drive directly across from the site. Route 52 Coronation travels along the King/Coronation corridor connecting the Ainslie Street transit terminal with the Fairview Park Mall transit terminal. Route 52 Coronation operates seven days a week, providing 15 minute peak service and 30 minute off peak service. Route 72 Cherry Blossom serves the Cambridge Business Park and operates weekday peak periods every 30 minutes. Integrating bus routes at this location will facilitate convenient passenger
transfers between GRT routes and between GRT and intercity bus services. The aBRT will serve the Sportsworld transit facility in fall of 2014.

GO and Greyhound buses will begin using the transit facility on January 4, 2013. The GO bus service travels between Waterloo Region and Mississauga with stops at University of Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier University, Charles Street Terminal, Sportsworld, Smartcentres Cambridge, Aberfoyle, and Milton. Two morning trips travel to the Milton GO train service. From the Sportsworld location, the GO bus service will provide approximately 19 trips on weekdays, 15 trips on Saturdays and 8 trips on Sundays in each direction.

The Greyhound service travels from Waterloo Region east to downtown Toronto and west to London.

The total capital costs for the Sportsworld carpool/transit facility is $1,120,800. The share to be funded by the Region is currently being finalized with Metrolinx and is not expected to exceed $365,000. There are funds in the approved GRT Capital Budget to fund this amount.

Regional staff will administer all maintenance for the facility, included, but not limited to, snow removal, garbage pick-up and cleaning of shelters. Metrolinx, the operators of GO Transit, will reimburse the Region for 50% of the maintenance costs associated with transit facilities (bus loop, platforms, shelter, waiting areas, waste receptacles, etc.) and will be responsible for all costs associated with the parking areas. The GRT share of the annual maintenance costs is estimated to be $7,500.

An agreement between Metrolinx and the Region is currently being finalized that outlines cost-sharing and the responsibilities of each party. The terms of the agreement will be to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor and the Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services. The Commissioner of Corporate Resources has the authority to execute the agreement on behalf of the Region pursuant to the Execution of Documents By-law Number 12-017.

In the future, MTO is planning to construct a new interchange at the current location of the Sportsworld carpool/transit facility. The new interchange is likely beyond a ten year horizon. In anticipation of the new interchange, there is the potential to relocate the Sportsworld carpool/transit facility to either the location of the interchange that is being replaced or integrated with the future stage 2 LRT station at Maple Grove Drive. In the event that the carpool/transit facility is to be relocated, bus shelters, benches, bus stop poles, real-time information display, bike racks and garbage receptacles would also be relocated to the new location.
MEMORANDUM

To:     Chair Jim Wideman and Members of Planning and Works Committee
From:   Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services
Subject: Re-appointment of Member to Lake Erie Source Protection Committee
File No: E06-70

The Lake Erie Source Protection Committee has been working to prepare a Source Protection Plan for the Grand River Watershed since October 2007. At that time Regional Council appointed Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner Transportation and Environmental Services as the Region’s and the area municipalities’ representative on the committee. The committee’s terms of reference required a representative be reappointed or a new representative appointed every five years. The Source Protection Plan is nearing completion and it is anticipated that the number of meetings will be reduced from monthly to twice a year after February 2013. It is recommended that Region Council reappoint Thomas Schmidt to the Source Protection Committee for the next five year period.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo re-appoint the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services as Waterloo Region’s member of the Lake Erie Source Protection Committee;

And that the Region of Waterloo forward this recommendation to Area Municipalities for their information.
Ms. Kathleen Barsoum  
Coordinator Waste & Transportation  
Region of Waterloo  
925 Erb Street West  
Waterloo ON N2J 3Z4  

Dear Ms. Barsoum:

I want to take this opportunity to convey my personal compliments to you and your municipality for receiving a Gold level 2012 Recycling Council of Ontario (RCO) Waste Minimization Award in the Municipal Diversion category.

Minimizing waste is a priority for our government, and we value the programs, events and activities that are created and administered by the RCO. I commend the RCO and its corporate partners for providing forums such as the Waste Minimization Awards ceremony to acknowledge the good work you have accomplished.

Your demonstrated leadership, innovation and commitment to minimizing waste in our workplaces, homes and communities are worthy of our recognition through the RCO Waste Minimization Award. The work you have undertaken helps our environment, and it also reminds us we have to do better – now and for the future.

In receiving a RCO Waste Minimization Award, you have distinguished yourself and the Region of Waterloo. Your dedication to environmental excellence will inspire others. You can take pride in your achievement, and I encourage you to continue to build upon your good work.

Congratulations, and please accept my personal thanks for your efforts on behalf of our environment.

Yours sincerely,

Jim Bradley  
Minister

Ms. Gail Beggs  
Deputy Minister
<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>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>
</tbody>
</table>
### COUNCIL ENQUIRIES AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

#### PLANNING AND WORKS COMMITTEE

<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-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>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>